

Automated Facility Enumeration for Building Compliance Checking using Door Detection and Large Language Models

Licheng Zhang^{1a}, Bach Le^a, Naveed Akhtar^a, and Tuan Ngo^a

^aThe University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria 3010, Australia. Email:

licheng.zhang@student.unimelb.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Building compliance checking (BCC) is a critical process for ensuring that constructed facilities meet regulatory standards. A core component of BCC is the accurate enumeration of facility types and their spatial distribution. Despite its importance, this problem has been largely overlooked in the literature, posing a significant challenge for BCC and leaving a critical gap in existing workflows. Performing this task manually is time-consuming and labor-intensive. Recent advances in large language models (LLMs) offer new opportunities to enhance automation by combining visual recognition with reasoning capabilities. In this paper, we introduce a new task for BCC: automated facility enumeration, which involves validating the quantity of each facility type against statutory requirements. To address it, we propose a novel method that integrates door detection with LLM-based reasoning. We are the first to apply LLMs to this task and further enhance their performance through a Chain-of-Thought (CoT) pipeline. Our approach generalizes well across diverse datasets and facility types. Experiments on both real-world and synthetic floor plan data demonstrate the effectiveness and robustness of our method.

PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

This work demonstrates the potential of LLMs to achieve accurate and generalizable automated facility enumeration. By leveraging LLMs' capability to interpret design layouts and reason

¹Corresponding author.

over facility placements, the proposed method enables automatic verification of sanitary facilities, kitchens, laundries, exits, fire safety equipment, accessibility provisions, and parking with minimal human intervention. It supports practitioners by accelerating design validation, reducing manual inspection efforts, and enhancing the accuracy of facility enumeration across diverse building projects.

AUTHOR KEYWORDS

Building compliance checking; Facility enumeration; Door detection; Large language models; Chain-of-Thought reasoning.

INTRODUCTION

Building compliance checking (BCC) has emerged as a critical area of research in the architecture, engineering, and construction (AEC) domain due to its direct implications for safety, functionality, and sustainability in the built environment. In Australia, compliance is governed by the National Construction Code (NCC) ([Australian Building Codes Board 2022](#)), the nation's primary regulatory framework developed by the Australian Building Codes Board and enforced through state and territory legislation. The NCC specifies minimum standards for building design and construction to ensure safety, health, amenity, accessibility, and environmental performance. Organized into three volumes, it covers a wide range of building classes, including residential, commercial, industrial, educational, and public facilities. Compliance with the NCC is mandatory, making it an indispensable reference for regulating facility provision and distribution. A core component of BCC under the NCC is facility enumeration, which calls for a systematic verification that sanitary facilities, kitchens, laundries, exits, fire safety equipment, accessibility features, and parking provisions etc. meet statutory requirements.

Traditionally, building compliance has been verified through manual checking ([Zhang et al. 2022](#); [Villaschi et al. 2022](#)), a process that is both time-consuming and labor-intensive. Automated solutions, such as object detection ([Jocher et al. 2023](#)), have been investigated to alleviate this burden ([Zaidi et al. 2024](#)). However, its effectiveness remains limited due to poor generalization, as

visual objects vary considerably across datasets, architectural conventions, and domains, leading to inconsistent performance when applied outside the training distribution (Wu et al. 2022).

Recent advances in Large Language Models (LLMs) (Hurst et al. 2024; OpenAI 2025b) open new opportunities for automating BCC. Unlike traditional vision-only approaches, LLMs integrate multimodal reasoning by combining visual understanding with textual interpretation (Dong et al. 2025). Trained on massive and diverse datasets, they possess the ability to generalize across regulatory contexts, interpret complex building requirements, and jointly reason over images and text. These capabilities hold strong potential for more intelligent and scalable compliance checking workflows, reducing manual workload while improving accuracy, robustness, and adaptability (Chen et al. 2025). Although still at an early stage, LLM-based approaches show promise as intelligent assistants for the AEC industry, with the potential to significantly transform compliance verification practices (Katooziani et al. 2025).

Within this context, CAD floor plan drawings represent an ideal medium for BCC. As visual abstractions of architectural layouts, CAD drawings are widely available, easily interpretable, and more lightweight than structured alternatives such as building information modeling (BIM). Their visual clarity makes them particularly suitable for automated analysis of regulatory adherence.

Leveraging the above facts, this work introduces a new task of *automated facility enumeration* from CAD floor plan images, which serves as a critical step toward scalable and accurate BCC under the NCC. This task goes beyond merely detecting facilities, requiring verification of their quantity, spatial distribution, and compliance with regulatory standards. It is a high-impact and non-trivial problem in intelligent compliance automation, ensuring that all essential facilities, such as sanitary fixtures, kitchens, laundries, exits, fire safety equipment, accessibility features, and parking, are correctly provided, distributed, and configured to meet safety and regulatory requirements. Errors in facility enumeration can lead to serious safety and legal risks. For instance, a missing exit door or fire extinguisher can invalidate a design and delay project approval, while overestimating the number of emergency exits or fire extinguishers may also create safety hazards, such as improper evacuation planning or misallocation of resources. Regulatory agencies mandate strict compliance,

and even a single miscount may be unacceptable. Beyond safety, accurate facility enumeration is critical for downstream BCC tasks such as occupant load analysis, fire evacuation modeling, and accessibility audits, and it can be integrated with BIM or digital twin workflows to support end-to-end automated compliance. From an economic and sustainability perspective, automating facility enumeration reduces costly rework, shortens design cycles, and minimizes resource waste caused by late-stage design changes.

At the same time, the task poses significant technical and research challenges. Floor plans are inherently ambiguous, as facility symbols can vary due to differing architectural standards, regional practices, and design styles, and may be partially occluded or overlap with other elements. Facility enumeration involves more than simply counting symbols: some facilities are shared across multiple dwellings, while others depend on occupant load or functional use requiring careful contextual reasoning to ensure accurate compliance verification. This task requires reasoning over both spatial context and regulatory rules. Furthermore, it spans multiple scales, from local features such as doors and sanitary fixtures to global facilities such as site-wide car parking. Each facility type presents heterogeneous representation challenges, rendering the task inherently multi-domain and multi-class. Critically, automated facility enumeration is a zero-tolerance task: overestimating or underestimating even a single instance constitutes non-compliance, distinguishing it from conventional counting or detection problems.

Given these challenges, we propose an approach that leverages the combined visual and textual reasoning capabilities of LLMs, augmented with an intermediate step of door detection. The pipeline begins by detecting door symbols, which are relatively consistent across floor plan drawings and generalize well across domains. Detected doors serve as anchor points for the LLM to perform facility enumeration. Doors are selected for three main reasons: (1) unlike rooms, which vary widely in shape, size, and spatial configuration, doors exhibit stable symbolic representations across drawings, enabling reliable cross-domain detection; (2) they allow the LLM to focus on local regions around each door rather than analyzing the entire image, simplifying reasoning and improving predictive accuracy; and (3) highlighted doors provide reference points for identifying

additional instances of the same facility type, such as emergency exits, where visually similar doors can be considered valid instances.

Viewed more broadly, automated facility enumeration can be framed as a multi-modal reasoning benchmark for compliance-critical verification, encompassing the symbol, room, and building levels, together with rule-based validation against NCC standards. Its zero-tolerance requirement across diverse building types makes it uniquely challenging and positions it as a meaningful and non-trivial problem in intelligent, scalable BCC.

Furthermore, motivated by the growing evidence that LLMs achieve superior performance on reasoning-intensive tasks when supported by Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting (Kojima et al. 2022; Wei et al. 2022), we propose a CoT-based strategy tailored to facility enumeration. This design leverages intermediate reasoning steps to enhance interpretability and accuracy, positioning our approach as a principled framework for advancing automated BCC.

In summary, the contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We introduce a novel task of automated facility enumeration from CAD floor plan images, representing a key step toward scalable automation in BCC.
- We propose a new approach that combines door detection with the capabilities of LLMs, incorporating Chain-of-Thought reasoning to perform accurate and generalizable facility enumeration.
- We conduct comprehensive experiments across diverse compliance scenarios to validate the effectiveness, robustness, and generalizability of our method.

BACKGROUND

Under the NCC (Australian Building Codes Board 2022), buildings in Australia are categorised into nine classes according to their primary use and occupancy type. **Class 1:** single residential dwellings, **Class 2:** apartments, **Class 3:** hotels, motels, and boarding houses, **Class 4:** dwelling within another building (e.g., caretaker’s residence), **Class 5:** office buildings, **Class 6:** shops and retail premises, **Class 7:** carparks and storage buildings, **Class 8:** factories and laboratories, and

Class 9: public buildings such as schools, hospitals, and assembly spaces.

To ensure compliance with the NCC, it is essential to enumerate building facilities accurately. The requirements vary by facility type across the different building classes, as summarised below.

Sanitary facilities. For residential classes (Class 1–4), each dwelling or unit must include at least one toilet, wash basin, and shower or bath. In Class 3 facilities (e.g., hotels), one set of sanitary facilities must be provided for every ten residents without private amenities. For Class 5–9 buildings (offices, shops, factories, public buildings), the number of toilets and wash basins is determined by occupant load. In all non-residential classes, at least one accessible unisex sanitary facility per floor is required.

Kitchens. Dwellings (Class 1, 2, 4) must have a functional kitchen. Class 3 facilities require kitchens or kitchenettes for long-term accommodation, while short-term stays may provide shared facilities. For Class 5–9 buildings, kitchens are not always mandatory; they are required only where building use demands them (e.g., staff facilities in offices and factories, canteens in schools, hospital kitchens). Carparks (Class 7) do not require kitchens.

Laundries. Residential classes (Class 1, 2, 4) require either an in-unit laundry or access to a shared laundry. Class 3 buildings must provide shared laundry facilities for residents. Laundries are not generally required in Class 5–9 buildings, except where the specific use demands them (e.g., hospitals or aged care in Class 9).

Exits and egress. Class 1 dwellings require at least one exit, whereas all other classes (Class 2–9) generally require a minimum of two exits per floor. Multi-storey buildings must include staircases, and ramps are required wherever accessibility is needed.

Fire and safety equipment. Smoke alarms are mandatory in all habitable rooms across residential classes (Class 1–4) and in most spaces for Class 5–9 buildings. Non-residential buildings also require fire extinguishers, hose reels, and in many cases sprinklers, with specifications tied to occupant load and assessed risk.

Accessibility. Each floor of Class 2–9 buildings must provide at least one accessible entrance and one accessible facility to ensure compliance with accessibility standards. Residential Class 1

dwellings are exempt from common-area accessibility requirements but must comply with smoke alarm provisions.

Parking. Class 1 and Class 2 dwellings are required to provide at least one car parking space per dwelling. Additionally, in any building class where parking is provided, at least one accessible parking space must be provided for every fifty standard parking spaces. These requirements represent the minimum mandatory provisions to ensure adequate parking and accessibility.

These requirements establish the regulatory framework for facility enumeration in compliance checking, underscoring the need for automated, scalable methods capable of handling diverse facility types across building classes.

RELATED WORK

Owing to our contribution in automation for BCC using LLMs ([Hettiarachchi et al. 2025](#); [Chen and Bao 2025](#); [Saluz et al. 2025](#); [Adil et al. 2025](#)), we contextualize our work by focusing on the existing strategies to integrate LLMs with reasoning, prompting, BIM, and vision-language capabilities to improve automated compliance checking.

LLMs with Knowledge Representation and Reasoning

Several studies have focused on combining LLMs with structure knowledge representations to enhance reasoning. For instance, [Fuchs et al. \(2024\)](#) explored using LLMs to translate complex building regulations into a computable LegalRuleML format, enabling more efficient and automated compliance checking through formalized rule representation. Along the same lines, [Li et al. \(2024\)](#) developed an intelligent compliance checking method that combined knowledge graphs and LLMs to automatically parse and evaluate construction schemes with enhanced accuracy. Moreover, [Al-Turki et al. \(2024\)](#) introduced a human-in-the-loop framework using GPT-4o ([Hurst et al. 2024](#)) and active learning to automate RASE tagging of building regulations, which improved the accuracy of structured compliance data generation by combining few-shot learning, fine-tuning, and expert feedback. [Hettiarachchi et al. \(2025\)](#) further contributed by developing a dataset of annotated building regulation sentences designed to facilitate machine-readable rule generation, enabling LLMs to perform entity recognition and relation extraction more effectively in the AEC domain.

Prompting, RAG, and Autonomous Agents

Beyond knowledge representation, other studies have emphasized prompting, retrieval-augmented generation (RAG), and autonomous agent design for leveraging LLMs in AEC. For example, [Liu et al. \(2023\)](#) leveraged prompt engineering in a GPT-based automated compliance checking method to input building design specifications and codes directly, facilitating automated evaluation without additional domain knowledge. In a similar vein, [Yang and Zhang \(2024\)](#) designed a prompt-based framework using GPT to automate the transformation of building code information into machine-readable formats, significantly reducing manual effort and training data while maintaining high accuracy. [Zhu et al. \(2024\)](#) further demonstrated how fine-tuning pre-trained LLMs can improve accuracy and efficiency in reviewing bridge construction compliance. Similarly, [Wang et al. \(2025\)](#) introduced HSE-Bench, a benchmark dataset to evaluate LLMs in health, safety, and environment compliance, coupled with a reasoning-of-experts prompting method to improve domain-specific legal reasoning. [He et al. \(2025\)](#) extended this concept by proposing a hybrid RAG framework combining keyword and semantic search to enhance LLM responses for construction regulation inquiries, thus enabling precise, domain-aware question answering on fragmented and unstructured regulations. Likewise, [Katooziani et al. \(2025\)](#) systematically evaluated GPT for construction safety management, highlighting its strengths and limitations in automation, critical reasoning, and adaptability. Extending this idea, [Sun et al. \(2025\)](#) proposed an RAG framework that combined LLMs with logic reasoning and semantic embedding techniques using event-centric graphs to improve text-based compliance checking. Finally, [Chen and Bao \(2025\)](#) proposed a multi-agent LLM framework that decomposed code-compliant reinforced concrete design into specialized LLM agents which coordinated, cross-checked results, and generated verifiable design calculations.

LLMs Integrated with BIM

Integration of LLMs with BIM systems has also been widely explored. For example, [Ying and Sacks \(2024\)](#) proposed an autonomous compliance checking framework leveraging LLMs as intelligent agents capable of understanding building design requirements, planning verification tasks, retrieving BIM data, and executing checks independently. Similarly, [Chen et al. \(2024\)](#)

proposed an automated BIM compliance checking framework that integrated LLMs, deep learning, and ontology-based reasoning. In addition, [Nakhace et al. \(2024\)](#) presented a unified framework combining hybrid knowledge graphs and LLMs to automate BCC, enabling semantic reasoning over regulations and BIM data for improved accuracy and scalability. Likewise, [Madireddy et al. \(2025\)](#) proposed a semi-automated system that integrated LLMs with BIM software to interpret building codes and generate executable scripts for automatic BCC, improving accuracy and efficiency. Furthermore, [Saluz et al. \(2025\)](#) proposed a CoT-based approach using LLMs to align BIM authoring models with compliance constraints, reducing expert involvement and enabling automated checking for modular Kit-of-Parts architecture.

VLMs for Compliance and Safety

Finally, Vision-Language Models (VLMs) ([OpenAI 2025a](#)) have also been used for visual compliance and safety monitoring. For instance, [Chen et al. \(2025\)](#) proposed a VLM approach using a vision Transformer combined with multimodal fusion to frame fire hazard recognition as a visual question answering task, enabling continuous fire safety monitoring with improved accuracy. Similarly, [Adil et al. \(2025\)](#) developed a VLM-based framework for construction safety hazard identification, using prompt engineering to convert safety guidelines into contextual queries, allowing the model to analyze site images and generate hazard assessments aligned with regulations. Likewise, [Zhang et al. \(2025a\)](#) highlighted the potential of LLMs for CAD-based compliance checking, noting their ability to enhance efficiency, reduce manual effort, and support more accurate verification. A closely related work by [Zhang et al. \(2025b\)](#) leveraged LLMs and object detection to construct a functional multi-class door detection dataset, which required human-in-the-loop refinement. In contrast, our framework is fully automated, eliminating the need for human intervention.

METHODOLOGY

In this section, we first elaborate on our proposed new task for BCC, and then describe each component of our proposed pipeline in detail, one by one.

Automated Facility Enumeration Task

In this paper, we propose a new fundamental task for BCC, termed *automated facility enumeration*, which is anticipated to become a core component of modern BCC in practice because enumeration of facilities is essential to the subsequent validation procedures for statutory requirements, such as NCC. Automated, as opposed to manual, facility enumeration is targeted at large scale downstream validation.

Definition 1 (Automated Facility Enumeration). Let I denote a CAD floor plan image. The task of *automated facility enumeration* is to automatically identify and count facilities of interest $\mathcal{F} = \{\text{sanitary facilities, kitchens, laundries, exits, fire safety equipment, accessibility provisions, parking}\}$ from I .

Formally, the goal is to produce a mapping

$$E : I \rightarrow \{(f_i, n_i)\}_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{F}|},$$

where $f_i \in \mathcal{F}$ is a facility type and $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ is the corresponding count.

Door Detection

The complete workflow of our approach is illustrated in Figure 1. The process begins with door detection, serving as an essential precursor for accurate identification and analysis of facility types in the following stages.

Doors are present in most room designs. In our proposed method, door detection is a crucial step. To achieve optimal results and ensure robust generalization across domains, we adopt Co-DETR (Zong et al. 2023), a state-of-the-art object detection model benchmarked on COCO (Lin et al. 2014). Its effectiveness for door detection has been validated in (Zhang et al. 2025b). Co-DETR builds upon DETR (Carion et al. 2020) by incorporating auxiliary heads trained with one-to-many label assignment, similar to Faster R-CNN (Ren et al. 2016), in addition to the standard one-to-one matching of DETR. This design increases supervision during training by introducing more positive samples, which significantly improves detection performance.

Mathematically, the door detection step can be expressed as:

$$\{(b_i, c_i)\}_{i=1}^N = \text{Co-DETR}(\mathbf{I}), \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{I} denotes the input floor plan image, N is the number of detected instances, $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^4$ represents the predicted bounding box coordinates for the i -th door, and c_i denotes its corresponding confidence score.

Door detection can achieve high accuracy when using state-of-the-art object detectors such as Co-DETR, particularly with abundant labeled training samples. Even in the presence of occasional missed or false detections, the CoT pipeline introduced in the following section is designed to tolerate such errors and still deliver strong overall performance.

LLM Prediction via CoT

In recent years, numerous LLM variants have emerged. In this paper, we adopt OpenAI’s latest flagship model, GPT-5 (OpenAI 2025b), as the primary LLM in our framework. GPT-5 is a unified multimodal model that advances over prior versions in reasoning, factual accuracy, and adaptability across domains such as coding, mathematics, health, writing, and visual perception. Compared with earlier models, GPT-5 reduces hallucinations, improves instruction following, minimizes sycophancy, and provides more contextually nuanced, user-aligned responses.

To fully leverage the reasoning and multimodal capabilities of GPT-5, we propose a CoT pipeline tailored for the task. This pipeline decomposes the overall problem into a series of structured reasoning steps, allowing the model to methodically process and integrate visual and textual information.

Room Connection Prediction

Here, we use toilet prediction as a running example, while noting that the proposed method can be seamlessly extended to other facility types.

Following door detection, the first step of the CoT pipeline is to predict the room connected to each detected door. For a given door, the LLM is prompted to determine whether it leads to a

specific room type T (e.g., a toilet).

Formally, room connection prediction is defined as:

$$P_i = \text{LLM}(L_i, \mathbf{I} \mid \mathcal{P}), \quad (2)$$

where $P_i \in \{yes, no\}$ denotes the prediction result for the i -th door, L_i represents its location (given by the red bounding box in the floor plan), \mathbf{I} is the input image, and \mathcal{P} is the constructed prompt containing task instructions, room characteristics, and other contextual information.

Room Consolidation

After identifying all doors predicted to lead to a specific room type T (e.g., toilets), multiple doors may correspond to the same room. To resolve this, we use the LLM to perform pairwise room consolidation, determining which doors belong to the same room and eliminating duplicates to produce a single instance for each room.

Let

$$\mathcal{D}_T = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_N\}$$

denote the set of doors predicted to connect to room type T . Many doors in \mathcal{D}_T may belong to the same room. To identify which doors correspond to the same room, we define a function that evaluates each pair of doors:

$$S_{ij} = \text{LLM}(d_i, d_j, \mathbf{I} \mid \mathcal{P}_{\text{room-assignment}}), \quad (3)$$

where $S_{ij} \in \{yes, no\}$ indicates whether doors d_i and d_j connect to the same room, \mathbf{I} is the input image, $\mathcal{P}_{\text{room-assignment}}$ is the prompt designed to determine whether a given pair of doors connect to the same room.

After pairwise room consolidation, we obtain a deduplicated set of doors:

$$\mathcal{D}_T^{\text{filtered}} = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_M\}, \quad M \leq N$$

where $\mathcal{D}_T^{\text{filtered}}$ is the set of doors after pairwise room consolidation, containing only one representative door for each room. Here, M is the number of doors remaining after consolidation, which is less than or equal to the original number of doors N .

Omission Correction

Following the previous steps, predictions are expected to be largely accurate. Nevertheless, some doors connecting to valid toilets may be misclassified by the LLM, leading to missing predictions. Additionally, open rooms without any associated doors are not detected or counted in the earlier steps. To address these gaps, we introduce a final step in the CoT pipeline specifically designed to capture any missing cases.

Specifically, all retained door predictions are highlighted in the image, and the LLM is prompted to detect any missing instances that lack a corresponding bounding box.

In formal terms,

$$N_{\text{missing}} = \text{LLM}(\mathbf{I}, \mathcal{D}_T^{\text{filtered}} \mid \mathcal{P}_{\text{missing}}), \quad (4)$$

where $N_{\text{missing}} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ denotes the number of missing instances predicted by the LLM, \mathbf{I} is the input image, and $\mathcal{P}_{\text{missing}}$ is the prompt instructing the LLM to identify and count instances not associated with a marked bounding box.

The final predicted number of a specific facility type is:

$$N_{\text{final}} = |\mathcal{D}_T^{\text{filtered}}| + N_{\text{missing}}.$$

Our proposed method is robust and generalizable across different datasets and scenarios, and it can be readily applied to any room type, including rooms without connected doors. Differences across room types are primarily captured in the prompts, which integrate both type-specific domain knowledge and the contextual scenario.

EXPERIMENTS

Datasets

We select a diverse set of publicly available datasets to conduct our experiments. These datasets encompass various types of graphical documents, providing comprehensive coverage of symbol arrangements, document structures, and complexity levels. These subsets will be made publicly available to facilitate future comparisons.

1. **CubiCasa5K** (Kalervo et al. 2019). CubiCasa5K is a high-resolution floorplan dataset with annotations for over 80 object categories, providing rich semantic and geometric information for building layout understanding and architectural analysis. We use 97 test images for our experiments.
2. **FloorPlanCAD** (Fan et al. 2021). FloorPlanCAD is a large-scale dataset of real-world CAD floor plans from diverse building types, with expert annotations covering 30 object categories. We use 140 interior-layout samples from the test set for our experiments.
3. **BRIDGE** (Goyal et al. 2019). BRIDGE is a large-scale dataset of floor plan images collected from public sources, with annotations for 16 classes of interior symbols, room regions, and textual descriptions of complete layouts. We use 113 high-quality samples for our experiments.
4. **SESYD** (Delalandre et al. 2010). SESYD is a synthetic dataset of 1000 document images, including architectural floorplans and electrical diagrams, containing over 57000 annotated symbols across diverse backgrounds. We use 48 images from this dataset for our experiments.
5. **ROBIN** (Sharma et al. 2017). ROBIN is a dataset of 510 real-world floor plans annotated using standard notations, capturing diverse room types and layouts. We use 48 images from this dataset for our experiments.
6. **SydneyHouse** (Chu et al. 2016). SydneyHouse is a dataset of 174 residential houses across Sydney, Australia, with detailed floorplans, approximate geo-locations, and wide-baseline StreetView images capturing the building exteriors. We use 88 images from this dataset for our experiments.

7. **CVC-FP** (de las Heras et al. 2015). CVC-FP is a dataset of real architectural floor plan images, supporting high-resolution files and annotated with key elements and their spatial and functional relationships. Only a resized version (640×640) is available, so we select 15 relatively clear images for our experiments.
8. **MLSTRUCT-FP** (Pizarro et al. 2023). MLSTRUCT-FP contains 954 high-resolution multi-unit floor plan images from Chilean residential buildings. For our experiments, we select 6 samples (345 door instances). Each image is divided into several parts for processing, and the results from all parts are combined to obtain the final prediction.

Evaluation Metric and Baseline

To validate our proposed method, we use accuracy as the evaluation metric, comparing the predicted count of each facility type against the ground truth. An image is considered correctly predicted if the number of instances for a given type is estimated accurately.

We also use the LLM’s predictions as a baseline by prompting it to estimate instance counts. A prediction is considered accurate if the estimated count matches the ground truth, regardless of spatial positions. While the LLM can describe object locations, the exact positions remain ambiguous. Similarly, our method is deemed accurate when the predicted count for a specific type matches the ground truth.

Experiment Settings

To train the door detection model, we used two publicly available datasets (University 2022; Architecture Plan 2024). The first (Architecture Plan 2024) contains 1047 training and 62 test samples, and the second (University 2022) contains 837 training and 43 test samples. The training samples were combined into a unified training set, and the test samples were merged into a single test set. To further improve accuracy, we manually labeled a subset of examples from each dataset, which will be made publicly available in the future.

Experimental Results

Results for the Toilet Category: We begin by evaluating the toilet category. Table 1 presents a comparison between our proposed CoT pipeline and the GPT-5 baseline. Across all eight experiments, our method consistently outperforms the baseline, demonstrating the effectiveness of the CoT approach in capturing complex spatial and contextual cues for accurate facility prediction.

Results for the Kitchen Category: We next evaluate our method on the kitchen category. Table 2 reports the comparative results between our CoT-based approach and the GPT-5 baseline on the CubiCasa5K and SydneyHouse datasets. In both experiments, although the baseline performs strongly, our method achieves slightly better results, indicating the superiority of the proposed approach.

Results for the Emergency Exit Door Category: We further evaluate our method on the emergency exit door category. According to the NCC, exit doors are required to ensure safe evacuation, while no notion of an ‘emergency room’ is defined. Therefore, the task is formulated as verifying the number of doors serving as emergency exit doors. We compare our proposed method with GPT-5 on the CubiCasa5K dataset. Table 3 presents the results. As shown, our CoT-based method consistently outperforms the baseline GPT-5, demonstrating both the necessity and effectiveness of incorporating CoT reasoning.

Results for the Car Parking Category: Finally, we evaluate the performance of our CoT method and the baseline on the car parking category using the CubiCasa5K and SydneyHouse datasets. Table 4 summarizes the quantitative results for each dataset. On CubiCasa5K, our CoT method performs slightly better than GPT-5, while on SydneyHouse, our method outperforms the baseline by a large margin, clearly demonstrating the advantage of integrating CoT reasoning with LLMs.

Overall, the experiments confirm the critical role and practical advantage of the proposed CoT pipeline in enabling the adopted LLM method to perform facility enumeration in a generalizable, robust, and accurate manner, which is vital for meeting BCC requirements under the NCC.

Notably, through experiments, we found that appending “tell me the reason” at the end of the prompt consistently improves performance. It suggests that encouraging the LLM to explicitly

justify its predictions fosters more deliberate reasoning, thereby enhancing accuracy.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, we address the challenges of accurate facility enumeration for compliance verification by focusing on BCC requirements under the NCC and exploring how these regulatory rules can be translated into automated analysis tasks. Based on the identified compliance rules, we introduce a new task, automated facility enumeration, which systematically identifies and counts key facilities in floor plans, including sanitary facilities, kitchens, laundries, exits, fire safety equipment, accessibility features, and parking. To address this task, we leverage the reasoning capabilities of LLMs. Furthermore, we propose a CoT framework that integrates door detection with LLM-based reasoning to enhance precision and robustness. Extensive experiments across diverse datasets and facility types demonstrate that our approach achieves accurate and generalizable results, highlighting its potential to support intelligent, scalable compliance checking workflows.

REFERENCES

- Adil, M., Lee, G., Gonzalez, V. A., and Mei, Q. (2025). “Using vision language models for safety hazard identification in construction.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.09083*.
- Al-Turki, D., Hettiarachchi, H., Gaber, M. M., Abdelsamea, M. M., Basurra, S., Iranmanesh, S., Saadany, H., and Vakaj, E. (2024). “Human-in-the-loop learning with llms for efficient rase tagging in building compliance regulations.” *IEEE Access*.
- Architecture Plan (2024). “Door object detection dataset.” *Roboflow Universe* (jul).
- Australian Building Codes Board (2022). “National construction code 2022.” *Australian Building Codes Board*.
- Carion, N., Massa, F., Synnaeve, G., Usunier, N., Kirillov, A., and Zagoruyko, S. (2020). “End-to-end object detection with transformers.” *European conference on computer vision*, Springer, 213–229.
- Chen, D., Chen, L., Zeng, Y., Hancock, C., Lock, R., and Solvsten, S. (2025). “Vision llm-driven operational hazard recognition for building fire safety compliance checking.” *The Sixth International Conference in Civil and Building Engineering Informatics (ICCBEI 2025)*.

- Chen, J. and Bao, Y. (2025). “Multi-agent large language model framework for code-compliant automated design of reinforced concrete structures.” *Automation in Construction*, 177, 106331.
- Chen, N., Lin, X., Jiang, H., and An, Y. (2024). “Automated building information modeling compliance check through a large language model combined with deep learning and ontology.” *Buildings*, 14(7), 1983.
- Chu, H., Wang, S., Urtasun, R., and Fidler, S. (2016). “Housecraft: Building houses from rental ads and street views.” *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11-14, 2016, Proceedings, Part VI 14*, 500–516.
- de las Heras, L.-P., Terrades, O. R., Robles, S., and Sánchez, G. (2015). “Cvc-fp and sgt: a new database for structural floor plan analysis and its groundtruthing tool.” *International Journal on Document Analysis and Recognition (IJ DAR)*, 18, 15–30.
- Delalandre, M., Valveny, E., Pridmore, T., and Karatzas, D. (2010). “Generation of synthetic documents for performance evaluation of symbol recognition & spotting systems.” *International Journal on Document Analysis and Recognition (IJ DAR)*, 13(3), 187–207.
- Dong, Y., Liu, Z., Sun, H.-L., Yang, J., Hu, W., Rao, Y., and Liu, Z. (2025). “Insight-v: Exploring long-chain visual reasoning with multimodal large language models.” *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, 9062–9072.
- Fan, Z., Zhu, L., Li, H., Chen, X., Zhu, S., and Tan, P. (2021). “Floorplancad: A large-scale cad drawing dataset for panoptic symbol spotting.” *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 10128–10137.
- Fuchs, S., Witbrock, M., Dimyadi, J., and Amor, R. (2024). “Using large language models for the interpretation of building regulations.” *Journal of Engineering, Project & Production Management*, 14(4).
- Goyal, S., Mistry, V., Chattopadhyay, C., and Bhatnagar, G. (2019). “Bridge: Building plan repository for image description generation, and evaluation.” *2019 International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (ICDAR)*, 1071–1076.
- He, C., He, W., Liu, M., Leng, S., and Wei, S. (2025). “Enriched construction regulation inquiry

- responses: A hybrid search approach for large language models.” *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 41(3), 04025001.
- Hettiarachchi, H., Dridi, A., Gaber, M. M., Parsafard, P., Bocaneala, N., Breitenfelder, K., Costa, G., Hedblom, M., Juganaru-Mathieu, M., Mecharnia, T., et al. (2025). “Code-accord: A corpus of building regulatory data for rule generation towards automatic compliance checking.” *Scientific data*, 12(1), 170.
- Hurst, A., Lerer, A., Goucher, A. P., Perelman, A., Ramesh, A., Clark, A., Ostrow, A., Welihinda, A., Hayes, A., Radford, A., et al. (2024). “Gpt-4o system card.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*.
- Jocher, G., Chaurasia, A., and Qiu, J. (2023). “Yolov8.
- Kalervo, A., Ylioinas, J., Häikiö, M., Karhu, A., and Kannala, J. (2019). “Cubicasa5k: A dataset and an improved multi-task model for floorplan image analysis.” *Image Analysis: 21st Scandinavian Conference, SCIA 2019, Norrköping, Sweden, June 11–13, 2019, Proceedings 21*, 28–40.
- Katooziani, A., Jeelani, I., and Gheisari, M. (2025). “Gpt applications for construction safety: A use case analysis.” *Buildings*, 15(14), 2410.
- Kojima, T., Gu, S. S., Reid, M., Matsuo, Y., and Iwasawa, Y. (2022). “Large language models are zero-shot reasoners.” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35, 22199–22213.
- Li, H., Yang, R., Xu, S., Xiao, Y., and Zhao, H. (2024). “Intelligent checking method for construction schemes via fusion of knowledge graph and large language models.” *Buildings*, 14(8), 2502.
- Lin, T.-Y., Maire, M., Belongie, S., Hays, J., Perona, P., Ramanan, D., Dollár, P., and Zitnick, C. L. (2014). “Microsoft coco: Common objects in context.” *Computer vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European conference, zurich, Switzerland, September 6-12, 2014, proceedings, part v 13*, 740–755.
- Liu, X., Li, H., and Zhu, X. (2023). “A gpt-based method of automated compliance checking through prompt engineering.” *Proceedings of the 30th European Group for Intelligent Computing in Engineering (EG-ICE) Conference, Towards Sustainable, Smart and Resilient Buildings, Infrastructures and Cities*, University College London, UK, <<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/159694/>> (July).

- Madireddy, S., Gao, L., Din, Z. U., Kim, K., Senouci, A., Han, Z., and Zhang, Y. (2025). “Large language model-driven code compliance checking in building information modeling.” *Electronics*, 14(11), 2146.
- Nakhaee, A., Elshani, D., and Wortmann, T. (2024). “A vision for automated building code compliance checking by unifying hybrid knowledge graphs and large language models.” *Design Modelling Symposium Berlin*, Springer, 445–457.
- OpenAI (2025a). “Introducing gpt-4.1 in the api, <<https://openai.com/index/gpt-4-1/>> (April).
- OpenAI (2025b). “Introducing gpt-5.” *OpenAI Blog* (August).
- Pizarro, P. N., Hitschfeld, N., and Sipiran, I. (2023). “Large-scale multi-unit floor plan dataset for architectural plan analysis and recognition.” *Automation in Construction*, 156, 105132.
- Ren, S., He, K., Girshick, R., and Sun, J. (2016). “Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks.” *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 39(6), 1137–1149.
- Saluz, U., Baimuratov, I., and Geyer, P. (2025). “Large-language-model-based building-information-model alignment for automatic-compliance-checking: towards closing the gap between model authoring and model checking for kit-of-parts architecture.” *EG-ICE*, University of Strathclyde Publishing.
- Sharma, D., Gupta, N., Chattopadhyay, C., and Mehta, S. (2017). “Daniel: A deep architecture for automatic analysis and retrieval of building floor plans.” *2017 14th IAPR international conference on document analysis and recognition (ICDAR)*, Vol. 1, 420–425.
- Sun, J., Luo, Z., and Li, Y. (2025). “A compliance checking framework based on retrieval augmented generation.” *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 2603–2615.
- University (2022). “Floor plans 500 dataset.” *Roboflow Universe* (sep).
- Villaschi, F. S., Carvalho, J. P., and Bragança, L. (2022). “Bim-based method for the verification of building code compliance.” *Applied System Innovation*, 5(4), 64.
- Wang, J., Wang, M., Zhou, Y., Xing, Z., Liu, Q., Xu, X., Zhang, W., and Zhu, L. (2025). “Llm-

- based hse compliance assessment: Benchmark, performance, and advancements.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.22959*.
- Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q. V., Zhou, D., et al. (2022). “Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models.” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35, 24824–24837.
- Wu, J., Zhang, J., and Debs, L. (2022). “Model validation for automated building code compliance checking.” *Construction Research Congress 2022*, 640–650.
- Yang, F. and Zhang, J. (2024). “Prompt-based automation of building code information transformation for compliance checking.” *Automation in Construction*, 168, 105817.
- Ying, H. and Sacks, R. (2024). “From automatic to autonomous: A large language model-driven approach for generic building compliance checking.” *Proceedings of the CIB W78 Conference*.
- Zaidi, S. F. A., Yang, J., Abbas, M. S., Hussain, R., Lee, D., and Park, C. (2024). “Vision-based construction safety monitoring utilizing temporal analysis to reduce false alarms.” *Buildings*, 14(6), 1878.
- Zhang, L., Le, B., Akhtar, N., Lam, S.-K., and Ngo, T. (2025a). “Large language models for computer-aided design: A survey.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.08137*.
- Zhang, L., Le, B., Akhtar, N., and Ngo, T. (2025b). “Doordet: Semi-automated multi-class door detection dataset via object detection and large language models.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.07714*.
- Zhang, Z., Ma, L., and Broyd, T. (2022). “Towards fully-automated code compliance checking of building regulations: challenges for rule interpretation and representation.” *EC3 Conference 2022*, Vol. 3, European Council on Computing in Construction, 0–0.
- Zhu, Y., Zhao, G., Liu, H., Sun, D., and He, Y. (2024). “Refining bridge engineering-based construction scheme compliance review with advanced large language model integration.” *Proceedings of the 2024 8th International Conference on Big Data and Internet of Things*, 297–305.
- Zong, Z., Song, G., and Liu, Y. (2023). “Detrs with collaborative hybrid assignments training.” *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 6748–6758.

List of Tables

1	Comparison of the baseline and our CoT-based method for the toilet category across eight publicly available datasets.	23
2	Comparison of the baseline and our CoT-based method for the kitchen category using two selected publicly available datasets.	24
3	Comparison of the baseline and our CoT-based method for the emergency exit category on the CubiCasa5K dataset.	25
4	Comparison of the baseline and our CoT-based method for the car parking category using two selected publicly available datasets.	26

TABLE 1. Comparison of the baseline and our CoT-based method for the toilet category across eight publicly available datasets.

Datasets	Accuracy (%)	
	GPT-5	Ours
CubiCasa5K (Kalervo et al. 2019)	85.57	87.63
FloorPlanCAD (Fan et al. 2021)	79.29	85.71
BRIDGE (Goyal et al. 2019)	77.88	81.42
SESYD (Delalandre et al. 2010)	68.75	95.83
ROBIN (Sharma et al. 2017)	64.58	85.42
SydneyHouse (Chu et al. 2016)	57.95	71.59
CVC-FP (de las Heras et al. 2015)	40.00	86.67
MLSTRUCT-FP (Pizarro et al. 2023)	50.00	66.67

TABLE 2. Comparison of the baseline and our CoT-based method for the kitchen category using two selected publicly available datasets.

Datasets	Accuracy (%)	
	GPT-5	Ours
CubiCasa5K (Kalervo et al. 2019)	96.91	98.97
SydneyHouse (Chu et al. 2016)	97.73	98.86

TABLE 3. Comparison of the baseline and our CoT-based method for the emergency exit category on the CubiCasa5K dataset.

Datasets	Accuracy (%)	
	GPT-5	Ours
CubiCasa5K (Kalervo et al. 2019)	67.01	70.10

TABLE 4. Comparison of the baseline and our CoT-based method for the car parking category using two selected publicly available datasets.

Datasets	Accuracy (%)	
	GPT-5	Ours
CubiCasa5K (Kalervo et al. 2019)	96.91	97.94
SydneyHouse (Chu et al. 2016)	87.50	93.18

List of Figures

- 1 We illustrate our method using toilet prediction as an example. Given an input image, Co-DETR first detects all door instances. For each detected door, GPT-5 predicts whether it connects to a toilet. For all doors predicted to connect to a toilet, GPT-5 further determines whether they belong to the same toilet, removing duplicate instances. Finally, GPT-5 estimates whether any toilets have been missed. The image shown in the figure is from CubiCasa5K (Kalervo et al. 2019). 28




Fig. 1. We illustrate our method using toilet prediction as an example. Given an input image, Co-DETR first detects all door instances. For each detected door, GPT-5 predicts whether it connects to a toilet. For all doors predicted to connect to a toilet, GPT-5 further determines whether they belong to the same toilet, removing duplicate instances. Finally, GPT-5 estimates whether any toilets have been missed. The image shown in the figure is from CubiCasa5K (Kalervo et al. 2019).