

Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 5/2009 held on 10.2.2009

(a) MAI 1 5/2009

Issue : Exclusion of the voids over the living room of the duplex units from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee noted that exemption of the voids was given, inter alia, on the basis that there would not be any structural beam at the outer perimeter of the voids. The committee also noted that steel beams were actually built on site. The committee did not accept the AP's claim that the steel beams were parts of the curtain wall system to withstand only the loading of the curtain wall. Hence, the committee did not agree to the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation.

(b) MAI 2 5/2009

Issue : (i) Building over of a ROW.
(ii) Setback area to be taken as part of a street for the purpose of provision of lighting and ventilation for habitation rooms.

Decision : (i) The committee noted that the area in question was a lane in service. The committee noted that the AP's proposal for a bridge at the 3/F level linking the main tower and the landscaped roof of the ancillary block and fins for the support of building services at the 2/F level might turn into an overriding floor over the existing lane. The committee, having studied the design, did not agree to the building over of the ROW as proposed by the AP.

(ii) The committee did not agree that the setback area formed part of a street for the purpose of B(P)Reg 30.

(c) BCI 1 5/2009

Issue : Projection of shelter over street.

Decision : The committee noted that the structure was intended to be used as a shelter for passenger dropped off at the lay-by. The committee also noted that the portion of the shelter within the site had been included in GFA calculation. Having studied the design of the shelter, the committee accepted the projection of portion of the shelter over street subject to no adverse comment from HyD and the Airport Authority.

(d) BCI 2 5/2009

Issue : Application for excessive non-domestic site coverage in accordance with PNAP 280.

Decision : Noting that the proposal was in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP 280 and that there was no adverse comments from the outside departments, the committee agreed to grant a modification to permit excessive site coverage.

(e) BCI 3 5/2009

Issue : Exclusion of the void over the foyers of single-family houses and exclusion of voids over entrance foyer of clubhouses from GFA calculation.

Decision : Having studied the design, the committee agreed to accept exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation under B(P)Reg.

(f) BCI 4 5/2009

Issue : Proposed development on a site not abutting a 4.5m wide street.

Decision : The committee agreed to defer a decision on the proposed development intensity under B(P)Reg 19(3) pending further information on the provision of proper access to the development.

(g) BCI 5 5/2009

Issue : (h) Inclusion of lane in site area.

(i) Provision of a bridge at 7/F over an existing lane.

Decision : (i) The committee noted that the lane was not a required lane under the BO. Hence, the committee agreed to the inclusion of the lane in site area in line with paragraph 6 of PNAP 179.

(ii) The committee noted the lane was not a required lane under the BO. The committee also noted that the proposed bridge would facilitate the residents for access to the recreational facilities. Having considered all relevant factors, the committee accepted the projection of the proposed bridge over the existing lane.

(h) BCI 6 5/2009

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. Having considered the existing layout of the sites in the vicinity, the committee accepted the non-provision of a service lane.

(i) BCI 7 5/2009

Issue : Proposed access and drop off arrangements for a school proposal.

Decision : Having noted the advice of TD that the proposal was not acceptable from traffic engineering point of view. The committee agreed to invoke sec 16(1)(j) of the BO requiring the AP to provide further information to address the concerns on the proposed vehicular access as well as the servicing strategy for the proposed school development. The committee also agreed to reserve position under sec 16(1)(h) and (p) of the BO.