

## **Brief Notes of Liaison Meeting between FSD and Authorized Persons**

**Date** : 24 August 2016 (Wednesday)  
**Time** : 1500 hours  
**Venue** : Conference Room, Fire Safety Command, FSD

### **Matters Discussed in the Meeting :**

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

Since Legislative Council could not process the Bill before its prorogation on 16.7.2016 as a result of filibustering, the Bill was eventually lapsed. Nevertheless, FSD was in joint effort with Security Bureau in planning ahead the re-introduction of the proposed legislation to the Legislative Council in the Legislative Year 2016/17.

#### **2. FSI Requirements for Buildings with Lifts Serving Direct to Occupancy**

A reply for the subject proposal was recently received from the EMSD after consultation with the lift trade. In gist, there was no objection to override all car calls to prevent lift passengers unknowingly disembark on the scene of fire on upper floor and at the same time initiate the home landing operation. However, for fire signal at the home landing [i.e. operation sequence (c) in the draft paper], the trade opined that it would be difficult to redirect the lift to non-designated floors. Furthermore, there was no lift manufacturer that could provide such function at present.

As the original intent of the subject proposal was to avoid the potential hazard of those lifts NOT opening to a lobby, the scenario of redirecting the lift car away from home landing should be regarded as an added safety feature. Noting that the home landing floor (usually ground floor) being a location leading directly to a place of safety and the technical infeasibility, the additional proposed feature to redirect away from home landing would not be further pursued.

FSD would revise the proposal and circulate to the EMSD for further comment.

3. **Stop Valve Management System for Fire Hydrant /Hose Reel System**

The draft FSD Circular Letter was under the deliberation of the FSD management. The relevant circular letter would be issued forthwith.

4. **Alteration to Windows in Existing Industrial Buildings**

Difficulties in fire-fighting were encountered in the recent Amoycan Mini-storage Fire as a result of the blocked window openings, amongst other circumstances. In general, smoke and heat could be vented through the windows and fire-fighters could direct jets through the window openings, or even gain external access from an aerial ladder into the building for internal fire-fighting and rescue. For fire safety reason, FSD had advised the mini-storage trade to remove any obstruction and provide sufficient window openings. In this connection, members' attention was drawn to the fire safety concern of blocking window openings in case of A&A works at industrial buildings. Notwithstanding that there was no specific requirement in the building regulation or code to mandate the extent of window openings in industrial buildings, the FSD had expressed the same concern to the Buildings Department.

5. **Enquiries from HKIA**

Member asked whether the address shown on Form (FS172) should be confirmed by BD before submitting to FSD. Since BD normally would not provide confirmation on the address for this purpose, he asked if there would be any agreed principle on determining the official address used in FS172.

If the address used in FS172 was not the same as the one listed in FS161 and the previous building plan submissions, a letter from Rating and Valuation Department (RVD) or the correspondence with BD would then be required for confirming the new address to be the finalized official address. It was also stated that under normal circumstances, it would not be allowed to further revise the address on

FS172 once issued.

APs should assure the information accuracy in all building plan submissions, as it would be difficult for the Government to set up a mechanism for verifying different versions of address regarding the same building.

Member raised another enquiry regarding the submission of as-built drawings with FSI/314 as mentioned in the FSD Circular Letter No. 1/2015. Since it was no longer required to submit as-built drawings of smoke control systems when applying for compliance inspection with FSI/314, he concerned if there would be any liability issues aroused to APs as the design drawings submitted before FSI/314 were prepared by RPEs.

The drawings regarding the smoke control systems should be submitted and approved before applying for initial compliance inspection with FSI/501, and if further changes were needed, revised drawings should be submitted for approval again before compliance inspection as well.

Whenever a change would result in affecting smoke control performance, revised drawings should be submitted to reflect these major changes.

As changes in the design drawings of smoke control systems might affect the entire calculation and would affect the smoke control performance ultimately, APs/RPEs were advised to submit revised drawings if any component in the systems had been modified. APs were also reminded that parallel applications with FSI/501 and FSI/314 would be undesirable and should be avoided as far as practicable.

END