

Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 36/2010 held on 14.9.2010

(a) MAI 1 36/2010

Issue : Exclusion of void over living room in duplex unit.

Decision : The committee, having studied the design, had no objection to the exclusion of the void from GFA calculation.

(b) MAI 2 36/2010

Issue : (i) Proposed development on a site not provided with an access from a street.

(ii) Proposed development on a site not abutting a 4.5m wide street.

Decision : (i) The committee noted that the site was accessible via an existing EVA and a vacant government land. Having studied the plans and noted that there was no objection from relevant outside departments, the committee had no objection to the proposal under B(P)R 5.

(ii) The committee noted that there was no objection from relevant outside departments. Having considered all the relevant factors, the committee agreed to the development intensity under B(P)Reg 19(3).

(c) MAI 3 36/2010

Issue : Projections over private street.

Decision : The committee noted that the noise barriers and footbridge as noise mitigating measure had been approved by the Town Planning Board, that the footbridge was for pedestrian passage only without commercial activities. Having studied the plans and noted that there was no objection from relevant outside departments, the committee agreed in-principle to the projections over private street under BOs 31(1).

(d) BCI 1 36/2010

Issue : Proposed change in use from shop to residential care home for the persons with a disability.

Decision : The committee noted that the proposed change in use would contravene building regulations. Having considered the comments of relevant outside departments, the committee agreed that the BA's position in respect of the proposed change in use be reserved.

(e) BCI 2 36/2010

Issue : (i) Exclusion of covered landscape garden and residents' recreational facilities from GFA calculation.

(ii) Excessive storey height.

Decision : (i) 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 GFA exemption.

(ii) The committee studied the plans and noted that the headroom was excessive. The committee did not accept the excessive storey height.

(f) BCI 3 36/2010

Issue : Proposed development on a site not provided with an access from a street.

Decision : The committee noted that the site was accessible from a local footpath and trails, and that the proposed development parameter was in line with the OZP. The committee also noted the comments of relevant outside departments. Having considered all the relevant factors, the committee had no objection to the proposal under B(P)R 5 and agreed to the proposed development intensity under B(P)Reg 19(3) subject to no objection from FSD.

(g) BCI 4 36/2010

Issue : Application for excessive non-domestic site coverage in accordance with PNAP APP-132.

Decision : Having considered the case, the committee asked for additional information and deferred a decision.

(h) BCI 5 36/2010

Issue : Conversion without horizontal or vertical addition to building built under the "Volume Regulations".

Decision : The committee noted that proposed building works were internal alteration without vertical and horizontal extension and no additional GFA would be proposed. The committee agreed that reassessment of PR and SC under the current B(P)Reg was not required for the proposed works.

(i) BCI 6 36/2010

Issue : Horizontal planes of prescribed windows protruding beyond lot boundary over the adjoining box culvert.

Decision : The committee noted that the protrusion was minimal and that there was no planned development at the area and no objection from relevant outside departments. Hence, the committee accepted the rectangular horizontal planes to protrude outside lot boundary over the box culvert.

(j) BCI 7 36/2010

Issue : Inclusion of lane into site area.

Decision : The committee, having noted that the lane was not a required lane under the BO and that it would not be built over, agreed to the inclusion of the lane in the site area in line with PNAP APP-73.

(k) BCI 8 36/2010

Issue : (i) Proposed dedication of land required to be surrendered under lease in return for bonus PR and SC.
(ii) Inclusion of area to be surrendered in site area for PR & SC calculation.
(iii) Formal appeal against disapproval of building plans.

Decision : (i) Having noted the advice of relevant outside departments and considered all relevant factors, the committee did not agree the granting of bonus PR & SC for the proposed dedication.
(ii) Noting that the area could be included in site area under lease, the committee agreed in-principle to accept the inclusion of area to be surrendered in site area subject to no objection from PlanD
(iii) Having reviewed the case, the committee agreed in-principle to contest the appeal.

(l) BCI 9 36/2010

Issue : Exclusion of void over shopping arcade from GFA calculation.

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

(m) BCI 10 36/2010

Issue : (i) Inclusion of lane into site area.

(ii) Building over existing lane with ROW.

Decision : (i) & (ii) As the lanes were not required under the BO, the committee accepted the inclusion of such lanes in site area. The committee however, did not accept one of such lanes to be built over in order to maintain the ROW for the adjoining lots.