

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 6/2010 held on 9.2.2010**

(a) MAI 1 6/2010

Issue : Exclusion of sky garden from GFA calculation.

Decision : Having considered all relevant issues, the committee agreed to defer a decision pending further advice from the relevant department.

(b) MAI 2 6/2010

Issue : Application for hotel concession.

Decision : The committee, having noted the proposal was generally in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP APP-40, agreed to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A subject to no adverse comments from relevant departments.

(c) BCI 1 6/2010

Issue : Application for hotel concession.

Decision : The committee, having noted the proposal was generally in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP APP-40, agreed to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

(d) BCI 2 6/2010

Issue : (i) Application for hotel concession.
(ii) Proposed sunshades of 1.5m projection to be excluded from site coverage and plot ratio calculations.
(iii) Exclusion of architectural feature over the main entrance from SC and PR calculations.

Decision : (i) The committee, having noted the proposal was generally in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP APP-40, agreed to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A subject to no adverse comments from TD.
(ii) In view of the excessive size of the feature and the lack of justification from the AP, the committee did not agree to the granting of exemption for the exclusion of the proposed sunshades from SC and PR calculation.

(iii) Having considered the feature was a genuine design feature, the committee agreed to the exclusion of the feature from SC and PR calculations.

(e) BCI 3 6/2010

Issue : Exclusion of void over G/F entrance lobby from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee, having agreed that the storey height of the entrance hall to be excessive, did not agree to the exclusion of the void from GFA calculation.

(f) BCI 4 6/2010

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.

(g) BCI 5 6/2010

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

Decision : The committee, having studied the design, agreed to the exclusion of the void from GFA calculation.

(h) BCI 6 6/2010

Issue : Exclusion of sky garden from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee noted the concern raised by a department on the excessive building height of the proposed development. Having considered all relevant factors, the committee did not agree to the granting of exemption for the exclusion of the sky garden from GFA calculation.

(i) BCI 7 6/2010

Issue : Application for hotel concession.

Decision : The committee, having noted the proposal was generally in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP APP-40, agreed to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A subject to no adverse comment from TD.

(j) BCI 8 6/2010

Issue : Exclusion of bay windows from GFA calculation.

Decision : Having studied the plans, the committee raised no objection to the exclusion of the bay windows from GFA calculation.

(k) BCI 9 6/2010

Issue : (i) Extinguishment of the existing service lanes and the inclusion of the same in site area for PR & SC calculation.
(ii) Inclusion of the proposed diversionary lane into site area for PR & SC calculation.

Decision : (i) The committee noted that the AP would provide a diversionary lane to serve the adjoining lots. The committee had no objection to the granting of modification to permit the extinguishment of the existing service lane under BO s31(1) and B(P)Reg 23(2)(a) and the inclusion of the same in site area for PR & SC calculation subject to no objection from other relevant departments and that the new diversionary lane would be enjoyed by the owners and occupants of the adjacent buildings.
(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 relevant outside departments, members had no in-principle objection to the inclusion of proposed diversionary lane in site area under PNAP APP-73.

(l) BCI 10 6/2010

Issue : (i) Non-provision of a service lane.
(ii) Exclusion of precast loss formwork for external wall from SC and PR calculations.

Decision : (i) 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.
(ii) The committee accepted that the loss formwork resembled external wall finishes. In line with PNAP APP-2, the committee agreed to the exclusion of the loss formwork from SC and PR calculations.

(m) BCI 11 6/2010

Issue : (i) Proposed surrender of setback for road widening in return for bonus PR and SC.

(ii) Disapproval of building plans under BO s16(1)(h).

Decision : (i) Having noted that the proposed setback was required for road widening by the government, the committee agreed to the granting of bonus PR and SC in return for the surrender.

(ii) Having considered the plans, the committee agreed to invoke section 16(1)(h) of the BO to reject the plans subject to confirmation of TD that the proposed run-in out was not acceptable under section 16(1)(h) of the BO.

(n) BCI 12 6/2010

Issue : (i) Proposed single family house on a site not abutting a street of not less than 4.5m wide.

(ii) Non-provision of a service lane.

Decision : (i) Having noted the advice from the relevant outside departments and taking into account of previous determinations on the other houses on the same parent lot, the committee did not agree to the proposed site coverage under B(P)Reg 19(3). The committee also required the AP to provide clarification on the site area and site boundaries.

(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.