

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee**  
**Building Committee I 22/2009 held on 9.6.2009**

(a) MAI 1 22/2009

- Issue : (i) Disapproval of plan under BO s16(1)(g).
- (ii) Application for hotel concession.
- (iii) Exclusion of architectural features from PR calculation.
- (iv) Exclusion of podium garden areas covered by projected building footprint from GFA calculation.
- (v) Exclusion of voids over entrance lobby and reception area/lounge from GFA calculation.
- Decision : (i) The committee could not identify any character or features to be preserved in the neighbourhood. In the absence of a properly defined neighbourhood and in line with the earlier decision of the appeal tribunal as well as legal advice, the committee agreed not to invoke BO s16(1)(g) to reject the plans.
- (ii) 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 no adverse comment from TD.
- (iii) The committee, having considered the unique design of the building and the chance of abuse was minimal, agreed to the exclusion of the features from GFA calculation subject to the conditions that the features were of non-structural in design and that the rooms containing such features were included in the hotel licence area.
- (iv) As the area covered by the building did not serve any functional use, the committee agreed to the exclusion of the area of the shadow cast by the building from GFA calculation.
- (v) At the request of a member, the committee deferred a decision on the subject.

(b) MAI 2 22/2009

Issue : Proposed revision of the dedication area.

Decision : The committee noted that the proposal would result in diminishing of public right of passage and that no public interest could be identified. Taking into account a legal advice obtained in mid 2008, the committee did not accept the revised dedication proposal.

(c) BCI 1 22/2009

- Issue : (i) High headroom for carpark storey.  
(ii) Non-provision of a service lane.

- Decision : (i) The committee noted that the high headroom was required due to the presence of the structural members. The committee also noted that the relevant department did not raise concern on the building height and bulk. Hence, the committee had no objection to the proposed headroom for the carpark storey.
- (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.