

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee**  
**Building Committee I 19/2009 held on 19.5.2009**

(a) Matters Arising from MAI 2 18/2009

Issue : Proposed setback for a composite building in return for excessive non-domestic/domestic site coverage under PNAP 280.

Decision : The committee, having accepted the revised setback was in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP 280, agreed to the granting of modification for excessive site coverage.

(b) BCI 1 19/2009

Issue : (i) Extinguishment of the existing service lane and the inclusion of the same in site area for PR & SC calculation.

(ii) Measurement of the height of a building for a site abutting two streets with level difference of about 6m.

Decision : (i) The committee noted that the AP would provide a diversionary lane with ROW to serve the adjoining lots and that such lane would be deducted from the site area. Subject that the AP would provide further justification on how to secure the future ROW and to maintain the new provision, and no objection from TD, the committee had no objection to grant modification to permit the extinguishment of the existing service lane under BOs 31(1) and B(P)Reg 23(2)(a).

(ii) Having noted the adverse comments from an outside department and also the height of a building was measured from the mean level of the lower or lowest street upon which it abutted, the committee did not accept the AP's proposed measurement of the height of podium by taking the mean of levels of two streets as ground level.

(c) BCI 2 19/2009

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

Decision : The committee noted that the ROW was allowed to count for site area and be built over for two existing buildings 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 build over.

(d) BCI 3 19/2009

Issue : Application for hotel concession.

Decision : The committee noted that the proposal was generally in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP 111 and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments. The committee agreed to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

(e) BCI 4 19/2009

Issue : Application for hotel concession.

Decision : The committee noted that the proposal was generally in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP 111 and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments. The committee agreed to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

(f) BCI 5 19/2009

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, agreed to grant hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A subject to the AP's demonstration on the compliance with OZP to PlanD's satisfaction.

(g) BCI 6 19/2009

Issue : Application for hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A for the conversion of some floors of a composite building which was built under "Volume Regulation".

Decision : The committee noted that the proposed A&A works would be carried out within the existing building envelope. The committee also noted that the proposal was 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. Hence, the committee agreed to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

(h) BCI 7 19/2009

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, agreed to grant hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

(i) BCI 8 19/2009

Issue : Re-diversion of existing footpath providing access to the adjoining lots.

Decision : The committee noted that there was no ROW over the existing footpath and the owner would re-provide an access road/EVA with ROW granted to the adjoining owner. Subject to the condition that the new access road/ EVA be completed prior to the extinguishment of the existing footpath, the committee accepted the proposed access to the adjoining lots under B(P)Reg 5.

(j) BCI 9 19/2009

Issue : Proposed conversion of the existing carparks into a shop restaurant in a building approved under “Volume Regulation”.

Decision : The committee noted that proposed building works were internal alteration without vertical and horizontal extension and no additional GFA would be proposed and that TD had no objection to the deletion of the carparks. The committee agreed that reassessment of site coverage and plot ratio under the current B(P)Reg was not required for the proposed works.

(k) BCI 10 19/2009

Issue : Proposed change in use from estate office to residential care home for the elderly (RCHE).

Decision : The committee noted that the exit arrangement for the proposed RCHE did not comply with the MOE Code. As the proposed change in use would not be acceptable under s25 of the BO, the committee supported the recommendation to prohibit the proposed change in use.

(l) BCI 11 19/2009

Issue : (i) Application for hotel concession.  
(ii) Exclusion of covered area at G/F under the footprint of 2/F from GFA calculation.  
(iii)(a)-(c) Exclusion of various voids over entrance lobby, pre-function area and ballroom from GFA calculation.  
(iii)(d) Exclusion of covered area at G/F under the footprint of building at 4/F from GFA calculation.

(iii)(e) Exclusion of vertical architectural features from GFA calculation.

- Decision : (i) Noting that the proposal generally complied with the criteria set out in PNAP 111 and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments, the committee agreed to grant hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.
- (ii) Having considered the design and the size of the covered area at G/F, the committee did not agree to the exclusion of the covered area from GFA calculation.
- (iii)(a)-(c) Having considered the design and the function of the voids, the committee accepted the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation.
- (iii)(d) Having considered the design, the committee did not agree to the exclusion of the covered area at G/F underneath 4/F from GFA calculation.
- (iii)(e) Having considered the features were genuine design features, the committee agreed to the exclusion of them from GFA calculation.

(m) BCI 12 19/2009

- Issue : Proposed surrender for pedestrian passage in return for bonus PR and SC.
- Decision : Having noted that the proposed surrender was required by lease and was supported by relevant outside departments, the committee accepted the proposed surrender in return for bonus concession subject to acceptance of the same by TD.

(n) BCI 13 19/2009

- Issue : (i) Proposed footbridge projected over street.
- (ii) Exclusion of portion of a covered footbridge within private lot from GFA calculation.
- Decision : (i) The committee noted that the footbridge was required under lease and that there was no adverse comment from outside departments. Having considered the case, the committee agreed to permit the footbridge to project over the internal street.
- (ii) Having considered the design and the status of the footbridge, the committee agreed to the exclusion of the portion of the footbridge within the private lot from GFA calculation.