

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee  
Building Committee I 17/2010 held on 4.5.2010**

(a) MAI 1 17/2010

- Issue : (i) Proposed residential development on a site not provided with an access from a street.
- (ii) Development intensity for a site not abutting on a street.
- Decision : (i) Noting the existence of a building in the past and that the site was accessible from the public pier, the committee accepted the proposed residential development on a site not provided with an access from a street.
- (ii) The committee noted that there was no objection from relevant outside departments. Hence, the committee agreed to the development intensity.

(b) MAI 2 17/2010

- Issue : (i) Disapproval of plan under BO s16(1)(g).
- (ii) Site Classification.
- Decision : (i) The committee noted that the change in circumstances as shown in the revised residential development proposal and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments. The committee agreed not to disapprove the plans under BO s16(1)(g).
- (ii) The committee noted that the site abutted on a specified street and possessed the characteristic of a Class B site under B(P)Reg 18A and that BC had agreed on earlier occasion to grant a technical modification to regard the site be a Class B site. Hence, the committee reaffirmed its earlier decision and agreed to grant a technical modification to regard the site be a Class B site.

(c) MAI 3 17/2010

- Issue : Application for hotel concession.
- Decision : The committee considered the design and layout of the guestrooms were dubious and did not agree to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

(d) MAI 4 17/2010

- Issue : (i) Disapproval of plan under BO s16(1)(g).
- (ii) Total SC of the proposed building on a carved-out lot and the existing buildings on the parent lot.
- Decision : (i) The committee noted that the proposed development would result in a building differing in height from the buildings within the immediate neighbourhood. Having noted that there was no change in site circumstances and taking into account the advice of other related government department, the committee agreed to reaffirmed its earlier decision that s16(1)(g) be invoked to disapprove the plans.
- (ii) The committee, having noted the history of the site and that there was no change in site circumstances, agreed to reaffirmed its earlier decision that the proposed building on the carved-out lot should not be allowed to render the total SC of the overall development including the proposed building and the existing buildings on the parent lot to exceed the permitted SC under B(P)Reg 20.

(e) BCI 1 17/2010

- Issue : Exclusion of voids over living rooms.
- Decision : The committee, having studied the design, had no objection to the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation subject to the provision of appropriate anti-abuse measures.

(f) BCI 2 17/2010

- Issue : Application for excessive non-domestic site coverage in accordance with PNAP APP-132.
- Decision : The committee took the view that the disposition of the setback areas did not comply with para. 3(e) of PNAP APP-132. Hence, the committee did not agree to grant the modification for excessive site coverage.

(g) BCI 3 17/2010

- Issue : (i) Inclusion of ROWs in site area.
- (ii) A bridge to be built over existing ROWs and exclusion of the covered area under the bridge from gross floor area calculation.
- Decision : (i) The committee noted that the ROWs were not required service lanes for the purpose of BO and the areas in question formed part of the existing site. Hence, the committee agreed to the inclusion of the ROWs in site area.
- (ii) Having noted the adverse comments from an outside department, the committee did not agree to permit the bridge to be built over the ROWs and exclusion of the area beneath the bridge from gross floor area calculation.