

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 31/2011 held on 2.8.2011**

(a) MAI 1 31/2011

Issue : Extinguishment and building upon of the existing ROW with the provision of a diversionary lane and inclusion of it in site area.

Decision : The committee noted that the existing ROW was not required for the subject site under B(P)R 28, it had been accepted for inclusion in the site area in line with the current lane policy under PNAP APP-73, and that a diversionary lane would be provided. The committee also noted that the existing ROW would become redundant upon redevelopment and the new diversionary lane was not required under the BO for the subject site. The committee raised no objection to the proposed extinguishment and building upon of the existing ROW for the development with the provision of a diversionary lane and inclusion of it in site area.

(b) MAI 2 31/2011

Issue : Formal appeals against disapprovals of plans.

Decision : Having considered the cases, the committee agreed to contest the appeals.

(c) BCI 1 31/2011

Issue : Exclusion of sunshades from GFA and SC calculations.

Decision : Having studied the plans, the committee agreed to the granting of modification to exclude from GFA and SC calculations only for the sunshades that would not adversely affect the immediately adjoining green balconies from complying with the requirements under JPN-1.

(d) BCI 2 31/2011

Issue : Formal appeal against disapproval of plans.

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

(e) BCI 3 31/2011

Issue : New GFA concession policy under PNAP APP-151 (January 2011).

Decision : Having heard the AP's presentation, the advice of relevant outside departments, and considered all relevant factors, the committee agreed that the new GFA concession policy was applicable to the current resubmission of building plans.

(f) BCI 4 31/2011

Issue : Proposed temporary buildings on a site not provided with an access from a street.

Decision : The committee noted the comments of relevant outside departments and that the site was accessible from a local footpath. Having considered all the relevant factors, the committee had no in-principle objection to the proposal under B(P)R 5 and agreed to the proposed development intensity under B(P)R 19(3).