## Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee Building Committee I 10/2011 held on 7.3.2011

- (a) <u>MAI 1 10/2011</u>
  - Issue : Decking over of void in a building approved under "Volume Regulations".
  - Decision : Having studied the proposal, the committee raised no objection under the BO and accepted the decking over of void in the building. The committee also agreed that the AP should be reminded of the provision of BO s14(2).
- (b) <u>MAI 2 10/2011</u>
  - Issue : Building over of a portion of a lane.
  - Decision : Having studied the site circumstances and noted that there was no objection from relevant outside departments, the committee accepted the projection of the open bridge over the lane under BO s31(1).
- (c) <u>BCI 1 10/2011</u>
  - Issue : Formal appeal against BA's disapproval of plans.
  - Decision : Having considered the case, the committee agreed to contest the appeal.
- (d) <u>BCI 2 10/2011</u>
  - 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.
- (e) <u>BCI 3 10/2011</u>
  - 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 that there was no objection from relevant outside departments, the committee agreed to the granting of modification to permit excessive site coverage.

(f) <u>BCI 4 10/2011</u>

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.

- (g) <u>BCI 5 10/2011</u>
  - Issue : Exemption of full-height vertical green walls from GFA calculation.

Decision : Having studied the design and considered all relevant factors, the committee did not agree to the exemption of vertical green walls from GFA calculation.

- (h) <u>BCI 6 10/2011</u>
  - Issue : Requirements for building set back.
  - Decision : Having considered the site circumstances, the committee agreed that the requirements for building set back were not applicable to the proposed sale site as the green area at which the site abutted together with its adjacent land were zoned as road in the OZP having a width of not less than 15m.
- (i) <u>BCI 7 10/2011</u>
  - Issue : (i) Disapproval of plan under BO s16(1)(g).
    - (ii) Inclusion of the existing ROW into site area.
  - Decision : (i) The committee could not identify any character or features to be preserved in the immediate neighbourhood, and agreed not to invoke BO s16(1)(g) to reject the plans.
    - (ii) The committee noted that the existing ROW was a street. Hence, the committee did not agree to the inclusion of the ROW into site area.

- (j) <u>BCI 8 10/2011</u>
  - Issue : (i) Arrangement of EVA with inadequate width on the adjoining public housing estate.
    - (ii) Exclusion of void over entrance lift lobby from GFA calculation.
  - Decision : (i) The committee, having considered the site circumstances and the advice of FSD, agreed in principle to the EVA arrangement subject to the compliance with the requirements of FSD.
    - (ii) The committee, having studied the design and function of the void, agreed to the exclusion of the void from GFA calculation.

## (k) <u>BCI 9 10/2011</u>

- Issue : (i) Proposed surrender of setbacks for road widening in return for bonus PR and SC.
  - (ii) Application for hotel concession.
- Decision : (i) Having studied the proposal, the committee raised no objection to the proposed surrender for road widening. The committee agreed in principle to the granting of bonus PR and SC in return for the proposed surrender.
  - (ii) The committee noted 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)R 23A.

## (l) <u>BCI 10 10/2011</u>

- Issue : Excessive site coverage of the podium above 15m up to 20m from the mean level of the streets abutting the site for a composite development with depot, station and public transport interchange.
- Decision : Having considered the site circumstances and noted that the proposal was in line with the criteria set out in PNAP APP-101, and that there was no adverse comments from relevant outside departments, the committee agreed in-principle to accept excessive site coverage of the podium above 15m from the mean level of the streets abutting the site.