

**PROPOSED MINOR RELAXATION OF PLOT RATIO (PR) AND BUILDING HEIGHT (BH) RESTRICTIONS FOR PROPOSED HOTEL USE AT
107-109 WAI YIP STREET, KWUN TONG (KWUN TONG INLAND LOT NOS. 570, 571, 572 & 573)**

Planning Application No. A/K14/835

Response-to-Comment Table

Departmental Comments	Response
<u>Email dated 8th October 2025 refers:</u>	
<u>Comments of the Environmental Protection Department</u>	
According to Section 2.1 of the SPS, the Site was previously occupied by a 10-storey (including ground floor) industrial building. The FII provided information to address potential land contamination issue for the Site and we have further comments as follows :-	Noted with thanks. Please find the clarifications in the attached replacement pages of the Supplementary Planning Statement Section 5.6.3.
(1) Response to Comment (2) – Section 5.6.3	
a) To facilitate vetting, please elaborate on the land use of the ground floor of the concerned office building.	Please be clarified that similar to the proposed hotel, ground floor of the said office building was mainly used for internal transport facilities, entrance lobby, receptions, lift core and a transformer room all serving the previous office building.
b) Please clarify whether there were basement floors for the office building that previously occupied the Application Site between 1973 and 2020.	Please be clarified that there was no basement floor in the previous office building.
c) Please supplement relevant photographic records showing the land use of the open carpark to facilitate vetting.	Please find relevant photo record for open carpark on the Site for private vehicle after 2020 in Section 5.6.3.
Response to Comment (2) – Table 5.3	
a) The Consultant shall supplement aerial photographic records to show the transition from the office building to the carpark in Year 2020 as mentioned in Section 5.6.3.	Please find the clarifications in table 5.3.
b) Please be advised that the Application Site was no longer occupied as an office building in Year 2024. The Consultant shall update the description in the first column to avoid confusion.	Please find the clarifications in table 5.3.
<u>Email dated 10th October 2025 refers:</u>	
<u>Comments of the Urban Design Unit of UD&L Section, Planning Department</u>	
<u>Planning Statement</u>	
1. R-to-C Item 2, Section 4.2 – Our previous comments have not been properly addressed. The applicant's responses regarding	Please find the following clarifications on the compliance with SBDG requirements:

the fulfilment of SBDG are missing.	The requirements of site coverage of greenery are fulfilled. (See FIG-05 in Appendix 1) The subject site with an area (i) less than 20,000m² and (ii) proposed with building having a continuous projected façade length (Lp) of below 60m, falls outside the prescribed categories requiring compliance with the building separation requirements in accordance with APP-152. The Site fronting Wai Yip Street having a width of MORE than 15m falls outside the prescribed category requiring compliance with the building setback requirements.
2. Section 5.4 – Please review if this para. should read “...provide a further 1.5m non-building area with a clear height of 5.1m setback. The proposed...” and ensure consistency across the submission.	Please find Section 5.4 revised.
<u>Appendix 1</u> 3. R-to-C Item 6, Figure 7 – The applicant is reminded to ensure the accuracy of the façade details shown on the visual illustration in terms of scale. The applicant may wish to annotate the proposed 2.3m-wide setback and canopy, as well as Wai Yip Street on this figure for easy reference.	Attached please find Appendix 1 - FIG 07 with minor adjustment to the façade illustration and annotations added. Please note that FIG 07 is for illustration reference only.
<u>Visual Impact Assessment</u> 4. R-to-C Item 5, 2nd bullet of para. 2.2 – The applicant’s clarifications of not providing the 3m-wide public passage at G/F are noted. Please review if this bullet should be deleted accordingly.	Please find the replacement pages in Appendix 4 for relevant sections of the VIA clarified. Please find para. 2.2 clarified.
5. R-to-C Item 11 – As commented previously, the applicant is requested to confirm if the bulk of the proposed development at the subject site and the planned/committed developments in the surrounding have been accurately reflected on the photomontages.	It is confirmed that the proposed development at the subject site and the planned/committed developments in the surrounding have been accurately reflected on the photomontages.
6. R-to-C Item 12, Remark (e) of Section 2.1 – The applicant’s clarifications of not considering MiC construction methods at this stage are noted. Please review if this remark should be	Please find remarks in Section 2.1 clarified.

deleted accordingly.	
7. R-to-C Item 23, Figure 6.6 – a) Please review if the location the proposed development and the planned development (application No. A/K14/809) should be shifted slightly to the right, while the planned development (application No. A/K14/809) would be largely screened off by the surrounding existing buildings.	Please find attached Figure 6.6 clarified.
b) Please be reminded that the annotations of all surrounding planned/ committed developments should point towards their respective building bulk on the photomontages for easy reference.	Please note that the arrow colours have been faded out in the last FI(1) submission. Please find the photomontages from the last submission with arrows clarified and reattached.
c) The resolution of the photomontages should be enhanced.	Please note that the resolutions have been lowered in the last FI(1) submission. Please find the photomontages clarified and re-attached.
8. R-to-C Item 25, VP7, Para. 6.21 and Table 3 – Noting that the applicant has confirmed the accuracy of the photomontages and that the proposed development would be largely screened off by the existing residential development of Wah Mei Lau, please review if the visual impact rating of this VP should be “negligible”.	Please find Para. 6.21 and Table 3 clarified.
9. Paras. 6.9, 6.13 and 6.16 – Please review if terminology of the visual impact rating in these paras. should read “slightly adverse” instead of “slight” with reference to TPB PG No. 41.	Please find Paras. 6.9, 6.13 and 6.16 clarified.