
Responses to Departmental Comments

RtoC Table (Departmental Comments)

Table of Contents

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | Highways Department | 1 |
| 2. | Hong Kong District Planning Office, Planning Department | 2 |
| 3. | Urban Design Section, Planning Department | 4 |
| 4. | Environmental Protection Department | 5 |
| 5. | Transport Department | 6 |

| | Departmental Comments | Responses to Comments |
|-----------|--|------------------------------|
| 1. | Comments from District Engineer/North Point, Urban Regional, Highways Department | |
| 1.1 | It is understood that the applicants are responsible for the design and implementation of the proposed pick up/drop off layby abutting King’s Road (which is outside the application site) and would handover to TD and HyD for taking up the management and maintenance responsibility. | Noted. |
| 1.2 | <p>We have no comment from highways maintenance point of view for the new pick up/drop off layby, subject to the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) As a portion of the existing footpath will be converted to carriageway, the existing utilities within that footpath must be diverted or lowered to maintain the minimum cover of 900mm. The applicants shall be responsible for all coordination with the utility companies for any diversion works, ensuring that minimum cover is provided for utilities under the proposed layby (carriageway). b) The road profile of the new layby shall be carefully designed, and additional gullies shall be provided at suitable locations to prevent water ponding. c) The proposed layby should be constructed in accordance with current highway standards. The roadworks design, including road alignments, road drainage, paving pattern, and traffic aids, should be submitted to this Regional Office and the Transport Department for comment. d) The applicants shall apply for an Excavation Permit from this Regional Office for any excavation works on public pavement. | Noted. |
| 1.3 | We reserve our rights to provide comments upon receiving further submission from the applicants. | Noted. |

| | Departmental Comments | Responses to Comments |
|-----|--|---|
| 2. | Comments from the Hong Kong District Planning Office, Planning Department | |
| 2.1 | Item No. 7.6 of the R-to-C - The applicants should consider to update Figure 3.2 of the Planning Statement (PS) by indicating the existing uses by floor. | Figure 3.2 has been updated. Please refer to the revised Planning Statement (see Attachment 1). |
| 2.2 | Item No. 7.7 of the R-to-C and 5/F Land Ownership Plan - The proposed enhancement works area outside the 5/F southern entrance lobby as shown on the 5/F Landscape Plan are commonly owned by the applicants and other owners and it is noted that the applicants have obtained “no objection” from the other owners for implementation. Please supplement with relevant no objection letter or written agreement or any other proof to demonstrate that the Applicant is authorized to implement the proposed enhancement works in the common area. In addition, please also clarify the M&M responsibilities of (i) the enhancement works outside the 5/F southern entrance lobby; and (ii) the improved pedestrian connectivity between King’s Road and Taikoo Shing Road by providing a more direct internal route linking the escalator/service lift at the southern entrance lobby to the 6/F shuttle lift to G/F. | <p>The Applicant would like to point out that the GFA Deed, which relates to legal agreements of GFA of different portions within the subject site as documented under the land records, has already assured the Applicant’s right to implement the Proposed Development (including the concerned proposed enhancement works). More specifically:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clause 5.2(a) – the GFA Deed expressly recognises the right of the Site V-A1 Office Owner (i.e. the Applicant) to apply for the proposed office extension works. [note: Site V-A1 refers to the area now occupied by 1111 King’s Road and a portion of Cityplaza] • Clause 5.4(b) – the Site V-C Owner and the other owners of Site V-A1 (i.e. the other owners) are required to assist the Site V-A1 Office Owner (i.e. the Applicant) in order to permit the proposed office extension works to be built. [note: Site V-C refers to the area now occupied by East Hotel] <p>Hence, upon obtaining all requisite approvals from Town Planning Board and other relevant departments, the Applicant is contractually entitled to implement the Proposed Development, including the carrying out of the concerned proposed enhancement works which was submitted as part of the proposal under this planning application.</p> <p>In addition, we would like to highlight that lease modification and amendments to the Master Development Plans are required to implement the Proposed Development. All relevant legal documents,</p> |

| | Departmental Comments | Responses to Comments |
|-----|--|---|
| | | including those duly executed by all owners, will need to be submitted to the Lands Department for processing at a later stage. |
| 2.3 | Table 3.3 and para. 3.4.9 of the PS - Please clarify whether the proposed private open space at 5/F (accessible by the public) with an area of about 1,060m ² is an existing open space and provide the area of existing open space within the Development Site or Site V-A1. | <p>Please be clarified that there is no open space requirement at the Development Site or Site V-A1. Hence, there is no such calculation of “existing open space”.</p> <p>For the concerned area of about 1,060m² on 5/F, it is currently an existing outdoor area with some basic landscaping provided and is accessible by the public. The Applicant proposes to enhance the landscaping works there, and remains to keep it as accessible by the public.</p> |
| 2.4 | Figure 3.6 of the PS - The applicants are advised to provide a plan showing the current internal layout of 5/F and 6/F and illustrating the existing pedestrian circulation route between the southern entrance lobby and the 6/F shuttle lift lobby to G/F for better understanding of the proposed improvement of the pedestrian connectivity. | A new Figure 3.7 has been prepared. Please refer to the revised Planning Statement (see Attachment 1). |
| 2.5 | Paragraph 3.3 (Page 9) & Paragraph 8.5.3 (Page 22) of the PS - the subtitle emphasizing the “Provision of barrier-free access to office lobby...” as planning gain is a bit misleading. Barrier-free access from the public footpaths at both King’s Road (southern entrance at 5/F) and Taikoo Shing Road (northern entrance at G/F) of 1111 King’s Road are available. Instead, the applicants may consider to revise the subtitle to, “Provision of pick-up/drop-off for taxi/private car at King’s Road with barrier-free access to 1111 King’s Road and Cityplaza”. You may wish to revise other relevant write up in the PS. | <p>Relevant paragraphs regarding the provision of the pick-up/drop-off for taxi/private car at King’s Road with barrier-free access have been updated. Please refer to the revised Planning Statement (see Attachment 1).</p> <p>Opportunity has also been taken to extract relevant paragraphs from the TIA report to elaborate Paragraph 5.1 of the PS on the traffic considerations. Please refer to the revised Planning Statement (see Attachment 1). Please note that there is no change to the submitted TIA report.</p> |

| | Departmental Comments | Responses to Comments |
|-----------|---|---|
| 2.6 | Para. 1.1.4 and para. 2.3.1 of the PS – please cross-check whether the proposed building height under the 2008 Approved GBP should be 189.95mPD or 190.45mPD. | Typo rectified. The proposed building height under the 2008 Approved GBP should be 189.95mPD. Please refer to the revised Planning Statement (see Attachment 1). |
| 3. | Comments from Urban Design Section, Planning Department | |
| 3.1 | Item No. 6.1 of the R-to-C - Visual envelope in the VIA is still missing. | Having regard to the urban context with existing high-density and high-rise developments in the surrounding area, there is only limited view towards the Proposed Development from the identified vantage points. The visual envelope is, in effect, equivalent to the area of visual influence for this case, except that the visual envelope also covers the view from the waterfront promenade at Kai Tak Development, from which the top floors of the Proposed Development will be visible from a remote distance. Figure 3.1 and relevant paragraph of the VIA has been updated (see Attachment 2). |

| 4. | Comments from Director of Environmental Protection | |
|-----|--|---|
| 4.1 | Section 2.1.1 - It shall be read as: “The aim of this SIA is to show assess if existing the sewerage network is sufficient to cope with the additional sewage flow from the Proposed Development and propose corresponding mitigation measures if necessary.” | Section 2.1.1 has been updated accordingly (see Attachment 3). |
| 4.2 | Section 2.2.3 - According to GESF, the total unit flow generated from an employee in a particular trade is the sum of the unit flow factor of employee and the unit flow factor of commercial activities of a particular, suggest to amend as below for better clarification: “The following unit flow factors of commercial activities have been adopted in the...” | Section 2.2.3 has been updated accordingly (see Attachment 3). |
| 4.3 | Table 3 in Appendix 2.1 - Please advise if podium under east Hong Kong has been accounted for in this hydraulic calculation. | The no. of storeys of East Hong Kong has been updated to include the podium under East Hong Kong (see Attachment 3). |
| 4.4 | Tables 3 and 4 in Appendix 2.1 - Conforming to Table T-2 of GESF, UFF of J4 – Wholesale & Retail is 0.28m3/day instead of 0.08m3/day, please revise. | Appendix 2.1 has been updated accordingly (see Attachment 3). |
| 4.5 | Tables 3, 4, 6, 8 and 9 in Appendix 2.1 - Please revise the P _{cif} to 1.25 at SKW PTW conforming to Section 2.2.4. | Appendix 2.1 has been updated accordingly (see Attachment 3). |
| 4.6 | Tables 7 and 9 in Appendix 2.1 - Please review the discharge point of catchment. | The discharge points of Catchment F and H have been updated to FMH7036297 and FMH7036270 respectively (see Attachment 3). |
| 4.7 | Table 10 - Upstream Manhole reference for S15 – S16 should be FMH7036294 instead of FMH7036292. | Table 10 has been updated accordingly (see Attachment 3). |
| 4.8 | Tables 10 and 12 in Appendix 2.1 - Please check the material of sewers and hence the roughness for assessing sewer capacity. | The material has been updated to “Concrete” and hence roughness of sewers has been updated (see Attachment 3). |

| 5. | Comments from Transport Department | |
|-----|--|--|
| 5.1 | As a gentle reminder, the provision of the 2m-wide footpath within the Application Site for 24-hour public use should be suitably reflected in the subsequent lease modification. | Noted. |
| 5.2 | Regarding applicant’s response on Item No. 2.7 of the R-to-C (<i>submitted under the previous Further Information (1)</i>) about the proposed road works outside the application, please be clarified that the road works, i.e. converting the existing public footpath into carriageway and a public lay-by with suitable road markings, should be within existing public roads and involve no surrender of land. As the portion is within public road, TD would continue to perform traffic management of the proposed lay-by. Please also confirm with HyD if they will assume the maintenance responsibility of the newly constructed carriageway and public lay-by. | Noted. Please also be confirmed that PlanD has included HyD in the circulation list of this planning application, and the Applicants were given to understand that HyD has replied PlanD “no objection / no comment”. |