

Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 47/2006 held on 21.11.2006

(a) MAI 1 47/2006

Issue : Claiming of hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

Decision : The committee noted that the proposal was generally in compliance with the requirements set out in PNAP 111 and that Transport Department had no objection to the non-provision of on-site transport facilities. Having considered all relevant matters, the committee agreed to grant hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A subject to the satisfactory provision of central A/C and hot water systems and the compliance with BO in relation to the provision of prescribed windows for the guest rooms.

(b) BCI 1 47/2006

Issue : Proposed cladding to the existing architectural features over street.

Decision : Having considered the projection and the function of the cladding, the committee agreed to grant exemption under Sec 31(1) of the BO to permit the projection of the proposed cladding over the street.

(c) BCI 2 47/2006

Issue : (i) Non-provision of service lane.
(ii) Exclusion of wider lift lobbies from GFA calculation under JPN1.

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. Hence, the committee accepted the non-provision of a service lane.
(ii) Having noted the concern on the adequacy of natural ventilation provided to the rear lift lobbies, the committee requested the AP to provide further information regarding the provision of natural ventilation via a “duct” from the external air.

(d) BCI 3 47/2006

Issue : Disapproval of plan under BO s16(1)(g).

Decision : Having considered the views offered by PlanD, the committee decided to refer the case to Building Authority Conference for a decision on whether s.16(1)(g) of the BO should be invoked.

(e) BCI 4 47/2006

- Issue : (i) Proposed footbridge projected over street.
- (ii) Exclusion of a covered footbridge link from GFA calculation.
- Decision : (i) The committee noted that the footbridge did serve public benefit and that there was no adverse comments from outside departments. Having considered the case, the committee agreed to permit the footbridge to project over the internal street.
- (ii) The committee did not identify any valid ground for the exclusion of the covered footbridge from GFA calculation.