

Attachment 4: Updated Table of Response to TD Comments

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

Response to Transport Department Comments

Comments of Transport Department	Responses																				
<p><u>Response on TD’s previous Comments</u></p> <p>3) For responses no. 6(a) and no. 12(a), please note that the trip rates in TPDM or the parking requirements in HKPSG are different for flats of different sizes. For example, if there would be 189 no of flats (with reference to Table 2 of the Planning Statement) with flat size of 140 Sq. m (assuming the maximized use of 26,545 sq. m domestic GFA), 195 number of PC parking spaces would be required. Under such scenario, additional 20+ numbers of parking spaces would be required, as per HKPSG. Your response that the assessment based on the maximum number of flats as a “conservative approach” is therefore unfounded. Please review and consider the most critical scenarios for traffic impact assessment.</p>	<p>Please note that some 189 flats and not more than 225 flats are proposed under this S12A planning application. To demonstrate that the most critical scenario has been considered in the TIA, a sensitivity test is conducted to review the internal parking and servicing provision required and potential traffic impacts to the nearby road network under different scenarios as shown in the following:</p> <p>Table 1 - Required Internal Transport Facilities Provision Under Different Scenarios</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Scenario 1</u> 225 flats, avg flat size at 118m²</th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Scenario 2</u> 189 flats, avg flat size at 140m²</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Car Parking</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Global Parking Standard (GPS) x R1 x R2 x R3 ⁽¹⁾</td> <td style="text-align: center;">99 to 173</td> <td style="text-align: center;">112 to 195</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Visitor parking</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Additional 5 spaces per block</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Motorcycle</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 space per 100-150 flats</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2 to 3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Loading/ Unloading (L/UL)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Min 1 bay for every 800 flats or Min 1 bay for each block</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Min. 3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Min. 3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>Scenario 1</u> 225 flats, avg flat size at 118m ²	<u>Scenario 2</u> 189 flats, avg flat size at 140m ²	Car Parking	Global Parking Standard (GPS) x R1 x R2 x R3 ⁽¹⁾	99 to 173	112 to 195	Visitor parking	Additional 5 spaces per block	15	15	Motorcycle	1 space per 100-150 flats	2 to 3	2	Loading/ Unloading (L/UL)	Min 1 bay for every 800 flats or Min 1 bay for each block	Min. 3	Min. 3
		<u>Scenario 1</u> 225 flats, avg flat size at 118m ²	<u>Scenario 2</u> 189 flats, avg flat size at 140m ²																		
Car Parking	Global Parking Standard (GPS) x R1 x R2 x R3 ⁽¹⁾	99 to 173	112 to 195																		
Visitor parking	Additional 5 spaces per block	15	15																		
Motorcycle	1 space per 100-150 flats	2 to 3	2																		
Loading/ Unloading (L/UL)	Min 1 bay for every 800 flats or Min 1 bay for each block	Min. 3	Min. 3																		

Based on the result in **Table 1** above, it is revealed that Scenario 2 (i.e. total 189 flats) would require additional 22 nos. of car parking spaces (comparing with the 225 flats scenario) and represent the most critical situation in terms of the required internal transport facilities provision. Nevertheless, the proposed basement layout plans (**Figure 2.4_Rev.B** and **Figure 2.5_Rev.B** refer) showed that there is still spare room to accommodate the additional 22 parking spaces, if required.

Table 2 - Vehicular Traffic Trips of the Proposed Development Under Different Scenarios

	AM Peak		Noon Peak		PM Peak	
	Gen.	Att.	Gen.	Gen.	Att.	Gen.
Scenario 1 - 225 flats, avg flat size at 118m ²						
Trip Rate (Private Housing: avg flat size of 120m ² /mean)	0.2246	0.1157	0.1068	0.1468	0.1068	0.1468
Traffic Trips (pcu/hr)	51	27	25	34	25	34
Total Traffic Trips (pcu/hr)	78		59		59	
Scenario 2 - 189 flats, avg flat size at 140m ²						
Trip Rate (Private Housing: avg flat size of 140m ² /mean)	0.2604	0.1372	0.1275	0.1722	0.1275	0.1722
Traffic Trips (pcu/hr)	50	26	25	33	25	33
Total Traffic Trips (pcu/hr)	76		58		58	

Based on the result of **Table 2** above, it is revealed that Scenario 1 would generate more traffic trips and hence represent the most critical situation. Nevertheless, a sensitivity test assuming a total of 189 flats with average flat size of 140m² was also conducted for the junction performance assessment to assess the potential traffic impacts to the adjacent road network due to the proposed development.

Table 3 - Junction Performance of Critical Junctions in Design Year 2033 (Sensitivity Test)

Ref. No.	Junctions	Type of Junction	2033 RC/ RFC ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾					
			225 flats, 118m ²			189 flats, 140m ²		
			AM Peak	Noon Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	Noon Peak	PM Peak
J1	Hoi Yu Street/ Hoi Chak Street	Priority	0.207	0.317	0.288	0.191	0.317	0.288
J2	Java Road/ Hoi Yu Street	Signalised	13%	56%	72%	13%	56%	72%
J3	King's Road/ Java Road	Signalised	>100%	>100%	>100%	>100%	>100%	>100%
J4	Hoi Tai Street/ Hoi Chak Street/ Finnie Street/ Hoi Kwong Street	Signalised	60%	>100%	72%	60%	>100%	72%
J5	King's Road/ Finnie Street	Signalised	92%	96%	40%	92%	96%	40%
J6	King's Road/ Model Lane	Signalised	>100%	>100%	84%	>100%	>100%	84%
J7	Java Road/ Man Hong Street	Signalised	73%	81%	77%	73%	81%	77%
J8	King's Road/ Healthy Street West/ Man Hong Street	Signalised	92%	84%	93%	92%	84%	93%
J9	Tsat Tsz Mui Road/ Healthy Street West	Signalised	>100%	>100%	>100%	>100%	>100%	>100%
J10	Tsat Tsz Mui Road/ Tin Chiu West	Signalised	57%	73%	81%	57%	73%	81%
J11	King's Road/ Tin Chiu Street	Signalised	>100%	>100%	>100%	>100%	>100%	>100%
With Junction Improvement								
J1	Hoi Yu Street/ Hoi Chak Street	Priority	0.207	0.317	0.288	0.191	0.317	0.288
J2	Java Road/ Hoi Yu Street	Signalised	40%	25%	57%	43%	25%	57%
J4	Hoi Tai Street/ Hoi Chak Street/ Finnie Street/ Hoi Kwong Street	Signalised	27%	50%	43%	27%	50%	43%

Notes: (1) Zero Reserve Capacity (RC) represents signalised junction operating at capacity. Positive RC represents signalized junction operating with spare capacity. Negative RC means signalised junction is overloaded.
(2) Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC) = 1.0 represents priority junction/roundabout operating at capacity. RFC < 1.0 represents priority junction/roundabout operating with spare capacity. RFC > 1.0 means priority junction/roundabout is overloaded.

The result of **Table 3** above indicated that all the junctions would be operating within their capacities under both scenarios with the proposed junction improvement schemes.

<p>4) For Response no. 12(b) which refers to the Response no. 6(b), there is no information on trip generation/attraction of the quoted existing cultural facilities of similar scale and nature provided. Please review.</p>	<p>We would like to clarify that the proposed cultural venue would be operated on a controlled time-slot basis for better pedestrian flow management (visitors are expected to come/ leave constantly within the opening hours), unlike the conventional cultural venues. There are some cultural events/ venues with similar operation arrangement in Hong Kong such as Naked Flowers 1881, TeamLab, Hong Kong Cultural Center etc as mentioned in our previous RtoC (“the quoted existing cultural facilities” refers). However, it is considered no similar scale and nature of cultural events/ venues in Hong Kong today that could be referenced to.</p> <p>In this regard, it is considered that the approach on estimating the visitor trips of the proposed cultural venue/ digital museum as mentioned in Para 4.5.2 of the TIA is reasonable and supported.</p>
<p>5) For Response no. 11 regarding the assessment on the impact to the existing public transport services arising from the proposed development, please provide assessment of current utilization/ occupancy figures of public transport services in the vicinity of the development on its adequacy to cater for the new passenger demand from proposed development, and advise if public transport service enhancement and public transport facilities improvement is concomitantly required. The estimated peak 2-way pedestrian trips of the proposed development, viz. 276 (AM peak), 624 (Noon) and 624 (PM peak) in the response, are inconsistent to Table 4.12 of the TIA. Please review.</p>	<p>As mentioned in the TIA and our previous responses, the application site is currently well-served by a range of public transport services, including MTR, franchised buses, green mini-bus (GMB), public light bus (PLB) and tram, with no more than 10 mins walking distance (especially with the proposed footbridge).</p> <p>Given the diversity and frequency of services, passenger demand from the proposed development would be distributed among multiple modes, minimizing the impact on any single service. The estimated pedestrian trips of the proposed development are in fact contributing less than 1% of the total capacity of the surrounding public transport services. In view of the aforesaid, it is considered that the capacity of the existing public transport services is well sufficient to cater for the new passenger demand from proposed development. Assessment and survey for the current utilization/ occupancy figures are therefore considered not necessary. Enhancement or improvement measure for the existing public transport services due to the proposed development is also considered not required.</p>

	Besides, we would like to clarify that the pedestrian trips in Table 4.12 were in a 15-minute interval, whereas the pedestrian flows in the RtoC were in a 60-minute (hourly) interval. Hence the figures are consistent.
Revised TIA Report	
6) Para. 1.1.11 - the comments and responses on the TIA shall be recorded in the RtC but not in the main text of the TIA. Please provide both clear and track—change version of the revised TIA report for reference.	Noted. Both clear and track version of the revised TIA report are provided for your easy reference. Changes made in this round of TIA submission are highlighted in blue for easy reference.
7) Table 2.2 - please find the comments below, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For accessibility adjustment ratio (R2), please provide a layout plan to show that the development site falls within 500-radius of rail station. The motorcycle cycle parking spaces for retail development should be ranged from 5% to 10% of total car parking spaces for retail. Please review. 	Please note that the development site falls within 500m radius of rail station as shown in Figure RC1 as attached. Please note that 5% to 10% of the total car parking spaces for retail has already been proposed (i.e. 16-31 car parking required for retail and 4 nos. motorcycle parking was proposed) as shown in Table 2.2 of the TIA report.
8) Para 2.4.4, please refer to comment item (1).	Noted.
9) Table 4.1, please adopt AADT 2024.	Noted. AADT 2024 was adopted in the revised Table 4.1 of the TIA report.
10) Table 4.6 to Table 4.8, the trip rates adopted do not tally with the stated average flat sizes or the figures of the adopted rates are incorrect in accordance with TPDM. Please review.	Noted and it was due to typo mistakes. The trip rates adopted (which are tally with the stated average flat sizes) have been updated in the revised Table 4.6 to Table 4.8 of the TIA report.
11) Table 4.10, please refer to comments (3) and (4) above.	Noted.

12) Table 4.11 and 4.12:

- Please provide a summary of the pedestrian trip rate surveys for the residential and retail developments mentioned in RtC no. 13.
- Please add a footnote to explain how the pedestrian trips for the cultural venue was derived.

Please note that the adopted pedestrian trip rate has made reference to the “in-house” data surveyed from the residential and retail developments listed below:

	Flat no. /GFA (m ²)	Pedestrian Trips (people)				Pedestrian Trip rate (people/ 15 mins)			
		AM Peak		PM Peak		AM Peak		PM Peak	
		Gen	Att	Gen	Att	Gen	Att	Gen	Att
Residential developments									
The Floridian	214 nos.	157	59	62	62	0.734	0.276	0.290	0.290
Mount Parker Residences	92nos.	62	41	37	20	0.674	0.446	0.402	0.217
Prima Villa	1024 nos.	780	614	416	292	0.762	0.600	0.406	0.285
Average						0.723	0.440	0.366	0.264
Retail									
Mega Box	102,193	103	145	300	279	0.1005	0.1417	0.2936	0.2730

Section 4.5.2 of the TIA explained how the pedestrian trips for the cultural venue was derived and the section is extracted below for your easy reference.

“The cultural venue/ digital museum is planned to have a servicing capacity of about 5,000 guests per day. Visitors would flow through the space with an expected stay of about 45-60 mins, subject to future operation, for each immersive experience (i.e. “show”). Hence, visitors would come and go constantly within the opening hours between 10:00AM to 19:00PM. Therefore, it was assumed that about 11.1% of the visitors would come during the PM peak hours (i.e. average of the 9 hours and nil during the AM peak as it is anticipated yet opened) and the estimated traffic generations by the cultural venue/ digital museum were superimposed onto the reference traffic flows to assess the potential traffic impact due to the proposed development.”

Nevertheless, a footnote explaining how the pedestrian trips for the cultural venue was derived, as of below, is added to Table 4.12:

“As mentioned in Section 4.5.2, the serving capacity of the Cultural Venue/ Digital Museum is about 5000 guests per day with 0%,11.1% &11.1% visitor distribution during AM, Noon & PM peak hour respectively. Therefore, the peak 15-min pedestrian trips are 0, 113 & 113 during AM, Noon & PM peak hour respectively.”

13) For the proposed improvement at the junction of Java Road/ Hoi Yu Street:

- According to Table 5.2, the proposed improvement though would bring the RC of am peak from 14% to 26%, it would significantly reduce the RC at noon peak and pm peak. Please review.

Please note that layout plan and RC calculation of the proposed improvement of the junction Java Road/ Hoi Yu Street has further been reviewed. Based on our subsequent discussions with your office, the existing cautionary crossing will be converted to a signalized crossing and two traffic lanes will be maintained for Hoi Yu Street southbound under the latest scheme. Also, different green-time for pedestrians is proposed during AM, NOON and PM peaks to balance the demand between vehicles and pedestrians (higher pedestrian demand in noon peak comparing to AM and PM peaks). In this regard, the RC of AM peak would be raised from 14% to 44%, while the RC of NOON and PM peaks would be reduced from 57% and 72% to 25% and 57% respectively. Details please refer to **Figure 5.1_Rev.C** in the revised TIA report and the revised RC calculation in Appendix A.

Ref. No.	Junctions	Type of Junction	2033 RC/ RFC ^{(1)/(2)}					
			225 flats, 118m ²			189 flats, 140m ²		
			AM Peak	Noon Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	Noon Peak	PM Peak
J2	Java Road/ Hoi Yu Street	Signalised	14%	57%	72%	13%	56%	72%
With Junction Improvement								
J2	Java Road/ Hoi Yu Street	Signalised	44%	25%	57%	43%	25%	57%

- For RC calculation for the junction of Java Street/Hoi Yu Street in existing and design year 2033 without improvement scheme, please justify the assumption

Currently, it is observed that there are many illegal parking or kerbside activities along both sides of Java Road, downstream near the Hong Kong Funeral Home, especially on the fourth lane (from left/ north side). Vehicles turn right to King’s Road are required to go via the third lane. However, some vehicles would leave from the fourth lane and cause delay to the

<p>on the site factor adopted for Java Road’s second, third and fourth lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For RC calculation for the junction of Java Street/Hoi Yu Street in design year 2033 with improvement scheme, please review the site factors adopted, in particular the change of the site factor for the second lane of Java Road before and after the proposed improvement. 	<p>traffic on the third lane. At the same time, some vehicles turn left to Hoi Yu Street from Java Road would merge from the second lane (from the nearside) to the first lane outside the North Point Government Offices/ North Point Police Station. These vehicles would move very slowly and even stop on the second lane hence causing blockage or delay to the through traffic. In view of the above-mentioned, site factors are adopted for Java Road’s second, third and fourth lane and is considered reasonable and supported.</p> <p>As mentioned in above, it is observed that some vehicles turn left to Hoi Yu Street from Java Road would merge from the second lane (from the nearside) to the first lane outside the North Point Government Offices/ North Point Police Station currently. These vehicles would move very slowly and even stop on the second lane hence causing blockage or delay to the through traffic. A site factor was therefore adopted under the existing and future scenarios (without improvement). However, vehicles on the second lane could also turn left to Hoi Yu Street under the proposed improvement scheme and are anticipated would not block or cause delay to the through traffic. The site factor adopted was therefore taken out under the proposed improvement scheme.</p>
<p>14) For the proposed improvement at the junction of Finnie Street/Hoi Chak Street/Hoi Kwong Street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RC figures show in Table 5.2 do not tally with the RC calculation sheets. Please review. Please review the proposed improvement scheme aiming for further enhancement on the LOS of the critical footpaths, e.g. by modifying the planter and re-aligning the carriageways to allow widening of footpaths and /or traffic islands. 	<p>Noted and the RC calculation sheets have been revised.</p> <p>The proposed improvement scheme of Finnie Street/Hoi Chak Street/Hoi Kwong Street has been further reviewed to enhance the pedestrian condition as shown in Figure 5.2_Rev.C for your consideration. The junctions and crossings performance assessment have also been updated in the TIA accordingly.</p>
<p>15) Para. 5.3.1 - please review if Table 4.3 shall read Table 4.12</p>	<p>Noted and revised.</p>

16) Table 5.3 - please provide a layout plan to show the pedestrian flow arisen from the proposed development and their distribution among the pedestrian routes with justification.

The pedestrian generation of the proposed development are added in **Figure 2.6_Rev.B** and the proposed distribution among the pedestrian routes are explained in the remarks.