

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee II 37/2014 held on 17.9.2014**

(a) BCII 1 37/2014

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.

(b) BCII 2 37/2014

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 3 37/2014

Issue : Refuge floor for the purpose of interchange of required staircases having a net area for refuge less than 50% of the total gross floor area of the refuge floor.

Decision : Having regard to the special circumstances of the case, the committee accepted the proposed provision of refuge floor for the purpose of interchange of required staircases.

(d) BCII 4 37/2014

Issue : Sanitary fitments and fittings to lavatories to be provided after acknowledgement of Form BA 14.

Decision : The committee had no objection to the proposal which was generally in line with the spirit of PNAP APP-114.

(e) BCII 5 37/2014

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 6 37/2014

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 7 37/2014

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

Decision : Noting that the proposed A&A works for the construction of a new building would be carried out in an area designated as common parts in the Deed of Mutual Covenant and the applicant shown on the Form BA4 and Form BA5 was the Incorporated Owners of the building, the committee accepted the proof of realistic prospect of control of the land forming the site.

(h) BCII 8 37/2014

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 9 37/2014

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.

(j) BCII 10 37/2014

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

Decision : Noting that the applicant was one of the lot owners and had been authorised to submit plans by all other lot owners, the committee accepted the proof of realistic prospect of control of the land forming the site.

(k) BCII 11 37/2014

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

Decision : Noting that the applicant had been authorised by the lot owner to carry out the proposed works, the committee accepted the proof of realistic prospect of control of the land forming the site.

(l) BCII 12 37/2014

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.