

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee**  
**Building Committee I 49/2005 held on 21.12.2005**

(a) MAI 1 49/2005

Issue : Proposed mono-rail structure for building maintenance projecting over street.

Decision : The committee noted that there were alternative solutions available and no public interest was identified. Hence, the committee did not agree to grant exemption for the mono-rail structure to project over street.

(b) MAI 2 49/2005

Issue : Consent application for an approved hotel without on-site transport facilities.

Decision : As there was no objection raised by TD, the committee noted the issue.

(c) MAI 3 49/2005

Issue : Exclusion of void over living room and outside the external wall of a single-family house from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee, having considered the design, agreed to exclude the void from GFA calculation.

(d) MAI 4 49/2005

Issue : Exclusion of the areas covered by architectural features on roof from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee considered that the proposal was a genuine feature. Hence, the committee agreed to exclude the covered area of the features from GFA calculation.

(e) BCI 1 49/2005

Issue : Exclusion of the areas covered by glass canopy at G/F from GFA calculation.

Proposed signboards at 1/F projecting over ROW and public pavement.

Decision : Noting that the canopy did not comply with B(P)R 10, the committee did not accept the exclusion of the covered area of the glass canopy from GFA calculation.

Noting the design of the proposal, the committee agreed to grant the

modification subject to the compliance with the provisions under PNAP 269.

(f) BCI 2 49/2005

Issue : Exclusion of void from GFA calculation:  
(i) The voids at 10/F over guest rooms at 9/F;  
(ii) The void at 10/F over a storeroom at 9/F; and  
(iii) The voids at 10/F over living room and at 11/F over bedroom of a duplex suite room at 9/F.

Proposed guest rooms at 9/F.

Decision : The committee noted that the high headroom was resulted from the existing structure and the percentage of suite in the hotel was reasonable. Hence, the committee agreed to exclude the voids from GFA and accept the design of the guestrooms.

(g) BCI 3 49/2005

Issue : Proposed portion of building over an existing ROW and inclusion of the ROW into site area.

Decision : Noting that the ROW had been included in the site area of the adjacent developments and the extinguishment of the portion of ROW would not affect the others, the committee agreed to the proposal.

(h) BCI 4 49/2005

Issue : Proposed development within the ungazetted area of rail route protection.

Decision : The committee agreed not to disapprove the proposal.

(i) BCI 5 49/2005

Issue : Exclusion of covered areas of covered walkways and projections of pitch roof eave from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee noted that the covered walkways were in fact part of the building, hence, did not agree to grant modification to permit the exclusion from GFA calculation.

Noting that the projections of the pitch roof eaves were genuine architectural features, the committee agreed to grant modification to permit the exclusion of the covered area from GFA calculation.

(j) BCI 6 49/2005

- Issue : Exclusion of void in duplex units from GFA calculation.
- Exclusion of the refuse storage and material recovery room for each flat from GFA calculation.
- Prescribed windows facing the private footpath.
- Decision : Having considered the design of the voids, the committee did not agree to exclude them from GFA calculation.
- Having considered the design, the committee agreed not to disregard the refuse storage and material recovery room for each flat from GFA calculation.
- The committee agreed to accept the prescribed windows facing the private footpath which had been excluded from site area under B(P)R.

(k) BCI 7 49/2005

- Issue : Proposed non-provision of services lane and prescribed windows of the residential flats facing into intervening government slopes between the site and the streets.
- Decision : Having considered the existing site situation, the committee agreed the non-provision of the services lane to the development.
- The committee having considered the width of the intervening space was much wider and the possibility of development, did not agree to accept the prescribed windows facing into intervening government slopes between the site and streets.

(l) BCI 8 49/2005

- Issue : Exclusion of covered walkway from GFA calculation.
- Decision : Noting the design of the proposal, the Committee agreed not to grant modification to exclude the covered walkway from GFA calculation.

(m) BCI 9 49/2005

- Issue : Exclusion of the pedestrian walkway with public ROW from site area.
- Decision : The committee noted that the pedestrian walkway served the purpose of a street and also existed on site as a footpath. Hence, the committee agreed to the exclusion of the walkway from site area.