

**Proposed Minor Relaxation of Site Coverage Restriction for Permitted House Development in
“Residential (Group C) 3” and “Green Belt” Zones,
No. 66 Deep Water Bay Road, Shouson Hill, Hong Kong**

Comments forwarded from Hong Kong District Planning Office

Comments	Responses
Comments from Fire Services Department (Received on 14 November 2025) (Contact Person: Mr. QIU Yi, Tel.: 2733 5845)	
<p>1. Please be informed that we have no specific comment on the proposal subject to fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services.</p> <p>Detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of the formal submission of general building plans.</p> <p>Furthermore, the provision of emergency vehicular access in the subject work shall comply with the requirements as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011.</p>	<p>Noted. Detailed fire safety requirements will be addressed in the Building Plan submission stage.</p>
Comments from Civil Engineering and Development Department (Received on 14 November 2025) (Contact Person: Mr. Tsz Kei TSE ; Tel.: 2762 5384)	
<p>1. It is noted that the applicant has committed in the Geotechnical Planning Review Report (Appendix 8) to undertake a natural terrain hazard study (NTHS) and to implement mitigation measures, if necessary, as part of the proposed development.</p> <p>Should the application be approved, an approval condition on the submission of a NTHS and implementation of the hazard mitigation measures recommended therein, as part of the development, is required.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Comments from Hong Kong Police Force (Received on 14 November 2025) (Contact Person: Mr. Amos LAM; Tel.: 3660 1321)	
<p>Our Police division have the following comments for your consideration:</p> <p>1. During the work period, noise and nuisance caused to nearby residents should be minimized.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Comments	Responses
2. All work must comply with the laws and regulations of the Hong Kong SAR.	Noted.
3. Ensure the safety of pedestrians at all times.	Noted.
4. Ensure that the work does not cause congestion or obstruction to traffic, including illegal parking at nearby site area.	Noted.
5. Maintain the security of the site area and prevent unauthorised access.	Noted.
Comments from Transport Department (Received on 14 November 2025) (Contact Person: Mr. Henry Chow; Tel.: 2829 5427)	
Please find below the comments on the Traffic Assessment Report from the traffic engineering viewpoint:	Please be advised that the traffic survey was conducted on 14 October 2025 which is a typical weekday (Appendix 3 refers).
1. Please advise the date of the traffic survey as mentioned in paragraph 3.2.2 of the Traffic Assessment Report;	
2. The planned development in the vicinity, including but not limited to No. 37 Shouson Hill Road and No. 39 Shouson Hill Road, should be included in your traffic assessment;	Please be advised that the planned developments in the vicinity which have been approved by Town Planning Board (TPB) and shown in Town Planning Board Statutory Planning Portal 3 (if any) are considered. For the mentioned two development sites at No. 37 Shouson Hill Road and No. 39 Shouson Hill Road, please be advised that the latest development schedules cannot be found in public domain. Nevertheless, these 2 development sites are located on Shouson Hill Road and they are closer to the junction of Wong Chung Hang Road / Shouson Hill Road as compared with the junction of Deep Water Bay Road / Island Road), majority of development traffic will be via Shouson Hill Road to Wong Chung Hang Road, thus negligible traffic will be via Deep Water Bay Road and Island Road to Wong Chung Hang Road. With consideration of the zoning of these two developments (i.e. R(C)3 zone, maximum 3 storeys in additional to 1 storey of carports is allowed with maximum plot ratio of 0.75 and maximum site coverage of 25%), it will not impose any adverse traffic impact on the concerned junctions and road links.
3. According to paragraph 4.3.1 of the Traffic Assessment Report, a traffic survey was conducted for four referenced developments on Repulse Bay Road and South Bay Road for deriving the trip generation/attraction rates for House 1, with flat size of approx. 1,370m ² GFA. Please provide the details of the survey such as survey date and period, survey methodology, occupancy of the development during survey, location of the development, etc. for reference.	Please be advised that manual classified count (MCC) surveys were conducted during AM Peak between 7:00am to 9:30am and PM Peak between 4:30pm to 7:00pm on 18 September 2025 which is a typical weekday. The surveys were conducted near the vehicular accesses of the residential houses.

Comments	Responses
<p>4. According to Table 4.7, it is noted that the flat size of all the referenced developments (i.e. ranging from 900m² to 1,120m²) are smaller than House 1. Besides, the surveyed trip generation/attraction rate of some of the referenced developments are zero. Please review and demonstrate that the surveyed trip generation/ attraction rate for these referenced developments could represent the traffic pattern of House 1;</p>	<p>Before conducting the trip generation surveys, we checked in Bravo to search the residential houses in Southern District with similar sizes and parking provision (i.e. 2 parking spaces per house) as House 1 while we noted these 4 residential houses with similar nature, their trip generation / attraction rate could represent the traffic pattern of House 1. Some larger residential houses were not chosen for trip generation survey due to their significantly large house size or different parking spaces provision, they could not represent the traffic pattern of House 1.</p> <p>It is noted that the surveyed trip generation / attraction rate of some of the reference development are zero. To be more conservative, zero trip will be replaced by 1 as shown in Tables 4.7 to 4.10. Among the results of the 4 surveyed Residential Houses A to D, the highest values of trip generation / attraction for Residential House B were adopted as the vehicular trips generations of the proposed development "House 1" as shown in Table 4.8 for conservative assessment purpose.</p> <p>Since the proposed residential redevelopment would have insignificant traffic impact on the concerned road links and junctions in the vicinity, the proposed residential redevelopment is still considered acceptable from traffic engineering point of view. The relevant amended pages in the Final Traffic Assessment Report have been updated and attached for TD's consideration.</p>
<p>5. According to Drawing nos. SK1 and SK2, the width of some section of the internal road is 4m. Please review the proposed road width and demonstrate that vehicles could maneuver smoothly along the internal road; and</p>	<p>Please note that according to Drawing No. SK1 and SK2 in Annex A in the Final Traffic Assessment Report, the width of the vehicular ramp from G/F to Basement is 4m at straight section with further widening at bend. The width of the internal road at basement is 6m.</p> <p>In order to maintain a smooth manoeuvring of two-way traffic along the vehicular ramp, manual traffic control measures will be provided to control the overall traffic arrangement along the vehicular ramp.</p> <p>Access priority will be given to the incoming vehicle first and egress vehicle will have to wait at their own parking space at basement level until the vehicular ramp is clear. Security guards will assist and communicate through walkie-talkie / mobile phone to ensure only one vehicle will occupy the vehicular ramp at one time. As there are only 4 no. of parking spaces provided within the development, this manual traffic control measures can ensure a smooth manoeuvring of two-way traffic between G/F and Basement.</p> <p>Referring to SK3 to SK6 in Annex A, swept paths of private vehicles are conducted and illustrated that vehicles can manoeuvre smoothly along the internal road.</p>

Comments	Responses
6. Please indicate the dimension of the proposed parking spaces in Drawing no. SK1.	The dimension of the proposed parking spaces is indicated in Drawing no. SK2 attached.
Comments from Drainage Services Department (Received on 14 November 2025) (Contact Person: Ms. Ray ZHOU; Tel.: 3101 2366)	
Please find our comments on DIA and SIA below:	Please note that the Drainage Impact Assessment ("DIA") has been revised to incorporate the rainfall parameter in corrigendum No. 1/2024 SDM (Appendix 4 refers). The previous results of the DIA (i.e. no adverse impacts on existing drainage infrastructure are anticipated) would remain unchanged.
1. Please adopt the rainfall parameters in corrigendum No. 1/2024 of SDM.	
2. The design allowance (12.1%) should be considered for end 21st Century Climate Change Scenario according to Corrigendum No. 1/2022 of SDM.	Please note that 16% rainfall increase factor has already been allowed in the runoff calculation in DIA report (Pages 7 and 9 of Appendix 4 refer) according to corrigendum no. 1/2022 SDM. The previous results of the DIA (i.e. no adverse impacts on existing drainage infrastructure are anticipated) would remain unchanged.
Comments from Landscape Unit, Urban Design and Landscape Section, Planning Department (Received on 14 November 2025) (Contact Person: Mr. Chak Man NGAI; Tel.: 3565 3955)	
1. We have no adverse comments on the application from landscape planning perspective.	Noted.
<u>Advisory Comments</u>	Noted and revised accordingly.
2. It is noted that 5 dead trees within the Site are proposed to be felled. Part 9 of the application form, which indicated there is no tree felling, should be revised accordingly.	
3. The applicant is reminded that approval of the application does not imply approval of the greenery coverage requirements under BD's PNAP APP-152 and/or under the lease. The greenery coverage calculation should be submitted separately to BD/LandsD for approval. Similarly for any proposed tree preservation/removal scheme, the applicant shall be reminded to approach relevant authority/government department(s) direct to obtain the necessary approval.	Noted.
Comments from Urban Design Unit, Urban Design and Landscape Section, Planning Department (Received on 14 November 2025) (Contact Person: Ms. Vanessa TSANG; Tel.: 3565 3942)	
1. Please find below our observations/comments from urban design and visual perspectives:	Noted.

Comments	Responses
<p>The Site (about 2,043m²) is located in Shouson Hill to the northwest of Deep Water Bay Beach. The surrounding area is characterised by 2 to 5-storey houses (about 59.8mPD to 115.7mPD) within the “R(C)3” zones. The proposed minor relaxation of site coverage does not involve additional BH beyond that permitted in the OZP. According to the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), the visual impact of the proposed development is rated negligible as compared with the existing condition. The proposed development has incorporated terraced architectural style and adopted landscape treatment such as edge plantings and vertical green. The above design measures may promote visual interest and amenity. The VIA concludes that the proposed minor relaxation will not cause significant adverse impact in visual context. We have no objection to the conclusion.</p>	
<p>2. Please find below our observations/comments from urban design and visual perspectives:</p> <p><u>VIA</u></p> <p>(i) Figure 6.2 – The photo of the existing condition and photomontage for the proposed development appear to be zoom-in photos instead of actual views from Viewpoint 2.</p>	<p>Please note that Figure 6.2 has been updated which reflected the actual view from viewpoint 2 (Appendix 5 refers).</p>
<p>(ii) Section 7 – Some texts in paras. 7.1.3 to 7.1.5 are inconsistent with that in Section 6, e.g. the rating of overall visual impact for all viewpoints is ‘negligible’, not ‘negligible to enhanced’.</p>	<p>Noted and revised accordingly.</p>
<p><u>Supporting Planning Statement (SPS)</u></p> <p>(iii) Para. 4.3.1 – Ditto.</p>	<p>Noted and revised accordingly (Appendix 1 refers).</p>
<p><u>Architectural Drawings</u></p> <p>(iv) The spot level of +104.35 of the flat roof shown in Master Layout Plan and R/F Plan is inconsistent with that shown in other drawings and the Building Height (Main Roof) mentioned in the VIA and SPS.</p>	<p>Please be clarified that there is a minor height difference of about 0.15m between the outdoor and indoor sections on the roof floor. As shown in the Section Plan and R/F plan, the higher spot level of about +104.5mPD instead of +104.35mPD has been adopted as the building height of roof floor for the Proposed Development (Appendix 2 refers).</p>
<p>Comments from Planning Department (Received on 14 November 2025) (Contact Person: Mr. Jacky LEE; Tel.: 2231 4603)</p>	
<p>1. The supplementary planning statement (SPS) mentioned that the schematic design has taken into account the various site constraints (Para. 3.2.1 refers). Please provide more elaborations on the site</p>	<p>The Site is surrounded by low-density residential developments to its east and southeast with vegetated hillslopes of Shouson Hill forming a natural landscape backdrop at the inland side at the northwest and overlooking the seaward side of</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>constraints and how they affect the design (e.g. the need to relax site coverage).</p>	<p>Deep Water Bay to the south. It is prominently located at a higher level than other residential developments in the “(R(C)3” cluster hence it is visible from the surrounding area especially Deep Water Bay Beach and Repulse Bay Road. The prominent location of the Site with the backdrop of Shouson Hill has in fact been a major site constraint/consideration when formulating the architectural design for the Proposed Development which aims to respect the unique topographic setting. To achieve a development that respects and blends into its topographic context, a terraced massing profile has been adopted that follows the natural topography of Shouson Hill and progressively reduces in scale as it rises (i.e. from site coverage of about 37% to about 15%).</p> <p>Hence, minor relaxation of site coverage restriction to not more than 37% would be required in order to address the topographic constraint and avoid intrusion of the ridgeline. The amenity of the Proposed Development will be greatly enhanced as compared to the existing traditional rectangular and rigid building form upon redevelopment.</p> <p>In addition, the Proposed Development has been carefully designed to largely re-use the existing lower cut platform for the basement carport, requiring only minimal additional excavation and backfilling. Such design would significantly reduce any possible geotechnical, landscape and ecological impacts onto the surrounding hillside environment.</p>
<p>2. Please note we have the following observations on the architectural drawings in Appendix 1:</p>	
<p>(i) The GFA of House 1 is significantly greater than House 2 (i.e. almost 8.5 times). It is also observed that an “owners corporation office” and a “caretaker quarter” are proposed at G/F of House 1. Please provide justification for such design;</p>	<p>Please note that House 1 is proposed to serve as the owner’s family residence, while the smaller House 2 is intended to serve as a guest house providing comfortable short-stay accommodation for visiting relatives and friends.</p> <p>Please also note that the owner’s corporation office has been removed and the area would only be used as caretaker quarter (Appendix 2 refers).</p>
<p>(ii) B/F layout: the location and position of the lift, E&M room and the surrounding staircases at B/F mismatch with the layout of other floors and section plans. Please check and rectify;</p>	<p>Noted. The B/F layout has been revised accordingly (Appendix 2 refers).</p>
<p>(iii) following item (ii) above, you are also reminded to check whether further revisions on the plan “Percentage of area for car parking use” and relevant calculation be required. Please ensure that the predominant use of the carport level should be for car parking purpose</p>	<p>Noted. The plan on “Percentage of area for car parking use” and relevant calculation have been revised accordingly (Appendix 2 refers).</p>

Comments	Responses
with not less than 50% of the carport level areas dedicated for car parking use (including carpark associated uses such as driveways and ramps) as per Joint Practice Note No. 5 (JPN 5);	
<p><u>House 1</u></p> <p>(iv) please provide a top roof layout and indicate the top level of the lift and lift machine room for the House. With reference to Section B, it is noticed that the top roof level would range from 108mPD to 109.7mPD. Please review and ensure that all the roof-top structure and /or roof-top architectural features are in order. The criteria for rooftop structures for the purpose of administering building height restriction set out in JPN 5 should be observed;</p>	<p>Please note that the layout of the top roof has been supplemented on the R/F plan (Appendix 2 refers). The top roof level would range from 107.5mPD to 109.7mPD. All rooftop structures would be not more than 3m, except the lift tower with not more than 5.2m above the main roof. The proposed top roof levels would fully comply with the administering building height restriction set out in JPN 5.</p>
<p>(v) it is noticed that part of House 1 (i.e. the area marked 'Formal Living' at G/F of the house) would have a floor-to-floor height of about 8m. Please provide a plan to demonstrate the section of that part of the House and provide justifications for the floor-to-floor height.</p>	<p>As shown in the updated section D at Appendix 2, there is a structural and E&M zone in the ceiling of the formal living room. The floor-to-floor height of the 'Formal Living' room at G/F is only 7m. The structural and E&M zone will be required for a deep beam that spans between the living room, and the ductwork for air conditioner uses under the beam, which would be covered by false ceiling. Hence, the proposed void at the Proposed Development complies with the maximum headroom of void (7m) for houses development stipulated in PNAP-APP2.</p>
<p>(vi) 2/F layout: please indicate the proposed use for the space adjacent to the "indoor pool";</p>	<p>Please note that the space adjacent to the "indoor pool" on 2/F layout plan is a "indoor pool facility area".</p>
<p><u>House 2</u></p> <p>(vii) 1/F layout: please indicate the proposed use for the room inside the "bedroom" on the layout plan.</p>	<p>Please note that the room inside the "bedroom" on 1/F layout is a "store room".</p>
<p>3. The above observations are not exhaustive. Please make sure the drawings and photomontages in the SPS and appendices are consistent and reflect the latest design of the proposed development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>4. In the TIA, the GFA for House 1 and 2 are about 1,370sq.m. and 162sq.m. respectively (in table 2.3), which are different from the GFA set out in table 4.8 (i.e. about 1,370sq.m. and 180sq.m). Grateful if you could clarify the GFA for House 1 and 2.</p>	<p>Noted. Please be clarified that the GFA for House 2 is about 162m² and Table 4.8 in the Traffic Impact Assessment has been revised accordingly (Appendix 3 refers).</p>

Comments	Responses
Comments from Lands Department (Received on 14 November 2025) (Contact Person: Ms. Irene LI; Tel.: 2835 1552)	
1. The subject site falls within RBL 573 ("the Lot"), which is held under Government Lease dated 16.4.1968 as varied by a Deed of Variation dated 9.5.1988, and is restricted for private residential purposes. The permitted maximum gross floor area and site coverage under lease are 1,532.89m ² and 25% of the area of the Lot respectively. The proposed development with a site coverage of not more than 37% (i.e. exceeding 25%), a total GFA of 1,532.902m ² (i.e. exceeding 1,532.89m ²) and a carport at basement not directly under the building(s) will be in breach of the lease restrictions.	Noted.
2. We reserve our comments on the detailed design of the proposed development as shown on the Architectural Drawings at Appendix 1, which will be considered during the building plan submission stage.	Noted.
3. Should the proposed application be approved by the Town Planning Board, the registered owner of the Lot is required to apply to LandsD for a lease modification for implementation of the proposal. Upon receipt of the formal application, LandsD would process such application in the capacity of a landlord and there is no guarantee that the application will be approved. If the application is approved, it will be subject to such terms and conditions, including payment of premium and administrative fee, as may be imposed by LandsD at its absolute discretion.	Noted.
Comments from Environmental Protection Department (Received on 14 November 2025) (Contact Person: Mr. Andy Ko; Tel.: 2835 1011)	
1. The Planning Statement comprises an Environmental Assessment (EA) and Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to support the future planning application. Please find below our technical comments on the Planning Statement and EA for the applicant's follow up:	Noted.
Planning Statement 2. Please add a section in Section 4.6 or a paragraph under Section 4.6.6 of the Planning Statement to present the findings of Land Contamination Section (i.e. Section 7) of the EA.	Noted. Findings of land contamination section in Environmental Assessment has been incorporated in the Planning Statement (Appendix 1 refers).
Environmental Assessment 3. Section 1.1.2 – Please mention the land contamination assessment in the section.	Section 1.1.2 has been updated (Appendix 6 refers).

Comments	Responses
4. Section 4 – There are two Table 4.6, please revise.	Table 4.6 and Table 4.7 have been revised respectively (Appendix 6 refers).
5. Section 6.4.3 – The term “minimal” is subjective and can be misleading. Please remove this term. Instead, the consultant may wish to specify whether any adverse environmental impact is anticipated.	Section 6.4.3 has been revised (Appendix 6 refers).
6. Section 7.1 – It is suggested to include the latest aerial photographs for completeness.	Latest aerial photograph has been added (Appendix 6 refers).
Comments from Building Department (Received on 24 November 2025) (Contact Person: Mr. CHEUNG Suet-ching; Tel.: 2626 1371)	
1. Please be advised that GFA of the proposed void in house with floor-to-floor height about 8m at “Formal Living” on G/F may not be exempted from GFA calculation under PNAP APP-2 (extracted as attached for reference). For other issues, our previous comments vide our memo dated 6 June 2025 are still valid.	As shown in the updated section D at Appendix 2 , there is a structural and E&M zone in the ceiling of the formal living room. The floor-to-floor height of the ‘Formal Living’ room at G/F is only 7m. The structural and E&M zone will be required for a deep beam that spans between the living room, and the ductwork for air conditioner uses under the beam, which would be covered by false ceiling. Hence, the proposed void at the Proposed Development complies with the maximum headroom of void (7m) for houses development stipulated in PNAP-APP2.

Comments	Responses																		
<div>1. Exemption Criteria for Exclusion of Voids in Duplex Domestic Flats and Houses from Gross Floor Area Calculations</div> <div><div><div></div><table><thead><tr><th></th><th>Duplex Flats</th><th>Houses</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>UFS⁽¹⁾ of premises</td><td>150 m² (min.)</td><td>250m² (min.)</td></tr><tr><td>% of void to UFS of premises</td><td>10% (max.)</td><td>5% (max.)</td></tr><tr><td>% of void to total domestic GFA</td><td>Only two levels of voids will be allowed for each residential tower block, subject to a maximum of 0.5%⁽²⁾ of the total domestic GFA of the development.</td><td>N.A.</td></tr><tr><td>Headroom of void</td><td>6.5m (max.)</td><td>7.0m (max.)⁽³⁾</td></tr><tr><td>Location of void</td><td>Living/ dining room or entrance foyer</td><td>Living/ dining room or entrance foyer</td></tr></tbody></table></div><div><div>(1) "UFS" means any floor space other than staircases, staircase halls, lift landings, the space used in providing water-closet fittings, urinals and lavatory basins and the space occupied by machinery for any lift, air-conditioning system or similar services.</div><div>(2) The "0.5% cap" will be applied with some flexibility for low-rise and low-density flat-type development which is similar to house-type development. Each case will be considered on individual merits.</div><div>(3) In case of sloping ceiling resulted from a pitch roof, the headroom should be measured to the mean level of the underside of the portion of ceiling that is above the void area.</div></div><div>2. Conditions of Exemption</div><div><div>(i) The Building Authority (BA) is satisfied that the void design is compatible with the type of residential development and that effective measures to prevent any possible abuse are provided, such as up-stand beam design, voids fronted by large glazing panels facing the exterior, no adjoining structural wall or beam, etc.</div><div>(ii) The development after excluding the area of voids from GFA calculation will not contravene the development restrictions relating to building height, GFA, etc. in the relevant statutory town plan and any specific provisions or restrictions in the lease conditions.</div></div></div>		Duplex Flats	Houses	UFS ⁽¹⁾ of premises	150 m ² (min.)	250m ² (min.)	% of void to UFS of premises	10% (max.)	5% (max.)	% of void to total domestic GFA	Only two levels of voids will be allowed for each residential tower block, subject to a maximum of 0.5% ⁽²⁾ of the total domestic GFA of the development.	N.A.	Headroom of void	6.5m (max.)	7.0m (max.) ⁽³⁾	Location of void	Living/ dining room or entrance foyer	Living/ dining room or entrance foyer	
	Duplex Flats	Houses																	
UFS ⁽¹⁾ of premises	150 m ² (min.)	250m ² (min.)																	
% of void to UFS of premises	10% (max.)	5% (max.)																	
% of void to total domestic GFA	Only two levels of voids will be allowed for each residential tower block, subject to a maximum of 0.5% ⁽²⁾ of the total domestic GFA of the development.	N.A.																	
Headroom of void	6.5m (max.)	7.0m (max.) ⁽³⁾																	
Location of void	Living/ dining room or entrance foyer	Living/ dining room or entrance foyer																	
2. Detailed comments under the Building Ordinance will be provided upon building plan submission to the Buildings Department.	Noted.																		

Comments	Responses
Comments from Architectural Services Department (Received on 21 November 2025) (Contact Person: Mr. Sherman SUM; Tel.: 2582 5314)	
<p>1. According to Figures 4.3 and 4.5 of the revised Visual Impact Assessment, it is noted that the proposed carports in basement of the development have a significant visual impact. The overall bulk of the proposed development appears large, as the extent of the carports extending beyond the ground floor footprint is not included in the site coverage calculation. The large flat roof provided on G/F above the carport serves as a usable flat roof accessible from G/F of the houses. Due to the significant visual impact on the neighbouring developments, it is suggested that the applicant should review the building design and supplement the relevant information, such as the extent of soil filling and the retaining structures, and seek comments from the relevant departments at an early stage. Furthermore, the proposed carports create a tilting effect, which is considered undesirable from visual impact point of view and may not be compatible with the surrounding setting, subject to PlanD's view.</p>	<p><i>Incorporation of Landscaping Measures to reduce the Visual Bulk of the Basement Structure</i> Please note that Figures 4.3 and 4.5 of the revised Visual Impact Assessment ("VIA") are aerial / close-up views to illustrate the incorporation of various design merits of the Proposed Development. As demonstrated in the photomontages from the various public viewpoints in the revised VIA, the basement carport will be partially screened off by the existing vegetation at the natural hillslope.</p> <p>The Applicant has also considered other options such as a carport without the 2m setback for planting strip; however, the visual impact would be far less favourable as the structure would appear rigid and monolithic without the softening effect of the continuous planting strip. With the proposed 2m setback of the basement façade to accommodate a continuous planting strip and the application of edge planting, the visual bulk of the basement structure will be greatly reduced. Together with the terraced massing profile (with progressive setback from the site boundary as it rises) responding the natural topography of Shouson Hill, the visual impact of the Proposed Development from the various public viewpoints is considered negligible. Urban Design and Landscape Section of Planning Department has indicated no comment to the Planning Application from urban design point of view.</p> <p><i>Site Coverage Calculation</i> Regarding the calculation of site coverage, it should be noted that the proposed basement carport is not accountable in the site coverage calculation according to the Building (Planning) Regulations (Cap. 123F). The subject of this Planning Application (i.e. minor relaxation of site coverage restriction) is relating to the above-ground building footprint and relevant Government Departments have indicated no adverse comment on the site coverage calculation.</p> <p><i>Minimal Excavation and Backfilling</i> The Proposed Development has been carefully designed to largely re-use the existing lower cut platform for the basement carport, requiring only minimal additional excavation and backfilling. Such design would reduce any possible geotechnical, landscape and ecological impacts onto the surrounding hillside environment.</p> <p><i>The Scale of the Basement Carport is Not Excessive</i> As demonstrated in the carport calculation in Appendix 2, over 50% of the carport area is dedicated for carparking use in accordance with Joint Practice Note No.5. Hence, the scale of the basement is not excessive.</p>

Comments	Responses
	<p><i>Public Concerns on the Planning Application Can Be Duly Addressed</i></p> <p>Please note that only one public comment was received during the statutory public inspection period relating to the potential “wall effect” and disturbance to the low-density character of the area. Please note that the terracing / stepping design, progressive reduction of building footprint from 37% to 15%, and extensive multi-level greenery would duly address and alleviate these concerns, resulting in a development that is more harmonious with the surrounding topographical context than the existing rigid structures.</p> <p>In conclusion, the basement carport is sensitively integrated into the existing topography with extensive landscape screening and does not create an undesirable stilting effect. The photomontages submitted in the VIA also clearly illustrated that the overall visual impact on neighbouring developments and the surrounding low-density residential setting is minimal and no major public concerns have been raised during the public consultation period. The current Planning Application has also been circulated to relevant Government Departments, including Lands Department, Buildings Department, and Planning Department and no adverse comment has been received to date. Soil filling and design of retaining structure shall comply with relevant guidelines such as LAO Practice Notes No. 3/2020. Detailed information will be submitted during Building Plan stage.</p>

Compiled by: KTA

Date: 28 November 2025