

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee**  
**Building Committee I 51/2006 held on 19.12.2006**

(a) MAI 1 51/2006

Issue : Exclusion of the areas covered by green balconies/utility platforms from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee, having noted the covered private gardens were open on two sides and the areas under balconies was subject to the 8% cap under JPN, agreed to exclude the areas under green balcony/ utility platforms from GFA calculation.

(b) MAI 2 51/2006

Issue : (i) Exclusion of wider lift lobbies from GFA calculation under JPN1.

(ii) Exclusion of the area covered by the canopy.

Decision : (i) The committee noted the lift lobbies were in compliance with the criteria of JPN1 and agreed to grant the incentive under JPN1.

(ii) The committee, having studied the design and the width of the canopy, agreed to exclude the area underneath from GFA calculation.

(c) MAI 3 51/2006

Issue : Headroom of a single-family house.

Decision : The committee, having considered the pitched roof design, accepted the proposed headroom of 4.5m at G/F and an average of 4.375m floor height for the 1/F.

(d) MAI 4 51/2006

Issue : Excessive non-domestic site coverage for the podium of a residential development.

Decision : Having noted that the proposal had been accepted under the lease and that the proposal complied with the criteria set out in PNAP 233, the committee had no in-principle objection to the excessive non-domestic site coverage for the proposed podium height subject to DPO's no objection.

(e) BCI 1 51/2006

Issue : Non-provision of a service lane.

Decision : The committee was of the view that the extension lot should have formed part of the site under the BO such that the site abutted on a street at the front and at the rear. Hence, the committee agreed to accept the non-provision of a lane under B(P)Reg 28.

(f) BCI 2 51/2006

Issue : Application for hotel concession.

Decision : The committee, having noted the proposal was not in compliance with the requirements set out in PNAP 111 including the non-provision of on-site transport facilities, agreed not to grant hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

(g) BCI 3 51/2006

Issue : Application for hotel concession for a conversion from office to hotel under B(P)Reg 23A.

Decision : The committee, having noted the proposal was in compliance with the requirements set out in PNAP 111, agreed to grant hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

(h) BCI 4 51/2006

Issue : Exclusion of areas covered by trellis from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee had no objection to the proposed trellis on the common podium roof noting that the size of trellis was located in a common area and its size was less than 5% of the common roof.

(i) BCI 5 51/2006

Issue : Application for hotel concession.

Decision : The committee agreed that the provision of suite-type guestrooms was excessive and the provision of the BOH exceeded the limit set out in PNAP 111. Hence the committee agreed not to grant the hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

(j) BCI 6 51/2006

Issue : Exclusion of void over main entrance lobby from GFA calculation.

Decision : Having studied the design, the committee accepted the void a genuine design feature and agreed to have the void excluded from GFA calculation.

(k) BCI 7 51/2006

Issue : (i) Re-diversion of existing footpath providing access to the adjoining lot and built over of the new pedestrian way.

(ii)(a) Exclusion of the private flat roof covered by the green balconies from GFA calculation.

(ii)(b) High headroom of shops, restaurant on G/F.

Decision : (i) Having considered the case, the committee requested the AP to provide further information regarding the land status, ownership and whether the existing footpath was subject to any legal right of way for further consideration.

(ii)(a) The committee, having noted the covered private flat roofs 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 balconies from GFA calculation by way of modification.

(ii)(b) The committee noted that a PTI with high headroom was proposed on the G/F. The committee raised no objection to the high headroom for the other accommodations on the G/F.