

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 30/2012 held on 7.8.2012**

(a) MAI 1 30/2012

Issue : Exclusion of outdoor rock climbing wall from GFA and site coverage calculations in a composite development.

Decision : Noting that the proposed wall on the podium would result in a site coverage exceeding the permissible limit under the First Schedule of B(P)Rs, and in the absence of details from the AP, the committee did not accept the proposal.

(b) MAI 2 30/2012

Issue : (i) Exclusion of void over entrance lobby from GFA calculation for a proposed single-family house.

(ii) Exclusion of void over entrance porch from GFA calculation.

Decision : (i) Noting that abuse of use could not be easily identified from outside, the committee agreed not to exclude the void over entrance lobby from GFA calculation.

(ii) Having considered the void was a genuine design feature at the exterior of the building, the committee agreed to exclude the void from GFA calculation.

The committee also agreed that the AP should be reminded of the provision of BO s14(2) regarding compliance with the lease conditions.

(c) BCI 1 30/2012

Issue : Exclusion of void over entrance foyer from GFA calculation for single-family houses.

Decision : The committee, having studied the design, had no objection to the proposed exclusion of voids from GFA calculation in line with PNAP APP-2.

(d) BCI 2 30/2012

Issue : Exclusion of area for public passage from GFA calculation.

Decision : In the lack of support from relevant government departments, the committee agreed that the proposed exclusion of area for public passage from GFA calculation be not accepted.

(e) BCI 3 30/2012

Issue : Exclusion of architectural features from GFA and site coverage calculations.

Decision : Having considered the architectural projections were genuine design features, the committee agreed in-principle to exclude the proposed architectural features from GFA and site coverage calculations.

(f) BCI 4 30/2012

Issue : (i) Proposed plant rooms with high headroom for a composite development.

(ii) Proposed architectural fins projecting from vehicular ramps.

Decision : (i) Noting the functional needs for high headroom and that the areas of concern were fully occupied by plants for necessary FS systems, the committee accepted the proposed headroom.

(ii) Noting that the proposed architectural projections were not more than 300mm, the committee raised no objection to the proposal.

(g) BCI 5 30/2012

Issue : Exclusion of void over covered landscape garden from GFA calculation.

Decision : Having studied the design, the committee agreed to exclude the void from GFA calculation.

(h) BCI 6 30/2012

Issue : Exclusion of the following from GFA calculation :-

(i) voids above basement car park for a composite development,

(ii) voids over residential lobbies on G/F,

(iii) voids over recreational facilities.

Decision : (i) Having considered the functional needs for high headroom at the basement car park for accommodating services below G/F, the committee agreed to the proposed exclusion of voids from GFA calculation.

(ii) & (iii) Having studied the design and noted that the voids were excessive in size, the committee did not agree to the proposed exclusion of voids over residential lobbies and recreational facilities from GFA calculation.

(i) BCI 7 30/2012

Issue : Design requirements on Continuous Projected Facade Length, Separation Distance and Permeability.

Decision : Noting that the proposal was in line with the guidelines laid down in PNAP APP-152, the committee agreed that the design requirements on Continuous Projected Facade Length, Separation Distance and Permeability were not applicable.