

城市規劃委員會

香港北角渣華道三百三十三號  
北角政府合署十五樓

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

15/F., North Point Government Offices  
333 Java Road, North Point,  
Hong Kong.

傳 真 Fax: 2877 0245 / 2522 8426

電 話 Tel: 2231 4810

來函檔號 Your Reference:

覆函請註明本會檔號

In reply please quote this ref.: TPB/A/K14/576

By Registered Post & Fax (2116 5273)

13 February 2009

Urban Renewal Authority  
Unit 1-3, 23/F, Millennium City 6  
392 Kwun Tong Road  
Kowloon, Kowloon  
(Attn.: Mr. Mike Kwan)

Dear Sir,

**Comprehensive Redevelopment with Residential and Commercial  
Uses including Hotel, Office, Retail with Provision of Public Open Space,  
Government, Institution or Community Facilities,  
Public Transport Interchange and Supporting Facilities  
in "Comprehensive Development Area (1)" zone,  
Kwun Tong Town Centre - Main Site (Area Bounded by  
Kwun Tong Road, Hong Ning Road, Mut Wah Street and Hip Wo Street)**

I refer to my letter to you dated 19.1.2009.

After giving consideration to the application, the Town Planning Board (the TPB) approved the application for permission under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance on the terms of the application as submitted to the TPB. The permission is subject to the following conditions and shall be valid until 23.1.2013; and after the said date, the permission shall cease to have effect unless before the said date either the development hereby permitted is commenced or the permission is renewed :

- (a) submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan (MLP) to take into account the approval conditions as stated in paragraphs (b) to (t) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the building height of the proposed commercial development within the application site should not exceed 260mPD;
- (c) the proposed observation deck should be opened for public enjoyment;
- (d) submission of detailed breakdown of the site area and Gross Floor Area for each of the Development Package Areas to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (e) submission and implementation of the public transport interchange proposal to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB;

- (f) submission and implementation of detailed setback proposal to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (g) submission of a Landscape Master Plan including tree preservation scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (h) implementation of the approved Landscape Master Plan (LMP) to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.
- (i) submission of the quarterly tree monitoring report to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (j) submission and implementation of a LMP for the proposed at-grade public open space to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB;
- (k) submission and implementation of a tree preservation and tree replanting scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB;
- (l) submission of a revised air ventilation assessment and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (m) submission of a revised drainage impact assessment and revised sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (n) submission of a revised traffic impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (o) submission of a revised water impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB;
- (p) submission and implementation of interim sewerage diversion scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection and the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (q) provision of a refuse collection point to the satisfaction of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene or of the TPB;
- (r) provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (s) submission and implementation of a detailed risk assessment and contingency plan on potential road unsettlement of Hip Wo Street, Mut Wah Street and Kwun Tong Road arising from construction activities of the proposed car park and sunken bazaar to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB; and

- (t) submission and implementation of a design proposal for the retail podium façade and the pedestrian deck along Kwun Tong Road to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

The TPB also agreed to advise you :

- (a) that the approved MLP, together with the set of approval conditions, would be certified by the Chairman of the TPB and deposited in the Land Registry in accordance with section 4A(3) of the Town Planning Ordinance. Efforts should be made to incorporate the relevant approval conditions into a revised MLP for deposition in the Land Registry as soon as practicable;
- (b) the arrangement of emergency vehicular access should comply with Part VI of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Fire Fighting and Rescue administered by the Buildings Department;
- (c) to liaise with relevant Government departments on the landscape works on public pavement;
- (d) to liaise with relevant Government departments on the management and maintenance responsibilities of the public transport interchange;
- (e) to clarify the management and maintenance responsibilities of the areas to be landscaped and improved by the Urban Renewal Authority with relevant Government departments;
- (f) to liaise with the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East on land administration matters;
- (g) to liaise with affected hawkers on the interim relocation arrangement for the hawker bazaar;
- (h) to liaise with the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene and wall stall owners on the arrangements for the licensed wall stalls;
- (i) to consult the Kwun Tong District Council on the suggestion to relocate a bus route to Choi Hung Mass Transit Railway Station bus terminus;
- (j) to liaise with relevant Government departments on reprovisioning and management and maintenance responsibilities for Government, Institution or Community facilities and temporary reprovisioning arrangements;
- (k) to liaise with the Commissioner for Transport on temporary traffic management and maintenance matter to ensure that the traffic and pedestrian flow would not be affected during the construction phases;
- (l) to liaise with the Commissioner for Transport on detailed arrangements for the reprovisioning of public transport services including the provision of temporary facilities and other detailed traffic arrangements to refrain the potential traffic problems induced by the observation deck;

- (m) to take note of the Chief Highway Engineer/Kowloon, Highways Department's comments that a minimum clearance of 500mm to the roadside planter from kerblines should be provided subject to the Commissioner for Transport's comment; and to consult their Lighting Division to ensure that the proposed trees would not affect the functioning of road light system;
- (n) to liaise with the Director of Highways on public footpath landscape and streetscape proposal and maintenance responsibilities;
- (o) to note the Director of Environment Protection's comment to explore and implement further noise mitigation measures to minimize road traffic noise impact on the proposed development and to inform the future occupants clearly of the special design of fixed windows or glazing as one of the noise mitigation measures;
- (p) to note the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services' requirements that no proposed sewer or even temporary one should be laid across the Yue Man Square Rest Garden or laid along the public pedestrian pavement close to the two Old Valuable Trees at Yue Man Square Rest Garden;
- (q) to take note of the TPB's concern on the potential glare effect in the façade design of the commercial tower to avoid causing nuisance to the surrounding areas; and
- (r) to take note of TPB Members' views that the observation deck should not form part of the hotel development.

If you wish to seek an extension of the validity of this permission, you may submit an application to the TPB for renewal of the permission no less than six weeks before its expiry. This is to allow sufficient time for processing of the application in consultation with the concerned departments. The TPB will not consider any application for renewal of permission if the time limit for commencement of development specified in the permission has already expired at the time of consideration by the TPB. Please refer to the TPB Guidelines No. 35A and 36 for details. The Guidelines and application forms are available at the TPB's website ([www.info.gov.hk/tpb/](http://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/)), the Planning Enquiry Counters of the Planning Department (Hotline : 2231 5000) at 17/F, North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, North Point; 14/F, Sha Tin Government Offices, 1 Sheung Wo Che Road, Sha Tin; and the Secretariat of the TPB at 15/F, North Point Government Offices.

For amendments to the approved scheme that may be permitted with or without application under section 16A, please refer to TPB Guidelines No. 36 for details.

A copy of the TPB Guidelines on Compliance of Approval Conditions is attached for your reference.

A copy of the TPB Paper in respect of the application and the relevant extract of minutes of the TPB meeting held on 23.1.2009 are enclosed herewith for your reference. You may also visit the TPB's website to listen to the open session of the TPB meeting relating to the application, which is normally available for two weeks, starting from the date of this letter.



Under section 17(1) of the Town Planning Ordinance, an applicant aggrieved by a decision of the TPB may apply to the TPB for a review of the decision. If you wish to seek a review, you should inform me within 21 days from the date of this letter. I will then contact you to arrange a hearing before the TPB which you and/or your authorized representative will be invited to attend. The TPB is required to consider a review application within three months of receipt of the application for review. Please note that any review application will be published for three weeks for public comments.

This permission by the TPB under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance should not be taken to indicate that any other government approval which may be needed in connection with the development, will be given. You should approach the appropriate government departments on any such matter.

If you have any queries regarding this planning permission, please contact Miss Helen So of Kowloon District Planning Office at 2231 4966. In case you wish to consult the relevant Government departments on matters relating to the above approval conditions, a list of the concerned Government officers is attached herewith for your reference.

Yours faithfully,



( Miss Y.K. NG )  
for Secretary, Town Planning Board

b.c.c. CA/ASC, ASD  
DLO/KE, Lands D  
CHE/K, HyD  
D of FS  
CTP/UD&L  
DPO/K  
PSO/TA

DO/KT, HAD  
AC for T/U, TD  
CBS/K, BD  
DEP  
DEVB  
SSO/TPB  
SSO/NTHQ

**Site Record**

YKN/LL/cl

(

1998年12月



城市規劃委員會

香港北角渣華道三百三十三號  
北角政府合署十五樓

傳真 Fax: 2877 0245 / 2522 8426

電話 Tel: 2231 4810

來函檔號 Your Reference:

覆函請註明本會檔號

In reply please quote this ref.: TPB/A/K14/727

By Registered Post & Fax (39229797)

8 January 2016

AECOM Asia Co. Ltd.  
7/F Grand Central Plaza, Tower 2  
138 Shatin Rural Committee Road  
Shatin, New Territories  
(Attn: Ebby Leung)

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Proposed Comprehensive Redevelopment with Residential and Commercial Uses  
including Hotel, Office, Retail, Public Open Space, Government, Institution  
or Community Facilities, Public Transport Interchange and Supporting Facilities  
(Amendments to Approved Master Layout Plan) in “Comprehensive Development Area  
(1)” Zone, Kwun Tong Town Centre – Main Site (Area Bounded  
by Kwun Tong Road, Hong Ning Road, Mut Wah Street and Hip Wo Street)**

I refer to my letter to you dated 11.12.2015.

After giving consideration to the application, the Town Planning Board (the TPB) approved the application for permission under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance on the terms of the application as submitted to the TPB. The permission shall be valid until 18.12.2019; and after the said date, the permission should be valid until, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- (a) the submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan (MLP) to take into account the approval conditions as stated in paragraphs (b) to (u) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the building height of the proposed commercial development within the site should not exceed 260mPD;
- (c) the proposed observation deck should be opened for public enjoyment;
- (d) the submission of a detailed breakdown of the site area and gross floor area for each of the Development Package Areas to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (e) the submission and implementation of the public transport interchange proposal to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB;



- (f) the submission and implementation of a detailed setback proposal to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (g) the submission of a Landscape Master Plan (LMP) including a tree preservation scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (h) the implementation of the approved LMP to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (i) the submission of the quarterly tree monitoring report to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (j) the submission and implementation of a LMP for the proposed at-grade public open space to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB;
- (k) the submission and implementation of a tree preservation and tree replanting scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB;
- (l) the submission of a revised air ventilation assessment and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (m) the submission of a revised drainage impact assessment and a revised sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services and the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (n) the submission of a revised traffic impact assessment and the implementation of traffic mitigation measures (i.e. roads, footpaths and junctions improvement) identified therein for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (o) the submission of a revised water impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB;
- (p) the submission and implementation of an interim sewerage diversion scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection and the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (q) the provision of a refuse collection point and a hawker bazaar to the satisfaction of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene or of the TPB;
- (r) the provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;



- (s) the submission and implementation of a detailed risk assessment and a contingency plan on potential road unsettlement of Hip Wo Street, Mut Wah Street, Hong Ning Road, and Kwun Tong Road arising from construction activities of the proposed car park and sunken bazaar to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (t) the submission and implementation of a design proposal for the retail podium façade and the pedestrian deck along Kwun Tong Road to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (u) the submission of a noise impact assessment and the implementation of noise mitigation measures identified therein for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board.

The TPB also agreed to advise you to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VI of the TPB Paper

If you wish to seek an extension of the validity of this permission, you may submit an application to the TPB for renewal of the permission no less than six weeks before its expiry. This is to allow sufficient time for processing of the application in consultation with the concerned departments. The TPB will not consider any application for renewal of permission if the time limit for commencement of development specified in the permission has already expired at the time of consideration by the TPB. Please refer to the TPB Guidelines No. 35B and 36A for details. The Guidelines and application forms are available at the TPB's website ([www.info.gov.hk/tpb/](http://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/)), the Planning Enquiry Counters (PECs) of the Planning Department (Hotline : 2231 5000) at 17/F, North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, North Point; 14/F, Sha Tin Government Offices, 1 Sheung Wo Che Road, Sha Tin; and the Secretariat of the TPB at 15/F, North Point Government Offices.

For amendments to the approved scheme that may be permitted with or without application under section 16A, please refer to TPB Guidelines No. 36A for details.

A copy of the TPB Paper in respect of the application (except the supplementary planning statement/technical report(s), if any) and the relevant extract of minutes of the TPB meeting held on 18.12.2015 are enclosed herewith for your reference.

Under section 17(1) of the Town Planning Ordinance, an applicant aggrieved by a decision of the TPB may apply to the TPB for a review of the decision. If you wish to seek a review, you should inform me within 21 days from the date of this letter (on or before 29.1.2016). I will then contact you to arrange a hearing before the TPB which you and/or your authorized representative will be invited to attend. The TPB is required to consider a review application within three months of receipt of the application for review. Please note that any review application will be published for three weeks for public comments.

This permission by the TPB under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance should not be taken to indicate that any other government approval which may be needed in connection with the development, will be given. You should approach the appropriate government departments on any such matter.

If you have any queries regarding this planning permission, please contact Ms. Joyce So of Kowloon District Planning Office at 2231 4966. In case you wish to consult the relevant Government departments on matters relating to the above approval conditions, a list of the concerned Government officers is attached herewith for your reference.

Yours faithfully,



( Raymond KAN )  
for Secretary, Town Planning Board

b.c.c.

DEP

D of FS

AC for T/U, TD

CBS/K, BD

DLCS

CA/CMD2, ArchSD

CE/Dev(2), WSD

DFEH

Div Commander (Kwun Tong)

CTP/UD&L

SSO/TPB

SSO/NTHQ

CE/MS, DSD

DO/KT, HAD

DLO/KE, LandsD

CHE/K, HyD

GPA

DEMS

PM/K, CEDD

Post Master General

DEVB (f.i.)

DPO/K

PSO/TA

RK/DY/syl

**TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**Minutes of 386th Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 5.12.2008**

**Present**

Director of Planning  
Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng

Chairperson

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen

Professor N.K. Leung

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Dr. Daniel B.M. To

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),  
Transport Department  
Mr. Anthony Loo



Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr. C.W. Tse

Assistant Director (Kowloon), Lands Department  
Ms. Olga Lam

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang

Dr. Ellen Y.Y. Lau

Assistant Director(2), Home Affairs Department  
Mr. Andrew Tsang

**In Attendance**

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr. W.S. Lau

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Miss Alice Y.Y. Cheung

**Agenda Item 9**

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/576            Proposed comprehensive redevelopment with residential and commercial uses including hotel, office, retail, provision of public open space, Government, Institution or Community facilities, public transport interchange and supporting facilities in “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zone, Kwun Tong Town Centre – Main Site (Area bounded by Kwun Tong Road, Hong Ning Road, Mut Wah Street and Hip Wo Street) (MPC Paper No. A/K14/576)

---

21.            The Secretary reported that as the application was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA), the following Members had declared interests on this item :

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng<br>as the Director of Planning                          | ) | being a non-executive director of the URA   |
| Ms. Olga Lam<br>as the Assistant Director of Lands                       | ) |   |
| Mr. Walter K.L. Chan   | ) |   |
| Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee   | ) | being an ex-non executive director of the URA (The term of office was ended on 30.11.2008.) |
| Mr. Andrew Tsang<br>as the Assistant Director of Home Affairs Department | ) | being a co-opt member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of URA        |
| Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan   | ) | being a member of Kwun Tong District Advisory Committee of URA (Kwun Tong area only)        |
| Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim   | ) | having current business dealings with the URA   |

[Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng and Professor Bernard V.M.F. Lim left the meeting temporarily, while Ms. Olga Lam and Mr. Walter K.L. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

22. The Vice-chairman, Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong, chaired the meeting for this item at this point. Members noted that Mr. Andrew Tsang had sent his apology for being unable to attend the meeting while Mr. Maurice Lee had not arrived to join the meeting. Members noted that Mr. Lee was no longer a non-executive director of the URA on 30.11.2008 and according to the Guidelines for Declaration of Interests in the Town Planning Board Procedure and Practice, Mr Lee was required to declare an interest but he could stay in the meeting to join the discussion.

23. Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan asked whether Town Planning Board (TPB) Members who was a member of the advisory body which had expressed views on projects submitted to the Board was allowed to stay in the TPB meeting to join the discussion. The Secretary reported that in the recent TPB meeting on 3.12.2008 about the further consideration of representations and comments in respect of the Draft Ting Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-TK/14, the Board had discussed on the issue and agreed that one of the Members, being a member of the Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE), which had expressed views on the subject considered by the Board, was allowed to stay at the meeting. To maintain consistency in practice, Members considered that Mr. Chan, who was a member of Kwun Tong District Council and a member of Kwun Tong District Advisory Committee of URA's projects in Kwun Tong, should declare interest but could stay in the meeting to join the discussion. The Committee agreed that in similar situation, Members of the Committee who were members of a public advisory body whose role was only advisory in nature, the concerned Member should declare an interest on the item but could stay in the meeting to join the discussion.

[Ms. Starry W.K. Lee arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

24. Mr Eric C.K. Yue, DPO/K briefly explained that the presentation would be divided into two parts. The first part would be a 5-minutes video presentation prepared by



the URA giving a general introduction of the redevelopment proposals, which included the Main Site (subject of this application) and the Yuet Wah Street Site (subject of another application as per Item 10 below). After the video show, there would be a presentation by PlanD on the development details, the departmental comments and the planning considerations and assessment on the application. Mr. Eric Yue said that the main concern for the application at the Main Site was the proposed building height of 280mPD (at main roof level) for the landmark building and the Committee was requested to consider whether the justifications put forward by the URA were acceptable.

25. After the video show, with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Helen L.M. So presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the comprehensive redevelopment with residential and commercial uses including hotel, offices and retail, with provision of public open space, Government, Institution or Community facilities, public transport interchange (PTI) and supporting facilities;
- (c) departmental comments – relevant Government departments had no adverse comments except for some technical comments such as setback proposal and detailed traffic arrangement for the PTI as per paragraph 9 of the Paper. Notwithstanding, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of Planning Department (CTP/UD&L of PlanD) was concerned about the visual impact and the insufficiency of the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) and the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) for the proposed development. CTP/UD&L considered that the justifications put forward by the URA to justify the proposed 280mPD building height for the landmark building was inadequate;
- (d) 1,002 public comments were received during the statutory publication period. The majority (87%) was in support of whereas 12.6% opposed the application. The public comments were summarized in paragraph 10 of the Paper:

- for those who supported, the major supporting grounds were: regenerating KTTC as a hub for Southeast Kowloon area, acceptable development intensity in metro area; enhancing the town centre image, commercial complex served as a noise barrier for the planned residential area; improved provision of G/IC, traffic and transport facilities, and open space provision; tourist attraction and business opportunities; not affecting the sensitive ridgeline and improving air circulation in Kwun Tong; easy accessibility of the G/IC facilities; preserving the local characters by retaining small street-side shops; job opportunities provided by the proposed social enterprises; and the permanent hawker bazaar providing an all-weathered and convenient shopping place for the public; and
  
  - for those who opposed, the major concerns were: unsatisfactory master layout / development intensity / design / building height resulting in excessive development intensity and podium design which would result in wall effect and air ventilation problems as well as obstructing the ridgeline; unsatisfactory provision and location of G/IC facilities; destruction of the community and the street character; lack of information on implementation phasing and compensation/ acquisition; insufficient public consultation and some misleading information being provided by the URA; unsatisfactory provision of open space and connectivity; need for more tree preservation.
- (e) the District Officer (Kwun Tong) (DO(KT))'s comments were detailed in paragraph 9.17 of the Paper. The DO(KT) advised that the URA should provide the development phasing programme on the provision of the G/IC facilities, government offices, hawker bazaar and open space; and to consult hawkers and street shop operators on the reprovisioning arrangement and time table;
- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

PlanD's assessments of the application were summarized below :

### Building Height

- the TPB was concerned about the proposed landmark commercial building with a building height of 280mPD when the Kwun Tong Town Centre (KTTC) – Main Site Development Scheme Plan (DSP) and Planning Brief (PB) were discussed at the TPB meeting on 7.9.2007. The TPB agreed to delete the building height restrictions in the Main Site and requested the URA to justify the proposed building height at the Master Layout Plan (MLP) submission on the basis of a fresh VIA. In the submitted VIA, the results of the VIA indicated that the landmark tower should be higher than 260mPD in order to be identifiable for the town centre from all vantages points;
- according to the URA, the proposed landmark building was to meet the public aspiration to signify the area as a district town centre. A taller building should be allowed to create a marker within a cluster of commercial buildings in the locality. The submitted VIA had gone through the criteria to measure good visual quality and the vision ahead;
- having considered the permitted development intensity, i.e. total gross floor area (GFA) of 401,250m<sup>2</sup> for the whole KTTC development, further reduction of building height of the landmark building might lead to an increase in the development bulk or the building heights of the residential towers in order to accommodate the permitted GFA. The resultant built form and the overall disposition of the building blocks might aggravate the air ventilation and might even worsen the visual quality of the surrounding area. Hence, it was PlanD's view at the PB preparation stage that a landmark building of 280mPD in the future KTTC was acceptable. Having considered URA's submission, PlanD maintained its view that 280mPD was acceptable though the submitted VIA would need further refinement and substantiation;



- CTP/UD&L, however, considered that a tall building did not automatically represent a landmark while the visibility factor as an argument for landmark was not sound. The submitted VIA had yet to demonstrate the visual impact of the future town centre on the surrounding visually sensitive receivers and to address the issues of integration and visual compatibility;
- the Committee was requested to consider whether URA's justifications for the 280mPD landmark building were acceptable and the issues on integration with the surrounding areas and visual compatibility were fully addressed;

#### Planning Intention

- the proposed comprehensive development for residential and commercial uses integrated with a PTI, at grade public open space and G/IC facilities in the town centre was generally in line with the planning intention of the "CDA(1)" zone;

#### Development Intensity

- the proposed development intensity of domestic and non-domestic plot ratio (PR) of 6.83 and 1.50 respectively for Residential Sub-Area A, and the proposed PR of 12 for Commercial Sub-Area B were in line with the endorsed PB;

#### Open Space Provision

- the provision of 8,700m<sup>2</sup> at-grade public open space (POS) in the town centre would improve accessibility of the site and attract more activities and people to the area;

### Connectivity

- the proposed seven grade-separated connections would enhance the connection between the Main Site and the surrounding areas at multi-levels and provide an improved barrier-free environment to facilitate the movements of the elderly and the mobility of the disadvantaged;

### Improvement to Urban Design

- there was room to improve the building design of the proposed development. For instance, the design of the retail podium and the pedestrian deck along Kwun Tong Road could be improved to reduce the visual impact of the building structure and to improve air ventilation along Kwun Tong Road frontage. As such, attempts should be made to reduce the pedestrian deck and ways to provide more openings in the podium should be explored; and

### Technical Issues

- relevant Government departments had no adverse comments on the proposed development;
- other technical issues like setback proposal and traffic arrangement at the PTI could be addressed at the detailed design stage.

26. The comments / questions raised by the Members were summarized as follows :

### Building Height

- (a) more justifications for the proposed 280mPD building height should be given as tall building did not automatically mean that the building design was good;

- (b) the justification based on the argument that a landmark had to be higher than all the other buildings in the locality and could be seen from all the vantage points (VPs) was questionable. As a matter of fact, a building height lower than 280mPD for the landmark building could still be visible from the VPs at Kai Tak Runway and Hong Ning Road Recreation Ground by adjusting the viewing angle at the two VPs. As such, the proposed building height of 280mPD was not justified;

#### Visual Impact

- (c) more information should be given to illustrate the visual impact of the proposed development;
- (d) the choice of VPs should be clarified and whether the proposed development would breach the ridgeline when viewed from Shau Kei Wan / Lei Yue Mun Park towards Fei Ngo Shan. The URA should be requested to submit further information in these regards;

#### Air Ventilation Assessment

- (e) while it was noted that the 280mPD building height had a better performance than the 220mPD building height in terms of air ventilation, it was not sure about the basic assumptions adopted and more information should be given in this respect;
- (f) whether the AVA had included assessments of various building height scenarios between 220mPD and 280mPD;

#### Building Design

- (g) from the submitted photomontages, it was not sure whether the so-called “marker-like” design could signify the landmark building. While there was no information on the impact of the slanting glass façade at the upper portion of the landmark building on the surrounding environment, the

experience from the Island East Tower was that the reflection of sun light from the glass façade had adversely affected the surrounding environment. PlanD should request the URA to provide information in this regard;

- (h) the design merits for the proposed development should be further elaborated;
- (i) the proposed development and podium structure would result in a significant visual impact with some wall effect;

[Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

#### Public Comments

- (j) whether the proposed building height of the development had wide public support from the local community of the Kwun Tong district as suggested by the URA as it could not be concluded from the comments from the DO(KT) and the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) as per paragraphs 9.1.17 and 9.1.18 of the Paper;

#### Other Technical Issues

##### (k) Pedestrian Connectivity

- more information should be given on connectivity between the proposed development to the other areas of Kwun Tong district. In particular, 24-hour pedestrians access across Kwun Tong Road should be provided; and

##### (l) Refuse Collection Point (RCP)

- more information should be given on the design and arrangement of the RCP as well as its integration with the KTTC redevelopment.

27. The responses made by Mr. Eric C.K. Yue and Miss Helen L.M. So were summarized as follows :

Building Height

- (a) the justifications put forward by the URA for the proposed building height of 280mPD for the landmark building were set out in sections 2 to 4 of the submitted VIA (Appendix 1b of the Paper refers), namely, to meet the public aspiration for a landmark building with reasonable development intensity and with appropriate building height as an icon for the town centre; the proposed height should be no less than 260mPD in order to be visible from all the 7 vantage points; and the submitted VIA demonstrated that the proposed 280mPD building height would not obstruct the ridgeline of Kowloon Peak (Fei Ngo Shan) and Lion Rock;

Visual Impact

- (b) the justifications of the URA for the proposed building height of 280mPD were presented in the submitted VIA (Appendix D, Vol. 3 - Book 1 of Appendix 1b of the Paper refers):
- in conducting the VIA, 7 vantage points were discussed and agreed with PlanD, viz. V1 – Quarry Bay Park, V2 – Kai Tak Runway, V3 – Hong Ning Road Recreation Ground, V4 – Kwun Tong Recreation Ground, V5 – Sai Tso Wan Recreation Ground, V6 – Devil’s Peak and V7 – Black Hill. Viewing from these 7 vantage points towards the proposed development, geographical information system (GIS) viewshed and 3D model analysis had been used to identify the extent of visibility for different building height scenarios (200, 220, 240, 260 and 280mPD) of the landmark building. The results indicated that the landmark building should be higher than 260mPD in order to be visible and visually significant from all vantages points. In order to achieve the “fair visibility” desired by the URA, a maximum building height of 280mPD for the landmark building was adopted to



achieve an icon roofline;

- photomontages from the 7 vantage points for the proposed 280mPD landmark building were produced to illustrate the visual appraisal of the proposed development. According to the Photomontages, the proposed landmark building when view from V1 (the only vantage point in Hong Kong Island) would not affect the protected ridgeline, whereas for V2 to V7, the proposed landmark building would be identifiable and thus the proposed 280mPD building height would be acceptable to the URA;
  - 3 aerial photomontages and 4 views from local vantage points were prepared to demonstrate that there would be no adverse visual impact and to help visualize the resulting streetscape improvement brought about by KTTC redevelopment;
  - according to the VIA, any reduction in building heights would sacrifice the much needed at-grade public open space serving the town centre and at the same time increase the bulkiness of the towers and reduce the permeability of the town centre in terms of air ventilation and visual penetration. The VIA therefore concluded that no unacceptable visual impacts would be resulted;
- (c) Under the Urban Design Study (commenced in 1998 and completed in 2003), 7 public VPs, which had undergone a long process of public consultation, had been identified upon which the public acknowledged that the view of the ridgeline from these VPs should be protected. Among these 7 public VPs, two of them were at the Kai Tak Runway and the Quarry Bay Park which were included in the VIA for the URA's KTTC redevelopment. The VPs in the VIA, which also included local viewpoints relevant to the application, were discussed and agreed between the URA and PlanD. The proposed development did not fall within the viewing fan of the protected ridgeline identified in the Urban Design Study. As such, the proposed development would not obstruct the ridgeline of Fei Ngo

Shan when viewed from V1 – Quarry Bay Park;

#### Air Ventilation Assessment

- (d) the URA submitted a supplementary AVA on 17.10.2008 comparing the scheme adopting the building height of 220mPD and that of 280mPD (Appendix 1f of the Paper). Wind tunnel studies were conducted to investigate the pedestrian level wind environment within and around the proposed KTTC development. The result of the AVA concluded that the air ventilation performance of the scheme with 280mPD was still better than the one with 220mPD on most of the concerned peripheral roads due to taller and slimmer building design and thus better air ventilation improvements were anticipated in the KTTC;
- (e) the supplementary AVA had only compared the schemes with 220mPD and 280mPD and assessment for the building height scenarios between 220mPD to 280mPD was not conducted. As pointed out in paragraph 9.1.14 of the Paper, the AVA had not taken into account some large scale planned developments like Kai Tak Development and mitigation measures to address the relatively poor ventilation performance caused by the bulky podium structure and pedestrian deck should be included;

#### Building Design

- (f) regarding the impact from the sun light reflection of the slanting glass façade on the surrounding environment, the URA had not provided information on this issue;
- (g) on the visual impact and wall effect imposed by the podium structure, the URA had committed to mitigate such impacts by incorporating more “openings” and urban windows into the design of the proposed development. A planning condition was suggested to be imposed in the planning permission requesting the URA to submit and implement a design proposal for the retail podium façade and pedestrian deck along Kwun

Tong Road should the application be approved;

### Public Comments

- (h) the public comments received during the statutory publication period were summarized in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The majority of the public comments was in support of the application. In the comments received, quite a number indicated support to the proposed building height with more ground level open space. On the public aspiration for a tall landmark building at KTTC, it was the view maintained by the URA after a series of consultation exercises with the Kwun Tong community. DO(KT) had also referred to the URA's consultation with the KTDC on 8.7.2008 and the comments from the KTDC members were summarized in paragraph 9.1.18 of the Paper. While a number of DC members supported the proposed redevelopment, one member specifically gave specific support to the proposed 280mPD landmark building;

### Other Technical Issues

- (i) Pedestrian Connectivity

- with reference to Plan A-4 of the Paper, a pedestrian deck would be provided by the applicant connecting the proposed redevelopment with the Kwun Tong MTR station. The applicant also proposed to provide new connections to link up three existing footbridges (Nos. 1-3) on Kwun Tong Road for pedestrian access from the Main Site to the APM and the area south of Kwun Tong Road and the Kwun Tong MTR station. The proposed pedestrian connections were considered acceptable. As for night time pedestrian access, it was a matter to be addressed at detailed design and a 24-hour access clause could be imposed in the lease condition. In addition, for the connection points annotated to be provided "by Others" (Nos. 4 and 6 in the Plan), they would be provided under other projects coordinated by relevant Government departments; and the applicant

would be responsible for the provision of the new footbridge (No. 5) connecting the Main Site and the Yuet Wah Street Site; and

(j) RCP

- the issue on RCP was under the responsibility of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD). The FEHD had no objection to the application and their comments on the RCP were stated in paragraph 9.1.9 of the Paper. As the detailed requirements for the RCP could be dealt with at the detailed design stage, an approval condition requesting the applicant to submit details of the RCP to the satisfaction of the FEHD was suggested to be included in the planning permission.

Deliberation Session

28. Members acknowledged the substantial efforts that had been committed by the URA to the current scheme, such as the landscape treatment, and the efforts to resolve the social issues, etc. Notwithstanding, the majority of members considered that the justifications put forward by the URA in the VIA to support the proposed building height of 280mPD were not satisfactory. In particular, Members did not agree to the URA's justifications that a landmark building had to be a tall building which should be visible from all the VPs. A Member considered that apart from having a smaller footprint, the AVA could not justify that the proposed 280mPD building height would give a better air ventilation performance as it had only compared with the scheme of 220mPD but not other scenarios in between. This Member considered that the design merits of the proposed development were not clearly explained to justify for the proposed building height of 280mPD.

29. A few Members considered that it was premature for the Committee to approve the application based on the current scheme which required justifications on the design merits and also further information on the VIA and AVA.

30. A Member enquired the possibility of reducing the development intensity for the KTTC redevelopment in view of the recent scaling down of a number of large scale projects. In response, the Secretary advised that the GFA for the KTTC redevelopment had undergone a long process of discussion between the Government and the URA. The GFA was agreed for the KTTC redevelopment in view of the uniqueness of the project. It was a large scale redevelopment at the town centre of the Kwun Tong district and had evolved for long time with a long implementation programme and substantial financial commitment on the part of the URA. Based on these considerations, it had been accepted that a tall building at the site would be required to accommodate the agreed GFA. The Board had previously accepted the development intensity and it would not be appropriate to request for a reduction of GFA for the KTTC redevelopment at this juncture. With the accepted GFA, the Committee should focus on whether the design of the MLP was acceptable and how to achieve the best layout and design in the MLP.

31. On the issue of building height, some Members suggested that the building design of the landmark building could be adjusted with a larger floor plate and a lower building height. On the other hand, a few Members considered that in order to achieve the agreed GFA, there would not be much room to manoeuvre with regard to the reduction in building height and the effect would not be visually significant. As a related issue, a Member was concerned whether the increase in the floor plate would affect the POS provision at ground level. Some Members noted the URA's argument that the increase in the building footprint resulting from the reduction of building height would affect the POS provision at ground level. Nonetheless, some Members considered that even with a lower building height, the POS provision at ground level would not be affected. Instead, it might affect the provision of private open space at the podium level. In this regard, Members considered that the URA should be invited to substantiate on the effect of reducing building height on the provision of open space within the scheme.

32. A Member considered that, in the Kwun Tong district, the key concern was the need for open space and better pedestrian circulation at ground level, which were in much desired by the local residents. As such, it would be more important for the landmark building to integrate with the local areas of the Kwun Tong district. This Member further considered that to justify the building height for the landmark building, the benefits of the high-rise building should be shared with the public. In this instance, it was a golden



opportunity for the landmark building to be opened for public access to enjoy its open view towards Lei Yue Mun and the South China Sea. To maximize the merits of the scheme, Members agreed to request the applicant to consider incorporating a public viewing deck in the landmark building so that the public could enjoy the panoramic views of the city offered by the high-rise building.

33. Two Members acknowledged that given the site constraint, the need to accommodate the agreed GFA and the requirements of providing the public facilities such as the POS on ground level and the PTI, it would be necessary to pursue a high-rise landmark building for the proposed development. However, the proposed MLP could not be approved at this juncture as the submitted VIA was flawed. While not objecting to the high-rise building per se, Members agreed that the URA should be invited to submit more justifications to support its proposal of a landmark building of 280mPD.

34. Members also noted the need to speedily proceed with the redevelopment of the KTTC in light of the local aspirations and the lengthy redevelopment process, including land resumption and compensation, involved. Members then discussed the best way of processing the project further. After some discussion, the Members agreed to expedite the processing of the application upon receipt of the applicant's further submission to address the Committee's concerns.

35. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application and agreed to request the applicant to provide further information to justify the proposed building height of 280mPD for the landmark building.

[Professor N.K. Leung and Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan left at this point while Ms. Starry W.K. Lee left the meeting temporarily.]

**TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**Minutes of 389th Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 23.1.2009**

**Present**

Director of Planning  
Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng

Chairperson

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen

Professor N.K. Leung

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Dr. Daniel B.M. To

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong,  
Transport Department  
Mr. H.L. Cheng

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr. C.W. Tse

Assistant Director (Kowloon), Lands Department  
Ms. Olga W.H. Lam

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr. Ellen Y.Y. Lau

Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang

Assistant Director(2), Home Affairs Department  
Mr. Andrew Y.T. Tsang

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Mr. Lau Sing

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr. J.J. Austin

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms. Doris S.Y. Ting

Extract of minutes of the Metro Planning Committee meeting on 23.1.2009

~~[The Chairperson thanked Miss Annic K.W. To, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Miss To left the meeting at this point.]~~

[Mr. Eric C.K. Yue, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K) and Miss Helen L.M. So, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan returned to join the meeting, while Ms. Olga W. H. Lam left the meeting temporarily and Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 14**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/576          Comprehensive Redevelopment with Residential and Commercial  
Uses including Hotel, Office, Retail with Provision of Public Open Space,  
Government, Institution or Community Facilities,  
Public Transport Interchange and Supporting Facilities  
in "Comprehensive Development Area (1)" zone,  
Kwun Tong Town Centre - Main Site (Area Bounded by  
Kwun Tong Road, Hong Ning Road, Mut Wah Street and Hip Wo Street)  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/576A)

---

57.            The Secretary said that the application was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA). The following Members had declared interests on this item:

Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng	]	
as the Director of Planning	]	
	]	
Ms. Olga W.H. Lam	]	being a non-executive director of the
as the Assistant Director of	]	URA
Lands Department	]	
	]	
Mr. Walter K.L. Chan	]	
	]	
Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee		being an ex-non executive director of the URA (the term of office was ended on 30.11.2008)

Mr. Andrew Y.T. Tsang  
as the Assistant Director of  
Home Affairs Department

being a co-opt member of the  
Planning, Development and  
Conservation Committee of the URA

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

being a member of the Kwun Tong  
District Council and the Kwun Tong  
District Advisory Committee of the  
URA

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

having current business dealings with  
the URA

58. As Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee was no longer a non-executive director of the URA since 30.11.2008 and Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan was a member of a public advisory body whose role was only advisory in nature, Members agreed that they should declare their interests but could stay in the meeting to join the discussion. Members noted that Mr. Andrew Y.T. Tsang had tendered an apology for not being able to attend the meeting, Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee had not yet arrived to join the meeting, while Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim and Ms. Olga W.H. Lam had already left the meeting.]

[Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng left the meeting temporarily, while Mr. Walter K.L. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

59. The Vice-chairman chaired the meeting at this point. Ms. Starry W.K. Lee also declared interest on this item as she was a member of the Kowloon City District Advisory Committee of the URA. Members considered Ms. Lee's interest as remote and she could stay in the meeting to participate in the discussion.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

60. The Vice-chairman said that as this item was related to the further consideration of an application which had been thoroughly discussed by the Committee on the previous occasion, PlanD's presentation should focus on how the applicant's further submission had addressed Members' previous concerns and suggestions.

61. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Eric C.K. Yue, DPO/K, presented the application and made the following main points as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) on 5.12.2008, the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) decided to defer a decision on the application pending the submission of further information from the applicant to justify the proposed building height of 280mPD for the landmark building. The main concerns/suggestions of the Committee were:
  - (i) the design merits of the proposed 280mPD landmark building were not clearly explained;
  - (ii) Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) for different height scenarios other than 220mPD and 280mPD for the proposed landmark building should be provided;
  - (iii) the adverse effect on the provision of open space caused by a reduction in building height should be substantiated;
  - (iv) to consider incorporating a public viewing deck in the landmark building; and
  - (v) the glare impact caused by the slanting glass façade on the surrounding environment should be assessed;
- (b) on 22.12.2008, the applicant submitted further information including a revised Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) to address Members' concerns. The justifications provided by the applicant, as detailed in paragraph 2 of the Paper, were summarised below:
  - (i) a single commercial tower would result in better natural ventilation and visual permeability, provide more open space/landscaped area at podium level, allow more effective use of floor space within the retail podium, provide an interesting building height profile stepped



down from 280mPD to 160mPD, and impose less design constraints on the Public Transport Interchange;

- (ii) the scale of the commercial podium, with a floorspace of 111,780m<sup>2</sup> for a regional shopping centre, was considered optimal. It could also serve as a noise barrier for the development. Further increase in bulk might increase the wall effect, worsen the visual quality along Kwun Tong Road and affect air ventilation;
  - (iii) a footprint analysis indicated that the floor plate of the 280mPD commercial tower was optimal as any further increase in footprint would reduce the building gap between the commercial and residential towers, reduce sunlight penetration to inner floor space, worsen air ventilation and result in an ineffective and uneconomical design in the layout of the office and hotel;
  - (iv) the findings of the visual analysis supported the building height of 280mPD for the commercial tower which was visible but not intrusive when viewed from the Quarry Bay Park. It was also visually compatible with the surrounding environment and in line with the cityscape of a town centre;
  - (v) an observation deck with an area not more than 750m<sup>2</sup> was proposed at Level 61 of the 280mPD commercial tower to provide a panoramic view for public enjoyment; and
  - (vi) enhancement measures would be explored at the detailed design stage to improve the day-light penetration of the pedestrian deck, to avoid causing glare nuisances, and to provide 24-hour public access to the pedestrian deck;
- (c) departmental comments – the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L) commented that the applicant had not explored the 2-tower option in detail with the support of

drawings and photomontages. Given the large site area, with appropriate design and disposition, the commercial tower with a larger footprint would not necessarily reduce the building gap between the commercial and residential towers and would not affect at-grade public open space provision. While the 280mPD option only represented a very marginal improvement in the wind velocity ratio (1.5%) over the 220mPD option, no additional AVA was provided to compare the air ventilation performance for other building height scenarios. The justifications for a single commercial tower through air ventilation, open space provision and stepped height design were not sufficient to support the preferred building height of 280mPD from the urban design point of view. The revised VIA was barely satisfactory and the applicant's conclusion that the 280mPD landmark building was acceptable had to be substantiated by other non-visual considerations. The Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban, Transport Department had no objection to the proposal subject to the provision of satisfactory traffic and loading/unloading arrangements for the proposed observation deck. Other concerned Government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) a total of 415 public comments were received during the statutory publication period. All except one supported the application on the grounds that the development intensity and building height of the proposed development were acceptable; the landmark building and proposed observation deck could attract tourists and bring more business opportunities; the retail podium could serve as a noise barrier reducing noise nuisances for the nearby residents; and the proposed landmark building would not obstruct the ridgeline. One commenter opposed the application due to its excessive building height and development intensity, its adverse visual impact on the district; the undesirable disposition of building blocks and excessive podium height; its poor quality open space and distorted consultation results; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no planning

objection to the application based on the assessment in paragraph 5 of the Paper. Although the proposed building height of 280mPD for the landmark building, which would signify the Kwun Tong Town Centre, could not be justified on visual and design aspects alone, other functionality and engineering considerations should also be taken into account in arriving at a balanced view. The revised VIA had demonstrated that the 280mPD landmark building was visible but not intrusive when viewed from the Quarry Bay Park and was in line with the cityscape of a town centre. To reduce the building height of the landmark building would result in a larger footprint and an ineffective and uneconomical design of the office and hotel floor space. An assessment of the two-tower option could not be conducted as the applicant did not submit the relevant information. An observation deck would be provided at the top of the landmark building to enable the public to enjoy a panoramic view of the district. All the public comments except one supported the 280mPD landmark building. Regarding the concern that no additional AVA had been provided in the current submission to compare the air ventilation performance for the other building height scenarios, this could be addressed by imposing relevant approval condition requiring the submission of a revised AVA. Other detailed design issues such as the problem of glare, massiveness of the retail podium and the provision of the pedestrian deck could be addressed through imposing relevant approval conditions and advisory clauses.

62. Members had the following main questions/views on the application:
- (a) the relationship between different height scenarios for the proposed commercial tower and the vantage points as shown in the Viewshed Analysis at Annex C of Appendix IV of the Paper;
  - (b) whether the observation deck to be provided at the top floor of the commercial tower would be accessible and opened to the public;
  - (c) the reason why the two-tower option was not examined in greater detail, in

particular when the proposed building height of 280mPD had exceeded the existing ridgeline by about 40%; and

- (d) whether the glare effect of the slanting glass façade on the surrounding environment had been properly addressed.

63. In response to Members' views/questions, Mr. Eric C.K. Yue made the following main points:

- (a) visual analysis for 7 options of building height ranging from 200mPD to 320mPD at an interval of 20m had been conducted by the applicant at seven vantage points (viz. Quarry Bay Park, Kai Tak Runway, Hong Ning Road Recreation Playground, Kwun Tong Recreation Playground, Sai Tso Wan Recreation Playground, Devil's Peak and Black Hill). The analysis provided by the applicant had demonstrated that the proposed landmark building at 280mPD would be visible but not intrusive when viewed from these vantage points;
- (b) the applicant had agreed to provide an observation deck (including ancillary food & beverage facilities and souvenir shops) at the top level of the proposed 280mPD commercial tower in order to allow the public to enjoy a 360° unobstructed view of the surrounding areas. As currently proposed, the observation deck was right above the hotel development and was likely to be part of the hotel establishment. However, the mode of operation and opening hours were yet to be determined and would be worked out in the detailed design stage;
- (c) according to the applicant, the development of a single commercial tower was functionally more efficient, and it would improve air ventilation, increase open space provision at the podium level (about 5,000m<sup>2</sup>), and create a more interesting stepped building height profile for the whole development site. Referring to Plan FA-3 of the Paper, the proposed commercial tower could broadly be divided into three portions (viz. the retail podium at the lowest portion up to a building height of about 62mPD;

the office portion in the middle with a building height of around 128m; and the top portion proposed for hotel development with a building height of around 56m). The adoption of a two-tower design could be done either by placing the hotel development as a separate block above the retail podium or by dividing the office and hotel development into two blocks of equal height. Both options were, however, undesirable from urban design and land use planning point of view as the proposed commercial towers would be substantially lower than the four residential towers within the development with building height ranging from 160mPD to 178mPD. Besides, the intention of creating a landmark building signifying the Kwun Tong Town Centre would be defeated and the proposed public observation deck at the top floor would not serve any purpose as its views would be substantially obstructed by the existing commercial development, APM (187mPD) to the south of the site; and

- (d) on the glare effect, the applicant indicated that external shading devices would be considered in the façade design of commercial tower at the detailed design stage and non-reflective construction materials would also be used to avoid causing nuisance to the surrounding. To address this concern, it was proposed to add an advisory clause to remind the applicant to reduce the glare effect.

64. The Secretary supplemented that the applicant had explained in its submission why a single commercial tower was preferred to a two-tower option, although diagrammatic illustrations were not provided. According to the applicant, different height scenarios for the commercial tower had been prepared to demonstrate the visual impact of the proposed development. To prepare additional plans and drawings for the two-tower option based on these different scenarios would require a lot of time, effort and resources which might not be worthwhile solely for comparison purposes.

#### Deliberation Session

65. One Member was concerned with the general belief that a landmark building had to be a tall building which was highly visible from other parts of Hong Kong. Based on the

photomontages submitted by the applicant, the proposed commercial tower of 280mPD was excessive and visually intrusive. This Member also raised a concern on the glare effect caused by the glass façade to the surrounding developments.

66. One Member said that from the perspective of local residents, the development of a single high-rise tower at this location was visually more acceptable than two medium-rise towers. Besides, the residents were also more concerned with the accessibility to and connectivity of the Site with other parts of the district including Tsui Ping Estate, Yuet Wah Street and the town centre and measures to improve the local traffic congestion and the environmental nuisances rather than the height of the tower.

67. Although the applicant's further submission could not satisfactorily address the Committee's previous concerns, one Member tended to support the application due to the aspirations of local residents in Kwun Tong district for the early implementation of this redevelopment project and the fact that the URA had carried out a comprehensive consultation process. Nevertheless, the Member raised a general concern that the current mode of operation of the URA had resulted in the development of a number of excessively tall and massive buildings (e.g. in Tai Kok Tsui), which were out-of-context and incompatible with the surrounding developments. This Member further said that the proposed observation deck should not form part of the hotel development which could only be enjoyed by a small group of people affordable to use the hotel facilities. Instead, the observation deck should be opened to the general public and such requirement should be incorporated as an approval condition.

68. The Secretary explained that planning approval would be given on the terms of the application as submitted by the applicant. The provision of a public observation deck already formed part of the subject application. Nevertheless, the Committee could impose an approval condition to require that the proposed observation deck should not form part of the hotel, but should be opened to the public. For the subject application, given the permitted development intensity for the proposed project and the non-visual and engineering considerations of the proposed development, the development of a high rise development seemed to be inevitable. On the general concern raised by the Member, the Secretary explained that the schemes were previously approved when the community was less concerned about the building height issue and the scheme had to fulfil the housing policy



objective. PlanD would adopt a cautious approach in scrutinising the development proposals for future URA projects in order to ensure that the development intensity and building height of the proposed projects were more compatible with the surrounding areas.

69. Some Members indicated support for the provision of an observation deck which could serve as a tourist attraction and considered that this public viewing facility should be easily accessible to the general public. Relevant approval condition should be imposed to ensure that the observation deck would be opened to the general public.

70. The Vice-chairman said that Members' concerns on improving the connectivity between the Site and other parts of the district, and the traffic and unloading/loading arrangement of the observation deck were partially covered by the approval conditions and advisory clauses as recommended by PlanD in paragraph 6 of the Paper.

71. Two Members said that the revised VIA submitted by the applicant could not satisfactorily address the previous concerns raised by the Committee. The visual impacts of different height scenarios ranging from 200mPD to 320mPD, as shown on the photomontages submitted by the applicant at Annexes C to E of Appendix IV of the Paper, did not show a significant difference and they were unconvinced that the 280mPD option would outperform other options. Moreover, it appeared that the reduction of building height for the proposed commercial tower would not cause any significant negative impacts on the surrounding areas. The Vice-chairman agreed that the applicant had not provided convincing arguments to substantiate the design merits of the 280mPD option but merely focused on presenting the design and functional drawbacks of adopting a two-tower design.

72. Noting the conflicting views between the CTP/UD&L who had reservations on the adequacy of the visual impact assessment submitted and the supportive views of the local residents of Kwun Tong on the single commercial tower of 280mPD, a Member said that the Committee was facing a dilemma on how to balance the wider public interest and local views. This Member was inclined to agree in-principle to the redevelopment proposal but considered that the building height of 280mPD for the commercial tower should be lowered in order to minimise the adverse visual impact of breaching the profile of the ridgeline.

73. One Member said that the height of the landmark building should be compatible with the general character and image of the area as well as the building height of the surrounding developments. Judging from the photomontages of different height scenarios submitted by the applicant, the commercial tower at 260mPD was considered more proportional in its building form and relatively more compatible with the overall building height profile of the surrounding areas. Another Member remarked that the project had the support of the local residents as it was anticipated that the image of the Kwun Tong Town Centre and the living environment of this old district would be greatly improved upon completion of this project.

74. One other Member said that although there was concern on the visual impact of the proposed development, the aspirations of the local residents of Kwun Tong advocating for the early implementation of the project should be taken into account. Since the existing commercial/office development (APM) to the immediate south of the application site had already been developed up to a building height of about 200mPD, it would not be desirable to adopt a two-tower design with medium-rise buildings since it did not meet the local sentiment of creating a landmark building at this location. While the proposed building height of 280mPD for the commercial tower as proposed by the applicant was 'barely acceptable', a lower building height of 260mPD would be more desirable. Another Member shared similar views that a building height of not exceeding 260mPD for the commercial tower could be tolerated taking into account the proposed footprint as shown on Drawing FA-1 of the Paper.

75. Judging from the photomontages at Annex D of Appendix IV of the Paper, one Member said that 240mPD would be more justified in that the proposed commercial tower at such building height would already be visibly taller than other developments, yet it could still form part of the overall building profile. However, another Member said that a proposed building height of 260mPD would be more acceptable than 240mPD in order to create a more discernible stepped height profile with the APM in close proximity. Another Member added that the commercial tower with a height of 260mPD could be accepted because it would allow the public to enjoy an unobstructed view from the observation deck to the old Kai Tai runway. Such panoramic view would however be slightly obstructed if the building height was reduced to 240mPD.

76. A Member considered that the proposed building height of the commercial tower at 280mPD was acceptable as the reduction of 20m would not be visually significant when viewed from various vantage points but the adverse impact for the Kwun Tong Business Area in terms of air ventilation would be substantial should the footprint of the proposed commercial tower be enlarged.

77. The Secretary said that while the applicant had submitted photomontages of the proposed commercial towers of different building height scenarios at various local vantage points (Annex F of Appendix IV of the Paper), the impact of the proposed development at a building height of 280mPD or 260mPD on the local environment might not be too significant.

78. The Vice-chairman noted that majority of Members considered that based on the further information submitted by the applicant, the design merits of the proposed commercial tower at 280mPD were not fully justified. However, a reduced building height of 260mPD for the commercial tower would be more acceptable from planning point of view taking into account the need to strike a balance between the visual and urban design concerns as well as other non-visual functional and engineering considerations. In view of the above, the Vice-chairman concluded that the application would be approved subject to imposition of an approval condition specifying the revised maximum building height of 260mPD for the proposed commercial tower, an approval condition requiring the submission of a revised Master Layout Plan to take into account the revised maximum building height, and a condition requiring that the proposed observation deck should be opened to the public. Members agreed.

[Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

79. One Member further commented that the proposed building design with a slanting angle at the roof level should be maintained in future submission in order to add variety to the cityscape. The Secretary said that this could be addressed when the applicant submitted a revised Master Layout Plan for approval.

80. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The

permission should be valid until 23.1.2013, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan to take into account the approval conditions as stated in paragraphs (b) to (t) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the building height of the proposed commercial development within the application site should not exceed 260mPD;
- (c) the proposed observation deck should be opened for public enjoyment;
- (d) submission of detailed breakdown of the site area and Gross Floor Area for each of the Development Package Areas to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (e) submission and implementation of the public transport interchange proposal to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (f) submission and implementation of detailed setback proposal to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (g) submission of a Landscape Master Plan including tree preservation scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (h) implementation of the approved Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.
- (i) submission of the quarterly tree monitoring report to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;

- (j) submission and implementation of a Landscape Master Plan for the proposed at-grade public open space to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB;
- (k) submission and implementation of a tree preservation and tree replanting scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB;
- (l) submission of a revised air ventilation assessment and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (m) submission of a revised drainage impact assessment and revised sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (n) submission of a revised traffic impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (o) submission of a revised water impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB;
- (p) submission and implementation of interim sewerage diversion scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection and the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (q) provision of a refuse collection point to the satisfaction of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene or of the TPB;
- (r) provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (s) submission and implementation of a detailed risk assessment and contingency plan on potential road unsettlement of Hip Wo Street, Mut

Wah Street and Kwun Tong Road arising from construction activities of the proposed car park and sunken bazaar to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB; and

- (t) submission and implementation of a design proposal for the retail podium façade and the pedestrian deck along Kwun Tong Road to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

81. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant :

- (a) that the approved Master Layout Plan, together with the set of approval conditions, would be certified by the Chairman of the TPB and deposited in the Land Registry in accordance with section 4A(3) of the Town Planning Ordinance. Efforts should be made to incorporate the relevant approval conditions into a revised Master Layout Plan for deposition in the Land Registry as soon as practicable;
- (b) the arrangement of emergency vehicular access should comply with Part VI of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Fire Fighting and Rescue administered by the Buildings Department;
- (c) to liaise with relevant Government departments on the landscape works on public pavement;
- (d) to liaise with relevant Government departments on the management and maintenance responsibilities of the public transport interchange;
- (e) to clarify the management and maintenance responsibilities of the areas to be landscaped and improved by the Urban Renewal Authority with relevant Government departments;
- (f) to liaise with the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East on land administration matters;



- (g) to liaise with affected hawkers on the interim relocation arrangement for the hawker bazaar;
- (h) to liaise with the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene and wall stall owners on the arrangements for the licensed wall stalls;
- (i) to consult the Kwun Tong District Council on the suggestion to relocate a bus route to Choi Hung Mass Transit Railway Station bus terminus;
- (j) to liaise with relevant Government departments on reprovisioning and management and maintenance responsibilities for Government, Institution or Community facilities and temporary reprovisioning arrangements;
- (k) to liaise with the Commissioner for Transport on temporary traffic management and maintenance matter to ensure that the traffic and pedestrian flow would not be affected during the construction phases;
- (l) to liaise with the Commissioner for Transport on detailed arrangements for the reprovisioning of public transport services including the provision of temporary facilities and other detailed traffic arrangements to refrain the potential traffic problems induced by the observation deck;
- (m) to take note of the Chief Highway Engineer/Kowloon, Highways Department's comments that a minimum clearance of 500mm to the roadside planter from kerblines should be provided subject to the Commissioner for Transport's comment; and to consult their Lighting Division to ensure that the proposed trees would not affect the functioning of road light system;
- (n) to liaise with the Director of Highways on public footpath landscape and streetscape proposal and maintenance responsibilities;
- (o) to note the Director of Environment Protection's comment to explore and implement further noise mitigation measures to minimize road traffic noise

impact on the proposed development and to inform the future occupants clearly of the special design of fixed windows or glazing as one of the noise mitigation measures;

- (p) to note the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services' requirements that no proposed sewer or even temporary one should be laid across the Yue Man Square Rest Garden or laid along the public pedestrian pavement close to the two Old Valuable Trees at Yue Man Square Rest Garden;
- (q) to take note of the TPB's concern on the potential glare effect in the façade design of the commercial tower to avoid causing nuisance to the surrounding areas; and
- (r) to take note of TPB Members' views that the observation deck should not form part of the hotel development.

~~Agenda Item 15~~

~~Section 16 Application~~

~~[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]~~

~~A/K14/580                      Proposed Shop and Services  
in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone,  
Workshop 2, G/F, Kwong Sang Hong Centre,  
151-153 Hoi Bun Road, Kwun Tong  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/580)~~

~~Presentation and Question Sessions~~

~~82.                      With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation. Miss Helen L.M. So, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :~~

~~[Ms. Olga W.H. Lam and Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng returned to join the meeting, while Ms. Starry W.K. Lee left the meeting temporarily at this point.]~~

Comparison of Main Development Parameters of the Current Scheme with the Planning Brief

Development Parameters	Endorsed Planning Brief	Current Proposal (Application No. A/K14/745)	Difference +/- (%)
<b>Development Scheme Area – CDA (1)</b> [for purpose of implementation of the DSP under URAO]	<b>48,860m<sup>2</sup></b> (approx.)	-	
<b>Gross Site Area</b> (about)	<b>46,294m<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>46,294m<sup>2</sup></b>	0
-Residential Sub-Area A	27,770m <sup>2</sup>	27,770m <sup>2</sup>	0
-Commercial Sub-Area B	18,524m <sup>2</sup>	18,524m <sup>2</sup>	0
<b>Net Site Area for Plot Ratio (PR) Calculation</b>		<b>36,442m<sup>2</sup></b>	-
-Residential Sub-Area A		19,700m <sup>2</sup> (deducting at-grade open space: 7,566m <sup>2</sup> , public/private roads: 504m <sup>2</sup> )	
-Commercial Sub-Area B		16,742m <sup>2</sup> (deducting at-grade open space: 1,782m <sup>2</sup> )	
<b>Development Intensity</b>			
<b>Total GFA</b>	<b>401,250m<sup>2</sup></b>  Total GFA of KTTC – Main Site and Yuet Wah Street Site (YWSS) including possible bonus PR not exceeding 401,250m <sup>2</sup>	<b>401,250m<sup>2</sup></b>  <u>Main Site: 373,420m<sup>2</sup></u> Domestic GFA: 138,980m <sup>2</sup> Residential sub-area A: 138,980m <sup>2</sup> Non-Domestic GFA: 234,440m <sup>2</sup> Residential sub-area A: 35,817m <sup>2</sup> Commercial sub-area B: 198,623m <sup>2</sup>  <u>YWSS: 27,830m<sup>2</sup></u> Domestic GFA: 21,630 m <sup>2</sup> Non-Domestic GFA: 6,200 m <sup>2</sup> [The details on YWSS is for information only]	0
<b>Plot Ratio</b>			
<b>Residential Sub-Area A</b>		<b>Total GFA: 174,797 m<sup>2</sup>/</b> <b>PR : 8.87</b> (about)  <b>Domestic GFA: 138,980m<sup>2</sup>/</b> <b>PR : 7.05</b> (about)	

Development Parameters	Endorsed Planning Brief	Current Proposal (Application No. A/K14/745)	Difference +/- (%)
<b>Commercial Sub-Area B</b>		<p><b>Non-Domestic GFA: 35,817m<sup>2</sup>/ PR : 1.82</b> (about)</p> <p><i>Including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retail/Education institution: 19,297m<sup>2</sup>/ PR 0.98 (about)</li> <li>• PTI: 15,000m<sup>2</sup>/ PR 0.76 (about)</li> <li>• G/IC (hawker bazaar + refuse collection point) : 1,520m<sup>2</sup>/ PR 0.08(about)</li> </ul> <p>[The above is in compliance with the restrictions on the DSP for the Residential Sub-Area i.e. maximum domestic PR of 7.5 and a maximum total PR of 9 for a building that is partly domestic and partly non-domestic.]</p> <p><b>Non-Domestic GFA:198,623m<sup>2</sup>/ PR: 11.86</b> (about)</p> <p><i>Including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hotel: 32,000m<sup>2</sup>/ PR 1.91 (about)</li> <li>• Office: 65,860m<sup>2</sup>/ PR 3.93 (about)</li> <li>• Retail: 92,483m<sup>2</sup>/ PR 5.52 (about)</li> <li>• PTI: 1,700m<sup>2</sup>/ PR 0.10 (about)</li> <li>• G/IC:6,580m<sup>2</sup>/ PR 0.39 (about)</li> </ul> <p>[The above is in compliance with the restrictions on the DSP for the Commercial Sub-Area i.e. maximum PR of 12 for a non-domestic building.]</p>	
<b>No. of Residential Towers</b>  Residential Sub-Area A  Commercial Sub-Area B		<b>Total: 4 (Drawing A-1)</b>  4  0	
<b>No. of Flats</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• within the range between 1,700 and 2,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. of residential units: Not more than 1,999</li> </ul>	

Development Parameters	Endorsed Planning Brief	Current Proposal (Application No. A/K14/745)	Difference +/- (%)
<b>Design Population</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Person-Per-Flat ratio for the area as estimated in the current TPEDM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Estimated residential population: 4,598</li> </ul>	
<b>Building Height (BH)</b>  <b>Residential Sub-Area A</b>   <b>Commercial Sub-Area B</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The BH of the composite residential/commercial development should take into account the high density residential development in the surrounding area</li> <li>The BH of the commercial development proposed should take into account the BH of the Kwun Tong Business Area and to achieve an iconic node for the town centre</li> <li>The proposed BH should be supported by a VIA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tower 1: 165.4 mPD</li> <li>Tower 2: 178 mPD</li> <li>Tower 3: 171.7 mPD</li> <li>Tower 5: 168.5 mPD</li> </ul> <p>[all built over 4 storeys retail including 2-level PTI and two storeys basement car park, and 3 other floors for residential clubhouse, residential lobby/refuge floor]</p> <p><b>(Drawings A-1, A-22 to A-24)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Office/Hotel tower: 285mPD [excluding 6 storeys basement carpark/retail]</li> <li>GIC cum commercial complex: 59.25 to 75 mPD [excluding 4 storeys basement carpark/retail]</li> </ul> <p><b>(Drawings A-1, A-22 to A-24)</b></p> <p>VIA in <b>Appendix Ic</b></p>	
<b>Open Space Provision</b>	Reprovision of area previously zoned “Open Space” provision:	Not less than 9,350 m <sup>2</sup> Residential Sub-Area: 7,566m <sup>2</sup> (about) Commercial Sub-Area: 1,782m <sup>2</sup>	

Development Parameters	Endorsed Planning Brief	Current Proposal (Application No. A/K14/745)	Difference +/- (%)
	<p>4,060 m<sup>2</sup> and in addition of not less than 1m<sup>2</sup>/ person at-grade public DOS for residential population</p> <p>Private open space of not less than 1m<sup>2</sup> for residents</p>	<p>(about) (Drawing A-28)</p> <p>4,598m<sup>2</sup> (for 4,598 persons)</p>	
<b>G/IC Provision</b>	<p>Minimum GFA 8,000m<sup>2</sup> (excluding PTI) for reprovision of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community facilities</li> <li>• Government offices</li> </ul> <p>All G/IC facilities will be considered as non-domestic uses and accountable for GFA of 401,250m<sup>2</sup></p>	<p>Total : <b>8,100m<sup>2</sup></b> (excluding PTI)</p> <p>Residential Sub-Area: <b>1,520m<sup>2</sup></b> <i>including</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hawker bazaar (1,270m<sup>2</sup>)</li> <li>• Refuse collection point (250m<sup>2</sup>)</li> </ul> <p>Commercial Sub-Area: <b>6,580m<sup>2</sup></b> <i>including</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government offices (6,080m<sup>2</sup>)</li> <li>• Social welfare facilities (500m<sup>2</sup>) [Multi-purpose activities centre of 1,500m<sup>2</sup> to be provided and managed by the applicant is counted towards the commercial GFA.]</li> </ul>	+100 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Public Transport Facilities</b>	<p>Provision of PLB/GMB terminus and on-street loading and unloading facilities for relocation of existing on-street PLB/GMB stands, bus stops and taxi stand</p>	<p>Residential Sub-Area: <b>15,000m<sup>2</sup></b> A covered two-level PTI at podium levels to accommodate a bus terminus, PLB/GMB terminus, and loading and unloading areas</p> <p>Commercial Sub-Area: <b>1,700m<sup>2</sup></b> A taxi stand at basement level</p>	
<b>Car Parking Provision</b>	<p>Provision according to HKPSG Chapter 8. In view of the</p>	<p>Residential Sub-Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car Parking Space: 353-415</li> <li>• Loading/ Unloading Spaces: 19</li> </ul>	



Development Parameters	Endorsed Planning Brief	Current Proposal (Application No. A/K14/745)	Difference +/- (%)
	proximity to the MTR Kwun Tong Station, the exact level of provision will be justified by TIA	Commercial Sub-Area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car Parking Space: 638-906</li> <li>• Loading/ Unloading Spaces: 105-158</li> </ul>	
<b>Pedestrian Connection</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitable enhanced pedestrian connections and landscape decks should be provided at appropriate locations at Hong Ning Road, Mut Wah Street, Hip Wo Street and Kwun Tong Road to link up with the surrounding areas, the MTR Kwun Tong Station and various sites within the development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian Circulations at podium and at-grade public open space (<b>Appendix Ic</b>) are included in the MLP submission</li> </ul> <p>(Drawings A-29 and A-32)</p>	

**Comments from Government Departments on F.I. submitted on 5.2.2018**

**Land Administration**

1. Comments of the Chief Estate Surveyor /Urban Renewal, LandsD (CES/UR, LandsD):

Comments on DA 4

- (a) Proposed Ingress/Egress Point of DA 4 & DA 5 and Shared Use of Egress Point at DA 4 by DA 5: There is no egress point in DA 5. URA has clarified that the egress point at Kwun Tong Road serves both DA 4 and 5. I reserve comment on the above arrangement from land administration point of view. URA is required to clarify whether an individual egress point can be provided in DA 5. Would TD and HyD offer comment on the above proposed ingress/egress arrangement.
- (b) Proposed Taxi Stand: HyD has already confirmed that HyD will not maintain this taxi-stand because it is detached from the public transport interchange of Phase 2 and 3. URA is required to clarify the management and maintenance party of the proposed taxi stand. Would TD and GPA advise if you would take up the management and maintenance responsibility of the proposed taxi stand.
- (c) Proposed Pedestrian Linkages among DA 2, DA 3, DA 4 and DA5: DLO/KE has advised that under the Conditions governing NKIL 6514 (i.e. DA 2 and DA 3), there is no requirement for the provision of pedestrian linkages within DA 2 and DA 3 for the purpose of connecting DA 4 and DA 5. However, URA has responded that “Provisions have been made under DAs 2 & 3 to provide openings to connect with DAs 4 & 5”. URA is required to clarify what the said “provisions” are and how the proposed pedestrian linkages can be implemented.
- (d) Carpark Area for DA 4 and DA 5: The proposed parking provisions are subject to TD’s agreement. I reserve comment on the proposed shared use of the car park area by DA 4 and DA 5 from land administration point of view.

Comments on DA 5

- (e) Proposed Ingress/Egress Point of DA 4 & DA 5 and Shared Use of Egress Point at DA 4 by DA 5: Please see my comments at para. (a) above.
- (f) Proposed Pedestrian Linkages among DA 2, DA 3, DA 4 and DA5: Please see my comments at para. (c) above.
- (g) Franchised Minibus Terminus and Bus-Stops/ Terminus affected : URA should seek agreement and comments from all the relevant parties and government departments on the relocation arrangements before the road gazettal and land grant submissions.
- (h) Carpark Area for DA 4 and DA 5: Please see my comments at para. (d) above.
- (i) Further Setback from Hong Ning Road: Subject to the agreement from HyD and TD to take up the street setback areas after their completion for future maintenance and management, all the setback areas to be handed over to the government should be free of any buildings and structures. No projections of any

part of the developments should be protruded over the setback areas to be handed over to the government.

- (j) New Mini-Covered Entrance Piazza and 'Grand Staircase': Proposals are subject to the comments and agreement from the relevant government departments and there is no guarantee that approval will be given by the relevant government departments.
- (k) Proposed New 500m<sup>2</sup> GIG GFA for SWD Facilities and Revision of GFA for Multi-Purpose Activity Centre: The revisions of the commercial and GIC GFA as clarified by URA are subject to the comments and agreement from PlanD and relevant government departments.
- (l) Footbridges and Covered Areas countable for GFA: URA's attention is again drawn that the covered areas or any part of these areas that fall within DA5 site may be GFA accountable for the site and URA is required to reflect this in the GFA calculations.
- (m) Civic Square, Yue Man Square Rest Garden, Landscape/Garden Area, Two New Entrance Plazas and Kwun Tong Plaza and Above-Grade Open Space: My previous comments on the F.I. submitted in 12.12.2017 are still valid.
- (n) Annex 2: MLP: The opening hours, operation and access arrangements of the open spaces and landscaped areas are subject to the comments and agreement from relevant parties and government departments. No clarification on the future maintenance and management party of the said areas is provided by URA and URA is required to clarify the same.
- (o) L1M Plan and L2 Plan: The proposed yellow circular shaped commercial uses/spaces are GFA accountable. URA should reflect this in the GFA calculation.
- (p) L6 Plan and Section A-A, B-B and C-C plans: The Multi-purpose venue should be shown on the L6 Plan to tally with the Section A-A plan to clearly reflect the said use on this floor. The revised Section A-A Plan's legend for open spaces is not the same as those in the MLPs which revision is subject to PlanD's comments.

## **Environmental**

### 2. Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection:

Based on the submissions, including the Environmental Assessment (EA) Report and Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA), provided by the applicant, we note the following key findings in respect of the environmental acceptability of the proposed amendments to the Approved Scheme for the re-design of the commercial and G/IC development and open space layout within DAs 4 and 5 under the Application No. A/K14/727:

- (a) On air quality, the EA Report indicated that the proposed amendments to the Approved Scheme are only on the commercial and G/IC developments in which the central air-conditioning system will be provided and would not rely on openable window for ventilation. The EA Report recommended that the location of fresh air intake of the central air-conditioning system should be situated at the

area where the HKPSG's recommended buffer distance for vehicular emission of >20m for Primary Distributor (Kwun Tong Road) and >10m for District Distributor (Hong Ning Road and Hip Wo Street). On the above basis, adverse air quality impact on the proposed development is not anticipated.

- (b) On noise, the EA Report indicated that with the implementation of a number of mitigation measures proposed (e.g. provision of maximum building set-back, podium, building orientation, acoustic windows/fins, etc.), adverse traffic and railway noise impacts are not anticipated. Based on the findings of the EA Report, it is considered that insurmountable noise impact on the proposed development is not anticipated.
- (c) On sewerage impact, based on the findings of the sewerage impact assessment, it is considered that insurmountable sewerage impact arising from the proposed development is not anticipated

On the above basis, we have no objections to the captioned planning application from the environmental perspective. Notwithstanding this, taking into consideration our comments above and with reference to the approved Planning Application No A/K14/727, we proposed that the following planning approval conditions will be imposed for the subject Planning Application No A/K14/745:

- “(m) submission of a revised sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;*
- (p) submission and implementation of interim sewerage diversion scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection and the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;*
- (u) the submission of a Noise Impact Assessment and implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB:”*

### **Urban Design and Landscape**

- 3. Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD)

#### **Urban Design**

- (a) The applicant should compare between the approved scheme and the proposed scheme the respective building setback distance from Hip Wo Street and Kwun Tong Road.
- (b) Annex 6, Appendix E - The exact same updated base photos should be used for the comparison photomontages.
- (c) Annex 7, Fig. 3.17- 0m-20m is indicated in the Figure as Low Zone. Calculation of permeability of the two schemes for comparison seems relevant.

### Air Ventilation

- (a) Two scenarios, i.e. the Baseline Scheme (the approved scheme under Application No. A/K14/727) and Proposed Scheme, have been assessed in the study. The Proposed Scheme has incorporated various mitigation measures including (i) five building separations of 16m to 42m wide; (ii) an east-west aligned air path of about 14m wide between DA2&3 and DA4&5 sites; and (iii) a 20m wide setback at the western boundary of the GIC building of DA5. According to the simulation results, the Proposed Scheme and Baseline Scheme have achieved the same overall ventilation performance under both annual and summer conditions.
- (b) There are various specific observations – (a) the ventilation performances at the project site boundary has deteriorated under the Proposed Scheme when compared to the Baseline Scheme under the annual condition; (b) the performance at the public open spaces within the site (i.e. Yue Man Square Rest Garden and the proposed Civic Square) has deteriorated under the Proposed Scheme when compared to the Baseline Scheme under both annual and summer conditions; and (c) the areas at Ka Lok Street, Ming Chi Street and Ming Chi Street Recreational Area which already experience relatively low wind availability under the Baseline Scheme will also be further deteriorated under the Proposed Scheme under the annual and summer conditions.
- (c) Notwithstanding the above, we have the following specific comments on the report. These comments would not affect the conclusion of the report.
- 1). In general, the discussion is still incomprehensive. Some of the observed phenomena have not been discussed and addressed.
  - 2). It is understood that the simulation has been revised. However, the overall annual and summer weighted VR contour plots have not been updated.
  - 3). Paragraphs 4.2.4 and 5.1.4 – The summary is not consistent with the results in Table 2.
  - 4). Paragraph 4.3.33
    - Lower VR is observed at Yue Man Square Rest Garden under the Baseline Scheme instead of the Proposed Scheme.
    - The observation in the text does not apply to the WSW wind condition.

### Others

#### 4. Comments of the Government Property Administrator

- (a) Proposed Taxi Stand at Development Area 4 ("DA4"): Regarding the management and maintenance responsibilities of the proposed taxi stand at DA4, we would like to clarify that in accordance with the Accommodation Regulations, the property management and maintenance responsibilities of the specialist /departmental buildings (SDBs) rest with the proponent/user departments. As such, you should seek comments / confirmation from the concerned user departments (i.e. TD in this case) in respect of the aforesaid matter.
- (b) Existing Elevated Podium along Kwun Tong Road at Development Area 5

(“DA5”): The elevated platform was constructed by the developers of the adjoining sites (KTIL 198, 309 & 310) pursuant to LandsD’s land grant conditions. Whilst the platform is virtually an unleased and unallocated Government land and all previous tenancies for the said podium issued by this Agency had been terminated, we have no objection that it be demolished by the Urban Renewal Authority.

**Recommended Advisory Clauses**

- (a) the approved Master Layout Plan (MLP), together with the set of approval conditions, would be certified by the Chairman of the Town Planning Board (TPB) and deposited in the Land Registry in accordance with section 4A(3) of the Town Planning Ordinance. Efforts should be made to incorporate the relevant approval conditions into a revised MLP for deposition in the Land Registry as soon as practicable;
- (b) the arrangement of emergency vehicular access shall comply with Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 which is administered by the Buildings Department;
- (c) to liaise with relevant government departments on the landscape works on public pavement;
- (d) to liaise with relevant government departments on the management of taxi stand in Development Area 4 especially the location of the taxi stand and connectivity of the taxi stand to the public transport interchange in Development Areas 2 and 3 for both interim construction stage and permanent stage;
- (e) to clarify the management and maintenance responsibilities of the areas to be landscaped and improved by the Urban Renewal Authority with relevant government departments;
- (f) to liaise with the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East (DLO/KE) and Urban Renewal Section (URS) of Lands Department on land administration matters;
- (g) to liaise with the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene and the hawkers of Tung Yan Street Interim Hawker Bazaar for relocation arrangement to permanent hawker bazaar;
- (h) to liaise with the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene and licensed hawkers of wall stalls and newspaper stalls on the arrangements for the licensed wall stalls and newspaper stalls at Yue Man Square;
- (i) to consult the Kwun Tong District Council on the suggestion to relocate a bus route to Choi Hung Mass Transit Railway Station bus terminus;
- (j) to liaise with relevant government departments on reprovisioning and management and maintenance responsibilities for Government, Institution or Community facilities and temporary reprovisioning arrangements;

- (k) to liaise with the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) on temporary traffic management and maintenance matter to ensure that the traffic and pedestrian flow would not be affected during the construction phases;
- (l) to liaise with the C for T on detailed arrangements for the reprovisioning of public transport services including the provision of temporary facilities and other detailed traffic arrangements to refrain the potential traffic problems induced by the observation deck;
- (m) to take note of the Chief Highway Engineer/Kowloon, Highways Department's comments that a minimum clearance of 500mm to the roadside planter from kerblines should be provided subject to the C for T's comment;
- (n) to consult their Lighting Division, Highways Department to ensure that the proposed trees would not affect the functioning of road light system and the lighting system below the proposed deck above carriageway which connects Kwun Tong MTR Station at southeast shall be sufficient;
- (o) to liaise with the Director of Highways on public footpath landscape and streetscape proposal such as paving pattern, railing, bollards, and other street furniture as well tree planting on public footpaths and maintenance responsibilities;
- (p) to note the Director of Environment Protection's comment to explore and implement further noise mitigation measures to minimize road traffic noise impact on the proposed development and to inform the future occupants clearly of the special design of fixed windows or glazing as one of the noise mitigation measures;
- (q) to note the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services' requirements that no proposed sewer and manhole or even temporary one should be laid inside Yue Man Square Rest Garden or laid along the public pedestrian pavement or passageway close to the two Old and Valuable Trees at Yue Man Square Rest Garden;
- (r) to liaise with the Government Property Administrator, at the detailed design stage, on measures to minimise noise nuisances caused by activities at the foyer and multi-purpose venue near the Government Offices;
- (s) to note the Lands Department's requirements that no noise barriers/any structures will protrude outside the lot boundaries after setback, and no public utilities (other than those serving the lot itself) would fall within the future regrant lot boundaries after setback;



- (t) to provide more tree plantings at the podium garden of the residential development and along Hip Wo Street to enhance the landscape and visual amenity of the development and streetscape and amenity of the street; and
- (u) to liaise with Lighting Division, Highways Department and other relevant departments on the maintenance and design of the Smart Street Lighting Posts;
- (v) to setback the future private lot boundary from permanent road kerblines by at least 2.1m for public street furniture such as traffic signage and safe clearance of carriageway unless otherwise approved by the Director of Highways;
- (w) to liaise with Civil Engineering and Development Department on the proposed subway across Hong Ning Road at the junction with Ngau Tau Kok Road;
- (x) to consult and liaise with relevant Government departments on the footbridge connection at Tsun Yip Lane; and
- (y) to consult and liaise with Railway Development Office, Highways Department and Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited on the connection of Kwun Tong MTR Station to the Development Area 4.