# Brief Notes of Liaison Meeting between FSD and Authorized Persons

**Date** : 24 April 2013 (Wednesday)
**Time** : 1530 hours
**Venue** : Conference Room, Fire Safety Command, FSD

**Matters Discussed in the Meeting :**

1. ***Registered Fire Engineer (RFE) Scheme***

The consultant had submitted the final report of the Business Impact Assessment (BIA) Study to the Working Group on 31.12.2012. Taking into consideration the comments raised by members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) during the 4th PSC meeting held on 4.3.2013, the consultant had refined the final report and submitted it to the Working Group for scrutinize. To tie-in with the 2013-14 Budget Speech of reviewing the government fees and charges in accordance with the "user pays" principle, the consultant had re-assessed the potential impact of the new policy to the trade. According to the consultant's assessment, the difference between the fee levels of FSD and RFE would be reduced hence made the RFE scheme more competitive.

A meeting between the Working Group and representatives of HKIE Fire Division was held on 11.3.2013. During the meeting, the findings of the BIA Study, the proposed registration and disciplinary mechanism were presented to the HKIE representatives. While the HKIE representatives had supported the composition of the RFE registration committee, they had proposed to include member(s) of the public who did not have any official dealing with FSI contractors, RSC(V), RFE or FSD into the disciplinary panel for the purpose of enhancing the impartiality of the panel. Such proposal had been included in the draft DDI.

2. ***Protected Access Routes for Firemen***

Before the issue of MoA Code 2004, connection from fireman's lift to required staircase was required by FSD *(paragraph 7.6 of Part I of FSD*

*Circular Letter No. 4/96 referred).* Paragraph 13.4 of MoA Code 2004 stipulated that "every lobby to a fireman's lift should have access, without any obstruction and lockable door, to an exit route".

In most GBP submissions, the fireman's lift lobby was directly connected to a required staircase through a protected route. However, in case a protected access was not provided, firemen and rescuees might encounter problems due to lack of a reliable means of escape if situation so required. Furthermore, there would not be a protected route for firemen to secure water supply for firefighting from fire hydrant outlets at staircase. Since it was a MoA issue under the jurisdiction of BD, issuing of certificate (FS 161) was not affected. However, FSD would strongly recommend AP to consider amending the layout, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Appendix B to PNAP ADM-2.

FSD had already put forward the matter to the Technical Committee on Review of the CoP for Fire Safety in Buildings to resolve the issue.

3. ***Fire Hydrant Outlet and Hose Reel within 30m of Any Part of the Floor***

The revised FSI Code had taken effect on 1.4.2012 after thorough consultation with building professional bodies and relevant stakeholders. Amongst other changes, the revised code stipulated that sufficient fire hydrant outlets were required to ensure that every part of the building should be reached by a length of not more than 30 m of fire services hose. On the other hand, the original requirement for siting of fire hydrant outlets was that they should be prominently sited in an approach lobby to a staircase or in the staircase enclosure. Clause B11.3 of the CoP for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 stipulated the maximum travel distance of 45 m or 36 m to a required staircase, depending on whether balcony approach was provided. In case the travel distance to a required staircase exceeded 30 m, the requirements for coverage and siting of fire hydrant outlets might NOT be met simultaneously.

From firefighting point of view, fire hydrants outlets were required to be situated in an approach lobby to a staircase or in the staircase

enclosure. This ensured immediate location of fire hydrant outlets by firemen. Also, the hose line would serve as a guide for firemen retreat to the staircase in case of emergency.

As a pragmatic approach, FSD suggested to amend the 30 m requirement for fire hydrants. Instead, fire hydrants were to be provided at all required staircases only. However, the requirement of hose reel on each floor to reach every part of the floor by a length of not more than 30 m hose reel tubing remained unchanged. The amended requirement only applied to buildings adopting prescriptive MoE requirements. If the proposal was received favourably, FSD would issue a circular letter to this effect.

The proposal might imply provision of additional fire hydrant outlets for those buildings with two required staircases but had small floor span (i.e. the travel distance between the two required staircases was less than 30 m). However, during firefighting, it would avoid uncertainty and delay in locating the fire hydrants. Furthermore, no additional fire pump and extra water tank capacity were involved.

Should the proposal (including buildings with small floor span) be considered feasible and acceptable in general, AP representatives would be invited to further consult members of their respective building professional bodies and provide comments/inputs from the industry at the next meeting.

4. ***Enquiry on Co-existence of Restaurants with Schools/Child Care Centres(CCC)/Residential Care Homes for the Elderly(RCHE) /Residential Care Homes for the Persons with Disabilities(RCHD)***

Whilst the co-existence of certain premises, i.e. godown, theatre, cinema and other premises with school/CCC/RCHE/RCHD had been restricted by the relevant legislations, in processing application for restaurant licence referred by the Licensing Authority, viz. Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD), FSD must be satisfied that the school/CCC/RCHE/RCHD were not exposed to any undue risk of fire due to the co-existence with the restaurant. The whole issue of fire safety would be critically examined by FSD to see whether there was any fire safety problem arising from the co-existence. All

contributing factors including business nature of the restaurant, type of fuel used, fire service installations installed/to be installed, any infringement of Dangerous Goods Ordinance/Regulations, fire hazard in the vicinity of either establishment, Buildings Department's comment on adequate means of escape, proper separation between their co-existence, etc. should be considered. Consideration should also be given to any remedial measures/provisions which might be taken to overcome the problem and each case would be only examined taking into account of the prevailing situation. For enquiry about co-existence of premises, applicants were encouraged to contact our respective Regional Offices/Policy Division for advice.

Co-existence of premises had been publicized in the "Guide to Application for Restaurant Licences" (Guide) issued by the FEHD under the topics of "Important Advice: DOs and DON'Ts" and "Main Consideration" that in general, the following premises were considered not suitable to be licensed as restaurants:

- Industrial portion of any buildings;
- Premises at or below basement level four;
- Premises in areas designated for emergency use, such as the 'buffer" floor and the refuge floor; and
- Premises located vertically below, therefore posing a fire hazard to, a registered school, CCC or RCHE/RCHD.

The Guide could be downloaded from FEHD's website. According to the Guide, applicants were advised to ensure operating food business at their shop premises was in compliance with the requirements imposed under the legislation administered by the FEHD and other government departments as well as the relevant authorities.

END