

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee II 19/2016 held on 24.5.2016**

(a) MAII 1 19/2016

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.

(b) BCII 1 19/2016

Issue : Temporary portable toilets for an asphalt batching plant without connecting to drains for the disposal of foul water.

Decision : Having considered the site situation and the advice of the relevant outside departments, the committee accepted the proposed provision of temporary portable toilets.

(c) BCII 2 19/2016

Issue : Headroom of corridor in a domestic unit underneath internal staircase was less than 2.5m.

Decision : Having regard to the circumstances of the case, the committee had no objection to accept the corridor underneath an internal staircase with mean headroom of not less than 2.5m.

(d) BCII 3 19/2016

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.

(e) BCII 4 19/2016

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

Decision : Noting that the applicant on the Form BA4 and Form BA5 had accepted the offer for the proposed land grant and would become the grantee of the land forming the site, the committee accepted the proof.

(f) BCII 5 19/2016

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.

(g) BCII 6 19/2016

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

Decision : Noting 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 and agreed that the plans should be disapproved.