

Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 11/2011 held on 15.3.2011

(a) MAI 1 11/2011

- Issue : (i) Application for hotel concession.
- (ii) Proposed high headroom for a floor of shopping arcade with cinemas, building services and planters.
- Decision : (i) 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)R 23A.
- (ii) The committee accepted the proposed storey height in view of the uses of the premises.

(b) MAI 2 11/2011

- Issue : Dedication for public passage within the building in return for bonus PR.
- Decision : The committee, noting that the proposed dedication was essential from traffic engineering point of view, agreed in principle to the dedication for public passage in return for bonus PR on a pro-rata basis.

(c) MAI 3 11/2011

- Issue : (i) Existing 2-storey buildings with high headroom to be used as a display venue and public open space.
- (ii)(a) Exclusion of the following public/private open space under the footprint of domestic tower from GFA calculation :-
- (i) setback area at G/F;
- (ii) landscape areas at G/F and UG/F;
- (ii)(b) Exclusion of rainwater recycling plant room and water tank from GFA calculation.
- Decision : (i) The committee, noting that the area in question would be used as a display venue and public open space, accepted the headroom of the existing buildings.
- (ii)(a)(i) Noting that the proposal was in compliance with the acceptance criteria under PNAP APP-19, the committee agreed in principle to exclude the setback area from GFA calculation.

- (ii)(a)(ii) The committee noted that the proposed private covered landscape area was generally in line with the approved planning scheme and that the area was similar to a podium garden, open in design and not encumbered with structural elements. The committee agreed in principle to exclude the private covered landscape area from GFA calculation. The committee did not accept to permit the exclusion of public covered landscape area, which was required under the lease, from GFA calculation.
- (ii)(b) Having considered the design and function of the system, the committee agreed to disregard the plant room and associated water tank from GFA calculation under B(P)R 23(3)(a).

(d) MAI 4 11/2011

Issue : Proposed private street for site classification purpose.

Decision : Having noted that the proposal was in compliance with B(P)R 18A(3)(a)(v) and PNAP APP-124, the areas in question would not be built over and not included in site area calculation, and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments, the committee accepted that the areas formed part of specified streets for the purpose of site classification.

(e) BCI 1 11/2011

Issue : Formal appeal against the BA's disapproval of plans.

Decision : Having considered the case, the committee agreed to contest the appeal.

(f) BCI 2 11/2011

Issue : Formal appeal against BA's disapproval of plans.

Decision : Having considered the case, the committee agreed to contest the appeal.

(g) BCI 3 11/2011

Issue : Exclusion of noise barriers from GFA and SC calculations.

Decision : The committee noted that the noise barriers formed part of the mitigation measures against the impact of road traffic noise. The committee also noted the proposal was generally in compliance with the criteria set out in JPN 2, and that there was no objection from

relevant outside departments. Hence the committee agreed to exclude the noise barriers from GFA and SC calculations.

(h) BCI 4 11/2011

- Issue : (i) Exclusion of covered landscape gardens from GFA calculation.
- (ii) Proposed covered landscape gardens with high headroom.
- Decision : (i) The committee noted that the covered landscape gardens were similar to podium gardens, open in design and not encumbered with structural elements. The committee agreed in principle to exclude the covered landscape gardens from GFA calculation.
- (ii) Having considered the design, the committee accepted the high headroom of the covered landscape gardens under the footprints of domestic towers.

(i) BCI 5 11/2011

- Issue : Building over and inclusion in site area of the existing private service lane.
- Decision : The committee noted that the lane was not required under the BO and that there was no objection from relevant departments. The committee raised no objection to the extinguishment, building over and inclusion in site area of the lane for the development.

(j) BCI 6 11/2011

- Issue : Formal appeal against the BA's disapproval of plans.
- Decision : Having considered all relevant issues, the committee agreed not to contest the appeal.

(k) BCI 7 11/2011

- Issue : (i) Proposed surrender of setback for road widening in return for bonus PR and SC.
- (ii) Proposed dedication for public passage in return for bonus PR & SC.
- Decision : (i) Noting that the proposed surrender was not necessary, the committee did not agree to the proposed surrender in return for bonus PR and SC.

- (ii) Having studied the plans, the committee did not agree to the proposed dedication for public passage in return for bonus PR and SC.

(l) BCI 8 11/2011

- Issue : Exclusion of residents' recreational facilities from GFA calculation for an existing development.
- Decision : Noting that the proposal was not in line with the acceptance criteria under PNAP APP-104, the committee did not agree to the granting of GFA exemption for the proposed residents' recreational facilities for an existing development.

(m) BCI 9 11/2011

- Issue : (i) Application for hotel concession.
- (ii) Exclusion of public passage areas from GFA calculation.
- (iii) Exclusion of the following from GFA calculation :-
(a) void over hotel lobby and around escalators;
(b) void over Function Hall and Pre-function area.
- Decision : (i) 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 in principle to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)R 23A.
- (ii) The committee noted that the proposed public passages were required under the lease, there was no claim for bonus PR and SC, and that the proposal was generally in line with PNAP APP-108. The committee, noting that there was no objection from relevant outside departments, agreed in principle to the granting of modification to exclude the public passage areas at G/F and 2/F from GFA calculation.
- (iii) Having studied the design, the committee agreed to the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation.

(n) BCI 10 11/2011

- 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. Hence, the committee agreed in principle to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)R 23A.

(o) BCI 11 11/2011

Issue : (i) Extinguishment and building over of existing service lane.

(ii) Inclusion of existing private lane in site area.

Decision : (i) Having considered the site circumstances, the committee did not accept the proposed extinguishment and building over of the existing service lane under BO s31(1).

(ii) Noting that the portion of lane in question was not required under the BO for the proposed building and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments, the committee had no in-principle objection to the proposed inclusion of the portion of lane in site area under PNAP APP-73.

(p) BCI 12 11/2011

Issue : (i) Portion of an existing ROW to be built over by the proposed open deck serving as run-in/out.

(ii) Portion of an existing ROW to be built over by the proposed open deck serving as pedestrian access to entrance lobby and means of escape.

Decision : (i) Noting that the proposed open deck was the only vehicular access to the proposed building and served to comply with B(P)R 41D, the committee agreed in principle to accept the proposal.

(ii) Having studied the proposal and considered the AP's justifications, the committee identified no special circumstances, which warranted the granting of exemption under BO s31(1). Hence, the committee did not agree to the proposal.