

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee**  
**Building Committee I 41/2006 held on 10.10.2006**

(a) MAI 1 41/2006

- Issue : (i) Exclusion of Refuse Storage & Material Recovery Rooms from GFA calculation.
- (ii) Exclusion of meter rooms from GFA calculation.
- (iii) Exclusion of filtration plant rooms from GFA calculation.
- (iv) Exclusion of AHU rooms for domestic flats from GFA calculation.
- Decision : (i) The committee, having considered the size and the design, accepted to exclude the revised Refuse Storage & Material Recovery Rooms with a depth of 1.5m from GFA calculation.
- (ii) The committee, having heard AP's presentation, was of the view that the meter rooms were excessive in size. Hence, it did not agree to exclude the said rooms from GFA calculation.
- (iii) The committee, having considered the design and plant layout, accepted to exclude the filtration for swimming pool from GFA calculation. However, the committee did not agree to exclude the filtration plant rooms for other water features from GFA calculation.
- (iv) The committee noted that the AHU rooms were for split type A/C units for domestic flats. The committee, having the view that the rooms were excessive in size, did not agree to the exclusion of the said rooms from GFA calculation.

(b) MAI 2 41/2006

- Issue : Formal Appeal against the disapproval of general building plans.
- Decision : The committee, having considered the relevant factors, agreed to contest the appeal.

(c) BCI 1 41/2006

- Issue : Excessive site coverage of podium portion of a office building.
- Decision : The committee noted that the proposal excessive podium height was to cater for the raised road level for a road improvement scheme and agreed to grant modification for the excessive site coverage for the proposed podium with a height of 15.79m.

(d) BCI 2 41/2006

Issue : Excessive site coverage of a temporary structure.

Decision : The committee noted that the proposal was a temporary structure for the purposes of noise reduction for the piling works. While the committee appreciated the positive contribution of the proposal as a noise mitigation measure; the committee requested the AP to explore the feasibility of having the structure built in phases so as to reduce the bulk of the structure on the site. Hence, the committee deferred a decision pending further information from the AP.

(e) BCI 3 41/2006

Issue : Proposed dedication for public passage to a open space required under TPB.

Decision : The committee noted that the access to the open space at the podium level was required under TPB. The committee did not identify valid justification for the Building Authority to require a public passage under the BO in the circumstances. Hence, the committee did not agree to exclude the area from GFA calculation.

(f) BCI 4 41/2006

Issue : (i) Extinguishment and building over of the existing services lane and the inclusion of the same in site area for PR & SC calculation.  
(ii) Inclusion of the proposed diversionary lane in site area for PR & SC allocation.

Decision : (i) The committee, having noted that a diversionary lane would be provided and there was no objection from the relevant department, accepted the proposal.  
(ii) The committee, having noted that the diversionary lane was not a required lane under the BO. In line with the spirit of PNAP 179, the committee agreed to include the lane in site area for PR and SC calculation.

(g) BCI 5 41/2006

Issue : (i) Exclusion of pedestrian passageway from GFA calculation.  
(ii) Exclusion of void between the cladding and the external wall from GFA calculation.

- Decision : (i) The committee noted a passageway was required under lease and such area could be exempted from GFA if so accepted by the Director of Lands. The committee also noted that the AP had assessed the exemption area on a pro-rata basis in line with PNAP 233 and that TD had raised no adverse comment on the pedestrian study report. Hence, the committee had no in-principle objection to the exemption of the passageway from GFA calculation subject to the acceptance of the same by LandsD.
- (ii) The committee noted that the features had been included in site coverage calculation. The committee, having studied the design, agreed to exclude the voids created by the genuine design features from plot ratio calculation.