

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 26/2008 held on 2.7.2008**

(a) BCI 1 26/2008

- Issue : (i) Exclusion of architectural features from SC and PR calculation.
- (ii) Exclusion of RC structure on podium level for the support of the adjoining party wall.
- Decision : (i) The committee, having considered the design, agreed to exclude the features from PR and SC calculations.
- (ii) The committee, having studied the design, agreed that the AP should provide further justification on the design.

(b) BCI 2 26/2008

- Issue : Adverse comment from other department on the building height of a proposed development.
- Decision : The committee noted that proposal complied with the extant OZP. Having considered all relevant factors, the committee agreed to defer a decision pending PlanD's further advice on the subject.

(c) BCI 3 26/2008

- Issue : Exclusion of void within the architectural features from GFA calculation.
- Decision : The committee noted that the features, projecting about 8m from the external wall, were excessive in size. Hence, the committee did not accept the proposal.

(d) BCI 4 26/2008

- Issue : Application for hotel concession.
- Decision : The committee noted that the proposal was generally in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP 111. Hence, the committee agreed to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A subject to the acceptance of TD on the proposal including the on-site transport facilities and the in compliance with the road widening scheme.

(e) BCI 5 26/2008

Issue : Building upon and inclusion in site area of the existing ROW.

Decision : The committee noted that the ROW allowed to count for site area and built over for the existing building on site. Having considered the case, the committee agreed that the ROW was not a street and hence had no objection to its inclusion in site area and partly built over.

(f) BCI 6 26/2008

Issue : Proposed single family house on a site not abutting a street of not less than 4.5m wide.

Decision : The committee noted that the boundary of the lot had not been verified and that the proposal did not comply with the lease conditions. Hence, the committee agreed that it was premature to make a determination of the permissible development intensity in the absence of information on the lot boundaries and site area as well as the lease conditions.