

**Summary of Decisions of the Building Committee
Building Committee I 22/2014 held on 3.6.2014**

(a) MAI 1 22/2014

Issue : Submission of building plans based on the determination of the Appeal Tribunal.

Decision : Having regard to the circumstances of the case, the committee considered that further substantiations were required for the proposal.

(b) BCI 1 22/2014

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

Decision : Noting that there was no objection from concerned departments, the committee agreed to grant bonus PR and SC in return for the proposed surrender.

(c) BCI 2 22/2014

Issue : Exclusion of lightwells from GFA calculations.

Decision : Having considered the design and noting that there was no objection from relevant departments, the committee had no objection to exclude the lightwells from GFA calculations.

(d) BCI 3 22/2014

Issues : (i) Existing public street to be extinguished, built in, over, upon and under, and included in site area.

(ii) Exclusion of carpark and the associated driveways/ramps from GFA calculations.

Decisions : (i) Noting that the street would be permanently closed and diverted as required under the lease and there were no adverse comments from relevant departments, the committee had no in-principle objection to the proposed extinguishment and building in, over, upon and under of the street and inclusion of such street in site area.

(ii) Having considered the existing levels of the streets on which the site abutted and the design of the proposed carpark, the committee agreed that the proposed carpark could be accepted as an underground carpark and be disregarded from GFA calculations in accordance with paragraph 16(b)(vii)(3) of PNAP APP-2.

(e) BCI 4 22/2014

Issues : (i) Proposed means of access to a site.
(ii) Development intensities and building height for a site not abutting a specified street of not less than 4.5m wide.

Decision : Noting that the site was accessible from an existing right-of-way which was properly formed and paved, and the proposed development intensities and building height were generally in line with the OZP, the committee had no objection to the proposal under B(P)R 5 and no in-principle objection to the proposed development intensities and building height under B(P)R 19(3) subject to no adverse comments from the concerned department.