

Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 4/2006 held on 24.1.2006

(a) MAI 1 4/2006

Issue : Projection of part of the railing of the stairlift over pavement.

Decision : The committee noted that the proposal was an improvement project. Having noted the site constraint and the advice of other government departments, the committee accepted the proposal.

(b) MAI 2 4/2006

Issue : Issue of Temporary Occupation Permit prior to the execution of Deed of Dedication.

Decision : Given the special circumstances of the case, the committee decided to refer the case to BAC for a decision.

(c) MAI 3 4/2006

Issue : Hotel development without on-site transport facilities.

Decision : Having noted the TD's adverse comment, the committee did not agree to grant the hotel concession.

(d) BCI 1 4/2006

Issue : Non-provision of service lane.

Decision : Having noted that there was no established lane pattern in the vicinity and there was no prospect of creating one in the future, the committee accepted the non-provision of service lane for the proposed low density development.

(e) BCI 2 4/2006

- Issue :
- (i) Dedication of pavement setback areas in return for bonus PR and SC for a hotel development.
 - (ii) Exclusion of voids over atrium/foyer and refuge floors from GFA calculation.
 - (iii) Exclusion of excessive A/C plant rooms.
 - (iv) Exclusion of covered areas from GFA calculation.
 - (v) Excessive headroom of the office in a hotel development.
 - (vi) Exclusion of gondola storage from GFA calculation.

- Decision : (i) The committee noted that the setback was required by government. Hence the committee agreed to accept the proposed dedication of setback for pavement widening in return for bonus PR and SC.
- (ii) Having accepted the voids were genuine design features, the committee agreed to exclude the voids from GFA calculation.
- (iii) Having studied the layout of the plant and the design of the buildings, the committee agreed to exclude the plant rooms from GFA calculation.
- (iv) The committee, having considered the design, did not agree to exclude the covered areas from GFA calculation.
- (v) The committee was of the view that the AP should provide further justification for the excessive headroom for the office.
- (vi) The committee did not agree to exclude the storage rooms for the gondola from GFA calculation.

(f) BCI 3 4/2006

Issue : Inclusion of the right of ways (ROW) and service lane into site area for a residential redevelopment.

Decision : The committee was of the view that further information was required to clarify if the piece of land in question was subject to ROW.

In respect of the existing service lane which would not serve any purpose upon redevelopment, the committee allowed the said service lane to count for site area.

(g) BCI 4 4/2006

Issue : (i) Exclusion of voids over the transfer lobby from GFA calculation.

(ii) Excessive storey height of office floors and the loading/unloading and carparks at basement floor.

Decision : (i) Having accepted the voids were genuine design features, the committee agreed to exclude the voids from GFA calculation.

(ii) Having studied the design and the argument put forward by the AP, the committee accepted the proposed headroom for the office floors and the loading/unloading/carparking floor.

(h) BCI 5 4/2006

Issue : The headroom on ground floor of the proposed workshop is excessive.

Decision : The committee, having noted that the proposal was for a specialized factory, accepted the proposed headroom.