

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee  
Building Committee I 20/2011 held on 17.5.2011**

(a) MAI 1 20/2011

Issue : Inclusion of the ROW in site area.

Decision : Having noted the earlier decision of BC and considered the justifications provided by the AP and solicitor, the committee did not identify valid reasons to depart from its previous decision noting that there was no change in circumstances. Hence, the committee reaffirmed its previous decision that the proposed inclusion of the existing ROW in site area be not accepted.

(b) MAI 2 20/2011

Issue : Inclusion of the ROW in site area.

Decision : Having considered the justifications provided by the AP and the owner's legal representative, the history of the case and site circumstances, the committee did not agree to the inclusion of the ROW in site area.

(c) MAI 3 20/2011

Issue : Private lane with ROW to be built over.

Decision : Having considered the justifications provided by the AP and the circumstances, the committee agreed that it was premature to consider the proposal under BO s31(1).

(d) MAI 4 20/2011

Issue : (i) Proposed surrender of land in return for bonus PR and SC.  
(ii) Horizontal planes of prescribed windows protruding onto the adjoining government land.  
(iii) Proposed private streets for site classification purpose.

Decision : (i) Having noted that the proposed surrender of land was required by the government and that there was no objection from relevant outside departments, the committee agreed in principle to the granting of bonus PR and SC in return for the proposed surrender.  
(ii) The committee, having noted the site circumstances and the advice of relevant outside departments, did not accept the proposal.

(iii) Having considered the site situation, the committee agreed that the areas in question formed part of specified streets for the purpose of site classification.

(e) MAI 5 20/2011

Issue : Building over of existing lane.

Decision : Having studied the plans and noted the advice of relevant outside departments, the committee had no in-principle objection to the granting of exemption to permit the existing lane to be built over under BO s31(1).

(f) BCI 1 20/2011

Issue : Inclusion of lane in site area.

Decision : Having noted that the proposed development was a detached building, the existing lane was not required under the BO and that it would not be built over, the committee agreed to the inclusion of the lane in site area in line with PNAP APP-73.

(g) BCI 2 20/2011

Issue : Proposed surrender of setback for road widening in return for bonus PR.

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

(h) BCI 3 20/2011

Issue : Proposed dedication of setback area for public passage in return for bonus PR & SC.

Decision : Having noted that the proposed setback was required by the government, the committee agreed in principle to the granting of bonus PR and SC in return for the proposed dedication.

(i) BCI 4 20/2011

Issue : Proposed private street for site classification purpose.

Decision : Having considered the site situation, the committee agreed that the area in question formed part of a specified street for the purpose of site classification.

(j) BCI 5 20/2011

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.

(k) BCI 6 20/2011

Issue : (i) Determination of site classification.  
(ii) Exclusion of void over entrance foyer of a house from GFA calculation.

Decision : (i) The committee noted that the site exhibited the characteristic of a Class B site and agreed to the granting of technical modification under B(P)R 18A.  
(ii) The committee, having studied the design, agreed to the exclusion of the void from GFA calculation.

(l) BCI 7 20/2011

Issue : (i) Exclusion of void over covered landscape area on G/F from GFA calculation.  
(ii) Exclusion of void over living room of a duplex unit from GFA calculation.  
(iii) Exclusion of acoustic fins from GFA & SC calculations.

Decision : (i) Noting that the covered landscape areas were facing the street, open on 2 sides and not encumbered with structural elements, the committee agreed to the exclusion of void over covered landscape area on G/F from GFA calculation.  
(ii) The committee, having studied the design, agreed to the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation.  
(iii) 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 the exclusion of acoustic fins from GFA & SC calculations.

(m) BCI 8 20/2011

- Issue : (i) Exclusion of open public car park from GFA calculation.
- (ii) Excessive non-domestic site coverage above 15m from ground level.
- (iii) Proposed surrender of setback for road widening in return for bonus PR and SC.

Exclusion of the following from GFA calculation :-

- (iv) voids over entrance lobbies
- (v) sky garden
- (vi) architectural features
- (vii) covered pick-up/drop-off areas including the safety island
- Decision : (i) Noting the plans were in contravention with the OZP, the committee agreed that the plans be disapproved.
- (ii) The committee identified no special circumstances warranting a deviation and the granting of exemption. The committee did not agree to the granting of modification to permit excessive site coverage.
- (iii) Having noted that the proposed surrender for road widening was 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 proposed surrender.
- (iv) The committee, having studied the design, agreed to the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation except for the enlarged void at 1/F that was excessive in size.
- (v) – (vii) Having studied the design, the committee did not accept the proposal.

(n) BCI 9 20/2011

Issue : Proposed private street for site classification purpose.

Decision : Having considered the site situation, the committee agreed that the area in question formed part of a specified street for the purpose of site classification.

(o) BCI 10 20/2011

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

Decision : Having noted that the proposed surrender for road widening was required by the government, the committee agreed in principle to the granting of bonus PR and SC in return for the proposed surrender.

(p) BCI 11 20/2011

Issue : Application for excessive non-domestic and 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, the committee agreed to the granting of modification to permit excessive site coverage.

(q) BCI 12 20/2011

Issue : (i) Exclusion of void over dinner room and voids over staircase from GFA calculation  
(ii) Exclusion of vertical sunshade from GFA calculation  
(iii) Exclusion of canopies from GFA and SC calculations  
(iv) Non-provision of service lane.

Decision : (i) The committee, having considered the design, did not agree to the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation.  
(ii) Having noted the AP's justification and that the vertical sunshade was not in line with the requirements under JPN 1, the committee did not agree to the exclusion of the vertical sunshade from GFA calculation.  
(iii) Having considered the design, the committee did not accept the proposal.  
(iv) 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.

(r) BCI 13 20/2011

Issue : Proposed surrender of setback for road widening in return for bonus PR.

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

(s) BCI 14 20/2011

Issue : (i) Determination of site classification.  
(ii) Exclusion of voids over halls of a religious tower block from GFA calculation.

Decision : (i) The committee noted that the site exhibited the characteristic of a Class B site and agreed to the granting of technical modification under B(P)R 18A.  
(ii) The committee, having considered the design and the function of the voids, agreed to the exclusion of the voids from GFA calculation.

(t) BCI 15 20/2011

Issue : Inclusion of lane in 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 site area in line with PNAP APP-73.

(u) BCI 16 20/2011

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.

(v) BCI 17 20/2011

Issue : Application for excessive 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, the committee agreed to the granting of modification to permit excessive site coverage.

(w) BCI 18 20/2011

Issue : Portion of a street and portion of private lots to be built over and included in site area.

Decision : Having studied the case, the committee did not accept the proposal.

(x) BCI 19 20/2011

Issue : (i) Exclusion of covered landscape area on G/F from GFA calculation for an institutional building.

(ii) Inaccessible roof covered by metal mesh to be excluded from GFA calculation.

Decision : (i) Having noted the use of the building and studied the design, the committee agreed to the exclusion of covered landscape area from GFA calculation.

(ii) The committee, having studied the design, agreed to the exclusion of the covered area from GFA calculation.

(y) BCI 20 20/2011

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.

(z) BCI 21 20/2011

Issue : Inclusion of lane in 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 site area in line with PNAP APP-73.

(aa) BCI 22 20/2011

Issue : (i) Proposed dedication of corner splays and setback for public passage in return for bonus PR and SC.

(ii) Inclusion of lane in site area.

(iii) Application for hotel concession.

- Decision : (i) The committee noted that the dedication of corner splays and setbacks were supported by TD and that there was no objection from relevant departments. The committee agreed in principle to the proposed dedication in return for bonus PR & SC.
- (ii) 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 site area in line with PNAP APP-73.
- (iii) The committee noted that the proposal was generally in compliance with the criteria set out in PNAP APP-40, and agreed in principle to the granting of hotel concession under B(P)R 23A.

(bb) BCI 23 20/2011

- Issue : (i) Proposed private streets for site classification purpose.
- (ii) Proposed surrender of setback for road widening in return for bonus PR and SC.
- (iii) Inclusion of lane in site area.

- Decision : (i) Having considered the site situation, the committee agreed that the area in question formed part of a specified street for the purpose of site classification.
- (ii) Having noted that the proposed surrender for road widening was accepted by the government earlier, the committee agreed in principle to the granting of bonus PR and SC in return for the proposed surrender.
- (iii) 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 site area in line with PNAP APP-73.

(cc) BCI 24 20/2011

- Issue : (i) Proposed private streets for site classification purpose.
- (ii) Proposed surrender of setback for road widening in return for bonus PR and SC.
- (iii) Inclusion of lane in site area.

- Decision : (i) Having considered the site situation, the committee agreed that the area in question formed part of a specified street for the purpose of site classification.
- (ii) Having noted that the proposed surrender for road widening was accepted by the government earlier, the committee agreed in principle to the granting of bonus PR and SC in return for the



proposed surrender.

- (iii) 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 site area in line with PNAP APP-73.

(dd) BCI 25 20/2011

Issue : (i) Extinguishment, building upon and inclusion in site area of the existing lane with the provision of a diversionary lane.

- (ii) Inclusion of the proposed diversionary lane in site area.

Decision : (i) The committee noted that the existing lane in question was not a required lane under the BO and it could be included in site area in line with the current lane policy under PNAP APP-73, and that a diversionary lane would be provided. The committee raised no objection to the proposed extinguishment, building upon and inclusion in site area of the existing lane for the development with the provision of a diversionary lane.

- (ii) Noting that the proposed diversionary lane was not required under the BO for the proposed development, the committee had no objection to the inclusion of the proposed diversionary lane in site area.

(ee) BCI 26 20/2011

Issue : (i) Extinguishment, building upon and inclusion in site area of the existing lane with the provision of a diversionary lane.

- (ii) Inclusion of the proposed diversionary lane in site area.

Decision : (i) The committee noted that the existing lane in question was not a required lane under the BO and it could be included in site area in line with the current lane policy under PNAP APP-73, and that a diversionary lane would be provided. The committee raised no objection to the proposed extinguishment, building upon and inclusion in site area of the existing lane for the development with the provision of a diversionary lane.

- (ii) Noting that the proposed diversionary lane was not required under the BO for the proposed development, the committee had no objection to the inclusion of the proposed diversionary lane in site area.