Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee Building Committee I 31/2006 held on 1.8.2006

(a) MAI 1 31/2006

Issue : Site classification for a site abutting a street of width less than 4.5m

wide.

Decision : The committee noted that the street from the eastern junction to the

northern corner of the site would be considered to have a width of 4.5m by the creation of setback in the form of street widening and the creation of a right of way at the adjoining site in favour of the site in question. As the widened street satisfied the requirements of a specified street under the B(P)Reg, the committee accepted the site as

a Class A site.

(b) BCI 1 31/2006

Issue : (i) Non-provision of a service lane.

(ii) Exclusion of voids over entrance/lift lobbies for a residential

development.

Decision : (i) The committee noted that there was no existing lane in the vicinity and that a lane pattern would unlikely be created in

future, accepted the non-provision of a service lane.

(ii) The committee accepted the voids as genuine design features

and agreed to grant an modification for the exclusion of the

voids from GFA calculation.

(c) BCI 2 31/2006

Issue : Exclusion of areas covered by green balconies and utility platforms

on G/F from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee, having noted the areas in question were open on at

least two sides, agreed to exclude them from GFA calculation.

(d) <u>BCI 3 31/2006</u>

Issue : Proposed single-storey retail building abutting a street of width less

than 4.5m wide.

Decision : The committee noted the proposed development intensity was for a

single storey building and that the proposed building would be setback in accordance with B(P)Reg 26. Having considered the comments from other departments and the proposed development intensity, the committee accepted the proposed plot ratio, site coverage and building

height under B(P)Reg 19(3).

(e) BCI 4 31/2006

Issue : Proposed single-storey retail building abutting a street of width less

than 4.5m wide.

Decision : The committee noted the proposed development intensity was for a

single storey building and that the proposed building would be setback in accordance with $B(P)Reg\ 26$. Having considered the comments from other departments and the proposed development intensity, the committee accepted the proposed plot ratio, site coverage and building

height under B(P)Reg 19(3).

(f) <u>BCI 5 31/2006</u>

Issue : Proposed single-storey retail building abutting a street of width less

than 4.5m wide.

Decision : The committee noted the proposed development intensity was for a

single storey building and that the proposed building would be setback in accordance with B(P)Reg 26. Having considered the comments from other departments and the proposed development intensity, the committee accepted the proposed plot ratio, site coverage and building

height under B(P)Reg 19(3).

(g) <u>BCI 6 31/2006</u>

Issue : Proposed single-storey retail building abutting a street of width less

than 4.5m wide.

Decision : The committee noted the proposed development intensity was for a

single storey building and that the proposed building would be setback in accordance with $B(P)Reg\ 26$. Having considered the comments from other departments and the proposed development intensity, the committee accepted the proposed plot ratio, site coverage and building

height under B(P)Reg 19(3).

(h) <u>BCI 7 31/2006</u>

Issue : Proposed single-storey retail building abutting a street of width less

than 4.5m wide.

Decision : The committee noted the proposed development intensity was for a

single storey building and that the proposed building would be setback in accordance with B(P)Reg 26. Having considered the comments from other departments and the proposed development intensity, the committee accepted the proposed plot ratio, site coverage and building

height under B(P)Reg 19(3).

(i) BCI 8 31/2006

Issue : Proposed single-storey retail building abutting a street of width less

than 4.5m wide.

Decision : The committee noted the proposed development intensity was for a

single storey building and that the proposed building would be setback in accordance with B(P)Reg 26. Having considered the comments from other departments and the proposed development intensity, the committee accepted the proposed plot ratio, site coverage and building

height under B(P)Reg 19(3).

(j) <u>BCI 9 31/2006</u>

Issue : Proposed single-storey retail building abutting a street of width less

than 4.5m wide.

Decision : The committee noted the proposed development intensity was for a

single storey building and that the proposed building would be setback in accordance with B(P)Reg 26. Having considered the comments from other departments and the proposed development intensity, the committee accepted the proposed plot ratio, site coverage and building

height under B(P)Reg 19(3).

(k) <u>BCI 10 31/2006</u>

Issue : Proposed single-storey retail building abutting a street of width less

than 4.5m wide.

Decision : The committee noted the proposed development intensity was for a

single storey building and that the proposed building would be setback in accordance with $B(P)Reg\ 26$. Having considered the comments from other departments and the proposed development intensity, the committee accepted the proposed plot ratio, site coverage and building

height under B(P)Reg 19(3).

(l) <u>BCI 11 31/2006</u>

Issue : Proposed single-storey retail building abutting a street of width less

than 4.5m wide.

Decision : The committee noted the proposed development intensity was for a

single storey building and that the proposed building would be setback in accordance with B(P)Reg 26. Having considered the comments from other departments and the proposed development intensity, the committee accepted the proposed plot ratio, site coverage and building

height under B(P)Reg 19(3).

(m) <u>BCI 12 31/2006</u>

Issue : (i) Proposed hotel concession for portion of the floors of a composite building under B(P)Reg 23A.

(ii) Proposed setback in return for excessive non-domestic site coverage under PNAP 280.

Decision : The committee, having considered the design of the proposal, required

the AP to provide further justification on the design concept and the

operation of the proposed hotel.