

Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 24/2010 held on 22.6.2010

(a) Matters Arising from BCI 4 23/2010

Issue : Proposed domestic development on a site abutting a street of less than 4.5m wide.

Decision : The committee noted that the proposed development parameter was in line with the OZP and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments. Having studied all the relevant factors, the committee accepted the proposed development intensity under B(P)Reg 19(3).

(b) MAI 1 24/2010

Issue : Exclusion of architectural features from GFA & SC calculation.

Decision : Having considered that the features were genuine design features, the committee agreed to the exclusion of them from GFA and SC calculation.

(c) MAI 2 24/2010

Issue : (i) Portion of a street less than 4.5m wide.
(ii) Proposed single family house on a site abutting a street of less than 4.5m wide.

Decision : (i) Having studied the layout of the street and the previous determinations on other houses on the same parent lot, the committee reaffirmed that B(P)Reg 19(3) was applicable to the site.
(ii) The committee noted that the proposal was not in line with development parameters set out in the Layout Plan. Having noted the objections raised by 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).

(d) BCI 1 24/2010

Issue : Exclusion of areas reserved for public transit from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee noted that the change in circumstance was a special occasion. Having considered the existing condition of the areas in question, public interest, the policy support from relevant bureaux and that there was no objection from relevant departments, the committee

agreed to permit the exclusion of the areas reserved for public transit from GFA calculation.

(e) BCI 2 24/2010

Issue : Exclusion of areas reserved for public transit from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee noted that the change in circumstance was a special occasion. Having considered the existing condition of the areas in question, public interest, the policy support from relevant bureaux and that there was no objection from relevant departments, the committee agreed to permit the exclusion of the areas reserved for public transit from GFA calculation.

(f) BCI 3 24/2010

Issue : Exclusion of areas reserved for public transit from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee noted that the change in circumstance was a special occasion. Having considered the existing condition of the areas in question, public interest, the policy support from relevant bureaux and that there was no objection from relevant departments, the committee agreed to permit the exclusion of the areas reserved for public transit from GFA calculation.

(g) BCI 4 24/2010

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.

(h) BCI 5 24/2010

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

Decision : 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.

(i) BCI 6 24/2010

Issue : Exclusion of the void over entrance lift lobbies and the voids over landscape courtyard from GFA calculation.

Decision : The committee, having considered the design and the function of the voids, agreed to exclude the voids from GFA calculation.

(j) BCI 7 24/2010

Issue : Exclusion of new canopies from GFA calculation.

Decision : Having noted that the canopies were excessive in size and the objection from a relevant outside department, the committee did not agree to permit the exclusion of the canopies from GFA calculation.

(k) BCI 8 24/2010

Issue : Inclusion of the existing ROW into site area.

Decision : Having studied the case, the committee did not identify the existence of ROW and the portion of land in question could not be justified as a street. Hence, the committee agreed to the inclusion of the portion of land into site area.