

Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 35/2007 held on 18.9.2007

(a) MAI 1 35/2007

- Issue : (i) Application for excessive non-domestic site coverage in accordance with PNAP 280.
- (ii)(a) Exclusion of passageway from GFA calculation.
- (ii)(b) Exclusion of sky garden from GFA calculation.
- Decision : (i)&(ii)(b) Noting that PlanD had concern on the podium bulk and the overall building height and that the AP had scheduled a meeting with PlanD to discuss the issues, the committee agreed to defer the decisions for items (i) & (ii)(b).
- (ii)(a) The committee noted the passageway was required under lease and the exemption area was calculated in line with PNAP 233. The committee also noted that there was no adverse comment from relevant departments including TD. The committee agreed to the application for exemption of portion of the passageway calculated in accordance with PNAP 233 from GFA calculation.

(b) MAI 2 35/2007

- Issue : Formal appeal against the disapproval of a building plan under BOs 16(1)(g), (d), (i) & (j).
- Decision : Having considered the case and the SoP, the committee agreed to contest the appeal.

(c) BCI 1 35/2007

- Issue : Addition of an internal fireman's lift with the machine room built on the roof of a building approved under "Volume" regulation.
- Decision : Having studied the plans, the committee agreed to grant technical modifications to permit the SC and PR of the existing building to exceed the permissible stipulated in the extant B(P)Reg.

(d) BCI 2 35/2007

- Issue : (i) Exclusion of void over entrance lobby and retail entrance lobby from GFA calculation.
- (ii) Exclusion of staircase void over G/F shop from GFA calculation.
- Decision : (i) Having considered the design, the committee agreed to the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation.
- (ii) The committee did not agree to accept the exclusion of staircase void from GFA calculation.

(e) BCI 3 35/2007

- Issue : Excessive site coverage of the podium up to 20m above ground level.
- Decision : Having considered the site constraints, AP's justifications and that there was no objection from the relevant departments, the committee agreed to the excessive site coverage of the podium up to 20m above ground level in line with PNAP 223.

(f) BCI 4 35/2007

- Issue : The stiling structure on existing slope of the houses be accepted as non-accountable for GFA.
- Decision : Having studied the plans, the committee agreed that the stiling structure did not constitute a floor. However, the committee requested CBS/NTW to draw AP's attention to PlanD's comments on the architectural treatment and the carpark design as well as the anti-stiling clause contained in lease.

(g) BCI 5 35/2007

- Issue : (i) Exclusion of the green balconies and utility platforms from GFA calculation.
- (ii) Exclusion of the areas covered by green balconies and utility platforms from GFA calculation.
- (iii) Exclusion of the covered area under the building footprint from GFA calculation.
- (iv) Exclusion of voids over entrance foyer and seating area.
- Decision : (i)&(ii) The committee noted that some of the green balconies/utility platforms did not comply with the criteria set out in JPN. The committee therefore did not agree to exempt the balconies/utility platforms and the areas underneath them from GFA calculation.
- (iii) The committee noted that the covered areas did not fall within the purview of PNAP 116. Hence, the committee did not agree to the exemption of the covered area from GFA calculation.
- (iv) The committee, having studied the plans, agreed to the exemption of the voids from GFA calculation.

(h) BCI 6 35/2007

- Issue : Application for excessive non-domestic site coverage in accordance with PNAP 280.
- Decision : Noting that the proposal was in compliance with the requirements set out in PNAP 280, the committee agreed to grant a modification to permit excessive site coverage.

(i) BCI 7 35/2007

- Issue : Proposed additions to a building not abutting on a street.
- Decision : The committee noted that the fundamental information of the site including the site area, the existing GFA and provision of access and arrangement of EVA had not been provided. The committee also noted that PlanD had advised that the proposed works would protrude into view fan and that advice from Harbour Enhancement Committee should be sought. Having considered all relevant factors, the committee considered it was premature for BA to consider the proposed works under B(P)Reg 5 and 19(3).