

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee**  
**Building Committee I 37/2006 held on 12.9.2006**

(a) MAI 1 37/2006

Issue : Excessive non-domestic site coverage of the podium.

Decision : The committee, having noted the proposal was in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP 223 and there was no objection from the relevant departments, accepted the proposal.

(b) MAI 2 37/2006

Issue : Application for hotel concession.

Decision : The committee noted the proposal was in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP 111 and there was no objection from the outside relevant departments. The provision of limited number of suite-type guestrooms was also found acceptable. Hence the committee agreed to grant the hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

(c) MAI 3 37/2006

Issue : (i) Horizontal planes of prescribed windows of the residential flats protruding onto the adjoining land zoned “open space” under OZP.  
(ii) Exclusion of pedestrian passageway from GFA calculation.  
(iii) Exclusion of void in an RCHE from GFA calculation.  
(iv) Exclusion of the areas covered by green balconies and utility platforms from GFA calculation.

Decision : (i) The committee, having studied the proposal and noting LCSD’s advice, was of the view that there were no planning constraints to comply with the regulation.  
(ii) The committee noted the passageway was required under lease. However, the AP had not assessed the GFA exemption on a pro-rata basis in line with PNAP 233. Hence the committee did not agree to exclude the passageway from GFA calculation.  
(iii) Having considered the design and the headroom of the void, the committee did not agree to exclude the void from GFA calculation.  
(iv) The committee, having noted the covered flat roof were open on at least two sides and the areas under balconies was subject to the 8% cap under JPN, agreed to exclude the areas under green balcony/utility platform from GFA calculation.

(d) BCI 1 37/2006

Issue : Proposed railing on top of the approved balcony of an existing building approved under “Volume Regulation” to be projected over street.

Decision : The committee noted that the proposed railing and a proper door opening onto the flat roof of the balcony below would be undesirable hence did not accept the proposal.