

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee**  
**Building Committee I 48/2004 held on 7.12.2004**

(a) MAI 1 48/2004

Issue : Proposed relocation of the lift machine room to roof of an existing composite building approved under the “volume” calculation.

Decision : The committee accepted that the proposal was a genuine enhancement proposal not resulting in additional usable floor area. The committee also noted that the extra GFA generated by the relocation had been offset by the provision of a machine room on G/F for a new lift for the podium floors. Taking into account of the above considerations and its effect on the building bulk, the committee accepted the proposal.

(b) BCI 1 48/2004

Issue : Proposed surrender for street widening in return for bonus plot ratio for a office and hotel development.

Decision : Having noted that the set back was a requirement by government, the committee agreed to grant bonus plot ratio in return for the surrender.

(c) BCI 2 48/2004

Issue : Proposed conversion from a 25-storey non-domestic building into a hotel.

Decision : The committee noted that Transport Department had raised no objection to the non-provision of on-site loading and unloading facilities and that the proposal complied with other requirements set out in PNAP 111. Hence the committee accepted the proposed conversion.

(d) BCI 3 48/2004

Issue : Proposed void at 1/F over living room to be excluded from GFA calculation for a 3-storey single-family house.

Decision : The committee, taken into account the LandsD’s view, considered the headroom was excessive in bulk and rejected the proposal.

(e) BCI 4 48/2004

- Issue : Proposed 3-storey single family house without the provision of service lane and exclusion of the following areas from GFA and/or SC calculations:-
- (a) the entrance terrace covered by canopy;
  - (b) void at 2/F over entrance gallery;
  - (c) 4 trellises at roof; and
  - (d) pitch roof eave projection.
- Decision :
- (i) The committee, having considered the layout of the buildings in vicinity, accepted the non-provision of a service lane.
  - (ii) The committee accepted that the canopy cover over the entrance terrace was a genuine feature and agreed that the canopy could be excluded from GFA calculation.
  - (iii) The committee was of the view that the void was excessive in headroom and hence did not agree to grant a modification to permit the exclusion of the void from GFA calculation.
  - (iv) The committee agreed that the trellises should be included in GFA and SC calculations.
  - (v) The committee considered that the eave projection should count for SC calculation and the flat roofs covered by the eave projection should be included in GFA calculation.