

Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 44/2010 held on 9.11.2010

(a) MAI 1 44/2010

Issue : Proposed single-family house on a site abutting a street of less than 4.5m wide.

Decision : The committee noted that the proposed development parameters were generally in line with the OZP and Layout Plan. Having considered all relevant factors and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments, the committee raised no objection to the proposal under B(P)Reg 19(3). The AP's attention was drawn to BO s14(2) on the compliance with the lease conditions.

(b) MAI 2 44/2010

Issue : ROWs to be shown on plan.

Decision : Noting the BC's earlier decisions and relevant documents, the committee took the view that the ROWs were not open yard, and the use of the land in question should be appropriately shown on plans.

(c) MAI 3 44/2010

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

Decision : Noting that the proposal was in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP APP-132 and there was no adverse comment from relevant outside departments, the committee agreed to the granting of modification to permit excessive site coverage.

(d) BCI 1 44/2010

Issue : (i) Proposed private street for site classification purpose.
(ii) Application for hotel concession.
(iii) Exclusion of voids over atrium and spa room hall, staircase void and inaccessible voids from GFA calculation.
(iv) & (v) High headroom of sky garden and drop-off area.

Decision : (i) Having studied the plans and noted the site circumstances, the committee accepted that the proposed private street was a specified street for the purpose of site classification.

- (ii) The committee noted that the guestrooms were prominently large in size in general, and a substantial number of guestrooms were provided with more than one bedroom. The committee also had reservation on the hotel design in terms of the provision of BOH facilities under PNAP APP-40 for a genuine hotel. Hence, the committee did not agree to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A in the absence of pertinent justification.
- (iii) The committee, having considered the design, did not agree to the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation.
- (iv) & (v) The committee, having studied the design, accepted the proposed headroom.