
Responses to Public Comments

RtoC Table (Public Comments)

	Public Comments	Responses to Public Comments
1.	Concerns on obstruction of daylight	The Applicant will ensure that the Proposed Development will fully comply with the design requirements under the Building (Planning) Regulations and relevant codes which properly govern the design and layout of the Proposed Development, including building separation, site coverage, etc. From statutory perspective, the Proposed Development would have no effect to the daylight concern of the surrounding buildings since each individual development should already fulfil the prescribed needs of natural daylight within their own site. In particular, when the Proposed Development is in general separated with the adjoining residential blocks by street which enables these neighbouring buildings face directly into an unobstructed space as defined under code to meet an effective lighting and ventilation requirement. In addition, the Applicant has already proposed a smaller footprint for the extension portion, as compared to the footprint of the existing office building. Even as compared with the nearby office building (i.e. One Island East), the Proposed Development is of much smaller scale. Hence, any non-compliant obstruction of daylight due to the Proposed Development is not anticipated, especially the surrounding area is already in an urban context with existing high-density and high-rise developments. Besides, the Applicant has submitted a Visual Impact Assessment and Air Ventilation Assessment to support the Proposed Development. The Urban Design Section of Planning Departments has no adverse comments from urban design perspective.
2.	Concerns on construction traffic impact	It is anticipated that the construction traffic will be less than the trip generation of the proposed development and would not be critical to the surrounding road network. Temporary traffic arrangement will be formulated during construction stage when necessary and will be submitted to relevant government departments for approval to minimise the disturbance to the public.
3.	Concerns on absence of pedestrian flow assessment	The Applicant would like to highlight that the proposed development have direct connection to the MTR Station via the shopping mall and in close proximity to the bus stop and minibus. The majority of pedestrian is expected to travel through the shopping mall and the adjacent footpath with ample width. Hence, it is expected that the pedestrian flows induced by the proposed development is insignificant to the current capacity of pedestrian walkway.

	Public Comments	Responses to Public Comments
4.	Concerns on the Applicants’ right to carry out any alteration works at common area	<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 at the common area). 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, including those duly executed by all owners, will need to be submitted to the Lands Department for processing at a later stage.</p>
5.	Concerns on absence of quantitative air ventilation assessment and micro-climate assessment	<p>The Application Site does not fall within an area with any major breezeways identified. It was observed that the prevailing winds would flow along the existing road networks. The Proposed Development is to increase the building height of an existing office tower, with the footprint of the extension portion being slightly smaller than the existing footprint. Adverse air ventilation impact is not anticipated. Hence, quantitative air ventilation assessment is not required.</p> <p>At the subsequent detailed design stage, when preparing the General Building Plan submission, the Applicants will take into consideration various design factors such as sustainable building design guidelines, BEAM Plus requirements, etc. to ensure building sustainability performance, under which micro-climate would be one of the evaluation under</p>

	Public Comments	Responses to Public Comments
		the site aspects category.
6.	Concerns on ground settlement due to the proposed construction works	In 2008, a set of General Building Plans (GBP) has already been approved by the Buildings Department, for a proposed development at the site with building height up to 189.95mPD. When preparing the GBP, structural loading and other relevant technical considerations including foundation and ground settlement issues have already been reviewed and taken into consideration. Under the current planning application, the building height of the proposed development has been reduced to 165mPD. It is anticipated that there would not be any ground settlement issue due to the proposed construction works of the proposed development.
7.	Concerns on insufficient foundation loading for the proposed development, and any adverse impact to the MTR tunnel	<p>In 2008, a set of General Building Plans (GBP) has already been approved by the Buildings Department, for a proposed development at the site with building height up to 189.95mPD. When preparing the GBP, structural loading and other relevant technical considerations including foundation loading have already been reviewed and taken into consideration. Under the current planning application, the building height of the proposed development has been reduced to 165mPD. It is anticipated that there would not be any foundation loading problem due to the proposed development. In fact, when constructing the existing office tower, sufficient foundation loading has already been reserved for the extension portion on top, and the extension portion is only proposed on top of an existing building without enlarging the tower footprint.</p> <p>As for the MTR tunnel, please be clarified that the alignment of the MTR tunnel does not run underneath the proposed development. Instead, the MTR tunnel runs along King’s Road to the south of Kornhill Gardens and Kornhill Plaza, which are further away from the proposed development. Nonetheless, the Applicants will observe the requirements for any interface, if any, with the railway protection boundary during construction stage, and will keep close liaison with MTRC where necessary.</p>
8.	Concerns on adverse traffic impact during the sewage upgrading works	When carrying out the sewage upgrading works, the Applicants will keep close liaison with relevant government departments to observe relevant requirements and apply for relevant permits for the works. The Applicants will also prepare and carry out temporary traffic management measures for approval by Transport Department.

	Public Comments	Responses to Public Comments
9.	Concerns on traffic survey (conducted in 2004/05) not being up-to-date	Please be informed that the Applicants have duly carried out a number of traffic surveys at different dates and times. The latest traffic survey adopted was carried out in 2025; not 2004 and 2005 as quoted in the public comments.
10.	Concerns on the existing shops on 5/F (a hotpot shop) and 6/F (a bank) not being legitimate	Please be reiterated that the Application Site falls within an area zoned “Commercial (7)” on the statutory Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). Commercial uses including ‘Shop and Services’, which includes restaurants and banks, are always permitted under the OZP. The existing shops on 5/F and 6/F were implemented through the submission and approval of building plans for Alteration & Addition (A&A) works for the concerned premises. The relevant building plans for A&A works were approved in May and September 2022.