

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee II 34/2014 held on 26.8.2014**

(a) MAII 1 34/2014

- Issues : (i) Protective barriers of inadequate height.
(ii) Design of gangways in a PPE.
- Decisions : (i) Having studied the proposal, the committee had no in-principle objection to accept the proposed protective barriers subject to revised design and further substantiations.
(ii) Having studied the proposal, the committee had no in-principle objection to the design of some of the gangways subject to the provision of enhanced safety measures. The committee considered that it was pre-mature to consider the acceptance of other gangways and further justifications were required.

(b) BCII 1 34/2014

- Issue : Non-provision of EVA.
- Decision : Having regard to the site circumstances and the advice of the D of FS, the committee accepted the non-provision of EVA subject to the provision of enhanced fire safety measures to the satisfaction of the D of FS.

(c) BCII 2 34/2014

- Issue : EVA of inadequate width, not in the form of two-way carriageway and serving less than one-fourth of the total length of all the perimeter walls of a building with industrial use.
- Decision : Having regard to the site circumstances and the advice of the D of FS, the committee accepted the proposed EVA arrangement subject to the provision of enhanced fire safety measures to the satisfaction of the D of FS.

(d) BCII 3 34/2014

- Issue : EVA of inadequate width and not in the form of two-way carriageway for an industrial building.
- Decision : Having regard to the site circumstances, the committee accepted the proposed EVA arrangement subject to the provision of enhanced fire safety measures and acceptance of the same by the D of FS.

(e) BCII 4 34/2014

Issue : Proof of ownership of the land forming the site.

Decision : Noting that the applicant was the registered lot owner according to the LR record submitted by the AP, and that the owner's name tallied with that shown on the Form BA4 and Form BA5, the committee accepted the proof of ownership of the land forming the site.

(f) BCII 5 34/2014

Issue : Proof of ownership of the land forming the site.

Decision : Noting that the applicant was the registered lot owner according to the LR record submitted by the AP, and that the owner's name tallied with that shown on the Form BA4 and Form BA5, the committee accepted the proof of ownership of the land forming the site.

(g) BCII 6 34/2014

Issue : Proof of ownership of the land forming the site.

Decision : Noting that the applicant was the registered lot owner according to the LR record submitted by the AP, and that the owner's name tallied with that shown on the Form BA4 and Form BA5, the committee accepted the proof of ownership of the land forming the site.

(h) BCII 7 34/2014

Issue : Proof of ownership of the land forming the site.

Decision : Noting that the applicant was the registered lot owner according to the LR record submitted by the AP, and that the owner's name tallied with that shown on the Form BA4 and Form BA5, the committee accepted the proof of ownership of the land forming the site.

(i) BCII 8 34/2014

Issue : Proof of ownership of the land forming the site.

Decision : Noting that the applicant was the grantee of the lot according to the land grant submitted by the AP, and that the grantee's name tallied with that shown on the Form BA4 and Form BA5, the committee accepted the proof of ownership of the land forming the site.

(j) BCII 9 34/2014

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

Decision : Noting that the applicant shown on the Form BA4 and Form BA5 had leased the land forming the site from the registered lot owner and the lease had authorised the lessee to develop the site, the committee accepted the proof of realistic prospect of control of the land forming the site.

(k) BCII 10 34/2014

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

Decision : From the documents submitted by the AP, the committee noted that the applicant shown on the Form BA4 and Form BA5 did not have 100% ownership of the land forming the site, and the submitted documents did not demonstrate that the applicant had realistic prospect of control of the land forming the site to support the proposed development for compliance with the BO. The committee did not accept the proof of ownership / realistic prospect of control of the land forming the site, and agreed that the plans be disapproved.

(l) BCII 11 34/2014

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

Decision : Noting that the AP did not submit any documentary proof to demonstrate that the applicant had ownership or realistic prospect of control of the land forming the site, the committee agreed that the plans be disapproved.