

Application for Amendment of Plan under Section 12A of the Town Planning Ordinance (Cap. 131)

**Approved Quarry Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H21/28 relating to the
“Other Specified Uses (1)” annotated “Cultural and/or Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses” (“OU(1)”) Zone
at Inland Lots 8590 RP (Part) and 8723 RP (Part) and Adjoining Government Land,
Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay, Hong Kong
(Planning Application No. Y/H21/7)**

Response to Departmental Comments

February 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
1st Batch of Departmental Comments	4
Response to Architectural Services Department Comments	4
Response to Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department Comments	5
Response to Eastern District Office, Home Affairs Department Comments	6
Response to Electrical and Mechanical Services Department Comments	10
Response to Fire Services Department Comments	10
Response to Hong Kong Observatory Comments	11
Response to Hong Kong Police Force Comments	13
Response to Highways Department Comments	13
Response to Lands Department Comments	15
Response to Leisure and Cultural Services Comments	21
Response to Marine Department Comments	23
Response to Landscape Unit, UD&L Section, PlanD Comments	24
Response to Urban Design Unit, UD&L Section, PlanD Comments	25
Response to Hong Kong District Planning Office, PlanD Comments	29
Response to Water Supplies Department Comments	30
2nd Batch of Departmental Comments	31
Response to Environmental Protection Department Comments	31
Response to South Development and Sustainable Lantau Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department Comments	47

Response to District Lands Office, Lands Department Comments	48
3rd Batch of Departmental Comments.....	50
Response to Transport Department Comments.....	50
4th Batch of Departmental Comments.....	57
Response to Buildings Department Comments.....	57

Introduction

This document contains the Applicant’s responses to the departmental comments received on 1st, 3rd, 5th December 2025 and 22nd January 2026. This document is accompanied by an updated version of the Planning Statement, which includes technical appendices that have been revised to address these comments. Therefore, any references to technical reports in this document can be found in the accompanying Planning Statement.

1st Batch of Departmental Comments

Response to Architectural Services Department Comments

Comments of Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) (Contact person: Mr. Sherman SUM; Tel.: 2582 5314)	Responses
<p>According to the updated Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) provided, we have the following comments from architectural and visual impact point of view:</p> <p>(a) The Alternative Conceptual Scheme is proposed, but is not reflected in the VIA, including the diagrams (Figures 4.4 to 4.8) and the vantage points (VP01 to VP09). In order to enable us to comment on the visual impact, it would be useful to have additional images/photomontages of the proposed development in its immediate surrounding context from different vantage points to demonstrate whether the proposal and its design features would be visually compactible with the existing surrounding environment.</p>	<p>Noted. The Alternative Conceptual Scheme adopts a building height (BH) of +47.0 mPD with the relocation of the central residential portion to either side of the cultural portion and the addition of one floor.</p> <p>A series of new diagrams and photomontages have been incorporated to demonstrate the design approach for the Alternative Conceptual Scheme. Please refer to Figure 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.5.1, 4.6.1, 4.7.1 for the new urban design diagrams and Figure 9.2.1, 9.3.1, 9.4.1, 9.5.1, 9.6.1, 9.7.1, 9.8.1, 9.9.1 and 9.10.1 for the update of photomontages.</p>
<p>(b) To avoid adverse impact on the ventilation and air permeability, the applicant is reminded to avoid screen wall design along the waterfront in both schemes and comply with the building</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As per our preliminary checking in response to sustainable building design under PNAP APP-152, the proposed scheme could comply with the</p>

<p>separation requirements and the sustainable design guidelines promulgated under PNAP APP-152.</p>	<p>requirement on façade length (LP) and permeability. The building setback could also be fulfilled with Island Eastern Corridor as a “specified street” which will be subject to further liaison with Building Department during GBP submission stage.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to ensure compliance with the relevant building separation requirements and sustainable design guidelines under PNAP APP-152 at the detailed design stage.</p>
<p>(c) The applicant may wish to consider the treatment/articulation of building façades (e.g. a stepped building profile) in the design stage to blend in more harmoniously with the surrounding neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Noted. Terraced effect and stepped building profile have been incorporated in the Conceptual Scheme and further enhanced in the Alternative Conceptual Scheme. Design features of similar or enhanced effect will be further considered in the detailed design stage to ensure that the development blends in harmoniously with the surrounding environment.</p>

Response to Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department Comments

<p>Comments of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (Contact person: Mr. Edison TSE; Tel.:2762 5384)</p>	<p>Responses</p>
<p>Please be reminded that part of the site is located within MTRC protection zone (Scheduled Area No. 3). In this regard, the applicant shall seek comments/obtain the necessary permission from relevant authorities for the proposed amendments.</p>	<p>Noted. Comments and necessary permission from relevant authorities will be sought in due course.</p>

Response to Eastern District Office, Home Affairs Department Comments

Comments of Eastern District Office, Home Affairs Department (Contact person: Mr. Andy WONG; Tel.: 3104 2301)	Responses
<p><u>Major Comments</u></p> <p>1. It is noted that the current Section 12A application related to (a) inclusion of “Flat” use under Column 2 of the subject zone; and (b) amendment to the building height restriction from 35mPD to 47mPD for the subject zone. The Conceptual Scheme and an Alternative Conceptual Scheme (the Schemes) submitted alongside by the applicant are indicative only, and the eventual development scheme would be subject to approval by the Town Planning Board under a separate Section 16 application. Comments by this office is being invited under this light.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>2. While invitation of comments on Section 12A application has been dispensed under the streamlined arrangements in 2023, it is advisable that the Eastern District Council (EDC) be consulted by way of a formal meeting at an early and appropriate juncture, given that the development may have significant impact on the livelihood and living environment of the people in the Eastern District.</p>	<p>Noted. The EDC will be consulted by way of a formal meeting in due course with respect to the streamlined arrangements under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO) as amended in 2023.</p> <p>In accordance with the TPO, it is understood that the appropriate stage for a formal consultation with the EDC would be after a draft plan with the proposed amendments is exhibited, should this S.12A application be accepted by the TPB.</p>
<p>3. When considering this application, the Town Planning Board (TPB) may wish to be recalled on the local concerns raised during previous planning applications for the subject site. Amongst others, when being consulted on the development proposals for application no. A/H21/150 back in</p>	<p>It should be noted that each application should be considered on its individual merits. The current proposal is significantly different in design and content from the application in 2018. The technical assessments and reports supporting the subject S.12A application, such as the Traffic Impact Assessment, Visual Impact Assessment, Air Ventilation Assessment</p>

<p>2018, members of the EDC repeatedly expressed grave concern over the application, and opined that the developer should strictly comply with the building height restriction (BHR) of 35mPD. Some EDC members also expressed concerns on other issues including the land exchange arrangement, increased traffic flow, potential visual impact and the proposal on the re-provisioning of the existing pet garden.</p>	<p>(Expert Evaluation) and Landscape Master Plan, have demonstrated that with appropriate mitigation measures, the proposal is technically feasible and acceptable. The existing pet garden will also be re-provisioned at the same location as that provided in the Approved Scheme (no. A/H21/150).</p> <p>As mentioned above, views of EDC members will be sought by way of a formal meeting at the appropriate juncture in line with streamlined arrangements under the 2023 amended TPO.</p>
<p>4. In this connection, TPB is suggested to take into account the possible heightened concerns by and implications to locals over the relaxation of building height, as the applicant is now seeking a relaxation of statutory BHR from 35mPD to 47mPD (the latter of which can be subject to further minor relaxation), as opposed to a minor relaxation to 41mPD under the application no. A/H21/150.</p>	<p>The streamlined process does not enable the EDC's views on the current proposal to be sought at this time, and the members may be supportive of the current proposal. The relaxation of Building Height Restriction (BHR) is proposed to enable a better design that would respect the site's harbourfront setting and its surrounding environment. This includes enabling the incorporation of significant variations in building height (ranging from 26.3mPD to 47mPD) that would reduce the overall building bulk and massing, enhance visual interest at this unique waterfront "OU(1)" site, and improve visual and air permeability for the local neighbourhood. The design merits achieved are in accordance with the Harbour Planning Principles and Harbour Planning Guidelines.</p> <p>Please refer to the revised VIA for further details on the urban design considerations and approach which ensure that any visual impacts resulting from the proposed Conceptual Scheme and Alternative Conceptual Scheme are minimised and acceptable. The VIA concluded that both schemes are</p>

	<p>considered to be visually compatible with their existing and future urban context, and represent a distinct improvement over the Approved Scheme.</p>
<p>5. Besides, as the harbourfront promenade in Eastern District will soon be fully connected with the completion of the East Coast Boardwalk (Eastern Section), EDC members may also enquire how the change of plan can contribute to both the boosting of local economy as well as the provision of more quality public space for public enjoyment. Also, they will likely be concerned about the impact on waterfront connectivity and public enjoyment of the promenade during the works period, in particular if the eventual development will involve substantial and lengthy works for altering the adjacent water frontage as per the Schemes submitted.</p>	<p>As mentioned in the above response to comment 2, EDC will be formally consulted at the appropriate juncture, in line with the streamlined arrangements under the 2023 amended TPO. Nevertheless, the possible enquiries and concerns of EDC members are noted, and the following points are relevant for consideration.</p> <p>At the core of the proposed development is a cultural venue intended to provide immersive experience that will become a significant tourist attraction. Apart from the economic benefits of attracting visitors to this locality, the cultural component will also provide job opportunities and promote and help expand technical expertise of local talents in the cultural, creative, and design and technology industries. As such, the proposal will boost Hong Kong's economy and more specifically, it will boost the cultural and tourism sectors in line with recent Government policy objectives. This represents a stark contrast to the previously approved proposal for hotel and office use, which are currently facing market downturns due to oversupply and insufficient demand. Further information on the economic and social benefits of the proposal is provided in the Planning Statement.</p> <p>The proposed development has been carefully designed to complement and seamlessly integrate with the East Coast Boardwalk to ensure a continuous waterfront connection. To enhance the pedestrian experience of this</p>

	<p>connection, large, vibrant, publicly accessible open areas including a waterfront piazza and a promenade with harbour steps, are proposed on the ground floor level that are connected to the Boardwalk. These features create an attractive and inviting space for the public to enjoy. The waterfront connectivity and public enjoyment of the promenade during the works period will be further studied at the detailed design and/or implementation stage.</p>
<p>6. In its response-to-comment regarding the pre-submission, the applicant mentioned about “an informal presentation has been made to the EDC on the current proposal”. We would like to clarify that the scheme presented back then in July 2025 involved a maximum building height of 42.7mPD instead of 47mPD. Also while the meeting was informal in nature, it should not preclude EDC’s position over this application and subsequent development. It should by no means be taken as that the concerns by EDC members have been addressed and support from EDC has been obtained either.</p>	<p>Noted, the EDC will be consulted by way of a formal meeting in due course with respect to the streamlined arrangements under the 2023 amended TPO. It should also be noted that the maximum building height has been increased to 47mPD to address comments received during the pre-submission stage. The key contributing factors for this increase include raising the existing site formation level by approx. 1.5m for storm surge mitigation, and improving the design of the pre-submission scheme to formulate an Alternative Conceptual Scheme to achieve enhanced building height variations, better visual and air ventilation, more iconic architecture, as well as to prevent interface issues between the residential and cultural uses.</p>

Response to Electrical and Mechanical Services Department Comments

Comments of Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (Contact person: Mr. Henry CHENG; Tel.: 2808 3692)	Responses
In the interests of public safety and ensuring the continuity of electricity supply, the parties concerned with planning, designing, organizing and supervising any activity near the underground cable under the mentioned document should approach the electricity supplier (i.e. CLP Power) for the requisition of cable plans to find out whether there is any underground cable within and/or in the vicinity of the concerned site. They should also be reminded to observe the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation and the “Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines” established under the Regulation when carrying out works in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines.	Noted. The Applicant will approach the electricity supplier and will observe relevant regulations accordingly in due course, should this S.12A application be accepted by the Town Planning Board.

Response to Fire Services Department Comments

Comments of Fire Services Department (Contact person: Mr. QIU Yi; Tel.: 2733 5845)	Responses
Our previous comments are still valid and recapped as follows. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For the proposed development, water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services. 	Noted.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Detailed fire services requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans. 	Noted.

<p>3. Furthermore, the EVA provision in the captioned work shall comply with the standard as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011, which is administered by the Buildings Department.</p>	<p>Noted and will comply. Provision of EVA in accordance with COP FS2011 will be justified during GBP submission stage.</p>
--	---

Response to Hong Kong Observatory Comments

Comments of Hong Kong Observatory (Contact person: Ms. Christy LEUNG; Tel.: 2926 8337)	Responses
<p><u>Major Comments</u></p> <p>1. Referring to the proposed amendments, it is noted that HKO’s Quarry Bay Tide Station (“QUB” for short, hosted on Lot GLA-HK 719) is located within the “Promenade” in the Proposed Open Space and close to the residential buildings in the Application Site “OU(1)” according to the conceptual design (Figure 4.8 of “Appendix 8 – Visual Impact Assessment” and Figure 4.2 of “Appendix 10 - Landscape Master Plan” refer). The Proposed Scheme specifically avoids the QUB Tide Station, recognizing its strategic importance both locally and internationally.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>2. We would like to reiterate and emphasize that suitable requirements should be incorporated to ensure that necessary precautions and mitigation measures would be taken by the applicant to avoid causing any disturbance to QUB, particularly during the construction of the proposed development.</p>	<p>Noted. Necessary precautions and mitigation measures will be taken to avoid causing disturbance to QUB, particularly during the construction of the proposed development.</p>

<p>3. Concerning the necessary precautions and mitigation measures to be taken to avoid causing disturbance to QUB, reference is made to the District Lands Conference Decision of 4 November 2021, in particular Special Conditions SC (46) on Tide Gauge Station. Specifically, it includes the following:</p> <p>(i) No form of percussive piling system shall be used within 15 metres from the external face of the Tide Gauge Station.</p>	<p>Noted, necessary precautions and mitigation measures will be taken to avoid causing disturbance to QUB at the detailed design and implementation stage.</p>
<p>(ii) Throughout the term and prior to the commencement of any works whatsoever on the lot or the Yellow Areas, the Grantee shall submit an assessment to the Director of the Hong Kong Observatory for his approval containing such information and particulars as the Director of the Hong Kong Observatory may require (“the Assessment Measures”).</p>	<p>Noted, an assessment will be submitted accordingly in due course.</p>
<p>(iii) The Grantee shall carry out and implement the Assessment Measures so as to ensure that any works do not damage, interfere with or endanger the Tide Gauge Station or the operation of the Tide Gauge Station.</p>	<p>Noted, the necessary measures will be carried out and implemented in due course.</p>

Response to Hong Kong Police Force Comments

Comments of Hong Kong Police Force (Contact person: Ms. Cherry CHEUNG; Tel.: 2860 1007)	Responses
Parking (for all types of vehicles including but not limited to motorcycle, commercial/private vehicles, medium goods vehicles, and coaches) should be considered to prevent overspill of illegal parking.	Noted. The estimation of parking provision is based on the upper end of the requirement of HKPSG which should be sufficient for the actual demand.

Response to Highways Department Comments

Comments of Highways Department (Contact person: Mr. Martin CHOI; Tel.: 2231 5624)	Responses
<p>The Chief Highway Engineer/Hong Kong objects to the application and has the following comments from highways maintenance point of view on the captioned amendment plan:</p> <p><u>Future Shorter Footbridge over IEC (viz para. 11.6(b)(iii) of the Planning Statement, paras. 6.4 to 6.9 of Appendix 1, and paragraph 2.4.3 of Appendix 4)</u></p> <p>1. Regarding the Applicant's responses in the RtoC Table to both LandsD and HyD, we note significant inconsistencies.</p> <p>(a) LandsD previously advised the Applicant to consult relevant departments (including TD and HyD) for the proposed Shorter</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant has subsequently discussed and clarified with Highways Department the status of the proposed footbridge, and that it is outside the S.12A application site. More specifically, it was explained that prior to and during the pre-submission stage no footbridge connection was</p>

<p>Footbridge. However, the Applicant replied to LandsD in the RtoC that the scheme for the shorter footbridge “<i>has been discussed and [has] initial consensus with relevant departments</i>” and that the “<i>detailed arrangement including construction by the Applicant or by the Government would be subject to mutual agreement at detailed design and land exchange.</i>” The Applicant further stated in paragraph 2.4.3 of Appendix 4 that “<i>...the proposed elevated walkway will be maintained and managed by the relevant Government department</i>”.</p> <p>(b) By contrast, in the Applicant’s response to HyD, the Applicant indicated that “<i>[t]he applicant proposes to build a footbridge over the IEC in response to comments received. Further consultation will be carried out regarding implementation</i>”.</p>	<p>proposed by the Applicant. The Applicant has had multiple meetings and/or discussions with Development Bureau (Harbour Office), Transport Department and Planning Department, all of which considered that a footbridge connecting the site to the hinterland would be necessary. In response, the Applicant proposed a short footbridge over Island Eastern Corridor and landing at Quarry Bay Park. The indicative alignment of a footbridge has therefore been included as an integral part of the Conceptual Scheme and Alternative Conceptual Scheme for the S.12A application. However, the footbridge is not a proposed amendment item under the Section 12A application. More details on the footbridge arrangement would be provided should the S.12A application be accepted and a S.16 application made. The design, construction and future maintenance of the proposed footbridge are therefore subject to further discussion and agreement with relevant departments, including TD and HyD, at later detailed design and land exchange stages.</p>
<p>2. Please be clarified that the Applicant has not approached or discussed with HyD about the design, construction and future maintenance of the proposed footbridge.</p>	
<p>3. In light of these conflicting statements, the Applicant shall provide detailed records of the referenced discussions to substantiate the claim of a consensus with relevant government departments in particular from TD and HyD.</p>	

Response to Lands Department Comments

Comments of Lands Department (Contact person: Mr. Edgar WONG; Tel.: 2155 2446)	Responses
<p>This office has the following comments on the planning application and the planning statement for the subject s.12A application intended to facilitate the implementation of “a cultural, leisure and tourism-led development supported by residential use”:-</p> <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Generally, with a view to ensuring the compliance with any proposed additional conditions under lease, it is LandsD’s requirement that any proposed conditions would only be considered to be incorporated under lease provided that there is a relevant bureau/department (“B/D”) requesting for or in support of such additional conditions. Such B/D would be responsible for monitoring the applicant’s compliance with such additional conditions. In the absence of such B/D’s request or support, such conditions would not be incorporated under lease. 	<p>Noted.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The figures including the site area mentioned in the subject s.12A application have not been checked by survey and is subject to verification, which will be addressed when handling the land exchange application (if received). 	<p>Noted.</p>

<u>Specific Comments</u>	
<p>3. Para. 7 of the Planning Statement (“PS”) – The application site covers parts of the Remaining Portion of Inland Lot No. 8590 (“IL 8590 RP”) and the Remaining Portion of Inland Lot No. 8723 (“IL 8723 RP”) which are held under Conditions of Grant No. 11824 dated 22.5.1985 and Conditions of Grant No. 12029 dated 20.12.1988 respectively. Both lots are restricted for industrial and/or godown purposes including the bulk storage and distribution of petroleum products and other petrochemical fluids and subject to a maximum height restriction of 85.34m above HKPD. In addition to IL 8590 RP and IL 8723 RP, it is noted that the proposed development would involve granting of additional government land. Given the proposed development is in conflict with the current lease conditions, subject to the current s.12A application and subsequent planning application(s) is/are approved by TPB, the applicant shall apply to LandsD for a land exchange whereas there is no guarantee that such land exchange application will be approved. Such land exchange application (if received) will be considered by LandsD acting in the capacity of landlord as its sole discretion and subject to policy clearance as well as terms and conditions including but not limited to payment of premium and administrative fee, as considered appropriate by LandsD.</p>	<p>Noted, a land exchange application will be submitted to LandsD in due course should the relevant planning approvals be obtained.</p>
<p>4. Para. 9.4 of PS – Part of the private lots (i.e. IL 8590 RP and IL 8723 RP) would form part of the open space outside the application site. Subject to the applicant’s clarification on whether the open space outside the application site would be re-delivered to government department(s) for</p>	<p>Noted. The open space outside the application site, including the parts presently covered by private lots IL 8590 RP and IL 8723 RP, is proposed to be implemented, managed and maintained by the applicant as part of an integrated development related to the cultural operation, retail, and</p>

<p>future management and maintenance in comment no. 10 below, the applicant shall seek agreement from the responsible department(s) for whether the erected foundation works (if any) would be allowed to remain on such open space upon completion of re-delivery of open space.</p>	<p>food and beverage operation. An indication of this proposed management and maintenance arrangement is included in the Landscape Master Plan report at Appendix 10 of the Planning Statement. It is envisaged that the open space areas outside the lot may be subject to conditions under the lease for them to be handed to the government if and when required. This would be subject to agreement with relevant government departments at the later detailed design and implementation stages.</p>
<p>5. Paras. 14 and 17 of PS and para. 8.5 of Appendix 10 – The proposed development would comprise public levels for retail, entertainment and cultural uses, podium level for landscaped areas and residential levels. The applicant intends to put the residential units for sale whereas there would be open space within the application site (including those parts accessible by public). Given it is the Government’s prevailing policy to avoid individual flat owners to bear the management and maintenance responsibilities of the public facilities in the private development, the applicant shall demonstrate how the public elements within the application site as well as any open space outside the applicant site in comment no. 10 below be managed and maintained prior to its re-delivery to Government without transferring their management and maintenance responsibilities to individual residential flat owners.</p>	<p>It is intended that the ownership of the non-domestic portions including the cultural venue, the open space within the lot accessible to the public, and any retail provision will be held by an entity (or entities) separate from the ownership of the residential portion. This separate entity will maintain and manage the public elements, including the public open space outside the application site.</p> <p>The “public elements”, including retail, entertainment and cultural uses, the open space within and outside the application site that are accessible to the public, will therefore be owned, maintained and managed by the separate entity. As such, future management and maintenance responsibilities of these “public elements” will not be transferred to individual residential flat owners.</p>

<p>6. Para. 11.6(b)(ii) of PS, para. 5.21 of Appendix 1 and para. 2.4.3 of Appendix 4 – A footbridge connecting the Quarry Bay hinterland from Hoi Tai Street to the application site was authorized under Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370) in 2022. Given that a shorter footbridge has now been proposed from the Quarry Bay Park to the application site, it should be noted any amendment to the authorized road scheme may require further or fresh statutory procedure. The applicant shall consult relevant B/D (including TD and HyD) for the proposed shorter footbridge which is proposed to be constructed by the applicant and managed and maintained by the Government.</p>	<p>Noted, the necessary statutory procedures for the proposed footbridge will be adhered to.</p> <p>TD and HyD have been consulted through circulation of the S.12A application by Planning Department, and our responses to their comments are included in this Response to Comments (RtC) document. The applicant will continue to consult the relevant B/Ds, as appropriate, should this S.12A application be accepted by the Town Planning Board.</p> <p>A footbridge is proposed as an integral part of the Conceptual Scheme and Alternative Conceptual Scheme, with reference to paragraph 11(b)ii and 11.8 of Planning Statement, paragraph 6.8 of Appendix 1, and 6.1.12 of Appendix 4. The party responsible for the construction of the proposed footbridge is still to be determined at a later appropriate stage, and is subject to future discussion and agreement between the applicant and the Government.</p>
<p>7. Para. 19.24 and Figure 12 of PS, Appendix 1, Appendix 2 and Figure 2.6 of Appendix 4 – Noting that the applicant proposed possible ground-level pedestrian accesses to and from the proposed development, the applicant should clearly set out the scope of works (in particular the areas or Government premises affected) and consult the relevant departments. For the proposed access through the Quarry Bay Park which is now held by LCSD (GLA-HK 917), the applicant shall demonstrate its feasibility and clarify whether it is intended that the construction/improvement works (if any) to be implemented under the proposed development as well as future management and maintenance of such possible pedestrian access</p>	<p>Noted. Part of the proposed possible ground-level pedestrian access will utilise existing pedestrian paths within the Quarry Bay Park that are currently open 24hrs. The other part includes improvement works connecting the Park to the area under the IEC (i.e. landing area of East Coast Boardwalk). As this proposed linkage involves Government land directly connecting the Boardwalk implemented by the Government and the Quarry Bay Park which is managed and maintained by the Government, it is therefore proposed that this ground level connection is to be implemented, managed and maintained by the Government. The proposed ground-level access is subject to further discussion and</p>

<p>and seek LCSD’s agreement for its proposal, including whether the operation mode of Quarry Bay Park could suit for the applicant’s proposed use (e.g. opening hours of the park). The applicant should also consult CEDD noting the possible pedestrian access may have interface with the CEDD’s project (i.e. Boardwalk underneath Island Eastern Corridor).</p>	<p>agreement with the relevant government departments at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>It should be noted that LCSD’s comments during the pre-submission stage have been considered and responded to. LCSD has subsequently been consulted through the circulation of the S.12A application by Planning Department. No adverse comments have been received in this regard at this stage. Our responses to their comments are included in this RtC document.</p> <p>CEDD has also been consulted through the circulation of the S.12A application by Planning Department, and our response to their comments is included in this RtC document.</p>
<p>8. Paras. 19.22, 19.23 and 20.4 of PS and Appendix 4 – The applicant shall clarify the implementation party of the road works (e.g. the road widening works and junction improvement works) outside the application site and seek comment from TD and HyD in particular the scope of road works and future management and maintenance of such road works.</p>	<p>The road works are proposed to be implemented by the applicant and will subsequently be handed over to the relevant government department(s) for management and maintenance. This proposal is subject to further discussion and agreement with relevant department(s) at detailed design stage.</p>
<p>9. Para. 14.7 and Figure 16 of PS, para. 6.14 of Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 – The applicant shall clarify whether the proposed harbour steps would be constructed under the subject development, bearing in mind that any works over an upon any foreshore and sea-bed at the harbour may invoke the statutory procedure under Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance (Cap. 127) and/or Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (Cap. 531) (“PHO”). The applicant shall provide the scope of works and consult</p>	<p>Noted. The HO/DEVB has been involved in discussions as has the Harbourfront Commission. All necessary statutory procedures and requirements will be adhered to and relevant B/Ds consulted in due course for the design and implementation of the proposed harbour steps. Reference has been made throughout to the requirements of the PHO.</p>

<p>the relevant B/D including Harbour Office/DEVB (“HO/DEVB”) for its proposal. In particular, the applicant should approach HO/DEVB for any proposed works initiated under the PHO to ensure the requirements under the PHO are fulfilled. The applicant should observe operational details and administrative requirements of the PHO as set out in the DEVB Technical Circular (Planning and Lands) No. 1/2025.</p>	
<p>10. Figure 12 of PS, drawing no. MPNP024 – TR001 of Appendix 9 and Figure 5.3 of Appendix 10 – Noting that some open space would be constructed by the applicant outside the application site, the applicant should clearly set out the extent and scope of works. In particular, the applicant should clarify whether the “proposed pedestrian linkage” as shown on Figure 12 of PS would be implemented under the proposed development. Subject to applicant’s clarification, the proposed open space and re-provisioning of Quarry Bay Promenade Pet Garden (as shown coloured orange and blue on Figure 5.3 Appendix 10) would affect the LCSD’s promenade cum pet garden (GLA-THK 1891) and Hong Kong Observatory (“HKO”)’s tide gauge station with Satellite Positioning Reference Station situated on top of the station (GLA-HK719). The applicant shall clarify the long-term management and maintenance of the said open space (i.e. whether it would be open for public use and re-delivered to the Government upon completion) and seek comments from relevant departments on its proposal. Also, some existing trees outside the said open space would be also proposed to be felled. The applicant shall also seek comments from relevant land users (including LCSD for Quarry Bay Park under GLA-THK 1891 and CEDD for GLA-THK</p>	<p>The proposed pedestrian linkages are intended to be implemented under the proposed development, subject to detailed design and agreement with relevant government departments at a later appropriate stage.</p> <p>The existing LCSD promenade cum pet garden and the location of HKO’s tide gauge station with Satellite Positioning Reference Station are noted. The proposed open space and re-provisioned pet garden outside the application site (as shown coloured orange and blue on Figure 5.3 of Appendix 10 Landscape Master Plan) would be for public use. The public open space outside the application site (coloured orange) is proposed to be maintained and managed by the applicant upon completion. Whereas the re-provisioned pet garden (coloured blue) is proposed to be redelivered to the Government for management and maintenance upon completion. Comments of LCSD and HKO have been sought through the circulation of this S.12A application by Planning Department, LCSD and HKO have no adverse comments at this stage in this regard. LCSD and HKO’s comments and our responses are included in this RtC document.</p> <p>With regards to the existing trees outside the said open space, please refer</p>

21EHGS2021_18 and STLA-THKE 31) where those affected trees are located.	to LCSD and CEDD's comments and our responses included in this RtC document.
11. It is noted that the Government land proposed to be included in the application site would affect a Geodetic Survey Control Station under GLA-THK 261/EHGS/87, which is a Bedrock Bench Mark for providing height reference to the tide gauge station as mentioned in comment no. 10 above. The applicant shall seek comment from the Geodetic Survey Section, Survey and Mapping Office, LandsD in this regard.	Noted, comment from the Geodetic Survey Section, Survey and Mapping Office, LandsD will be sought in due course, should the S.12A application be accepted by the Town Planning Board.
12. The referencing quoted above may not be exhaustive. The applicant shall ensure the consistency throughout the whole submission.	Noted.

Response to Leisure and Cultural Services Comments

Comments of Leisure and Cultural Services Department (Contact person: Ms. Jenny TO; Tel.: 2601 7404)	Responses
<p>Please find our comments below:</p> <p><i>Eastern District Leisure Services Office (EDLSO)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regarding the proposed footbridge across the Island Eastern Corridor connecting the site with the Quarry Bay Park (QBP) as stated in the RtoC Table, our views are as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) As there will be a footbridge/elevated walkway encroached into the QBP, the project proponent is required to provide the detailed design of the footbridge/elevated walkway especially the design, 	<p>Noted. Detailed design of the footbridge will be provided at the detailed design stage, should the S.12A application be accepted by the Town Planning Board.</p>

<p>drawings and size of the column of the footbridge to our office for further consideration and comment.</p>	
<p>(b) The TPRP of the affected trees within QBP should be provided to our office for comments. It is reminded to minimize the disturbance to the greenery and trees as possible.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>(c) In view of the feasibility of the relocation of the Quarry Bay Promenade Pet Garden is under studying, we have reserved the right to comment the re-provisioning of the new pet garden in this stage.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>(d) It is advised the project proponent/relevant parties to seek the consultation of Eastern District Council members before the implementation of the Project.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><i>Hong Kong East Tree Team (HKETT)</i></p> <p><u>Specific (Appendix 9 – Tree Preservation Proposal)</u></p> <p>2. According to the Tree Treatment Schedule in Annex II, LCSD was the maintenance department for those trees in Tree Group B01 (TGB01). In accordance with DEVB TC(W) No. 6/2015, LCSD is responsible for the maintenance of the trees at UUGL within 10 metres from kerb along non-expressway public road. Since the location of TGB01 is beyond 10 metres from kerb along non-expressway public road, the trees thereat should not be under LCSD.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The description under “Maintenance department to provide comments on TPRP” of the ‘Tree Treatment Schedule’ (Annex II refers) has been viewed and updated accordingly.</p>

Response to Marine Department Comments

Comments of Marine Department (Contact person: Mr. Ringo CHEUNG Tel.: 2852 4393)	Responses
1. With reference to Appendix 3, it is noted that a water taxi berth has been proposed. Considering the proximity of the site to the Eastern Fairway, further details regarding the water taxi services, such as the frequency of its schedule and the specifications of the water taxi should be provided to the relevant departments and the Marine Department (MD) for further evaluation. A Marine Traffic Impact Assessment (MTIA) for the proposed water taxi services may also be required.	Noted. The water taxi berth is intended to be an additional stop for existing water taxi services. If required, further relevant details regarding the water taxi services and a Marine Traffic Impact Assessment can be provided at an appropriate time.
2. With reference to Appendix 2, it is noted that some water sports events are proposed along the concerned site. The project proponent should clarify the boundary of the proposed water sports event area and provide details of the events to be conducted in this area once available. If the proposed water sports activities involve racing, the applicant must obtain prior permission to hold a racing event in Hong Kong waters.	The water sports events shown in Appendix 2 (Design Statement) are artist impressions intended solely to illustrate a conceptual idea for the potential design and use of the waterfront area. The water sports events are not proposed under this S.12A application. Should there be any water sports events at this location in the future, the necessary information will be submitted to the relevant government department(s) and prior permissions will be obtained by the event organisers.
3. Additionally, with reference to Appendix 2, it is noted that some floating structures are proposed along the concerned site. The project proponent should submit information such as the size, design, and material of these structures to the MD for further evaluation. Please also clarify whether the floating structures are intended to be of a temporary or permanent nature. Further assessment may be necessary to determine the feasibility of certifying and licensing the floating structures in compliance with relevant regulations.	The floating structures are artist impressions intended solely to illustrate a conceptual idea for the potential design and use of the waterfront area. They are not part of the S.12A application. Should any floating structures be proposed in the future, the necessary assessments and information will be submitted to the relevant government department(s), and approvals and license(s) obtained to ensure compliance with relevant regulations.

Response to Landscape Unit, UD&L Section, PlanD Comments

<p>Comments of the Landscape Unit, Urban Design & Landscape (UD&L) Section, Planning Department (PlanD) (Contact person: Mr. NGAI Chak Man; Tel.: 3565 3955)</p>	<p>Responses</p>
<p>Please find below the comments from landscape planning perspectives.</p> <p><u>Detailed Comments</u></p> <p>1. Based on the aerial photo of 2024, the application site (“the Site”) is generally vacant and mostly hard paved with some existing trees and vegetated areas.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>2. 24 trees of common species (including one <i>Leucaena leucocephala</i>) within the Site are proposed to be felled as they would unavoidably be affected by the proposed works and are not suitable to be transplanted. No registered Old and Valuable Trees (OVTs) or rare/protected species were identified within the Site. Not less than 24 heavy standard sized new trees are proposed to be planted within the Site. Significant adverse landscape impact arising from the proposed use is not anticipated.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><u>Advisory Comments</u></p> <p>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 within and outside site, the applicant shall be reminded to approach relevant authority/government department(s) direct to obtain the necessary approval.</p>	<p>Noted, the appropriate submissions will be made to relevant government departments during the detailed design stage of the project.</p>

Response to Urban Design Unit, UD&L Section, PlanD Comments

Comments of the Urban Design Unit, UD&L Section, PlanD (Contact person: Ms. Vanessa TSANG; Tel.: 3565 3942)	Responses
1. It is noted that the Applicant has proposed two schemes, namely Conceptual Scheme (i.e. with a maximum building height (BH) of 44mPD with residential component above the cultural venue) and the Alternative Conceptual Scheme (i.e. with a maximum BH of 47mPD with residential component on both side of the cultural venue). According to the Planning Statement, the Applicant proposes to amend the Notes of “OU(1)” annotated “Cultural and/or Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses” on the approved Quarry Bay OZP No. S/H21/28 to include ‘Flat’ use in Column 2 with a minor relaxation of BH restriction from 35mPD to 47mPD. Yet, technical assessments are only conducted on the Conceptual Scheme. From visual and air ventilation perspectives, there is insufficient information in the submission to support the maximum BH restriction of 47mPD proposed under the rezoning application.	<p>The revised VIA now includes an assessment for both the Proposed (Conceptual) Scheme and the Alternative (Conceptual) Scheme demonstrating the reasons for the increase in the BH restriction and the benefits of adopting this approach.</p> <p>The revised VIA includes series of diagrams describing the urban design considerations for the Alternative (Conceptual) Scheme and photomontages for the Alternative Concept Scheme have been implemented. Please refer to Figures 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.5.1, 4.6.1, 4.7.1; and Figures 9.2.1, 9.3.1, 9.4.1, 9.5.1, 9.6.1, 9.7.1, 9.8.1, 9.9.1 and 9.10.1 respectively.</p>
2. The Layout Plan and photomontages for the Conceptual Scheme do not correspond to the proposed development within the application site (the Site) boundary.	<p>Noted. The Layout Plan and photomontages for the Concept Scheme have been reviewed. The related diagrams and photomontages have been updated in accordance with the layout plan.</p>
3. The <u>VIA</u> for the Alternative Conceptual Scheme is missing .	<p>Noted, the revised VIA includes an assessment of the Alternative Conceptual Scheme, as well as a series of diagrams describing the urban design considerations for the</p>

	Alternative (Conceptual) Scheme and photomontages for the Alternative Concept Scheme. Please refer to Figures 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.5.1, 4.6.1, 4.7.1; and Figures 9.2.1, 9.3.1, 9.4.1, 9.5.1, 9.6.1, 9.7.1, 9.8.1, 9.9.1 and 9.10.1 respectively.
<p>4. Specific comments from urban design and visual perspectives are as follows:</p> <p>(a) the Conceptual Scheme is to develop the Site for cultural, leisure, tourism and residential uses and minor relaxation of BHR from 35mPD to 44mPD (with a proposed formation level of 5.5mPD). The Conceptual Scheme has incorporated some design features for enhancing visual permeability and visual amenity within the Site such as provision of building gaps ranging from about 11m to 22m from 11.9mPD (podium level), variations in BH of 26.3mPD, 40.7mPD and 44mPD and varying building setbacks surrounding the Site ranging from 2.5m to 22.7m. It is considered that the incorporation of building gaps would allow visual permeability between Victoria Harbour and the hinterland, avoid wall effect, and break up the elongated façade configuration. Variations in BH would provide some visual interest particularly when viewed from Kai Tak Cruise Terminal and SVP3 to avoid a monotonous harbourfront image. As demonstrated in Figure 9.12 in the VIA, the proposal will not encroach onto the 20% Building Free Zone.</p>	Noted.
<p>(b) please refer to the suggested ratings for VIA on the Conceptual Scheme as marked below. The suggested ratings also apply to Section 9.0.</p>	Noted the suggested changes to the ratings for the VIA have been adopted in the revised report including Table 11.1 (12.1).

Table 11.1 Summary of Visual Impact Assessment Ratings

Vantage Point (VP)	Sensitivity of Public Viewers	Visual Composition	Visual Obstruction	Effect on Public Viewers	Effect on Visual Resources	Overall Visual Impact
VP 01: View looking west along Quarry Bay Promenade	High	Apparent and Compatible	Small	Slight Negligible	Small	Slightly Adverse Negligible
VP 02: View from the Viewing Tower of Quarry Bay Park (located at the end of the Elevated Pedestrian Footbridge connecting Quarry Bay Park and Quarry Bay Promenade)	High	Apparent and Compatible	Small	Slight Negligible	Small	Slightly Adverse Negligible
VP 03: View from the staircases connecting City Plaza Three and Quarry Bay Park	Low	Not apparent	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
VP 04: View looking north west from Quarry Bay Park	Low	Not apparent	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
VP 05: View from the Quarry Bay Park Phase II	Medium High	Apparent and Compatible	Small	Slight	Small	Slightly Adverse
VP 06: View looking east along Hoi Yu Street	High	Apparent and Compatible	Small	Slight Negligible	Small	Slightly Adverse Negligible
VP 07: View looking east along the Island Eastern Corridor	Medium	Apparent and Compatible	Small	Slight Negligible	Small	Slightly Adverse Negligible
VP 08: View south from the Kai	High	Apparent and Compatible	Small	Slight	Small	Slightly Adverse
VP 09: View looking south from the Sai Wan Ho Ferry	Medium High	Apparent and Compatible	Small	Slight Negligible	Small	Slightly Adverse Negligible
SVP 3: Waterfront Promenade at Kai Tak Development (Views towards eastern Hong Kong Island)	High High	Apparent and Compatible	Small	Slight Negligible	Small	Slightly Adverse Negligible

Suggest deleting VP08 as it shares similar view as SVP3

<p>(c) Figure 4.4 – Elevation of the building separations is missing.</p>	<p>Noted, Figure 4.4 is included in the revised VIA and Figures 4.6 and 4.6.1 provide dimensions demonstrating the width of the building separations at various levels.</p>
<p>(d) Figure 4.4A – The setback of 22.7m appears to be wider than the setback of 27m.</p>	<p>Noted. The annotations indicating the setback distances have been revised (Figure 4.4.2).</p>
<p>5. Specific comments from air ventilation perspectives: (a) as noted from the AVA-EE, the report evaluates the potential air ventilation impact of the Conceptual Scheme compared against the approved scheme under A/H21/150. While the application proposes to amend the BH restriction of the “OU(1)” zone to 47mPD, <u>AVA-EE for the Alternative Conceptual Scheme are missing.</u></p>	<p>The AVA-EE for the Alternative Conceptual Scheme is now included in Section 2.5</p>
<p>(b) AVA-EE for the Conceptual Scheme:- (i) the potential wind flows (the arrows) shown in the wind performance figures for the Approved Scheme (i.e. Figures 2-16a, 2-17a, 2-18a, 2-19a and 2-20a) are not reasonable and inconsistent with the text descriptions.</p>	<p>The wind flow of the listed Figures is now revised and consistent with the text described.</p>
<p>(ii) the minimum effective widths on the wind performance figures (i.e. Figures 2-16b, 2-17b, 2-18b, 2-19b and 2-20b) are missing. The potential wind flows (the arrows) are not reasonable.</p>	<p>The wind flow of the listed Figures is now revised and consistent with the text described.</p>
<p>(iii) Tables 2-1 & 2-2 – The column of ‘Wind Speed at Elevation of 500m (m/s)’ appears to be irrelevant to the discussion.</p>	<p>The column of Wind Speed at Evaluation of 500m is now removed.</p>
<p>(iv) Para. 2.3.15 is irrelevant to the discussion.</p>	<p>Para 2.3.15 is now removed.</p>
<p>(v) Para. 2.3.16 – This paragraph is describing the “R(E)” zone.</p>	<p>This paragraph is now revised.</p>

<p>(vi) Para. 2.3.34 – The developments mentioned in this paragraph are “completed” instead of “planned and committed”.</p>	<p>This section is now updated.</p>
<p>(vii) Section 2.4 – No reference has been made to the <i>Term Consultancy for Expert Evaluation and Advisory Services on Air Ventilation Assessment (PLNQ 37/2007) Quarry Bay Area</i>.</p>	<p>The reference for Expert Evaluation and Advisory Services on Air Ventilation Assessment (PLNQ 37/2007) Quarry Bay Area is now discussed at the end of Section 2.4.</p>

Response to Hong Kong District Planning Office, PlanD Comments

Comments of Hong Kong District Planning Office, PlanD (Contact person: Mr. Henry AU; Tel.: 2231 4936)	Responses
<p>We understand from the Planning Statement that one of the proposed amendments to the Notes involve increasing the BHR for the “OU(1)” Zone from 35mPD to 47mPD (not 44mPD). Given comments and concerns from ArchSD, EDO and Urban Design Unit, PlanD on the VIA and visual impact as well as comments from Urban Design Unit, PlanD on the air ventilation impact, the applicant should revise both the VIA and AVA to comprehensively evaluate the visual and air ventilation impacts of the Alternative Conceptual Scheme, which help justify the proposed BHR of 47mPD.</p>	<p>Noted, the AVA-EE and VIA have been revised to evaluate the air ventilation and visual impacts of the Alternative Conceptual Scheme, as attached at Appendix 7 and 8 of the Planning Statement, respectively.</p>

Response to Water Supplies Department Comments

Comments of Water Supplies Department (Contact person: Mr. Terry LAW; Tel.: 2152 5737)	Responses
Our previous comment No. 3 (P.29 of RtoC) – “Please carry out demand assessment for WSD’s consideration, and a detailed Water Supply Impact Assessment may be required subject to the additional demand arising from the developments” has not yet been addressed in this submission. Please provide it accordingly.	A S.16 application for a development of a similar scale was approved by the Town Planning Board (TPB ref. A/H21/150). Upon the acceptance of this S.12A application by the TPB (i.e. “Flat” use is accepted to be in Column 2 of the “OU(1)” zone at this location), a S.16 application will subsequently need to be submitted for TPB’s approval and a Water Supply Impact Assessment, including a detailed demand assessment, will be carried out and provided at that time, as necessary.

2nd Batch of Departmental Comments

Response to Environmental Protection Department Comments

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Ms. Virginia WONG; Tel.: 2835 1109)	Responses
<p>1. Please find below our comments on the subject planning application based on the submission received by the Town Planning Board (TPB) on 27.10.2025, the noise modelling files for the Environmental Assessment received on 5.11.2025 and the air modelling files for the Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQIA) received on 13.11.2025 and 20.11.2025.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>2. The application site is the subject of a previous s.16 application No. A/H21/150 for proposed hotel, office, shop and services, eating place, place of recreation, sports or culture and elevated walkway with minor relaxation of building restriction, which was approved by the TPB with conditions on 22.02.2019. The applicant has proposed a revised scheme for cultural, tourism and recreational development with residential components at the subject site and the new residential units are air and noise sensitive receivers and are matters of concern with this rezoning application.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>3. The subject site is located about 170m from the Eastern Harbour Crossing tunnel portal, about 60m from the Eastern Harbour Crossing Ventilation building, and is adjacent to the Island Eastern Corridor, hence, the site would be very likely subject to adverse air quality impact from these major vehicular emission sources. The applicant</p>	<p>Noted. A revised AQIA report has been included as Appendix 6 of the updated Planning Statement, and has addressed these comments and the more detailed ones provided below.</p>

<p>is required to provide a detailed AQIA taking into account to all existing, committed and planned emission sources within 500m assessment area (and major emission sources within 4km i.e. the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal) to assess the cumulative air quality impact at sensitive uses of the proposed development for cultural, tourism and recreational development with residential components), and to demonstrate all air sensitive uses of the proposed development (including but not limited to openable windows, fresh air intake for mechanical ventilation, and open space for recreation use) would be outside any exceedance zones identified in the AQIA. In addition, the information in the AQIA is incomplete and inaccurate, e.g., the assumption on portal/ventilation building emission and its air pollution control with removal efficiency is unclear, and percentage of minor roads for calculation vehicular start emission is incorrect, etc.</p>	
<p>4. In view of the above, we are unable to support the rezoning application at this stage. In the event that the applicant still pursues for residential elements, the applicant is required to resubmit a detailed AQIA to demonstrate all air sensitive uses of the proposed development would comply with the HKPSG standards.</p>	<p>Noted. The revised AQIA has taken the comments from EPD into account. The assessment shows that the residential elements on this site will comply with HKPSG standards.</p>
<p>5. Please refer to Annex A for our detailed comments on Appendix 5 - Environmental Assessment and Appendix 6 - Air Quality Impact Assessment.</p>	<p>Noted. Please find our responses to the detailed comments below.</p>

Response to Annex A of Environmental Protection Department Comments

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Ms. Virginia WONG; Tel.: 2835 1109)	Responses
<p>Our comments on <u>Appendix 5 - Environmental Assessment, Appendix 6 - Air Quality Impact Assessment</u> are as below:</p> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>The AQIA (Appendix 6) at current stage is not complete, in particular that (i) major point source within 4km (i.e. Kai Tak Cruise Terminal) has not been included in the cumulative assessment, (ii) the assumption on portal/ventilation building emission is unclear and not justified as no confirmation or response from tunnel operator is provided, and (iii) % of minor roads for calculation vehicular start emission is incorrect.</p>	<p>(i) Potential emissions from Kai Tak Cruise Terminal have been included in the revised AQIA report attached at Appendix 6 of the updated Planning Statement.</p> <p>(ii) Since the operator cannot provide such information, the assumptions in the approved EIA report (i.e. reference 6 in the AQIA report) on portal/ventilation building emission has been adopted.</p> <p>(iii) Updated TD data in 2024 has been provided and used in the calculation.</p>
<p>The consultant should confirm with the tunnel operator whether the ventilation building would extract air from the tunnel and whether there is any air pollution control equipment (with removal efficiency) for the ventilation building.</p>	<p>Noted, please see our response to item (ii) in the comment above.</p>
<p><u>Appendix 6 – AQIA</u></p> <p>1) Section 1.4.4 –</p> <p>a) Please supplement “on the Proposed Scheme during operation phase” in line 3.</p>	<p>Updated accordingly in section 1.4.4.</p>
<p>b) Please check if the figure should be referred to “Figure 2-1”.</p>	<p>Updated accordingly in section 1.4.4.</p>
<p>2) Section 2.1.2 – Major point source should be within 4km for cumulative quantitative assessment. Please revise the 1st sentence.</p>	<p>Updated accordingly in section 2.1.2.</p>

3) Section 2.2 – Please supplement HKPSG buffer distance requirements.	Supplemented accordingly.
4) Section 2.2.3 – Please place heading before Section 2.2.3.	Updated accordingly.
5) Section 2.2.4 and 2.2.5 – Please delete these paragraphs.	Deleted accordingly.
6) Section 2.2.8 – Please explain why this is applicable to this proposed development.	Deleted accordingly after review.
7) Section 2.2.12 – Please supplement “ <u>and major point source within 4km from the Proposed Development (Tier 3)</u> ” in the last line.	Updated accordingly.
8) Section 2.2.18 – Please delete this section.	Deleted accordingly.
9) Section 2.2.20 – Please state the full name of SAMP when first mention.	Updated accordingly.
10) Section 2.2.21: Please clarify the approach for short-term and long-term as used in this assessment.	The annual minimum temperature and relative humidity were adopted for prediction of short-term and long-term averages of NO ₂ , RSP and FSP. This is added in Section 3.1.13.
11) Section 2.3.1 – Please rectify typo “., it” in line 2.	Updated accordingly.
12) Section 2.3.1, 2.3.2, Table 2.2 – a) AQMS data from 2020 to 2024 are available in SAMP v.2.1. Please update.	Updated accordingly in Table 2.2.
b) Please update the 2nd and last column of Table 2.2 with new AQOs and review whether the concentrations exceeded the new AQOs.	Updated accordingly in Table 2.2.
c) Please supplement in Table 2.2 for 24-hour NO ₂ and peak season ozone, and supplement if no CO data is available.	Updated accordingly in Table 2.2.
13) Section 2.3.3 – Please delete “Year 2026 (targeted commence year) and” in line 4 and “as a worst-case scenario” in the last line.	Deleted accordingly.
14) Section 2.3.3, 2.3.4, Table 2.3 – a) Please update the 3rd and 4th column of Table 2.3 with new AQOs and review whether the concentrations exceeded the new AQOs.	Updated accordingly.
b) Please supplement in Table 2.3 for peak season ozone and 24-hour CO.	Updated accordingly.
c) Please include all PATH grids of the 500m assessment area.	Updated accordingly.
d) Concentration of 24-hour NO ₂ in Table 2.3 is incorrect. Please rectify.	Updated accordingly.

e) Please provide the level of PATH data.	Updated accordingly.
15) Section 2.3.4 – a) Please reference to the latest Air Quality in Hong Kong report.	Updated accordingly.
b) Please change “AQOS” to “AQOs”.	Updated accordingly.
16) Section 2.4.1 – The section is incomplete. Please supplement the criteria of determination of ASRs.	Noted. Section 2.4.1 has been revised to supplement the determination criteria of ASRs, such as the inclusion of the floors of residential use and their assessment heights (mPD).
17) Section 2.4.2 – a) Since the proposed development is in early design stage, please assign ASRs at the site boundary at suitable heights.	Updated accordingly.
b) The meaning of “one ASR will be selected in the middle of the Project Site. The elevations of ASRs are assigned at the Low Zone of the Project Site.” Is unclear. Please clarify.	Deleted accordingly after review.
18) Table 2.4 – c) Please provide the assessment heights (in mAG or mPD).	Updated accordingly.
d) Please revise to “ASR ID” in 1st column header.	Updated accordingly.
19) Section 3.1.2 (c) – Please revise to “represents background contributions <u>and major point source within 4km from the Proposed Development.</u> ”	Updated accordingly.
20) Section 3.1.3: Please clarify why “5 coach parking sites” is mentioned in this paragraph.	"5 coach parking sites" was deleted since it is not relevant here. This paragraph has been revised.
21) Section 3.1.5 – Please provide more information on the paper artifact furnace to justify that no adverse air quality impact is anticipated from the furnace, including the followings: a) Please specify whether the “funeral services building” is Hong Kong Funeral Home.	It is Hong Kong Funeral Home, updated accordingly in report.

b) The quoted source said that the de-smoke system of paper artifact furnace in Hong Kong Funeral Home is in construction. Please check if it is in operation already.	De-smoke system of paper artifact furnace in Hong Kong Funeral Home is in operation.
c) Please specify that EPD's Guidelines on Air Pollution Control for Paper Artifacts Burning at Funeral Parlours and Other Places of Worship should be followed.	The EPD's Guidelines on Air Pollution Control for Paper Artifacts Burning at Funeral Parlours and Other Places of Worship has been included in the Section 2.2.
d) Please show the location of the funeral services building on a figure.	Figure of the location of the funeral services building is listed in Figure 2-1.
22) Section 3.1.6 – It is not justified to exclude Kai Tak Cruise Terminal in the cumulative quantitative assessment simply because the contour of SO2 in previous approved EIA reports did not have any exceedance in within 500m of their assessment areas, which did not cover the proposed development. The proposed development is only 1.7 km from and have direct line of sight to Kai Tak Cruise Terminal, and is susceptible to the impacts also on SO2, NO2, RSP and FSP. Please include the emissions from the hoteling at Kai Tak Cruise Terminal in the quantitative assessment.	The potential emissions from Kai Tak Cruise Terminal has been included in the revised report. The modelling information and assumptions for SO2, NO2, RSP and FSP from the cruises hoteling make reference to the approved AQIA report - S16 for Proposed 'Flat' (In-situ Conversion) in "Commercial (7)" Zone, No. 18 Salisbury Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon (Kowloon Inland Lot No. 9844 (part)) (Application No. A/K1/273).
23) Please show the 4km assessment area and indicate major point source within 4km in a figure.	It is indicated in Figure 2-2 in the revised submission.
24) A pier-like structure at North Point Fire Station is observed. Please check with FSD on whether there would be any associated marine emission. Also, please check whether there would be any regular ferries/ vessels passing through the assessment area. Please revise Section 3.1.8 if marine emission would be included.	An enquiry was made regarding any Fire Services Department (FSD) vessels berthed at the North Point Fire Station. According to the FSD's response, the vessels there are solely for emergency services. A review has also confirmed that no regular ferries or vessels pass through the 500 m assessment area. The above was added to Section 3.1.6 of the revised AQIA report.
25) Section 3.1.11 and Appendix C – Please provide TD's endorsement on the traffic data.	The traffic data has been submitted to Traffic Department and endorsement in process.
26) Section 3.1.12 – Please remove the last sentence.	Deleted accordingly.

<p>27) Section 3.1.13 – ATC 2024 has been released. Please update all relevant parts and the “Proportion of Roads with Potential Start within Hong Kong” in SAMP accordingly. Please derive % of VKT for RRs and LDs as the proportion of roads with potential start within Hong Kong based on the latest ATC. Also, please briefly describe the broad-brush approach and clarify which roads have considered start emissions.</p>	<p>The raw data from TD for ATC 2024 has been obtained. The VKT figures presented in the Table under Section 3.4 of ATC 2024 can be reproduced.</p> <p>Based on the VKT data used in the TD’s ATC 2024, the percentage of VKT for RRs and LDs as the proportion of roads within Hong Kong is calculated as 21.0%, which is adopted as the roads with start emissions.</p> <p>The broad-brush approach is now briefly discussed accordingly. The roads with start emissions are specified in Appendix E.</p>
<p>28) For vehicular emission, please clarify whether there is any PTI, bus depots, heavy goods vehicle and coach parking sites (e.g. FEHD Transport Section Quarry Bay Depot, Vehicle Pounds of Hong Kong Police Force) that would need to use precise approach for start emission within the 500m assessment area.</p>	<p>There are no emission sources of Public Transport Interchange (PTI) or bus depots within the 500 m assessment area. The heavy goods vehicle and coach parking sites at the FEHD Transport Section Quarry Bay Depot and Vehicle Pounds of Hong Kong Police Force could be potential emission sources. However, these facilities will be relocated outside the 500 m assessment area in 2026 and therefore will not contribute to any significant impacts during the operational phase of the proposed Project. Please refer to section 3.1.4 of the revised AQIA.</p>
<p>29) Section 3.1.16 – a) No tunnel operation’s response is provided in appendices. Please supplement.</p>	<p>The tunnel operator’s response is now included in the Appendix G of the AQIA.</p>
<p>b) Please clarify the meaning of “the ventilation building does not emit excessive pollutants under normal operating conditions.” (only exhaust smoke under fire or emergency?). Please confirm with the tunnel operator whether the ventilation building would extract air from the tunnel and any air pollution control equipment (with removal efficiency) is provided. If the ventilation building does not extract air from the tunnel, 100% of the emission should be assumed emitted from the tunnel portal.</p>	<p>The tunnel operator was contacted again with a more specific enquiry (Appendix G). He was asked whether data on the proportion of emissions attributable to the Ventilation Building of the Eastern Harbour Crossing is available. As no such information is provided, the assumption adopted in the approved EIA report for the Tseung Kwan O–Lam Tin Tunnel and Associated Works (AEIAR-173/2013) is used instead.</p>

30) Table 4.1 – Please insert a row for AQOs.	Updated accordingly.
31) Figure 2-1 –	
a) Hoi Shin Lane is missing in Line Source – Road.	Updated accordingly.
b) Please indicate the planned ASR of the proposed development in the figure.	Updated accordingly.
c) Please overlay PATH grids.	Updated accordingly in figure 2-1.
d) Please show the noise barriers in the assessment area and indicate whether they are semi-enclosed or fully enclosed.	Updated accordingly in figure 2-1.
32) Figure 2-2 to 2-4 – Please supplement north arrow.	Updated accordingly.
33) Please provide figures in higher resolution.	Noted.
34) Appendix B – The figure and appendix name seem irrelevant. Please review.	All figures and appendices are updated.
35) Appendix D –	
a) Please provide road link map overlaid with PATH grids, and show which roads have start emissions.	Noted.
b) Local distributor roads aren't applied with starting emissions (e.g., Hoi Shin Lane, Pan Hoi Street, Tai Koo Wan Road, Tai Yue Avenue, etc.). But some PD, UT and DD e.g. part of King's Road, Java Road, Pak Fuk Road, RD_142 has considered start emissions. Please clarify.	Updated accordingly.
36) Appendix G – Please improve the readability of the table.	Noted, the table has been revised to improve the readability (now Appendix M).
37) Appendix H	Noted.
a) Please show the AQO for each pollutant and shade the exceedance zone.	
b) Please highlight the contours at the concentration at the AQOs.	Noted.
c) If there is any exceedance zone, please state clearly on the contour maps whether there are any air sensitive uses within the exceedance zone.	Noted.
d) Please provide the heights of the contour maps.	Noted, the heights of the contour maps are now provided.

38) Please discuss if there is any odour impact to and from the proposed development.	It is discussed accordingly in Sections 3.1.8 and 5.1.3.
39) Please highlight all changes in the next submission.	The changes are highlighted in blue for easy reference.
40) Please rectify the grammatical mistakes and improve the readability of the report.	Noted, reviewed and rectified.
41) Appendix B: the consultant should obtain the confirmation from the tunnel operator to confirm that the ventilation building would extract air from the tunnel, so there will be emission from the ventilation building. The consultant should consult the tunnel operator to obtain the most updated and accurate data regarding the emission split of the portal and ventilation building. Assumption (e.g. referencing Eastern Harbour Crossing Kowloon Bound in the approved EIA report) can be made if the operator cannot provide such information. The consultant should also confirm with the operator whether there is any pollution control equipment (with removal efficiency) for the ventilation building.	Further update and clarification were made to the tunnel operator to obtain most updated data and to seek confirmation. However, as the operator cannot supply the requested data, we have adopted the emission split based on the approved Eastern Harbour Crossing (Kowloon Bound) EIA, which has a similar configuration in this AQIA.
<u>Appendix 5 – Environmental Assessment</u>	Noted and the Environmental Assessment will contain constructional AQIA in Appendix 5 while the Quantitative AQIA (operational) is included in Appendix 6 .
1) General – As a separate operational quantitative AQIA is submitted, it is suggested to include constructional AQIA in Appendix 5 and refer the operational AQIA to Appendix 6.	
2) Section 2.2 – Please supplement Cap. 311I Air Pollution Control (Fuel Restriction) Regulations.	Included in Section 2.2.
3) Section 2.2.7 – Please explain why this is applicable to this proposed development.	Section 2.2.7 is now removed.
4) Section 2.2.9 – Please supplement the buffer distance requirements for odour and dusty sources.	The buffer distance requirements for odour and dusty sources are listed.
5) Table 2.2 – Please repeat header if the table spans in next page.	Noted.
6) Section 2.3 – Please update to align with Appendix 6.	Updated and now aligned.

7) Section 2.4.1 – As separate operational AQIA is conducted, the list of ASRs can be limited to construction phase in this environmental assessment. Please revise this section.	Noted. The list of ASR in section 2.4 is revised.
8) Table 2.6 – a) Please revise to “ASR ID” in 1st column header.	The header of Column 1 has been revised.
b) Please revise to “Representative ASRs...during Construction Phase” in the table name.	The title of the table has been updated.
c) Suggest to remove A1-A3 as they are not ASRs during construction phase.	A1, A2 and A3 (indicated in the previous EA) are removed from the Table.
d) Please provide building heights.	The building heights in reference to the Open3DHK website is provided as the Column 6.
e) Please identify Quarry Bay Promenade at near Quarry Bay Tide Station, Quarry Bay Park Community Garden as ASRs. Please check if there is any office at Quarry Bay Salt Water Pumping Station, MTR Corporation Quarry Bay Substation, EHT Quarry Bay Ventilation Building, FEHD Transport Section Quarry Bay Depot and HKPF Quarry Bay Vehicle Pound that should be identified as ASRs.	The locations of the ASRs have been updated in the report. The Quarry Bay Saltwater Pumping Station, MTR Corporation Quarry Bay Substation, EHT Quarry Bay Ventilation Building are observed to be unmanned facilities, which will not be identified as ASRs.
f) Locations of ASRs should be identified at the nearest point to the proposed development. Please review the location of A4 and A15 in Figure 2-1 and their separation distance in Table 2.6.	The locations of the ASRs representing the Boardwalk and the Quarry Bay Promenade have been updated.
9) Section 2.5.3 – Please specify the date of site visit and indicate the location of the concurrent project in a figure.	The date of site visit was the 28th May 2025, and is included in Section 2.5.3.
10) Section 2.5.5, 2.5.6 – Noted that the no. of construction trucks and equipment, size of excavation and volume of excavated materials will be determined in detailed design stage. Instead of saying that detailed analysis or assessment will be conducted, please elaborate on the size of construction site, whether mitigation measures of relevant regulations will be followed. Please revise the last sentences of these 2 sections.	The last sentences of these 2 sections have been revised.

11) Section 2.5.6 – Please replace “fugitive dust” with “air quality impact” in line 6.	Revised.
12) Section 2.5.7 – Please replace “affecting” with “affected” and “fugitive dust” with “air quality” in the 2nd last line.	Revised.
13) Section 2.5.9 – Please revise to “ <u>Air quality</u> impact can be effectively...” in line 1.	Revised.
14) Section 2.6.2 – a) Please remove the heading “Identification of Emission Source”.	Revised.
b) ATC 2024 is released. Please update line 3-4.	Revised.
15) Section 2.6.3 – a) Please replace “buffer distance” with “assessment area” in line 2.	The assessment area in line 2 is updated.
b) Please delete “Site investigation was ...” and onwards to 2.6.6. Please mention that as the proposed development cannot meet the HKPSG buffer distance requirement for trunk road, a detailed quantitative assessment is conducted in Appendix 6 to evaluate the operational air quality impact to the planned ASRs of the proposed development.	Paragraph updated.
16) Section 2.7 – Please rewrite the conclusion for operational air quality impact (starting from line 4) by mentioning the findings and conclusion of the quantitative AQIA.	The conclusion in Section 2.7 is updated.
17) Figure 2-1 – a) Please overlay PATH grids.	The PATH grids have been added to Figure 2.1.
b) Please show ASR IDs.	The ASR IDs have been shown on the Figure 2.1 in replace of the name of the ASRs.

<p><u>Air Modelling</u></p> <p><i>Missing Information</i></p> <p>1) Model output files showing the hour-by-hour concentrations at each receptor have not been provided. The correctness of the modelling results in this submission cannot be verified due to the missing files. Please provide in the next submission.</p>	<p>Model output files with the hour-by-hour concentrations at each receptor are provided in the revised submission.</p>
<p><i>Modeling discrepancies</i></p> <p>1) Appendix F: AQMS data with years 2020 – 2024 for Jenkin Method are available and can be used for the assessment. Please update.</p>	<p>Accordingly, the AQMS data with years 2020 – 2024 for Jenkin Method is used in the revised submission.</p>
<p>2) The “ME PROFBASE” value in the AERMOD input file needs to match with the elevation value in “xxyy.in1” input file for AERMET. Please correct it in the AERMOD input files.</p>	<p>It is amended accordingly. The “ME PROFBASE” value in the AERMOD input file is matched with the elevation value in “xxyy.in1” input file for AERMET for the revised submission.</p>
<p>3) The population for the urban option seems wrong. Please review and update as appropriate.</p>	<p>The population for the urban option uses the population in Eastern District for the revised submission.</p>
<p>4) Vehicular PM2.5 emission rates do not match with that from the SAMP output. Please rectify.</p>	<p>It is rectified in the revised submission.</p>
<p>5) Result calculation in the provided spreadsheet for short-term averaging periods are incorrect. The PATH background and the Tier 2 contribution were not paired in time (i.e. not from the same hour of the year). The concentrations at an ASR should be first calculated hour by hour for all 8,760 annual hours and sorted in descending order to identify the required ranked value (e.g. 19th highest hourly NO2).</p>	<p>In the revised submission, for short-term averaging periods the PATH background and the Tier 2 contribution are paired in time. The concentrations at an ASR are first calculated hour by hour for all 8,760 hours and sorted in descending order.</p>
<p>6) Result calculation in the provided spreadsheet for Annual NO2 is incorrect. NOx background from PATH needs to be added to the Tier 1 and Tier 2 results before applying the Jenkin method to obtain the cumulative annual NO2 value.</p>	<p>In the revised submission, for annual NO2, NOx background from PATH is added to the Tier 1 and Tier 2 results before applying the Jenkin method.</p>

<p><i>Textual / Presentation comments</i></p> <p>1) Table 2.2: Please review the daily FSP value and the rank should be 19th highest instead of 36th highest.</p>	<p>The daily FSP value is reviewed and the rank of 19th highest is revised.</p>
<p>2) s.2.4.2: Please clarify what “Low Zone of the project site” mean when discussing the elevations of ASRs.</p>	<p>“Low Zone” is removed. S 2.4.2 is revised.</p>
<p>3) s.3.1.3: The paragraph describing the type of sources is confusing. Please review and revise as appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted. The paragraph is reviewed and revised accordingly.</p>
<p>4) P136, contour for annual NO2: please use a different colour for the contour lines that exceeded the AQO for a better presentation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><u>Noise Impact Assessment</u></p> <p>Our major concern on traffic noise impact and bring to their attention that exhaustive noise mitigation measures including single aspect building design, architectural fins, acoustic windows and balconies...etc. would be required in the building design, please find our comments below:</p>	<p>Noted. These measures will be included as mitigation measures.</p>
<p><i>General Comment</i></p> <p>The site located on Hoi Yu Street in Quarry Bay is proposed to be developed into residential, commercial and cultural facilities. From our quick noise assessment, <u>the proposed residential use could be severely affected by noise from the Island East Corridor (IEC), in particular the facades facing the IEC could expose to traffic noise level above 80dB(A) and the northern side facing away the IEC could still expose to traffic noise level of around 78dB(A).</u></p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Furthermore, fixed noise sources, e.g. ventilation system, from the Proposed Development and existing building may also be a concern. Although such noise impacts could be mitigated through combination of appropriate building design and noise mitigation measures including single aspect building design, architectural fins, acoustic windows and balconies...etc., the applicant should clearly demonstrate and confirm in the present submission that such exhaustive and appropriate noise mitigation measures are feasible and will be implemented</p>	<p>Noted. Appropriate noise mitigation measures are considered feasible and will be included in the Section 16 Application when more detailed design is undertaken. The present analysis indicates that the proposals will be able to fully mitigate the adverse road traffic noise impact so as to be in compliance with the HKPSG standards.</p>

<p>at the detailed design stage of the development to fully mitigate the adverse road traffic noise impact. A proper NIA should also be required under relevant planning approval condition and/or land title document with the above noise mitigation requirements be clearly conveyed to the developer.</p>	
<p>With the above general comment, we also have some quick observations on the Environmental Assessment (EA) as given below. As the current EA is prepared to facilitate the consideration of the captioned S12A application for which construction noise assessment is not required, we would not go into the technical noise details of the construction noise assessment in the report. The Applicant should note that our observations are not exhaustive and nothing shall bind us in making a decision or providing further comments on the future NIA(s).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Comment: 1) 3.7.5: Noise model and traffic flow need to be provided for assessing and checking the predicted road traffic noise level.</p>	<p>Noted. The traffic noise model is provided in conjunction with the revised Environmental Assessment report. The traffic flow adopted for the traffic noise modelling is supplemented as Appendix B of the revised Environmental Assessment report. The traffic noise model has been updated since the previous submission due to the slight change of the building elevation.</p>
<p>2) Table 3.7 Spotted that the Sound Power Level adopted are unreasonably low.</p>	<p>We are aware that the Sound Power Level shown in Table 3.7 might be less accurate because they are referenced from aged or other information, and some of the references did not document the measurement methodology. A full NIA will be prepared in relation to the Section 16 planning application stage. The fixed plant noise assessment of the Environmental Assessment report could be updated to a qualitative one. Table 3.7 and the relevant fixed plant noise calculation has been removed accordingly. Given observations during the site visit, the fixed noise impact on the development from the three identified sources is unlikely to be an issue and could be mitigated in future, if necessary.</p>

<p><u>Waste Management</u></p> <p>1) Contents –</p> <p>i) The page number "0" appears to be incorrect. Please correct the page number for WASTE MANAGEMENT section and the subsequent sections.</p>	<p>Page number is now updated and revised.</p>
<p>ii) Please review whether the title "Land Contamination" should be capitalized to align with other titles.</p>	<p>The title is now updated.</p>
<p>iii) Please correct the typo: "CLUSIONS".</p>	<p>The typo is now corrected.</p>
<p>2) Sections 5.5.3 & 5.5.5 – In Section 5.5.3, it states that "Inert C&D materials will be used on-site as backfilling as much as possible before transporting to PFRFs. It is estimated that all inert C&D materials will be transported to PFRFs." However, Section 5.5.5 mentions, "It is conservatively assumed that the excavated materials will only be reused within the corresponding site where the materials are generated." Please clarify whether any inert C&D materials will be used on-site as backfilling or if all of them will be sent to PFRFs.</p>	<p>If inert C&D materials are to be reused, they will only be reused within the Site. Otherwise, they will be transported to PFRFs.</p> <p>The last sentence of section 5.5.5 is revised to “It is conservatively assumed that if any excavated materials are to be reused, they will only be reused within the corresponding site where the materials are generated.”</p>
<p>3) Section 5.5.9 – Figure 5.2 cannot be found in the submission. Please supplement.</p>	<p>This was a typo and reference to Figure 5.2 is deleted. This section 5.5.9 refers to the architectural drawings in Appendix 3 of the Planning Statement.</p>
<p>4) Table 5.2 – Please complete each column of the table.</p>	<p>No marine sediment is expected to be encountered from the excavation of basement. Table 5.2 removed accordingly.</p>
<p>5) Section 5.5.13 – Please correct to "a few litre per month".</p>	<p>Revised.</p>
<p>6) Table 5.3 –</p> <p>i) Please clarify how the figure of 92,152m³ is calculated and share the calculation formula.</p>	<p>Now Table 5.2.</p> <p>Figure reviewed and revised to 93,852 m³.</p>

<p>ii) Regarding Inert C&D Materials, it is confusing that on-site reuse is listed as zero, while on-site reuse before disposal to PFRFs is also mentioned. Please clarify whether on-site reuse will occur. Additionally, please update the column for Marine Sediment to address similar confusion.</p>	<p>Revised to “Transport to PFRFs at Tseung Kwan O Area 137”.</p>
<p>7) Section 5.5.20 and relevant sections - At present, most of Hong Kong's food waste is disposed of at landfills together with other municipal solid waste (MSW). In 2023, 10,884 tonnes of MSW were disposed of at landfills daily. About 3,191 tonnes (29%) of these were food waste, constituting the largest MSW category. Food waste collection has been promogulated as a government initiative, especially in new government building. The Project Proponent shall review and explore the possibility of collecting food waste alongside other recyclables during the operational phase.</p>	<p>Section 5.5.20 revised.</p>
<p>8) Section 5.6 – Please clarify whether marine sediment should be included in the section.</p>	<p>Section 5.6.18 added for the mitigation measures of marine sediment.</p>
<p>9) Section 5.7.2 - Please clarify whether marine sediment should be included in the section.</p>	<p>As marine sediment is not anticipated upon review of the information. No changes for section 5.7.2.</p>
<p>10) Section 5.7.4 – Please clarify whether commercial activities should be included in addition to housing residents.</p>	<p>Section 5.7.4 revised.</p>
<p>11) Section 6.3.4 – The reply from EPD is missing from Appendix D. Please supplement.</p>	<p>Reply from EPD supplemented in Appendix F.</p>
<p>12) Appendix D – Please supplement the enquiry letters (with location plan) sent to the government departments and their replies as supporting documents.</p>	<p>Enquiry letters supplemented in Appendix F.</p>

13) Section 6.3.5 – Since a public fill barging point is designated for transferring public fill, it is suggested to analyse the nature of inert C&D materials to demonstrate that no land contamination issues are involved.	Section 6.3.5 revised to “The Temporary Quarry Bay Public Fill Barging Point was operated by the CEDD to collect and deliver inert construction and demolition materials in the past. The temporary barging point was closed in December 2008. Considering this facility was previously managed, and eventually terminated by a government authority, and that inert C&D materials consist of rocks, concrete, asphalt, rubbles, bricks, stones and earth that do not include any chemicals and organic wastes, it is very unlikely that the activity there caused land contamination issue.”
14) Section 8.1.15 – i) Please clarify whether asbestos-containing materials are anticipated for this project.	“Asbestos-containing materials” removed as no ACM are anticipated from this Project.
ii) Please review if marine sediment should be included.	As marine sediment is not anticipated upon review of the information. No changes for section 8.1.15.
15) Section 8.1.17 - Please clarify whether commercial activities should be included in addition to housing residents.	Revised.

Response to South Development and Sustainable Lantau Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department Comments

Comments of South Development and Sustainable Lantau Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (Contact person: Mr. Hugo KWOK; Tel.: 3842 7032)	Responses
1. As we have mentioned in our previous response, our Contractor is currently carrying out the site works of the project “Boardwalk underneath Island Eastern Corridor”. The major site works of the Boardwalk project would be completed by end of 2025 tentatively, while the remaining minor site works are anticipated to be completed by mid 2026. Harbour Office (HO) of DevB will be the management party of the completed Boardwalk.	Noted.

<p>2. Subject to the captioned application not having interface with, or affecting the current construction works for the Boardwalk project by this office, we have no comment on the captioned application from the viewpoints of project interface. Please alert this office if that's not the case.</p>	<p>Noted, the S.12A application will not affect the current construction works for the Boardwalk project.</p>
<p>3. Nevertheless, it is noted that the Applicant has proposed certain works schemes under the application that may amend/have interface with the arrangement of the completed Boardwalk in the future. Hence, please seek comment from HO (the management party of the completed Boardwalk) and/or other B/Ds as appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted, HO and/or other relevant B/Ds will be consulted as appropriate.</p>
<p>4. On the other hand, the latest schematic layout for the revised arrangement of Hoi Yu Street and the eastern end of the Boardwalk is appended for the information of the Applicant (Annex B refers). The attached file is a schematic layout and hence it does not contain details of relevant works, which may be subject to revision from time to time as appropriate. Also, please do not disclose the layout to any other external parties and keep it for the internal reference by the Applicant only and as necessary.</p>	<p>Noted, thank you.</p>

Response to District Lands Office, Lands Department Comments

Comments of District Lands Office, Lands Department (Contact person: Mr. Jimmy WONG; Tel.: 2835 1661)	Responses
<p>1. It is noted that the subject site would comprise portion of Inland Lot 8590 RP and portion of Inland Lot 8723 RP and a large piece of adjoining government land. Please note that the proposed in-situ land exchange application of the subject site (i.e. proposed Inland Lot No. 9077) is being handled by Land Supply Section, LandsD ("LSS"), I shall defer to LSS to provide their comments on the subject item directly.</p>	<p>Noted. Subject to the current s.12A application and subsequent planning application(s) is/are approved by TPB, the applicant will apply to LandsD for a land exchange.</p>

2. Apart from the above, other land uses affected by the proposed amendments are summarized below. The applicant is required to consult concerned parties for comments/consents as appropriate.

Land Affected	Status	Concerned Parties	Remarks / User
GLA-THK 1891		LCSD	Promenade cum pet garden
HKM9698		LCSD	Deposit area Quarry Bay Promenade
MTR Protection Boundary		MTRCL	Railway Protection Plan Boundary – MTRL 1 RP, MTRL 2 RP & MTRL 3
GLA-THK 261/EHGS/87		SMO of LandsD	Geodetic Survey Control Station No. 200054
STTHE0066		TD and DEVB (HO)	A fee-paying public carpark

Noted.

3. Given proposed footbridge across the Island Eastern Corridor connecting the subject site with the Quarry Bay Park does **NOT** form part of the application site, we reserve our comments on this aspect. Notwithstanding this, future management and maintenance responsibility of the said footbridge should be identified by the applicant at early stage.

Noted.

3rd Batch of Departmental Comments

Response to Transport Department Comments

Comments of Transport Department (Contact person: Ms. Jodie CHAN; Tel.: 2829 5410)	Responses
<p>We have the following comments on the subject planning application from the traffic engineering viewpoint:</p> <p><u>Comments on Pedestrian Study</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With reference to the Quarry Bay OZP no. S/H21/28, there shall be an elevated pedestrian link to connect the concerned site with Hoi Tai Street. The elevated pedestrian link is considered essential to improve the pedestrian accessibility of the Application Site and should be contingent upon the development, which shall be commissioned before the population intake/operation of the development. 	<p>Noted. The elevated footbridge connecting waterfront and Quarry Bay Park would be commissioned before the population intake/operation of the development. The detailed design and program of the footbridge will be provided in due course should the S.12A application be accepted by the Town Planning Board, and is subject to further discussion and agreement with the relevant government departments.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. It is noted that there is a proposed footbridge to connect the concerned site with Quarry Bay Park (under LCSD) and Hoi Shin Lane (under LandsD) as a replacement to the elevated pedestrian link under the Quarry Bay OZP which will affect the operation of Quarry Bay Park and Hoi Shin Lane. LCSD and LandsD shall be consulted about the design, construction and operation of the proposed replacement. 	<p>Noted, LCSD and LandsD have been consulted through the circulation of the S.12A application by Planning Department. Their comments and our response are included in this RtC document.</p> <p>Please refer to item 1 of LCSD's comment and item 6&7 of LandsD's comments respectively.</p>

<p>3. Figure 7 – The “Missing Ground-level Pedestrian Link” (indicated by red arrows) seems infeasible in view of the limited headroom of the area under the IEC flyover (i.e. about 1m).</p>	<p>The red arrow is a conceptual indication to show the missing ground-level pedestrian link in the existing situation, which has been revised to align with CEDD’s scheme for the East Coast Boardwalk project (see Appendix 1 of the Planning Statement). The ground-level connection is proposed to connect from Quarry Bay Park, via the “Open Space” zone indicated in Figure 6 of the Pedestrian Study, to the area under the IEC currently being constructed by CEDD as part of the East Coast Boardwalk project for pedestrian access.</p>
<p>4. Section 7 (Estimates of Pedestrian Flows) – Please refer to our comments on the Traffic Impact Assessment below.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><u>Comments on Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA)</u></p> <p>5. Table 2.1 – for 26,545m² domestic area of flats with sizes range from 45-105m², the number of flats shall range from 252 to 590. Please review and clarify the number of flats. The provision of internal transport facilities (Table 2.2) and the traffic generation (Table 4.10) shall be updated accordingly.</p>	<p>Please kindly note that maximum number of 225 flats will be provided with total 26,545 m² domestic area while the flat mix will be further developed in S.16 stage.</p>
<p>6. Table 2.2 –</p> <p>(a) The parking provision assessment shall base on a notional scheme of flat sizes and with reference to Table 11, Section 1, Chapter 8 of HKPSG</p>	<p>We would like to clarify that no notional scheme would be provided at the S.12A stage. The current estimation of provision of internal transport facilities is based on the maximum flat number and appropriate flat size to provide maximum car park provision (the upper end of the requirement of HKPSG) for conservative approach.</p>
<p>(b) For the cultural facilities, please substantiate the proposed provision of parking and loading/unloading facilities with reference to any existing cultural facilities of similar scale and nature.</p>	<p>Please kindly note that the proposed cultural venue would be operated by controlled time slot (visitor flow could be controlled to be constant) which is not similar to the conventional cultural venues. References of the cultural events/venues with similar operation arrangement in Hong Kong are shown below:</p>

	Cultural venue	Car Park	Loading/unloading
	Naked Flowers 1881	Nil	Nil
	teamLab:Continuous Life	Nil	Nil
	Hong Kong Cultural Center	Nil	1 cargo lift
	Hong Kong Space Museum	Nil	Nil
	Hong Kong Science Museum	Nil	1 Loading/unloading Area (no specific numbers of LUL bay)
	Proposed Quarry Bay Cultural Venue	50	3
	<p>It was observed that no/limited parking and loading/unloading facilities were provided. Therefore, the actual operational demand for parking and loading/unloading of the proposed cultural venue was estimated by the past experiences of the potential operator (i.e. the digital museum). Currently, 50 nos. of car park space and 3 nos. of loading/unloading bay have been provided which is more than that of the similar cultural events/venues in Hong Kong.</p>		
7. Section 2.3 – Please refer to comment no. 1 above and review.	Noted. Please refer to item 1.		
8. Clause 3.4.1 and Table 3.2 – Surveys were carried out based on the pedestrian route as shown in Figure 2.6 which shall include Model Lane.	Noted. The footpath of Model Lane has been included in the revised TIA.		

<p>9. Clause 4.4.3 and Table 4.6 – The clause stated that “traffic trips rate of office > traffic trips rate of residential” which contradicts the statement “traffic generations for residential development have been adopted... as a conservative approach” in the same clause. Furthermore, adopting trip rates of the actual development parameters is preferred. Please review.</p>	<p>Noted. “traffic trips rate of office > traffic trips rate of residential” has been removed to avoid contradictions and Clause 4.4.3 has been revised accordingly. According to Town Planning Board (TPB), the planning application (for the change of use from residential use to office use) of the planned development was rejected in 2020[A/H21/151A]. No further update of the development could be found in public domain and the site is always permitted to be redeveloped as residential use under the current OZP, therefore, it is assumed the residential development will be in place with the same parameter (GFA) as the rejected office development.</p>														
<p>10. Table 4.5.2 – Please clarify whether “11.1% of the visitors would come during the PM peak hours” means that 11.1% of the daily visitors would come in each hour (i.e. 556/hour), including the PM peak hours of the daily traffic. Please also advise some examples of similar cultural venues/digital museums which shows such constant “come and go” pattern throughout a day.</p>	<p>We would like to confirm that 11.1% of the visitors would come during the PM peak hours” means that 11.1% of the daily visitors would come in each hour (i.e. 556/hour), including the PM peak hours of the daily traffic.</p> <p>The example of cultural venues with of “come and go” pattern are as shown in below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1144 863 2130 1241"> <thead> <tr> <th>Cultural venues</th> <th>Country</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Impressions of Monet: The Experience</td> <td>Singapore</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Avatar: The Experience</td> <td>Singapore</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ramses and the Great and the Gold of the Pharaohs</td> <td>Paris</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jurassic World: The Exhibition</td> <td>Sydney</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Harry Potter: Visions of Magic</td> <td>Cologne</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ArtScience Museum</td> <td>Singapore</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Cultural venues	Country	Impressions of Monet: The Experience	Singapore	Avatar: The Experience	Singapore	Ramses and the Great and the Gold of the Pharaohs	Paris	Jurassic World: The Exhibition	Sydney	Harry Potter: Visions of Magic	Cologne	ArtScience Museum	Singapore
Cultural venues	Country														
Impressions of Monet: The Experience	Singapore														
Avatar: The Experience	Singapore														
Ramses and the Great and the Gold of the Pharaohs	Paris														
Jurassic World: The Exhibition	Sydney														
Harry Potter: Visions of Magic	Cologne														
ArtScience Museum	Singapore														

11. **Table 4.9** – Please advise the distribution of traffic generation and attraction among various transport modes. According to the predicted passenger demand on various public transport modes arising from domestic units as well as cultural venue/digital museum, please advise the proposed enhancement of public transport service and improvement (if any) of public transport facilities to cater for the said surge of passenger demand for both domestic units as well as cultural venue/digital museum.

The transport modes shown in Table 4.9 applies to both traffic generation and attraction for the proposed development. It is assumed that same generation and attraction was adapted for the Cultural Venue/ Digital Museum.

The proposed development is well-served by existing public transport options, including a nearby MTR station, 54 franchised bus routes, 5 green mini-bus (GMB) routes, and numerous public light bus (PLB) services, the capacity of the aforesaid public transport are estimated below:

	Capacity (passengers)	Peak-hour Frequency	Peak-hour Capacity (passengers)
MTR	2500 per train	30	75000
54 franchised bus routes	100-130 per bus	181	18100 - 23530
5 green mini-bus (GMB) routes	19 per bus	12	228
public light bus (PLB) services	19 per bus	/	/
Total			93328 - 98758

Given the diversity and frequency of services, passenger demand from the new development will be distributed among multiple modes, minimizing the impact on any single service. The estimated peak 2-way pedestrian trips of the

	<p>proposed development are 276, 624 and 624 during the AM, Noon and PM peak hour respectively which are less than 1% of the capacity of the surrounding public transport. Therefore, the existing public transport network is considered well sufficient to accommodate the additional demand generated by the proposed development.</p> <p>No enhancement of public transport service/improvement of public transport facilities would be needed for the proposed development.</p>
<p>12. Table 4.10 –</p> <p>(a) The residential trip rates shall base on a notional scheme of flat sizes and with reference to Table 1, Appendix 1, Chapter 3 of TPDM Volume 1. Please also advise if the most critical trip generations/attractions have been demonstrated</p>	<p>We would like to clarify that no notional scheme would be provided at the S.12A stage. The most critical trip generations/attractions have been adopted based on the maximum flat number and appropriate flat size.</p>
<p>(b) Please substantiate the assumed trip generation/attraction with reference to any existing cultural facilities of similar scale and nature.</p>	<p>Please refer to our response of item 6(b).</p>
<p>13. Table 4.11 – Please clarify and advise the validity of your “in-house data” to justify your assumed pedestrian generation rate.</p>	<p>The “in-house data” is the summary of our trip rate survey of residential developments including the Floridian, Mount Parker Residences and Prima Villa with similar flat mix/nature of the proposed residential buildings conducted in 2024.</p>
<p>14. Figure 5.1 – Please find the comments below:</p> <p>(a) Please indicate horizontal curvature, lane width and footpath width.</p>	<p>Noted and revised.</p>
<p>(b) For 12m swept path analysis indicated in drawing no. AP1 and AP1A, it is marginal and part of coach is encroached into double white line. Please review.</p>	<p>Noted and revised.</p>
<p>(c) The cautionary crossing across Hoi Yu Street has been planned to be signalized. Please incorporate the proposal into the assessment.</p>	<p>Noted and revised.</p>

<p>15. Figure 5.2 – Please find the comments below:</p> <p>(a) Please advise the MOC and the RC of the junction with the proposed improvement.</p>	<p>Noted. The MOC and performance of the junction improvement have been included in the revised Figure 5.2 and Table 5.2 respectively.</p>
<p>(b) Please indicate horizontal curvature, lane width and footpath width.</p>	<p>Noted and revised.</p>
<p>(c) Please provide swept path analysis for 12m and 7m long vehicles to demonstrate smooth maneuvering of various types of vehicles from Hoi Chak Street to Hoi Tai Street and from Hoi Chak Street and Finnie Street.</p>	<p>Noted and the swept path analysis for 12m and 7m long vehicles has been shown in drawing AP6 of Appendix B.</p>
<p>(d) Please provide calculation sheet to demonstrate junction performance and the LOS of both waiting area and crosswalk under this traffic improvement scheme.</p>	<p>Please kindly note that the calculation sheet of the junction performance was included in Appendix A of the previous TIA report and the detailed calculation of crossings please refer to Appendix A2.</p>
<p>16. Please incorporate the responses into and revised the TIA report for our further review. The Planning Statement shall also be revised accordingly.</p>	<p>Noted and the response has been incorporated in the attached amended pages of TIA.</p>

4th Batch of Departmental Comments

Response to Buildings Department Comments

Comments of Buildings Department (Contact person: Mr. Vincent MAN; Tel.: 2626 1423)	Responses
1. In accordance with the Government’s committed policy to implement building design to foster a quality and sustainable built environment, the sustainable building design (SBD) requirements should be included, where possible, in the conditions in the planning approvals. Applicant should demonstrate the compliance with the SBD requirements to the satisfaction of Town Planning Board if necessary.	Noted. Upon the acceptance of this S.12A application, a S.16 application will subsequently be submitted to the Town Planning Board for approval, and the Applicant will demonstrate compliance with any conditions attached to the relevant S.16 planning approval in due course.
2. Based on the information provided in the town planning application document, it is not sure if the SBD requirements will be fully complied with for this scheme.	<p>Our preliminary checking of the Conceptual Scheme and Alternative Conceptual Scheme in response to sustainable building design under PNAP APP-152 indicates that the proposed schemes could comply with the requirement on façade length (LP) and permeability. The building setback could also be fulfilled with Island Eastern Corridor as a “specified street” which will be subject to further liaison with Building Department during GBP submission stage.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to ensure compliance with the relevant SBD requirements at the detailed design stage.</p>
3. If GFA concession will be applied for green/amenity features and non-mandatory/non-essential plant rooms and services, compliance with the pre-requisites as stipulated in PNAP APP-151 and the sustainable building design guidelines in PNAP APP-152 are required.	Noted.

<p>4. The proposed development intensity should not exceed the limits stipulated in the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R). As per the development parameters listed in the Table 2 of the Planning Statement, the proposed site coverage for domestic building exceeds the limit stipulated in B(P)R. In this connection, application of more flexible application of the requirements under Regulation 20 and 25 of the B(P)R under PNAP APP-132 may be considered upon building plans submission stage.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed site coverage for domestic building may be subject to change at the detailed design stage. Where required, the relevant application(s) for more flexible application of the requirements under Regulation 20 and 25 of the B(P)R under PNAP APP-132 will be submitted to the Buildings Department for consideration and approval at the building plans submission stage.</p>
<p>5. Without detailed information of the proposed developments, we are unable to offer comment on the proposed developments under the purview of the BO.</p>	<p>Noted. Detailed development schedule of the proposed development will be provided during GBP submission stage.</p>
<p>6. Detailed checking for compliance with BO will be made upon building plan submission stage.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>