

Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 15/2007 held on 25.4.2007

(a) MAI 1 15/2007

- Issue : (i) Inclusion of lanes into site area and the building over of the same.
(ii) Non-provision of service lane.
(iii) Vehicular access run-in/run-out likely to be dangerous or prejudicial to the safety or convenience of the traffic.
- Decision : (i) & (ii) The committee noted that there was no change in circumstances since the last BC and did not identify any reason in deviating from the previous decision. The committee also noted that there was no objection from the outside department hence the committee accepted the inclusion of lanes into site area and the non-provision of service lane.
- (iii) Having noted that TD's objection to the run-in/out due to its conflict with a existing bus stop, the committee agreed to invoke section 16(1)(h) of the BO to reject the plans.

(b) MAI 2 15/2007

- Issue : Application for hotel concession.
- Decision : The committee, having studied the design, requested the AP to provide further information to justify the provision of the sinks and the central A/C system.

(c) BCI 1 15/2007

- Issue : Exclusion of voids over entrance foyer and shopping arcade from GFA calculation.
- Decision : The committee, having studied the design, agreed that they were genuine design features and agreed to exclude them from GFA calculation.

(d) BCI 2 15/2007

- Issue : Vehicular access run-in/run-out likely to be dangerous or prejudicial to the safety or convenience of the traffic.
- Decision : Having noted that TD had no further objection to the revised run-in/out, the committee agreed not to invoke section 16(1)(h) of the BO to reject the plans.

(e) BCI 3 15/2007

Issue : Exclusion of architectural features from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee, having considered the design of the architectural features excessive, did not agree to the exclusion of the features from GFA calculation.

(f) BCI 4 15/2007

Issue : Non-provision of a 3m wide service lane.

Decision : The committee noted that the site abutted a public lane of less than 3m wide and considered that the proposal should comply with the requirement stipulated in B(P)Reg 28(1).