Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee Building Committee I 34/2010 held on 31.8.2010

MAI 1 34/2010 (a)

Increase of GFA on a site abutting a specified street of less than 4.5m. Issue

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) BCI 1 34/2010

Application for hotel concession. Issue

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 TD.

BCI 2 34/2010 (c)

Issue (i) Exclusion of void over living room of a residential house from

GFA calculation.

(ii) Non-provision of a service lane.

The committee, having studied the design, had no objection to Decision (i)

the exclusion of the void from GFA calculation.

(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.

BCI 3 34/2010 (d)

Shop Extension to the rear yard of the building approved under Issue

"Volume Regulation".

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) <u>BCI 4 34/2010</u>

Issue : Exclusion of void over living room of a duplex unit from GFA

calculation.

Decision : The committee, having considered the design and having noted that

there was no objection from relevant outside departments, accepted the

exclusion of the void from GFA calculation.

(f) BCI 5 34/2010

Issue : Disapproval of plan under BO s16(1)(g).

Decision : Having considered the previous ruling and all relevant factors, the

committee agreed that BO s16(1)(g) was not applicable.