

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 3/2010 held on 19.1.2010**

(a) MAI 1 3/2010

- Issue : (i) Extinguishment and inclusion in site area of the existing lane cum ROW.
- (ii) Building over of the existing lane cum ROW.
- Decision : (i) The committee noted that the lane was a not required lane under the BO and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments. Hence, the committee agreed to permit the inclusion of the lane in site area.
- (ii) Having studied the case, the committee did not agree to permit the existing lane cum ROW to be built over which gave access to a government lane.

(b) MAI 2 3/2010

- Issue : Inclusion of existing private pedestrian way into site area.
- Decision : The committee noted that the private pedestrian way was not a required lane under the BO and that there was no objection from relevant departments. Hence, the committee agreed to the granting of exemption to allow the existing private street within site to count for site area.

(c) MAI 3 3/2010

- Issue : (i) Exclusion of voids from GFA calculation for an institution building.
- (ii) Vehicular access run-in/run-out likely to be dangerous or prejudicial to the safety or convenience of the traffic using the street.
- Decision : (i) The committee, having studied the design of proposed voids, agreed to the exclusion of voids from GFA calculation.
- (ii) Taking into account TD's adverse comments, the committee agreed to invoke Section 16(1)(h) of the BO to disapprove the plan.

(d) BCI 1 3/2010

Issue : Shop Extension to the yard area of the building approved under “Volume Regulations”.

Decision : Having noted that the PR would not exceed the permissible under the First Schedule, the committee agreed to grant a technical modification to permit the existing domestic site coverage on upper floors to exceed the permissible under the B(P)Reg.

(e) BCI 2 3/2010

Issue : Exclusion of void over entrance foyer from GFA calculation.

Decision : Having considered the design, the committee accepted the exclusion of the void from GFA calculation.

(f) BCI 3 3/2010

Issue : Inclusion of lane into site area.

Decision : The committee, having noted that the lane was not a required lane under the BO and that it would not be built over, agreed to the inclusion of the lane in site area in line with PNAP APP-73.

(g) BCI 4 3/2010

Issue : (i) Extinguishment, building over and inclusion in site area of the existing service lane.

(ii) Inclusion of the proposed diversionary lane in site area for PR & SC calculation.

Decision : (i) The committee noted that the lane was not a required lane under the BO and that there was no objection from relevant departments. The committee raised no in-principle objection to the extinguishment, building over and inclusion in site area of the said lane for the development.

(ii) Noting that the proposed diversionary lane was not required under the BO for the proposed building and that there was no objection from the outside departments, members had no in-principle objection to the inclusion of proposed diversionary lane in site area under PNAP APP-73.

(h) BCI 5 3/2010

- Issue : (i) Extinguishment, building over and inclusion in site area of the existing service lane.
- (ii) Inclusion of the proposed diversionary lane in site area for PR & SC calculation.
- Decision : (i) The committee noted that the lane was not a required lane under the BO and that there was no objection from relevant departments. The committee raised no in-principle objection to the extinguishment, building over and inclusion in site area of the said lane for the development.
- (ii) Noting that the proposed diversionary lane was not required under the BO for the proposed building and that there was no objection from the outside departments, members had no in-principle objection to the inclusion of proposed diversionary lane in site area under PNAP APP-73.

(i) BCI 6 3/2010

- Issue : Disapproval of plan under BO s16(1)(g).
- Decision : Having studied the case, the committee asked for additional information and deferred a decision.

(j) BCI 7 3/2010

- Issue : (i) Inclusion in site area of the existing ROW and partly building over and under of it.
- (ii) Exclusion of covered area of the existing ROW from GFA calculation.
- Decision : (i) Having accepted the ROW was not a street, the committee raised no objection to the inclusion of the ROW in site area and the building over/under of it.
- (ii) The committee having studied the plans, agreed that area covered by the building on 1/F could be excluded from GFA calculation if such area formed part of the circulation area for the carparking floor.

(k) BCI 8 3/2010

- Issue : (i) Extinguishment, building over and inclusion in site area of the existing service lane.
- (ii) Inclusion of the proposed diversionary lane in site area for PR & SC calculation.
- Decision : (i) The committee noted that the lane was not a required lane under the BO and that there was no objection from relevant departments. The committee raised no in-principle objection to the extinguishment, building over and inclusion in site area of the said lane for the development.
- (ii) Noting that the proposed diversionary lane was not required under the BO for the proposed building and that there was no objection from the outside departments, members had no in-principle objection to the inclusion of proposed diversionary lane in site area under PNAP APP-73.

(l) BCI 9 3/2010

- Issue : (i) Proposed private street for site classification purpose.
- (ii) Application for excessive non-domestic site coverage in accordance with PNAP APP-132.
- (iii) Inclusion of the proposed setback for lane widening into site area.
- Decision : (i) Having heard the clarification made by the AP in the meeting, the committee accepted the proposed private street was a specified street for the purpose of site classification.
- (ii) Noting that the proposal was in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP APP-132 and that there was no adverse comments from other departments, the committee agreed to grant a modification to permit excessive non-domestic site coverage.
- (iii) The committee noted that the AP had proposed to setback and widen the existing lane and that the lane was not a required lane for the proposed building under the BO. Having noted that there was no objection from other outside departments, the committee agreed to the inclusion of setback area in question into site area in line with PNAP APP-73.