Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee Building Committee I 31/2013 held on 6.8.2013

(a) MAI 1 31/2013

Issue : Non-compliance with the building separation requirements on

separating distance and permeability at the low zone.

Decision : Having regard to the site circumstances, the committee had no in-

principle objection to the proposal for compliance with the building

separation requirements on separating distance and permeability.

(b) MAI 2 31/2013

Issue : Proposed surrender of land for road widening in return for bonus plot

ratio and site coverage.

Decision : Noting that there was no objection from relevant outside departments,

the committee agreed to grant bonus plot ratio and site coverage in

return for the proposed surrender.

(c) MAI 3 31/2013

Issue : Proposed open-sided link bridges disregarded in building separation

assessment.

Decision : Noting that the proposal was in line with the relevant criteria under

PNAP APP-152, the committee agreed to disregard the link bridges in

building separation assessment.

(d) BCI 1 31/2013

Issue : Exclusion of vertical greenery from GFA calculation.

Decision : Having studied the design, the committee agreed to exclude the

vertical greenery from GFA calculation.

(e) BCI 2 31/2013

Issue : A&A works in an existing hotel building.

Decision : Having studied the proposal and considered the circumstances of the

case, the committee had objection to the proposed A&A works.

(f) BCI 3 31/2013

Issue : Exclusion of architectural features from GFA and SC calculations.

Decision : Having studied the proposal, the committee did not agree to exclude

the proposed architectural features from GFA calculation.

(g) <u>BCI 4 31/2013</u>

Issue : Inclusion of existing lane in site area and building over of a portion of

an existing lane.

Decision : Noting that the lane was not required under the BO for the proposed

building, that the existing lane pattern would generally be retained, and there was no objection from the relevant outside departments, the committee had no in-principle objection to the inclusion of the lane in

site area and building over of a portion of an existing lane.