

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I5/2008 held on 5.2.2008**

(a) MAI 1 5/2008

Issue : Application for hotel concession.

Decision : The committee, having noted that the proposal was generally in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP 111, agreed to grant hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A subject to no adverse comment from TD.

(b) MAI 2 5/2008

Issue : Dedication of passage in return for bonus PR and SC.

Decision : The committee agreed to defer a decision pending further justifications to the satisfaction of TD that the proposed subway and the exit/entrance to the building were essential provisions.

(c) BCI 1 5/2008

Issue : Proposed storey height for a rowing centre.

Decision : Having considered the use and the design of the building, the committee accepted the proposed headroom.

(d) BCI 2 5/2008

Issue : (i) Non-provision of a service lane for a building.
(ii) Inclusion of the existing lane in the site area calculation.

Decision : (i) & (ii) The committee did not agree the proposal was a detached building and the committee also noted that there was an existing lane at the rear. The committee, having considered the site situation, did not accept the non-provision of a service lane and the inclusion of the existing lane in the site area calculation.

(e) BCI 3 5/2008

Issue : Exclusion of the following areas from GFA calculation for the proposed domestic development: -

- (i) Void underneath the elevated podium decks over slope;
- (ii) Covered landscaped areas in front of the residential entrance lift lobbies on G/F and outside the perimeters of domestic towers;
- (iii) Areas covered by horizontal screen connecting to the clubhouse on podium;
- (iv) Covered areas under balconies and utility platforms;
- (v) Roof features projecting from the parapets of flat roofs;
- (vi) Open-grill architectural features at the external walls at some of the levels.

- Decision :
- (i) Having considered the topographical constraint, the committee agreed to the exclusion of the voids areas from GFA calculation.
 - (ii) Having studied the plans, and in line with the existing practice and policy, the committee could not identify special circumstances for the committee to allow the exclusion of the covered landscaped areas.
 - (iii) Having considered the design, the committee agreed that the covered area formed part of the recreational facilities. Hence the committee did not agree to grant further exemption from GFA calculation.
 - (iv) The committee, having noted that the covered areas were open on at least two sides and within the 8% cap set under the JPN, agreed to exclude such areas from GFA calculation.
 - (v)&(vi) Having considered the features were genuine features and would not count for site coverage, the committee agreed to the exclusion of them from GFA calculation provided that no flat roof areas would be covered by the said features.

(f) BCI 4 5/2008

- Issue :
- (i) Exclusion of lift shaft area from SC calculation for an addition and alteration works.
 - (ii) Exclusion of the architectural features from SC and GFA calculation and projection of them over street.
- Decision :
- (i) The committee noted that proposed disabled lift only served private areas. Hence the committee did not agree to the granting of exclusion of the lift shaft from SC calculation on ground of public interest.

- (ii) The committee noted that the features involved structural columns projecting over street. The committee also considered that the size of the features was excessive hence the committee did not agree to the proposal.

(g) BCI 5 5/2008

- Issue :
- (i) Exclusion of sky gardens and their associated voids from GFA calculation.
 - (ii) Exclusion of voids over landscaped gardens from GFA calculation.
 - (iii) Excessive domestic site coverage for Senior Citizen Residence.
 - (iv) Exclusion of refuge areas for Senior Citizen Residence from GFA calculation.
- Decision :
- (i) & (ii) The committee, having noted PlanD's adverse advice on the building height, did not agree to the exclusion of the sky gardens and the associated voids as well as the voids over the landscaped gardens from GFA calculation.
 - (iii) The committee did not identify valid justification hence did not accept the proposal.
 - (iv) Having considered the design, the committee would defer a decision pending further information from the AP.