Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee Building Committee I 12/2009 held on 31.3.2009

(a) MAI 1 12/2009

Issue : Proposed dedication for public enjoyment of a promenade zoned

under OZP.

Decision : Having noted that according to TD, there was no transport need from

traffic and transport point of view for the promenade in question. The committee also noted that the promenade did not fall within the ambit of PNAP 233. Hence, the committee reaffirmed the decision not to accept the proposed dedication of land for purpose of promenade

under the BO in return for the granting of bonus GFA.

(b) MAI 2 12/2009

Issue : (i) Proposed buildings for the elderly on a site not abutting a specified street of 4.5m wide.

(ii) Non-provision of a service lane.

(iii) Access to the building via access road fell within government

land.

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

(ii) 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.

(iii) The committee noted that the site was accessible via an existing EVA on government land, which was subject to a right of way in favour of the owner. Having noted that LandsD had no objection to the use of the said government land accessible to the site, the committee had no objection to the proposal under B(P)R 5.

(c) BCI 1 12/2009

Issue : Proposed concrete plinths projecting over street.

Decision : Having noted adverse comments from FSD and TD, the committee did

not agree to the granting of exemption for the proposed plinths on

street.

(d) BCI 2 12/2009

Issue : (i) Access of site via an access road on government land.

- (ii) High headroom for traditional Chinese temples and buildings.
- (iii) Exclusion of covered areas under the eave projections.

Decision : (i) Having noted the advice from LandsD that further clarification on the lot boundary was required and that a right of access over a government land to the site had not been granted, the committee agreed that it was premature to consider the proposal under B(P)R 5.

- (ii) Having noted that the high headroom were genuine design features, the committee did not have objection to the proposed headrooms
- (iii) The committee noted that the proposal was controlled under the lease and under the OZP as far as the restriction of GFA was concerned. The committee also noted that the proposal was well within the permissible limit under the B(P)Reg even if the areas under the eave projections were counted for GFA. The committee believed that it would be more appropriate to leave the issue for PlanD to decide if such features were accountable for GFA for the purpose of OZP. As the areas covered by the eave projections would have a functional use, the committee agreed such covered areas were accountable for GFA as far as the B(P)Reg was concerned.

(e) BCI 3 12/2009

Issue : Covered walkway projecting over private street.

Decision: The committee noted that the proposed covered walkway would provide weather protection and would count for GFA. The committee also noted that there was no objection from relevant departments. Hence, the committee agreed to grant exemption under

s31(1) of the BO for the proposed walkway over street.

(f) BCI 4 12/2009

Issue : Extinguishment of the existing lanes and inclusion of the same in site

area.

Decision : As a lane was not required under BO for the proposed development and the lanes between the existing buildings did not serve any useful function as a lane upon amalgamation of the sites for redevelopment, the committee agreed that the lanes in question could be included in site area in line with PNAP 179. Having noted that there was no

the extinguishment of the lanes between the buildings.

objection from relevant outside departments, the committee accepted

(g) <u>BCI 5 12/2009</u>

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 subject to favourable comment from TD, agreed to grant hotel concession under B(P)Reg

23A subject to no adverse comment from TD.

(h) <u>BCI 6 12/2009</u>

Issue : Exclusion of the Covered planters at the external wall of the

residential towers from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee noted while that the proposed planter would promote

greenery, the committee did not agree to the exclusion of the proposed planter boxes from GFA calculation having noted the substantial size

of the proposed planter boxes.

(i) BCI 7 12/2009

Issue : Exclusion of the covered landscaped area on a natural slope

underneath the carport podium.

Decision : The committee noted that the proposal was subject to a scheme

approved by the TPB. The committee deferred a decision pending further information on whether the area would be open for public

enjoyment.

(j) BCI 8 12/2009

Issue : (i) Exclusion of canopy from SC and PR calculation for an existing shopping centre of a Tenant Purchase Scheme estate.

(ii) Exclusion of vertical architectural feature and horizontal

architectural feature at roof from PR calculation.

Decision: (i) The committee noted that the canopy was proposed not only next to the main entrance but also next to commercial area which might be subject to abuse. Hence the committee did not

recommend ICU to accept the application for exclusion of the

covered area.

(ii) The committee, having studied the design, supported ICU's proposal to exclude the features in question from GFA calculation if they were count in SC calculation. However the committee was of the view that the roof feature should count for SC in view of its size.