

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee  
Building Committee I 1/2011 held on 4.1.2011**

(a) Matters Arising from MAI 4 50/2010

Issue : (i) An offshore site without access from a street.

(ii) The site does not abut a specified street.

Decision : (i) & (ii) The committee noted its earlier decision and that the circumstances of the case. The committee raised no objection to the acceptance of the proposal.

(b) BCI 1 1/2011

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.

(c) BCI 2 1/2011

Issue : Inclusion of the existing ROW into site area

Decision : The committee noted that the ROW was not a required lane for the purpose of BO and that the area in question formed part of the existing site. The committee, having considered the development history of the site, the documents submitted by the AP, and its earlier decision, raised no objection to the inclusion of the ROW in site area.

(d) BCI 3 1/2011

Issue : (i) Non-provision of a service lane.

(ii) Exclusion of the vertical acoustic fins from GFA calculation.

(iii) Exclusion of covered landscaped area on G/F from GFA calculation.

Decision : (i) Noting that there was no existing lane in the vicinity, a lane pattern would unlikely be created in future and that a promenade would be provided at the rear of the site, the committee agreed in principle to the non-provision of a service lane.

(ii) The committee noted that the acoustic fins served as a noise mitigation measure, which had been considered acceptable by EPD and TPB, and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments. Having considered all relevant factors, the committee agreed in principle to exclude the acoustic fins from GFA calculation.

- (iii) The committee noted that podium-free design was in line with the planning intention for the developments in the district, the covered landscaped area was similar to that of podium garden and anti-abuse measures would be provided. The committee agreed in principle to exclude the covered landscaped area on G/F from GFA calculation.

(e) BCI 4 1/2011

Issue : Exclusion of the following from GFA calculation :-

- (i) void over living room in a single-family house
- (ii) architectural feature with projection enclosing swimming pool
- (iii) open swimming pool with three sides enclosed
- (iv) sunshade devices
- (v) flat roof enclosed on three sides
- (vi) canopy projecting over swimming pool entrance

Decision : (i) The committee, having studied the design, agreed to the exclusion of the void from GFA calculation.

(ii) & (iii) The committee noted that the architectural feature was provided with projection enclosing the swimming pool on four sides, and that the pool was enclosed by walls on three sides. Having studied the design and considered all relevant issues, the committee did not agree to exclude the architectural feature and the swimming pool from GFA calculation.

(iv) Having considered that the sunshade devices protruded over private areas, the committee did not agree to exclude the sunshade devices from GFA calculation.

(v) Noting that there was no objection from relevant outside departments, the committee raised no objection to exclude the flat roof from GFA calculation.

(vi) Noting that the canopy projected over the entrance of the swimming pool and that the pool was enclosed on three sides, the committee did not agree to exclude the canopy from GFA calculation.

(f) BCI 5 1/2011

Issue : Non-provision of 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 service lane.