# Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee Building Committee I 18/2006 held on 3.5.2006

#### (a) MAI 1 18/2006

Issue : Application for hotel concession for a hotel proposal without the

provision of on-site transport facilities.

Application for the non-provision of service lane to the hotel

development.

Decision : The committee, having noted that TD had no objection to the

non-provision of on-site transport facilities and the proposal was generally in compliance with requirements set out in PNAP 111,

agreed to grant hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

The committee, having noted there were areas reserved for service lane in the adjoining building, did not agree the non-provision of

service lane.

#### (b) MAI 2 18/2006

Issue : Application for hotel concession.

Decision : The committee noted that TD had accepted the on-site transport

facilities. The committee however decided to refer the case for BAC

for consideration of the size of the guestrooms.

#### (c) <u>BCI 1 18/2006</u>

Issue : Proposed redevelopment not abutting a street.

Decision : The committee agreed that the site fell within B(P)Reg 19(3). The

committee also noted that the existing development intensity was accepted in the eighties and agreed the same development intensity could be allowed for the proposed development subject to no adverse

comments from TD and FSD.

### (d) <u>BCI 2 18/2006</u>

Issue : Proposed low-rise house development not abutting a street.

Decision : Having noted that existing access road for the site would be upgraded

to a width not less than 4.5m and there was no objection from other departments, the committee accepted the proposal subject to the completion of upgrading works before the completion of the

development.

## (e) <u>BCI 3 18/2006</u>

Issue : Proposed shrine building not abutting a street.

Decision : The committee noted that site was separated from the EVA by a strip

of government land. The committee also noted that concern on traffic impact had been raised by a government department. Hence the committee requested additional information regarding the access to the site and traffic impact of the proposal for further consideration.