

## Summary of Items Discussed in 5/2021 APSEC Discussion Forum on 12 November 2021

	Items proposed by Convenors for Discussion	Summary of Discussion and BD's Response
	<b>Items raised by HKIA</b>	
1.	<p><b><u>AC Platform combined with Balcony/Utility Platform (UP)</u></b></p> <p>Paragraph (h)(i) of Appendix B of the Code of Practice on Access for External Maintenance 2021 (AfEM Code) stipulates that the area of each AC platform should be not more than 0.8m<sup>2</sup> for exclusion of the AC platform from GFA calculation. Considering the variable sizes of AC outdoor units of different brands, as well as the respective capacity required to serve flat units of different sizes, it may sometimes be more practicable/viable to exclude the perimeter screens (as protective barriers) provided at the edge of the platform from the aforesaid 0.8m<sup>2</sup> platform area. Under such circumstances, the area of such screens is to be incorporated and included as an integral part of the corresponding Balcony/Utility Platform area.</p> <p>We understand that the above arrangement has been considered acceptable and please confirm our understanding is correct.</p>	<p>BD advised that HKIA's understanding was correct provided that the proposed concession area of the balcony/UP after deducting the 0.8m<sup>2</sup> of A/C platform met the criteria under JPN Nos. 1 and 2.</p>
2.	<p><b><u>Screen/ Guiderail to AC Platform</u></b></p> <p>Paragraph 2(a) of Appendix C of the AfEM Code mentions that the maximum projection of AC platform may be up to 900mm <i>disregarding the thickness of the protective barrier/guard-rail/screen including its</i></p>	<p>BD advised that according to Appendix C of AfEM Code, the maximum projection of AC platform might be up to 900mm. Screen might be provided at a platform provided that they were of maximum 50mm</p>

	<p><i>supporting structural members</i>. Paragraph 5 of the same Appendix also mentions that the screen/guardrail including its <i>supporting structural members</i> may be excluded from the measurement of the maximum projection of the AC platform.</p> <p>Based on the above and the respective sectional diagram in Figure C1 of the AfEM Code, it should be acceptable that the thickness of the supporting structural members of the screen is in addition to the 900mm projection of the platform as well as the 50mm thick screen, so far as the thickness of such supporting structural members is reasonable to serve the intended function. We recall that the above understanding has been discussed at the previous meeting of the Technical Committee on Code of Practice on Design for Safety – External Maintenance, please advise if our interpretation is correct.</p>	<p>thick. Such screen including its supporting structural members might be excluded from the measurement of the maximum projection of the AC platform. Members were encouraged to provide further details regarding the size of screen for further deliberation in the Technical Committee on the Code of Practice on Design for Safety – External Maintenance.</p>
3.	<p><b><u>Protective Barriers – PNAP APP-110</u></b></p> <p>Footnote 3 of the recently issued PNAP APP-110 stipulates that if the railing type barrier just has vertical balustrades without the bottom rail, the curb should be not less than 250mm high with protruding width less than 75mm.</p> <p>We would like to know the rationale behind the increase of the required height of the curb from 150mm to 250mm minimum instead.</p>	<p>BD would review the matter and provide responses in due course.</p>

<p>4.</p>	<p><b><u>Building Setback Requirement for A&amp;A works in Existing Buildings</u></b></p> <p>For an existing building abutting onto a street which does not fulfill the 15m-building setback requirement as stipulated under paragraph 7(a) of PNAP APP-152, if A&amp;A works are to be carried out at the roof of an existing building for which an occupation permit is required (such as an additional storey, as per BD’s circular letter dated 29 July 2013 on Application for Approval of Building Plans – Proof of Ownership of Land), please advise if the building setback requirement is not applicable to this case.</p>	<p>BD advised that for A&amp;A proposals resulting in new building(s) and entailing GFA concessions, the 10% overall cap on GFA concession and the Sustainable Building Design (SBD) Guidelines (viz. Building Separation, Building Setback and Site Coverage of Greenery - the 3 key elements) promulgated in PNAP APP-151 and APP-152 would apply.</p> <p>There are special circumstances in which genuine difficulties in complying with the SBD guidelines might be encountered. Paragraph 12 of PNAP APP-152 had already stipulated that BA took a flexible and pragmatic stance when considering applicant's proposals holistically to achieve the objectives of the SBD guidelines. Recognising the constraints of A&amp;A works, a pragmatic approach would be taken with the objective to encourage the improvement to the existing built environment. Deficiency in one key element might be compensated by other enhancement measures. Appendix E to PNAP APP-152 had provided general guidelines on the adoption of alternative design proposals and applications for exemption or modification of the building separation, building setback and site coverage of greenery requirements. Each application would be considered on its case merits.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b><u>EVA Passing Through a Building</u></b></p> <p>Please confirm that the covered portion of the EVA passing through the underside of a building to gain access to the major façade of a building is</p>	<p>BD advised that in general, the covered area of the EVA was GFA accountable under regulation 23(3)(a) of the Building (Planning)</p>

	<p>not GFA accountable.</p>	<p>Regulations (B(P)R). For EVA of genuine design satisfying the requirement of regulation 41D of the B(P)R and locally passing through the underside of a building, having regard to the required use of the EVA, BD would pragmatically consider excluding the covered portion from GFA calculation under regulation 23(3)(b) of the B(P)R on its case merits, provided that majority of the EVA was open in design and abuse was unlikely.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b><u>Fireman’s Lift Provision</u></b></p> <p>Referring to Table D1 “Number of Access Staircases, Fireman’s Lift and Firefighting and Rescue Stairways Required” in Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 (FS Code), it is our understanding that the determination of Fireman’s Lift provision for the basement of a building shall follow the criteria as set down in “item (8) All basements” in Table D1, instead of following the classification of the building aboveground.</p> <p>For example, for a domestic building exceeding 2 storeys and 30m in height above mean street level of the lowest street with 1 level of basement carpark, no Fireman’s Lift is required to be provided for the basement level as referring to “item (8) All basements” in Table D1.</p> <p>Please clarify if our understanding is correct.</p>	<p>BD advised that the number of access staircases, fireman’s lift and firefighting and rescue stairways in a building should be provided in accordance with Table D1 of FS Code in respect of the requirements stipulated therein including use classifications, basement, number of storeys, building height, etc. In respect of fireman's lift, attention should also be drawn to other relevant requirements in the FS Code including Subsection D8 – Floors served by a fireman's lift of Section 4 – Fireman's Lift.</p> <p>For the scenario in the quoted example, the provision of fireman’s lift for such basement was not required if the basement did not fall into the criteria in Item (8)(a) &amp; (b) under Table D1 and that other requirements for fireman's lift in the FS Code were complied with.</p>

<p>7.</p>	<p><b><u>Installation of A/C Units at the Soffit of Balcony/ UP</u></b></p> <p>Referring to item 19 of ADF 4/2021 held on 13 August 2021, we would like to clarify that A/C units can still be installed at the soffit of balcony/ UP, provided that the A/C units are installed in a less congested manner, where adequate M&amp;R working space could be maintained in accordance with the AfEM Code.</p>	<p>BD clarified that with the coming into operation of the Building (Construction) Regulation (B(C)R) on 1 February 2021, sections 27(2), 28(5), 31(3) and 34(3) of the B(C)R required the provision of adequate means of access for maintenance and repair of external building elements of a building with consent to the commencement of foundation works granted after such effective date. Compliance with the provisions of the AfEM Code would be deemed to satisfy these statutory requirements. The A/C platforms including the associated working space and access should therefore be designed in accordance with Appendices B and C to the AfEM Code. A/C units installed at the soffit of balcony/utility platform could not fulfil the requirements in Appendices B and C to the AfEM Code.</p> <p>BD also reminded about the labour safety concerns of working at height during maintenance and repair of external building elements.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p><b><u>Imposed Surcharge Loads for Buried Structures</u></b></p> <p>Further to item 7 of ADF 4/2021 held on 13 August 2021, it was clarified that for the design of buried structures under the public or private road with EVA provision, the surcharge live load (on top and side) of the buried structures (e.g. tunnel, box culvert) shall follow Clause 3.9.1 &amp; Clause 3.3.3 instead of Class 6D given in Clause 3.3 of the Code of Practice for Dead and Imposed Loads 2011.</p>	<p>BD clarified that the imposed loads on vehicular traffic and parking area with EVA provision should in general follow Class 6D given in Clause 3.3 of the Code of Practice for Dead and Imposed Loads 2011. The load dispersal to the buried structures should be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p>

	<p>In light of the above understanding, if OP has been granted to the project, it is our understanding that AP/RSE can submit an A&amp;A submission to BD to amend the loading assumption and clarify the setting out of the EVA without physical works.</p> <p>Please advise if the above understanding is correct.</p>	<p>Regarding the issue of A&amp;A submission without physical works, BD would review the matter and provide responses in due course.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p><b><u>Hoarding/ Covered Walkway</u></b></p> <p>Para. 2 of PNAP APP-102 stipulates that a properly built and maintained hoarding/covered walkway is always required to protect the public near building sites for superstructure works.</p> <p>Para. 3 of the said PNAP further requires that additional protection with precautionary measures is required except under the following conditions in Para. 4(a) or (b):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Para 4(a) – a building under 30 metres in height, or</li> <li>•Para 4(b) – a building set back from site boundary such that an inclined projection plane from the top outer edge of building at 10 degree from the vertical does not go beyond the site boundary at ground level.</li> </ul> <p>For the additional protection, it refers to:</p> <p>(a) Erection of suitable hoardings, covered walkways and gantry and</p>	<p>BD advised that pursuant to regulation 64 of the B(P)R, every building owner who intended to erect, alter, or demolish any building should erect hoardings, covered walkways AND gantries. Paragraph 2 of PNAP APP-102 reiterated that a properly built and maintained hoarding/covered walkway was always required to protect the public near building sites. For sites where superstructure works were being carried out, provisions of hoardings, covered walkways and gantries were required.</p> <p>According to paragraph 3 of PNAP APP-102, in order to further enhance the precautionary measures for the carrying out of superstructure works, catch platform should be provided in addition to the provision of hoardings, covered walkways and gantries during the erection of structural frame of a building. Besides, protective screen on façade of a building should also be provided. Such additional preventive measures were not required if the works satisfied the conditions under</p>

	<p>catch platform.; and</p> <p>(b) A screen consisting of two layers of netting provided on the building façade.</p> <p>We understand that both hoarding and hoarding with a covered walkway can satisfy the requirements of Para 2 of PNAP APP 102, and a covered walkway is only mandatory as additional protection when both the conditions of Para. 4(a) and 4(b) do not apply.</p> <p>Would BD please clarify if our understanding is correct or not?</p>	<p>paragraph 4 of PNAP APP-102.</p> <p>As PNAP APP-102 had not been updated for a long time, BD would consider reviewing the PNAP if necessary.</p>
<b>Items raised by HKIE</b>		
10.	<p><b><u>Hoarding Plan Submission</u></b></p> <p>To facilitate a smooth development program, it is suggested BD to simplify the acceptance procedures of hoarding plans and encourage the reuse of materials by standardization of concrete plinths, bolts/nuts, standard steel members or aluminium sections and etc.</p>	<p>To facilitate the development progress, BD had implemented streamlined procedures to facilitate the processing of hoarding permit application under PNAP APP-23. For cases meeting the streamlined processing criteria set out in paragraph 18 of PNAP APP-23, the BA would complete the processing of hoarding permit application within 30 days. Besides, minor amendments to hoardings/covered walkways might be carried out without prior agreement of the BA if the criteria set out in paragraph 25 of PNAP APP-23 were met.</p> <p>BD advised that standard hoarding/covered walkway details had been given in Appendix B of PNAP APP-21 to facilitate hoarding plan submission and encourage reuse of materials. The proposals of green</p>

		<p>hoarding using bolts/nuts and concrete plinths were also tabled for discussions in the meeting for Technical Committee on the Code of Practice for Demolition of Buildings held on 6 December 2021. The Technical Committee would review these standard details and supplement the Code/PNAP if necessary.</p>
11.	<p><b><u>Interpretation of Major Revision and Amendment</u></b></p> <p>Would BD please provide more guidelines on the definition of “Major Revision/Amendment” for Superstructure submission.</p>	<p>BD advised that the submissions had to be considered on case basis and welcomed early consultation with BD before submissions. The following are some typical examples of major revision for superstructure amendment submission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Superstructure amendment arising from major revision of the corresponding GBP involving substantial changes of building and/or floor layout;</li> <li>2. Change in the construction type of the superstructure, e.g. from RC to structural steel;</li> <li>3. Change in the structural stability system, e.g. from core walls to beam-column frames, use of new and/or major transfer structures etc.;</li> <li>4. Inclusions of new and/or major structures, e.g. additional storeys, other miscellaneous structures such as precast façade etc.;</li> <li>5. Uses of non-conventional construction methods and materials.</li> </ol> <p>The examples were non-exhaustive.</p>




<b>Items raised by AAP</b>	
<p>12.</p>	<p><b><u>Double leaf Exit Door</u></b></p> <p>According to Clause B13.4 of FS Code, no leaf of a double leaf door should be less than 600mm in width. For office tenant area provided with a double leaf exit door, is it acceptable if the width of one of the door leaves be less than 600mm provided such door leaf is normally closed and not used while the width of the other door leaf can comply with the requirements of a single leaf door in terms of both means of escape (MOE) and barrier free access (BFA)?</p> <p>BD advised that similar discussion on the acceptance of double leaf door at residential flats with the smaller leaf less than 600mm wide was made in item 15 of ADF 3/2015 held on 29 May 2015. Following the same principle, BD confirmed that double leaf exit door at office tenant area with smaller door leaf less than 600mm wide was acceptable as long as the smaller door leaf was not used for daily opening but for the transportation of large furniture in rare occasions and the width of the other door leaf complied with the requirement of a single leaf door, and same also applied for institutional buildings as long as other relevant requirements such as BFA were fulfilled.</p>
<p>13.</p>	<p><b><u>Escape through Kitchen</u></b></p> <p>With reference to Clause B11.5 of FS Code, it is understood that such clause does not apply to areas or rooms of a flat from which escape is directed through living/dining room or kitchen of the flat. As such, please confirm if the MOE provision of a maid room in the kitchen, similar to the plan below, is acceptable.</p> <p>BD advised that AAP's understanding was correct.</p>

	<p>The floor plan shows a residential unit with the following layout: A central living area (LIV.) and dining area (DIN.) are connected to a lobby. To the right are two bedrooms (B.R.2 and B.R.4). A staircase with 'UP' and 'DN' directions is located near a lift (LIFT 3). Another lift (LIFT 2) is located near a hallway (H.R.) and a meter room. The kitchen (KIT.) is located below the living area, with a utility room and a toilet (T.) below it. A maid room is located at the bottom of the unit.</p>	
14.	<p><b><u>Ventilation Requirement for Open Kitchen under Performance-based Approach</u></b></p> <p>According to Para. 4.1(c) of Appendix A of PNAP APP-130, 5 air changes per hour (ACH) mechanical ventilation is required for a room used as</p>	<p>BD advised that paragraph 4.1 of Appendix A to PNAP APP-130 referred to a room used for habitation or as a kitchen on the performance</p>


<p>kitchen. We understand that the same requirement also applies to an open kitchen with a notional area of, say, 1.5m x 1.5m only, rather than the total of both the open kitchen area and the adjoining living/ dining area, where the open kitchen is located. Please confirm if our understanding is correct.</p>	<p>standard of ventilation. It was not referring to open kitchen design.</p> <p>As per item 2 of ADF 3/2012 held on 18 May 2012, open kitchen should be located in a position where most of the open kitchen area could face the concerned prescribed window(s) of the room for the required natural lighting and ventilation. In calculating the openable window area provision for a living/ habitable room incorporated with open kitchen, the requirements stipulated in regulation 30(2)(a)(ii) of the B(P)R might be adopted instead of regulation 36(2)(b) of the B(P)R.</p> <p>As for the requirement of 5 ACH mechanical ventilation, BD would review the requirement in case of open kitchen design.</p> <p><b>[Post-meeting note:</b></p> <p>BD advised that for a domestic flat provided with an open kitchen, BD might consider to accept the alternative performance standards stipulated in paragraph 1 of PNAP APP-130 for the purpose of regulations 30, 31 and 32 of the B(P)R and the performance standards were deemed to be met by adopting the simplified assessment method stipulated in Appendix A to PNAP APP-130.</p> <p>In this connection, the notional area of the open kitchen should be defined and the cooking slab and sink should be indicated on the building plans. BD would favourably consider the application of the notional area of the open kitchen in the calculation of mechanical ventilation as required in paragraph 4.1(c) of Appendix A to PNAP</p>
---	--

		APP-130 if the effectiveness of mechanical ventilation for the open kitchen could be demonstrated including removal of pollutants generated from the source, i.e. a normal cooking process.]
15.	<p><b><u>Smoke Outlets</u></b></p> <p>Clause C14.2 of FS Code regarding smoke outlets states that:  “Every basement that is enclosed on four sides should be provided with smoke outlets, which should:</p> <p>...</p> <p>(g) be covered by stall-boards or pavement light that can be easily broken by firefighters in an emergency; and</p> <p>(h) be maintained unobstructed or covered only with a grill or louvres constructed of metal other than aluminium where they are terminating in the open air in a position inaccessible to a firefighter.”</p> <p>We opine that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Other than stall-boards, tiles / thin granite panels (of about 12mm thick) that can be easily broken by firefighters, are acceptable to cover the smoke outlets;</li> <li>2. If covered by grills or louvres, demonstration of the free areas is not necessary.</li> </ol> <p>Please advise if our interpretation is correct.</p>	BD confirmed that AAP’s interpretation was correct. For (1), the AP should ensure smoke outlets covered by such materials could be easily broken by firefighters.

<b>Items raised by ACEHK</b>	
<p>16. <b><u>Building (Minor Works) Regulation (B(MW)R) – Height of Construction</u></b></p> <p>Section 37(4) of the B(MW)R (see <b>Annex ACEHK01</b>) states <i>Class I minor works that satisfy the following criteria are specified for the purpose of subsection (1)(a) –</i></p> <p><i>(a) the height of the construction does not exceed 10m.</i></p> <p>Would BD please clarify whether the height of construction should refer to the parent structure or the new structure? For example, as shown in <b>Annex ACEHK01</b>, if a 3m high flag pole (H1) is to be installed at the roof top of a building with overall height taller than 10m (H2), is the design of the flag pole under Class I minor works only required AP rather than RSE’s endorsement as in accordance with section 37(1)(a)(i) of the B(MW)R?</p> <div style="text-align: center;">         Annex        ACEHK01.pdf     </div>	<p>BD advised that for the interpretation of section 37(4)(a) of the B(MW)R, BD took the height of the minor works concerned be the height of the construction, i.e. the height of the pole in this case. Regulation 12(4) of the Building (Administration) Regulations also referred.</p> <p>Apart from the consideration on the height of the construction, criteria under section 37(4)(b) to (e) of the B(MW)R should also be met for the purposes of section 37(1)(a) of the B(MW)R.</p>
<p>17. <b><u>Consent Condition for Submission of Structural Plan</u></b></p> <p>We came across couple cases that BS stated in the GBP approval letter that structural plan is required to be submitted as a consent condition. Then, RSE made structural submission to BD with structural plans and structural appraisal report. However, BD’s SE commented that structural submission</p>	<p>BD replied that this is an isolated case on communication issue and the matter would be followed up separately.</p>

	<p>was not required in such case and required RSE to withdraw the said submission.</p> <p>Would BD please clarify when such requirement would be imposed in the GBP approval? Is it a joint decision made by both BS and SE or is it a standard clause that worth reviewing on its necessity?</p>	
<p><b>Items raised by PBSCA</b></p>		
<p>18.</p>	<p><b><u>Addition of Slab over Void for Escalator in Shopping Arcades</u></b></p> <p>Shopping arcades will undergo different A&amp;A works from time to time. Some A&amp;A works would involve addition of slab over void which was previously installed with escalator at the time of OP.</p> <p>It is noted that such addition of slab will result in change of UFA which may not have great impact to the provision of sanitary fitments.</p> <p>In this regard, can the A&amp;A submission be excluded from consideration on the provision of sanitary fitments? If not, can the original approved design approach by combining UFA of several floors for calculating the required provision be followed, and also not requiring the existing accessible toilets be upgraded to the current design requirements under the Design Manual – Barrier Free Access 2008?</p>	<p>BD advised that the UFA of the existing building should be updated according to the proposed A&amp;A works and the corresponding provision of sanitary fitments should comply with regulation 7A(1) of the Building (Standards of Sanitary Fitments, Plumbing, Drainage Works and Latrines) Regulations.</p> <p>The design approach by combing UFA of several floors to determine provision required was applicable provided that area of the floors concerned were related to a shopping arcade.</p> <p>In general cases, accessible toilet affected by the proposed A&amp;A works should comply with the current design requirements under the Design Manual – Barrier Free Access 2008.</p>

19.	<p><b><u>Acknowledgement of Form BA14 for A&amp;A Works</u></b></p> <p>In recent cases, the issuance of acknowledgement for Form BA 14 usually required several months, could BD look into the matters and smooth out the process?</p>	<p>BD advised that as per item 20 of ADF 3/2016 held on 27 May 2016, BD had been monitoring regularly and reminding staff on processing submissions of Form BA14 in a timely manner.</p> <p>To facilitate processing of Forms BA14, BD reminded that APs/RSEs should submit full set of required documentations as most of the outstanding acknowledgements involved information/documents outstanding from AP/RSE/RC.</p>
<b>AOB items</b>		
20.	<p><b><u>Exits at Ground Storey - Opening to the Passage Leading from the Required Staircase to Its Ground Storey Discharge Point</u></b> (Item raised by BD)</p> <p>Clause B9.1 of FS Code stipulated "<i>the enclosing walls of every required staircase should be so continued at ground storey as to separate from the remainder of the building any passage or corridor leading from the required staircase to its ground storey discharge point. Every opening from the ground storey to such passage or corridor should be separated from it by a protected lobby</i>" subject to certain provisions.</p> <p>With regard to the required separation of such passage or corridor leading from the required staircase to its ground storey discharge point for residential buildings, BD would remind of the following:</p>	<p>Members noted and would observe the requirement accordingly.</p>

	<p>(a) to prevent any possible abuse, such protected lobby should be designed as a common area and an integral part of the required staircase so that it could not be readily incorporated as part of any adjacent accommodation;</p> <p>(b) door giving access to such protected lobby should be provided with a transparent upper view panel; and</p> <p>(c) for such passage or corridor also served as an access to a fireman's lift at ground storey, the requirements under Clause D7.3 should be complied with.</p>	
21.	<p><b><u>Calculation of GFA Concession for Car Park Associated Run-in/out and Driveway at Ground Level</u></b>          (Item raised by BD)</p> <p>Paragraph 10 of Appendix C to PNAP APP-2 stated that for cases where run-in/out or driveway at ground level serve loading and unloading areas at ground level or underground but also serve car parking spaces aboveground entitling only 50% GFA concessions, the percentage of GFA concessions of such run-in/out or driveway areas will be calculated on a pro-rata apportionment basis. Further to item 14 of ADF 2/2021 held on 19 March 2021, guidelines for calculation of the subject GFA concession is attached for members' reference:</p> <p>          Guidelines of GFA          Concession for Dri</p>	<p>BD advised that the guidelines served to provide the principle of the calculation on pro-rata basis and would be incorporated into PNAP APP-2 in due course.</p>



22.

**Registration of Letters of Undertaking**

(Item raised by BD)

Land Registry (LR) recently appealed to BD that some Undertaking Letters lodged by land owners are not acceptable for registration in the LR. Common problems are listed as follows:

- (a) undertaking letter which does not qualified as an instrument affecting land or interest in land under the Land Registration Ordinance (Cap. 128), e.g. undertake to register undertaking letter before submission of OP;
- (b) the word “confirm” is used instead of the key word of “undertake” ; and
- (c) information for registration does not involve any undertaking(s), e.g. financial report for the operation of RRF without undertaking letter.

In gist, Undertaking Letters should contain undertaking(s) given by the registered owner to the BA and the operative word “undertake” should be used. Samples of the Undertaking Letters are given below, members are advised to drawn owners’ attention about the format of Undertaking Letters:



Samples of Undertaking Lette

Members of HKIA shared that they experienced difficulties in registering some undertaking letters in LR submitted by developers/owners in support of the application for exemption. Members of REDA and AAP also suggested exploring the possibility of submission of one undertaking letter for various exemption items in a single application.

In response, BD requested members to provide the concerned undertaking letters with difficulties in LR registration for further discussion with LR. Regarding the submission of one undertaking letter for various exemption items in a single application, it is generally acceptable if the content and the context are relevant. .

23	<p><b><u>Provision and Size of Refuse Storage and Material Recovery Room (RS&amp;MRR) and Refuse Storage and Material Recovery Chamber (RS&amp;MRC)</u></b> (Item raised by BD)</p> <p>Building (Refuse Storage and Material Recovery Chambers and Refuse Chutes) Regulations set out minimum statutory requirements of RS&amp;MRR and RS&amp;MRC. To encourage the reduction of waste at source and to promote wider adoption of waste separation, recovery and recycling of reusable materials to enhance a sustainable environment, where provision of such facilities with genuine need achieves standards beyond the above statutory requirements, BD may favourably consider disregarding such facilities from GFA calculation under B(P)R 23(3)(b) subject to the merits of and justifications provided for each case.</p>	<p>Noting that BEAM Plus 2.0 was currently applied to all newly registered development projects, BD advised that provision of RS&amp;MRR and RS&amp;MRC with reference to the guidelines under BEAM Plus would be accepted for consideration of disregarding such from GFA calculation.</p>
24.	<p><b><u>Streamlining of Structural Submission of Secondary Building Elements</u></b> (Item raised by BD)</p> <p>As discussed in the Joint BSC &amp; APSEC meeting 4/21 held on 10 September 2021, some BSC &amp; APSEC member suggested that streamlined arrangement for structural submissions of curtain wall should also be considered. BD advised that upon implementation of the facilitation measure promulgated under PNAP ADV-33 in June 2021, a review on its effectiveness would be conducted with a view to considering the extension of the scope to cover other types of secondary building elements including</p>	<p>Members of HKIE would liaise with the sub-consultants of curtain wall to work out some sample drawings for BD's consideration.</p> <p>BD advised that the streamlining measures would be extended to cover 2 to 3 more types of secondary building elements in sequence proposed by members and a working group would be formed in due course.</p>

	<p>curtain wall. BD appealed to practitioner’s support in formulating the streamlined arrangement for submissions concerning secondary building elements including seeking feedback from sub-consultants for curtain wall.</p> <p>To follow up with the above discussion, apart from curtain wall, BD seeks members’ views on any other suitable types of secondary building elements including window/window wall, precast façade, canopy, signboard, architectural feature, drainage structural details, etc. for consideration for inclusion in the streamlining exercise.</p>	<p>Members welcomed BD’s initiative and would provide suggestions for BD’s further consideration.</p>
25.	<p><b><u>100 mm/150 mm Concrete Cubes</u></b> (Item raised by BD)</p> <p>RSEs are reminded that the prescriptive requirement of 150 mm concrete cube stipulated in regulation 58(1) of the repealed Building (Construction) Regulations (B(C)R) has been removed in the new B(C)R implemented since 1.2.2021. According to clause 10.3.4.2 of the Code of Practice for Structural Use of Concrete 2013, both 150 mm and 100 mm concrete cubes are acceptable.</p>	<p>Members noted and would observe the requirement accordingly.</p>
26.	<p><b><u>Streamlining Measures for 1<sup>st</sup> Approval of GBP</u></b> (Item raised by BD)</p> <p>BD has from time to time explored measures to facilitate early approval of building plans, in particular the first approval of GBPs as it is one of the milestones in the development process. Based on the existing curtailed</p>	<p>Members shared that the first approval of GBP was crucial for onward progress of the building development and welcomed BD’s proposed measures. For special and complicated cases, BD encouraged</p>

<p>check system on fundamental issues, BD is reviewing the feasibility of categorisation of essential information to be provided in the GBPs for approval / approved GBPs according to the three critical milestone stages of a development project, viz. for obtaining first GBP approval, for applying first superstructure consent, and for applying occupation permit.</p> <p>Details of the streamline measures will be circulated in BSC &amp; APSEC paper for members' comments once available.</p>	<p>practitioners to discuss such cases with the district chief officers to clarify or resolve any problems at early stage.</p> <p>In response to members' enquiries on GEO's comments on BD's referred submissions, BD advised that similar issue had been raised in item 11 of ADF 3/2021 held on 21 May 2021 and GEO had advised that the established procedures in handling the BD's referred submission remained effective.</p>
--	---