

Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 48/2007 held on 18.12.2007

(a) MAI 1 48/2007

- Issue : (i) Proposed single family houses development on a site not abutting a street of not less than 4.5m wide.
- (ii) Exclusion of voids over entrance foyer from GFA calculation.
- Decision : (i) The committee noted that the plans would be rejected under BO s16(1)(d) on the ground of the contravention of OZP. The committee also noted that the proposed development would be built to existing bulk as allowed under the town plan. Having studied the case, the committee would accept the proposed development intensity subject to the compliance of the town plans in all respect and subject to no objection from FSD.
- (ii) The committee, having studied the design and the size of the voids, agreed to the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation.

(b) MAI 2 48/2007

- Issue : Inclusion of the area of existing lanes in site area.
- Decision : The committee noted that the subject site was a Class C site and a lane was not required under the BO. The committee also noted that the service lanes in question became redundant upon redevelopment. Hence, the committee had no objection to the inclusion of the service lanes in site area and the building over of the same pursuant to PNAP 179 subject to diversion of water mains to the satisfaction of WSD.

(c) MAI 3 48/2007

- Issue : Dedication of passage in return for GFA exemption and bonus PR.
- Decision : The committee noted that the in principle support of TD on the proposed dedication of passages for the MTR subway. The committee also noted that the proposed passageways apparently were not the shortest possible routes. The committee also noted that the AP/owner would revisit the proposal and would provide further information/justifications on their case. Hence, the committee agreed that to defer a decision. However, the committee agreed in principle to grant concession on a pro-rata basis in return for the dedication of a public passage to be accepted by the BA.

(d) MAI 4 48/2007

Issue : Proposed additions to a building not abutting on a street.

Decision : The committee noted that the site was built on sea and connected to an existing building via footbridges. The committee also noted that FSD had no objection to the EVA and MOA arrangement and that an associated fire engineering report had been endorsed by FSC. Having considered the comments of the relevant departments, the committee accepted the proposed development intensity under B(P)Reg 19(3). AP would also be reminded to seek advice from Harbour Enhancement Committee.

(e) MAI 5 48/2007

Issue : (i) High headroom on G/F of an office building.
(ii) Exclusion of the central lightwell without intermediate floors from GFA calculation.
(iii) Proposed metal frame at the perimeter of the roof parapet.

Decision : (i) & (ii) The committee, having considered the design and that there was no objection from the relevant outside departments, accepted the proposed headroom.
(iii) The committee, having considered the size and the height of the metal frame, agreed not to grant exemption for the exclusion of the said frame for GFA calculation.

(f) BCI 1 48/2007

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

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

(g) BCI 2 48/2007

- Issue : (i) Exclusion of void over entrance foyer at G/F from GFA calculation.
- (ii) Non-provision of a service lane.
- Decision : (i) The committee, having considered the design and that there was no objection from the relevant outside departments, accepted the proposed headroom.
- (ii) 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.

(h) BCI 3 48/2007

- Issue : Formal appeal against disapproval of building plans under section 16(1)(d) of the BO.
- Decision : Having studied the plans and the background, the committee agreed to contest the appeal subject to further clarification from PlanD.

(i) BCI 4 48/2007

- Issue : Exclusion of the areas covered by green balconies and utility platforms from GFA calculation.
- Decision : The committee, having noted that the areas covered by the balconies and utility platforms were open on at least two sides and were within the 8% cap under JPN, agreed to exclude the covered areas from GFA calculation.

(j) BCI 5 48/2007

- Issue : (i) Exclusion of void over entrance lobby from GFA calculation.
- (ii) Exclusion of sunshades from SC and GFA calculation.
- Decision : (i) The committee, having considered the design and that there was no objection from the relevant outside departments, accepted the proposed headroom.
- (ii) The committee noted that some of the “sunshades” could serve other functions. Hence, the committee did not agree to accept the exclusion of the sunshades from GFA calculation.

(k) BCI 6 48/2007

Issue : Exclusion of cladding/ feature walls from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee, having considered the design, agreed only to accept the exclusion of those cladding walls in line with the criteria set out in PNAP 13 from GFA calculation.

(l) BCI 7 48/2007

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.

(m) BCI 8 48/2007

Issue : Proposed unmanned transposer station at a site not abutting on a street not less than 4.5m wide.

Decision : Having studied the nature of the development and the comments from the relevant government departments, the committee accepted the proposed development intensity.

(n) BCI 9 48/2007

Issue : Application for hotel concession.

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