

Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 48/2006 held on 28.11.2006

(a) MAI 1 48/2006

Issue : Non-provision of service lane to a hotel development.

Decision : The committee, having considered all the relevant factors, agreed to refer the informal appeal to DD for advice.

(b) BCI 1 48/2006

Issue : Exclusion of void of a curved feature wall from GFA calculation.

Decision : Having considered the feature wall a genuine design feature, the committee agreed to accept the exclusion of void from GFA calculation.

(c) BCI 2 48/2006

Issue : Exclusion of E&M room from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee noted that details on the type of plant for the E&M room had not been provided. The committee also noted that the proposed room did not comply with the requirements set out in PNAP 13 if the room were for the housing of air-conditioning plant. The committee hence agreed to the recommendation.

(d) BCI 3 48/2006

Issue : Exclusion of area covered by a canopy from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee noted that Lands Department had ruled that the covered area should count for GFA and that the feature did not satisfy the criteria for exclusion from GFA under PNAP 116. The committee saw no reason to depart from the decision of Lands Department in respect of the exclusion of the subject area from GFA calculation.

(e) BCI 4 48/2006

Issue : Exclusion of a void over a restaurant from GFA calculation.

Decision : Having considered the void a genuine design feature, the committee agreed to accept the exclusion of the void from GFA calculation.

(f) BCI 5 48/2006

Issue : Headroom of a single family house.

Decision : Having considered the design, the committee accepted the 4.35m headroom for the G/F of a single family house.

(g) BCI 6 48/2006

Issue : (i) Application for hotel concession for a conversion project.
(ii) Non-provision of service lane.

Decision : The committee had reservation on the design of the guestrooms and the administrative office on 2/F hence the AP was required to provide further justification. In this regard, the committee agreed to defer a decision on the non-provision of service lane.

(h) BCI 7 48/2006

Issue : Approved balustrades projected over street.

Decision : Having noted that the projection was minor and it was a de facto situation, the committee reluctantly accepted the AP's proposal in treating the balustrades as architectural features subject to the provision of additional railing as safety barrier to the windows.