

Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 10/2006 held on 7.3.2006

(a) MAI 1 10/2006

Issue : Excessive non-domestic site coverage under PNAP 280.

Decision : The committee agreed that the proposal did not comply with the requirements set out in PNAP 280. However, members noted that there was a substantial difference in level between the streets fronting the lot. The committee agreed that the mean level of the lower and upper streets could be taken for the purpose of B(P)Reg 20(3).

(b) BCI 1 10/2006

Issue : Proposed footbridges projected over street.

Decision : Having considered all relevant factors, the committee agreed to defer a decision pending further information on the impact of the proposed bridge on the environment in the vicinity.

(c) BCI 2 10/2006

Issue : Dedication for public passage in return for bonus PR.

Decision : TD took the view that the proposed dedication was desirable but not essential. The committee agreed to accept the dedication of passages within the proposed building in return for exemption of the dedicated passage from GFA on a pro rata basis in accordance with para. 8 of PNAP 233 subject to the following :-

- (i) The AP should revisit his design to provide a shortest route for public passage including that for provision for persons with a disability.
- (ii) The pedestrian flow data should be reassessed by taking into account the other possible opening proposed by MTRC.

(d) BCI 3 10/2006

Issue : Inclusion of a service lane in site area and building over of it.

Decision : The committee deferred a decision pending clarification if the lane was subject to any covenant.

(e) BCI 4 10/2006

Issue : Proposed ceiling panels under the existing balconies projected over street.

Decision : The committee, having considered the design and the nature of works, accepted the proposed projection over street.

(f) BCI 5 10/2006

Issue : Inclusion of service lane in site area.

Decision : The committee noted that the service lane was not a required lane under B(P)R. In line with the spirit of PNAP 179, the committee agreed to allow the lane to count for site area.