

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee**  
**Building Committee I 12/2007 held on 27.3.2007**

(a) MAI 1 12/2007

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

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

(b) MAI 2 12/2007

Issue : Vehicular access run-in/run-out arrangement for a proposed redevelopment.

Decision : Having noted TD's advice, the committee agreed not to invoke Section 16(1)(h) of the BO.

(c) MAI 3 12/2007

Issue : Exclusion of pedestrian passageway from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee noted a passageway was required under lease and the exemption area had been assessed in line with PNAP 233 and that TD had raised no adverse comment on the pedestrian study report. The committee also noted that LandsD had no objection to the exclusion of the passageway from GFA calculation. However, the owner would not provide an executed deed of dedication due to lease requirements, in lieu of this, the owner would undertake the provision for the same. Hence, the committee had no in-principle objection to the exemption of the passageway from GFA calculation subject to no objection to the acceptance of the undertaking arrangement by LandsD.

(d) BCI 1 12/2007

Issue : Exclusion of voids over entrance lobby and common area for a student hostel.

Decision : The committee, having studied the design, agreed to the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation.

(e) BCI 2 12/2007

- Issue : (i)(a) Exclusion of void over entrance lobby from GFA calculation.
- (i)(b) Exclusion of covered areas under roof overhangs from GFA calculation.
- (ii) Exclusion of the areas covered by balconies from GFA calculation.
- (iii) High headroom for bedrooms.
- Decision : (i)(a) The committee, having studied the design, agreed to the exclusion of void from GFA calculation.
- (i)(b) The committee, having considered that the overhangs were excessive in size, did not agree to exclude the covered areas from GFA calculation.
- (ii) The committee, having noted the covered areas were open on at least two sides, agreed to exclude the areas under balconies from GFA calculation.
- (iii) The committee, having noted that the headroom for the bedrooms under the pitched roof were reasonable, accepted the proposed headrooms.

(f) BCI 3 12/2007

- Issue : Non-provision of a service lane.
- Decision : The committee noted that there was no existing lane in the vicinity and that a lane pattern would unlikely be created in future, accepted the non-provision of a service lane.

(g) BCI 4 12/2007

- Issue : (i) Proposed surrender of setback for pavement widening in return for bonus PR and SC.
- (ii) Exclusion of void over the G/F entrance lobby and external covered entrance of an industrial building from GFA calculation.
- Decision : (i) The committee noted that the setback was required and considered to be essential by TD and there was no adverse comment from relevant outside departments. Hence members accepted the proposed surrender in return for bonus PR and SC.

- (ii) The committee, having considered the design, agreed to exclude the void over the G/F entrance and the covered entrance from GFA calculation.

(h) BCI 5 12/2007

Issue : Exclusion of void over the covered landscaped and car ramp from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee, having considered the design, agreed to exclude the void from GFA calculation.

(i) BCI 6 12/2007

Issue : Application for hotel concession for a hotel proposal without the provision of on-site transport facilities.

Decision : The committee, having noted that TD had no objection to the non-provision of on-site transport facilities and the proposal was generally in compliance with requirements set out in PNAP 111, agreed to grant hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

(j) BCI 7 12/2007

Issue : Architectural features projecting over street.

Decision : The committee was of the view that the projection was excessive and no public interest could be identified. Hence the committee did not accept the proposed features projecting over street.