

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 8/2011 held on 22.2.2011**

(a) MAI 1 8/2011

Issue : Exclusion of light wells from GFA calculation.

Decision : Having studied the designs, the committee agreed to the exclusion of the light wells from GFA calculation.

(b) MAI 2 8/2011

Issue : Existing ROW to be partially built over.

Decision : The committee noted that the existing ROW was not required under the lease. Having considered all relevant factors, the committee agreed that BO s31(1) was not applicable and raised no objection to the proposed ROW arrangement noting that it was similar to the existing conditions.

(c) MAI 3 8/2011

Issue : Exclusion of areas for public passages from GFA.

Decision : The committee noted that the area for public passage was required under the lease, and that the proposal was controlled under the OZP as far as the PR restriction was concerned. The committee also noted that the proposal was well within the permissible PR limit under the B(P)Regs even if the area in question was counted for GFA. Noting that the proposal was not in line with the lease requirements, the committee agreed that the proposal be not accepted.

(d) BCI 1 8/2011

Issue : Footbridge projecting over street.

Decision : Having noted that the proposal was considered acceptable by the ACABAS and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments, the committee agreed in principle to the proposed projection over street.

(e) BCI 2 8/2011

Issue : Intended material change in use from restaurant to guesthouse.

- Decision : Having noted that the intended change in use was in contravention with the BO, and in the absence of information and substantiation for the guesthouse, the committee agreed to prohibit the intended change in use.
- (f) BCI 3 8/2011
- Issue : Excessive site coverage of the podium above 15m from ground level.
- Decision : The committee noted that the proposed podium had been approved by the TPB and that the proposal was generally in line with PNAP APP-101. Hence, the committee agreed to accept the excessive site coverage of the podium above 15m from ground level.
- (g) BCI 4 8/2011
- Issue : Exclusion of the voids over entrance foyer and main lobby from GFA calculation.
- Decision : Having considered the design and nature of the development, the committee agreed to the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation.
- (h) BCI 5 8/2011
- 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.
- (i) BCI 6 8/2011
- Issue : Disapproval of building plans under BO s16(1)(h).
- Decision : Having considered the advice of TD that the proposed vehicular access arrangement was likely to be dangerous or prejudicial to the safety or convenience of traffic using the street, the committee agreed to reject the plans under BO s16(1)(h).
- (j) BCI 7 8/2011
- Issue : Existing verandahs with historic value and projection over street to be retained.
- Decision : The committee noted that the existing verandahs with historic value and projection over street be preserved.

(k) BCI 8 8/2011

- Issue : (i) Non-provision of service lane.
- (ii) Exclusion of covered landscape area and covered play area on G/F from GFA calculation.
- (iii) Exclusion of covered area under footprint of tower blocks and glass canopy over part of EVA from GFA calculation.
- Decision : (i) 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.
- (ii) The committee noted that the covered area was similar to podium garden, open in design and not encumbered with structural elements. The committee agreed in principle to the proposal.
- (iii) Noting that the areas in question formed a continuous covered walkway and served as a horizontal screen to provide protection against inclement weather and falling objects in line with PNAP APP-42, the committee agreed to exclude the covered area under footprint of tower blocks and glass canopy over part of EVA from GFA calculation.

(l) BCI 9 8/2011

- Issue : (i) Exclusion of vertical acoustic fins from GFA & SC calculations.
- (ii) Exclusion of voids from GFA calculation.
- Decision : (i) The committee noted that the acoustic fins served as a noise mitigation measure and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments. Having considered all relevant factors, the committee agreed to exclude the acoustic fins from GFA & SC calculations.
- (ii) The committee noted that the proposal was generally in line with the approved planning scheme and that covered public open space was required under the lease. Hence, having studied the proposal and noted that there was no objection from relevant outside departments, the committee agreed to exclude the voids from GFA calculation.

(m) BCI 10 8/2011

Issue : (i) Inclusion of the proposed setback into site area.

(ii) Setback area to be built under.

Decision : (i) Noting the provision of uncovered setback of 2.3m wide along the sides and the rear of the proposed building, the committee agreed that the proposed building was a detached building under B(P)R 2. The committee also, noting that the provision of service lane was not required under B(P)R 28 for detached buildings, and that the existing lane could be included in site area in line with the current lane policy set out in PNAP APP-73, accepted the inclusion of the setback into site area.

(ii) As the part of the building to be built under the setback area was not a detached building under B(P)R 2, the committee did not accept the setback area of a detached building to be built under.

(n) BCI 11 8/2011

Issue : Application for hotel concession.

Decision : The committee had reservation on the design of the hotel in terms of the provision of BOH facilities and did not agree to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)R 23A in the absence of substantiation from the AP.

(o) BCI 12 8/2011

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.