

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee**  
**Building Committee I 26/2012 held on 10.7.2012**

(a) MAI 1 26/2012

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 and 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.

(b) MAI 2 26/2012

Issue : Proposed single-family houses on a site not abutting a street of not less than 4.5m wide.

Decision : Noting that the proposal was generally in line with the OZP and there was no objection from relevant outside departments, the committee agreed to the proposed development intensity under B(P)R 19(3). The committee also agreed that the AP should be reminded of the provision of BO s14(2) regarding compliance with the lease conditions.

(c) MAI 3 26/2012

Issue : (i) Extinguishment, building over and inclusion in site area of an existing private service lane, and non-provision of a service lane.  
(ii) Horizontal plane of prescribed windows protruding onto the adjoining private lot with ROW granted in favour of the development site.

Decision : (i) The committee noted that the dead-end lane in question located in the central portion of the site did not serve any other buildings and 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. The committee raised no objection to the proposed extinguishment, building over and inclusion in site area of the dead-end lane. The committee also noted that there was no existing lane at the side and rear of the site and that a lane pattern would unlikely be created in future. Having considered the layout of the sites in the vicinity, the committee also accepted the proposed non-provision of service lane.

(ii) The committee noted that the ROW granted in favour of the subject development site over the adjoining private lot was for passage only, and did not accept the proposal in view of the development right of the adjoining lot.

(d) MAI 4 26/2012

- Issue : Flexible application of the requirement on non-domestic site coverage under 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 a larger site coverage.

(e) BCI 1 26/2012

- Issue : (i) Status of streets under PNAP APP-152.
- (ii) Existing developments to be considered as adjacent sites and excluded from the assessment site for the purpose of PNAP APP-151 and APP-152.
- (iii) Non-compliance with the building separation requirement on continuous projected facade length (Lp) and permeability (P) at the low zone of the existing structures, the planned infrastructures and the proposed development works adjacent to the existing structures and the planned infrastructures.
- (iv) Site coverage of greenery to be assessed individually for each development package.
- (v) Exclusion of aboveground car parks and loading bays from GFA calculation.
- Decision : (i) The committee agreed that the on-grade private streets having street characteristics and excluded from site area calculation were streets, and the internal access roads within the private podium deck were not streets for the purpose of PNAP APP-152.
- (ii) Noting the history of the entire large-scale development involving different development packages, that the master layout of the overall development had already been approved with adequate separating distance between the existing developments and the proposed new buildings, and considerable building structures had been completed before implementation of the SBD guidelines, the committee agreed in principle to the proposal.
- (iii) The committee noted the history of the entire development site, and that the master layout of the overall development including the planned infrastructures had already been approved and considerable building structures had been completed before implementation of the SBD guidelines. Nevertheless, the committee considered that further justifications should be provided and the deficiency under different scenario should be further elaborated.

- (iv) Noting the history of the entire development site involving different development packages, considerable building structures had been completed, and the higher site coverage of greenery based on the area of the entire site would be adopted for each development package, the committee agreed in principle to the proposal.
- (v) Having considered the site circumstances and the AP's justifications that it was technically infeasible to construct an underground car park due to site constraints, the existing public transport facilities and planned infrastructures, the committee agreed in principle to disregard the aboveground car parks and loading bays from GFA calculation.

(f) BCI 2 26/2012

- Issue : (i) Application for hotel concession.
- (ii) Space about a domestic building.
- (iii) Non-provision of service lane.
- Decision : (i) 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.
- (ii) Noting the situation of the existing building, the committee raised no objection under B(P)R 25(2).
- (iii) 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 layout of the sites in the vicinity, the committee accepted the proposed non-provision of service lane.