

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee  
Building Committee II 12/2012 held on 27.3.2012**

(a) MAII 1 12/2012

Issue : Proof of ownership or realistic prospect of control of the land forming the site.

Decision : Noting from the document submitted by the AP that the applicant had been authorized by the owner for the carrying out of construction works for the proposed industrial undertaking, the committee accepted the proof of realistic prospect of control of the land forming the site.

(b) BCII 1 12/2012

Issue : Existing combustible timber roof of a historic building.

Decision : The committee noted that the proposed compensatory measures were in line with the draft Practice Guidebook on Compliance with Building Safety and Health Requirements under the Buildings Ordinance for Adaptive Re-use of and Alteration and Addition Works to Heritage Buildings. Having considered the circumstances and noted the conservation needs as well as the support of the relevant government department, the committee raised no objection to the existing combustible timber roof under B(C)R 90.

(c) BCII 2 12/2012

Issue : Existing protective barriers and combustible timber roof of a historic building.

Decision : The committee noted that the proposed compensatory measures were in line with the draft Practice Guidebook on Compliance with Building Safety and Health Requirements under the Buildings Ordinance for Adaptive Re-use of and Alteration and Addition Works to Heritage Buildings. Having considered the circumstances and noted the conservation needs as well as the support of the relevant government department, the committee agreed to accept the existing protective barriers be less than 1,100mm under B(C)R 8 and the existing combustible timber roof under B(C)R 90.

(d) BCII 3 12/2012

Issue : Proof of ownership or realistic prospect of control of the land forming the site.

Decision : The committee noted that proof of ownership or realistic prospect of control of the land forming the site was required as the proposal involved vertical extension. Noting from the LR record submitted by the AP that the applicant was the registered owner of the lots, and the name of the owner tallied with that shown on Form BA 4, the committee accepted the proof of ownership of the site. It was also agreed that the SBD Guidelines and GFA concessions policy came into operation on 1.4.2011 were applicable to the new extension only.

(e) BCII 4 12/2012

Issue : Formal appeal against the BA's decision.

Decision : Having considered the case, the committee agreed to contest the appeal.

(f) BCII 5 12/2012

Issue : (i) Proof of ownership or realistic prospect of control of the land forming the site.  
(ii) Non-provision of EVA for a single-storey building accessible by sea only.

Decision : (i) Noting from the lease document submitted by the AP that the applicant was the lessee of the land, and the name of the lessee tallied with that shown on Form BA 4, the committee accepted the proof of realistic prospect of control of the land forming the site.  
(ii) The committee, having noted the site circumstances, accepted the proposed non-provision of EVA subject to the provision of enhanced fire safety measures and acceptance of the same by FSD.

(g) BCII 6 12/2012

Issue : (i) Proof of ownership or realistic prospect of control of the land forming the site.  
(ii) Proposed school served by an EVA with inadequate width at its entrance and non-provision of EVA for portions of the school.

Decision : (i) Noting from the LR record submitted by the AP that the applicant was the registered owner of the lots, and the name of the owner tallied with that shown on Form BA 4, the committee accepted the proof of ownership of the site.

- (ii) The committee, having noted the site circumstances, accepted the proposed EVA arrangement subject to the provision of enhanced fire safety measures and acceptance of the same by FSD.

(h) BCII 7 12/2012

Issue : One of the EVA for a proposed industrial building was temporarily inadequate in width.

Decision : Noting the circumstances and the specific operation of the building, the committee raised no objection to the proposal.