

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee  
Building Committee I 48/2008 held on 9.12.2008**

(a) BCI 1 48/2008

Issue : Intended change in use from office to domestic use.

Decision : As the intended change in use did not comply with Building (Planning) Regulations, the committee agreed to prohibit the proposed change in use.

(b) BCI 2 48/2008

Issue : (i) Application for hotel concession.

(ii) Inclusion of lane into site area.

Decision : (i) The committee, having 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, agreed to grant hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

(ii) The committee noted that the site was a Class B site and the lane was not a required lane under the BO. In line with PNAP 179, the committee agreed to allow the existing lane to count for site area.

(c) BCI 3 48/2008

Issue : Application for hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A for a hotel conversion project.

Decision : The committee, having noted 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, agreed to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

(d) BCI 4 48/2008

Issue : Proposed dedication for public passage in return for bonus PR & SC.

Decision : The committee noted that the relevant outside department had confirmed the proposed setback area was essential for pedestrian circulation. Hence, the committee had no in-principle objection to the granting of concession. However, the committee was of the view that the set back area should be surrendered in lieu of dedication as per recommendation. The committee requested the relevant Chief Building Surveyor to further clarify the issue with both Transport Department and Highways Department.

(e) BCI 5 48/2008

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

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