

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee  
Building Committee II 14/2005 held on 26.4.2005**

(a) BCII 1 14/2005

Issue : Proposed construction of a single-storey multi-activities covered playground and two-storey multi-purpose building in an existing camp site without the provision of EVA.

Decision : Having considered the existing site constraints, the scale of the development and the provision of upgraded FSI, the committee accepted the non-provision of EVA.

(b) BCII 2 14/2005

Issue : Proposed non-provision of connection between the escape staircases for a 3-storey commercial building.

Decision : The committee studied the requirement set out in para. 11.2 of the MOE Code and agreed the proposal resembled the commercial podium of a composite building and therefore accepted the proposed arrangement.

(c) BCII 3 14/2005

Issue : Proposed 4-storey building in an existing University campus with an EVA less than 6m in width in a section.

Decision : Having considered the existing site constraints and the comments of FSD, the committee accepted the proposed EVA.

(d) BCII 4 14/2005

Issue : Proposed EVA for a development for 10 3-storey domestic buildings with an EVA less than 6m wide and having inadequate turning space.

Decision : Having considered the scale of the development and the provision of enhanced safety measures, the committee accepted the proposal.

(e) BCII 5 14/2005

Issue : Proposed a 3-storey single family house with the provision of an EVA less than 6m in width and having inadequate turning space.

Decision : Having considered the existing site constraints, the scale of the development and FSD's comments, the committee accepted the proposal.

(f) BCII 6 14/2005

Issue : A proposed temporary structure for a performance not complying with the prescriptive requirements set out in the fire codes in terms of MOE provisions and fire protection.

Decision : The committee noted that the gangways would be increased to 1.2m wide and that the spectators could escape at the back of the seating area and hence members did not have strong view to the excessive travel distance provided that the exit way fronting the first row of seats should be of a minimum width of 2.4m. Members noted that there would be air tubes provided across 2 of the exits. While the consultant claimed that, in case of emergency, such air tubes would be deflated by means of manual control and blown away by the positive pressure inside the temporary structure. Members had reservation on the effectiveness of such arrangement as this had not been demonstrated on site.