

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 12/2010 held on 30.3.2010**

(a) BCI 1 12/2010

Issue : Development intensity for a site not abutting a street of not less than 4.5m wide.

Decision : The committee, having noted the objection of a Government department, did not accept the proposed development intensity under B(P)Reg 19(3).

(b) BCI 2 12/2010

Issue : Review for the proposed change in use from classroom to dormitory.

Decision : The committee studied the case and noted that the permissible SC would be exceeded arising from the proposal. Hence, the committee agreed to maintain that the proposal was not acceptable under the BO.

(c) BCI 3 12/2010

Issue : (i) Inclusion in site area of the existing lane cum ROW.
(ii) Inclusion in site area and building over of the existing ROW.
(iii) Application for excessive non-domestic site coverage in accordance with PNAP APP-132.
(iv) High headroom over entrance lobby and banking hall for a commercial building.

Decision : (i) The committee noted that the lane cum ROW was not a 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 noted that BO s31(1) did not apply to the ROW and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments. The committee agreed in-principle to the inclusion of the ROW in site area and building over of it.
(iii) Noting that the proposal was in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP APP-132 and there was no adverse comment from other departments, the committee agreed to the granting of modification to permit excessive site coverage.
(iv) Having considered the genuine design of the entrance lobby and banking hall, the committee agreed to accept the proposed headroom.

(d) BCI 4 12/2010

Issue : Development intensity for a site not abutting a street of not less than 4.5m wide.

Decision : The committee, having noted the objection of a Government department, did not accept the proposed development intensity under B(P)Reg 19(3).

(e) BCI 5 12/2010

Issue : (i) Proposed dedication of setback area for public passage in return for bonus PR & SC and inclusion of the area in site area.
(ii) Application for excessive non-domestic site coverage in accordance with PNAP APP-132.
(iii) Exclusion of voids over lift lobbies of duplex units from GFA calculation.
(iv) Exclusion of the void over the living room of the topmost duplex unit from GFA calculation.

Decision : (i) Having noted that the setback was not essential from traffic engineering point of view, the committee did not agree to the granting of bonus PR & SC in return for the proposed dedication. The committee also noted that the strip of land in question was not required under the BO and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments. Hence, the committee agreed to permit the inclusion of the land in site area.
(ii) Noting that the proposal was not in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP APP-132, the committee did not agree to the granting of modification to permit excessive site coverage.
(iii) The committee, having studied the design and noted that there was no objection from relevant outside departments, agreed to the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation.
(iv) Having studied the design, the committee did not agree to the exclusion of the void from GFA calculation.