

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 50/2010 held on 21.12.2010**

(a) MAI 1 50/2010

Issue : Formal appeal against disapproval of plans.

Decision : Having considered the case and all relevant factors, the committee agreed to contest the appeal.

(b) MAI 2 50/2010

Issue : Application for hotel concession.

Decision : The committee noted that the proposal was generally in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP APP-40 and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments. Hence, the committee agreed to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A.

(c) MAI 3 50/2010

Issue : (i) Proposed development on a site not abutting a 4.5m wide street.
(ii) Exclusion of voids over main entrance from GFA calculation.

Decision : (i) The committee noted that there was no in-principle objection from relevant outside departments. Having considered all the relevant factors, the committee agreed in-principle to the development intensity under B(P)Reg 19(3). The committee also agreed that the AP should be reminded of the provision of s14(2) of the BO.
(ii) The committee, having considered the design, did not agree to the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation.

(d) MAI 4 50/2010

Issue : (i) Formal appeal against BA's disapproval of plans.
(ii) Disapproval of plans under section 16(1)(d) of the BO.

Decision : (i) Having considered the case, the committee agreed to contest the appeal.
(ii) Noting the history of submission and the information provided by the AP, the committee agreed to reject the plans under BO s16(1)(d).

(e) BCI 1 50/2010

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.

(f) BCI 2 50/2010

Issue : Formal appeal against BA's disapproval of plans under s16(1)(i) of the BO.

Decision : Having considered the case and all relevant factors, the committee agreed to contest the appeal.

(g) BCI 3 50/2010

Issue : Shop Extension to the yard area of the building approved under "Volume Regulations".

Decision : Having noted that the PR would not exceed the permissible under the First Schedule, the committee agreed to the granting of technical modification to permit the existing domestic site coverage on upper floors to exceed the permissible under the B(P)Regs.

(h) BCI 4 50/2010

Issue : Exclusion of communal sky garden from GFA calculation.

Decision : Having studied the design, the committee agreed to the exclusion of communal sky garden from GFA calculation subject to the reduction in floor-to-floor height.

(i) BCI 5 50/2010

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

Decision : Having noted that the proposed setbacks for road widening were required by the government and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments, the committee agreed to the granting of bonus PR and SC in return for the surrender.

(j) BCI 6 50/2010

- Issue : (i) Application for hotel concession.
- (ii) Exclusion of sunshade from GFA and SC calculations.
- Decision : (i) The committee noted the advice of relevant outside departments and that the proposal was generally in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP APP-40. Hence, the committee agreed in principle to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)Reg 23A. The committee also agreed that the AP should be reminded of the provision of s14(2) of the BO.
- (ii) The committee noted that the proposal was for an existing building and that the exemptions under JPN1 were not applicable. Hence, the committee did not agree to the exclusion of sunshade from GFA and SC calculations.

(k) BCI 7 50/2010

- Issue : Exclusion of communal podium garden and sky gardens and the voids above such gardens from GFA calculation.
- Decision : The committee, having considered the design of the gardens being dubious and noted that their heights were excessive, did not agree to the exclusion of the gardens and the corresponding voids from GFA calculation.

(l) BCI 8 50/2010

- Issue : Exclusion of voids over living rooms of single-family houses from GFA calculation.
- Decision : The committee, having studied the design, agreed to the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation.