

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION
UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

APPLICATION NO. A/K14/797

- Applicant** : Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA)
- Site** : Site R2-5 and Site R2-8, Anderson Road Quarry Development (ARQD), Kowloon
- Site Area** : Site R2-5 : about 14,210m²
Site R2-8 : about 16,900m²
- Lease** : Government Land
- Plan** : Approved Kwun Tong (North) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K14N/15
- Zoning** : “Residential (Group B)3” (“R(B)3”) (for both Sites R2-5 and R2-8)
- (a) maximum plot ratio (PR) of 4.0
 - (b) Site R2-5 : building height restrictions (BHRs) of 240 meters above Principal Datum (mPD) (the Western Part) and 260mPD (the Eastern Part)

Site R2-8 : BHRs of 225mPD (the Western Part) and 255mPD (the Eastern Part)
 - (c) Based on the individual merits of a development or redevelopment proposal, minor relaxation of the PR/BH restrictions stated in the Notes of the OZP may be considered by the Town Planning Board (the Board) on application under s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance)
- Application** : Minor Relaxation of PR Restriction and BHR for Proposed ‘Social Welfare Facilities’, ‘School (not elsewhere specified)’, ‘Shop and Services’, ‘Market’, ‘Eating Place’, ‘Institutional Use (not elsewhere specified)’ and ‘Place of Entertainment’ for Permitted Residential Development at Site R2-5
- Minor Relaxation of PR Restriction and BHR for Proposed ‘Social Welfare Facilities’ and ‘School (Kindergarten)’ for Permitted Residential Development at Site R2-8

1. The Proposal

- 1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for proposed non-domestic facilities (including social welfare facilities) at the application sites (the Sites) in ARQD,

which are zoned “R(B)3” on the approved Kwun Tong (North) OZP No. S/K14N/15 (**Plan A-1**). The proposed ‘Social Welfare Facilities’, ‘School (Kindergarten)’, ‘School (not elsewhere specified)’, ‘Shop and Services’, ‘Market’, ‘Eating Place’, ‘Institutional Use (not elsewhere specified)’ and ‘Place of Entertainment’ are Column 2 uses under the Notes of the “R(B)3” zones that require planning permission from the Board.

- 1.2 To accommodate these proposed non-domestic uses at the permitted residential developments, the applicant also seeks minor relaxation in PR restrictions from 4 to 4.35 (+0.35 (+9%)) for Site R2-5 and to 4.25 (+0.25 (+6%)) for Site R2-8, and minor relaxation in BHRs in the respective Eastern Part of the Sites i.e. from 260mPD to 273mPD (+13m (+18%))^[1] for Site R2-5 and from 255mPD to 266mPD (+11m (+15%))^[2] for Site R2-8 (the Proposed Schemes).

Site R2-5

- 1.3 The public housing development at Site R2-5 comprises two domestic blocks (BH of 273mPD), with truncated wings (BH of 240mPD) atop 1 to 2-storey podium at the Western Part that a 12m buffer from the site boundary is reserved (**Drawings A-2 and A-6**). The proposed non-domestic facilities (including a Neighbourhood Elderly Centre (NEC)) would be provided at the southern portion of Block B where public could access from the adjoining public open space (POS) at LG/F and from Road H at G/F (**Drawings A-3 and A-4**). Local open space with planting areas would be provided at podium deck (**Drawing A-7**).

Site R2-8

- 1.4 The public housing development at Site R2-8 comprises three domestic blocks with proposed BH of 266mPD, except the southern wings of Blocks A and C at the Western Part with a lower BH of 225mPD (**Drawings A-9 and A-13**). A NEC and one six-classroom kindergarten would be provided at LG/F of Block A with public access from Road F (**Drawing A-10**). Local open space with planting areas would be provided at podium deck (**Drawing A-14**).
- 1.5 The Master Layout Plan (MLP), floor plans, sections, Landscape Master Plan (LMP), and photomontages submitted by the applicant are at **Drawings A-1 to A-16**. The major development parameters of the proposed development are tabulated below:

Development Parameters	Proposed Schemes	
	Site R2-5	Site R2-8
Site Area (about)	14,210m ²	16,900m ²
Total GFA (about)	61,814m ²	71,825m ²
• Domestic	56,840m ²	67,600m ²
• Non-domestic ^[a]	4,974m ²	4,225m ²
Total PR	4.35	4.25
• Domestic	4.0	4.0
• Non-domestic ^[a]	0.35	0.25

^[1] Site R2-5: increase by 18% in terms of absolute BH with mean site formation level at 189mPD, with corresponding increase by about 5% in terms of mPD.

^[2] Site R2-8: increase by 15% in terms of absolute BH with mean site formation level at 184mPD, with corresponding increase by about 4% in terms of mPD.

Development Parameters	Proposed Schemes	
	Site R2-5	Site R2-8
Non-domestic Uses		
• Social Welfare Facilities ^[a]	One NEC	One NEC
• Others ^[b]	Retails	One six-classroom kindergarten
Nos. of domestic tower	2	3
BH ^[c]		
• Eastern Part	273 mPD	266 mPD
• Western Part	240 mPD	225 mPD
BH (nos. of storey)	15 to 27 domestic storeys with 1 to 2-storey podium/ carpark	11 to 26 domestic storeys with 1 storey podium/semi-basement carpark
Site Coverage (SC)	60%	40%
No. of Flats (about)	About 1,140	About 1,380
Local Open Space ^[c]	Not less than 3,200 m ²	Not less than 3,860 m ²
Parking and L/UL Facilities		
• Private Cars	108	136
• Motorcycle	11	13
• Light Goods Vehicle Parking	5	6
• L/UL	6	7 ^[e]
• Bicycle	76	92
Target Completion Year	2024/25	2024/25

Notes:

- ^[a] Social welfare facilities subject to further review by the Social Welfare Department (SWD) at detailed design stage.
- ^[b] Including proposed commercial/educational/institutional facilities and other ancillary facilities.
- ^[c] Floor to floor height of 2.75m is adopted for the domestic floors.
- ^[d] Local open space of not less than 1m² per person would be provided as required under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG).
- ^[e] Including one for shared use by the non-domestic facilities including kindergarten.

1.6 In support of the application, the applicant has submitted the following documents:

- (a) Application form received on 14.12.2020; **(Appendix I)**
- (b) Supplementary planning statement enclosing Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) and Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) received on 14.12.2020; **(Appendix Ia)**
- (c) 1st Further information (FI) via email dated 27.1.2021 providing responses to departmental comments (RtoC)^[*]; **(Appendix Ib)**
- (d) 2nd FI dated 4.3.2021 providing RtoC with revised AVA report and new information shown on the revised MLP, LMP, floor and section plans^[*]; and **(Appendix Ic)**
- (e) 3rd FI dated 13.4.2021 providing RtoC and public comment and replacement pages of the revised AVA report^[*]. **(Appendix Id)**

^[*] FIs accepted and exempted from publication requirement

- 1.7 On 5.2.2021, the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) agreed to defer making a decision on the application for one month as requested by the applicant in order to allow sufficient time for preparation of FI to address departmental comments. With the FI received on 4.3.2021 (**Appendix Ic**), the application is scheduled for consideration by the Committee at this meeting.

2. **Justifications from the Applicant**

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application as set out in **Appendices Ia to Id** are summarized as follows:

To Provide Additional Community Facilities for the Community

- 2.1 As per Government's Six New Initiatives on Housing announced in June 2018 to better utilise existing land and housing resources to increase the supply of adequate and affordable housing, the Sites were allocated from private to public housing developments. In accordance with the HKPSG, NEC at each site as requested by SWD and one six-classroom kindergarten in Site R2-8 as agreed by the Education Bureau (EDB) are proposed. Besides, to serve the basic needs of the future residents in ARQD, other commercial/educational/institutional facilities are incorporated in Site R2-5. In order to not affect the flat production, minor relaxation of PR restriction and BHR to accommodate the aforementioned facilities are required.

Optimised BH with Site Constraints and Design Requirement

- 2.2 The building layouts and designs of the Proposed Schemes have been optimised with regards to the following site constraints and design requirements:
- (a) Setbacks of 5m from Road H at Site R2-5 and 8m from both Roads F and G at Site R2-8 have been incorporated for noise mitigation as recommended in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) for entire ARQD (**Drawings A-1 and A-8**).
 - (b) The Sites situate on sloping ground. G/F of the proposed developments are set to the same level of the respective abutting roads with podium for non-domestic uses at the LG level (**Drawings A-4 and A-11**) for providing more convenient accesses to future residents and that would also minimise the excavation works and associated time and cost implications on the program.
 - (c) For compliance with relevant fire safety requirement, emergency vehicular access (EVA) has to go through G/F of portion of domestic blocks. As such, higher clear headroom on G/F is incorporated in the Proposed Scheme in which the first level of domestic units is raised to a level of 202mPD for Site R2-5 and 197mPD for Site R2-8 (**Drawings A-9 and A-13**).
 - (d) Adopting a larger building footprint would affect provision of sufficient local open space within the Sites to serve the future resident.
- 2.3 For Site R2-5, with the irregular site configuration and minimal public road frontage, to meet the requirement on building separation and building setback under

alternative approaches^[3] of Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) (PNAP APP-152), full-height building setback of not less than 15% of the site area from the site boundary should be provided. Besides, the SC (including any podium) of not more than 65% is proposed to meet the SBDG requirement (**Drawing A-1**).

- 2.4 Building separations of 12 to 15m between domestic blocks at the two Sites is proposed to enhance air ventilation and visual permeability, including views towards to Rock Face and Tai Sheung Tok from street level (**Drawings A-1 and A-8**). Local open space of not less than 1m² per person under the HKSPG would be provided within the Sites. Alternative scheme with additional residential block(s) for maintaining flat production without minor relaxation in BHR is found to be technically infeasible.

Urban Design Considerations

- 2.5 Proposed Schemes for the Sites have taken into consideration of the planning and urban design concepts as specified in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP with due regard to (a) stepped BH profile to respect the Tai Sheung Tok ridgeline and the planned adjacent open space; (b) '20% building free zone' of Tai Sheung Tok ridgeline; (c) human-scale environment with the adjacent POS; and (d) BH variations of the building clusters.
- 2.6 Locations of the proposed non-domestic facilities are considered having regard to the planned pedestrian circulation in ARQD as a whole with an aim to fostering integration with the surrounding POS. For Site R2-5, the proposed non-domestic facilities are proposed at the southern portion of the site at the POS level (**Drawing A-3**) which is close to the planned Civic Core and the pedestrian connection facilities in its further south (**Plan A-4**). For Site R2-8, the NEC and the kindergarten would be provided at the portion of site near Road F that public transport services and landscaped elevated walkway to the northern portion of ARQD would be available (**Drawings A-8 and A-10**). Building blocks are provided at the Western Parts of the Sites with buffers for providing relatively human-scale environment with the adjacent POSs (**Drawings A-7 and A-14**).
- 2.7 Minimum of 20% SC of greenery will be adopted and at least half of the greenery will be provided at primary zone/at-grade or at levels easily accessible. New trees of 86 nos. for Sites R2-5 and 92 nos. for R2-8 would be planted. These proposed greenery treatments would enhance the landscape amenity of the Sites and to provide visual relief to surrounding POS (**Drawings A-7 and A-14**).

No Adverse Visual Impact with Proposed Minor Relaxation in the BHR

- 2.8 The VIA as submitted concluded that the proposed minor relaxation in BHRs for the Sites would have negligible and slightly adverse visual impact when viewed from long range vantage point (VP) at Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC) (**Drawing A-15**) and from medium range VP at Jordan Valley (**Drawing A-16**) respectively. The intended BH profile for the ARQ and the '20% building free zone' of Tai Sheung Tok ridgeline as mentioned in paragraph 2.5 above would still be maintained.

^[3] As set out in PNAP APP-152, for site with inadequate provision of a particular key design element under unique context (such as for sites with unobstructed surrounds) that may impose genuine constraints in compliance with the SBDG requirement, alternative approaches could be adopted.

2.9 The Proposed Schemes meet relevant criteria for consideration of minor relaxation of BHR in the ES of the OZP:

- (a) *providing separation between buildings to enhance air ventilation and visual permeability* – 12 to 15m-wide separations between buildings at the Sites would enhance air ventilation and visual permeability as discussed in para. 2.4 above; and
- (b) *accommodating building design to address specific site constraints in achieving the permissible PR under the OZP* – the Proposed Schemes with minor relaxation in BHRs would accommodate the non-domestic facilities without compromising the flat production having regards to the site constraints as discussed in paragraphs 2.2 to 2.3 above (**Drawings A-1 and A-8**).

No Adverse Impacts on Other Technical Aspects

2.10 The AVA submitted with wind enhancement features namely the building separations and setback along the site boundary (**Drawings A-1 and A-8**), which has taken into account the cumulative impacts of the proposed scheme of similar application in ARQD (see paragraph 6.2 below), would generally enhance the air ventilation of the surrounding areas under both annual and summer conditions (**Appendix Ic**) as compared with the notional scheme assessed under the ‘Planning Study on Future Land Use at ARQ – Feasibility Study’ (the Study)^[4]. Relevant technical conducted by CEDD ascertained the feasibility of the proposed public housing developments including the non-domestic facilities being applied. Similar to other departments in ARQD, the applicant would make use of the recycled grey water^[5] for non-potable purposes in public housing development.

3. Background

Imposition of BHRs for ARQD

3.1 With a view to examine the future land use, the key land use proposals in ARQD including Quarry Park, Residential Communities with supporting GIC facilities and Civic Core have been identified in the Study (**Plan A-4**). A stepped BH profile for the Residential Communities is recommended with a view to

- (a) respecting the Tai Sheung Tok ridgeline and the Quarry Park as viewed from strategic vantage point at HKCEC;
- (b) preserving an existing view corridor between the Tai Sheung Tok summit and Jordan Valley;

^[4] The notional scheme for the Site R2-5 as assessed under the AVA conducted under the Study comprising eight residential blocks with five in the Western Part and three in the Eastern Part, whereas, that for the Site R2-8 included nine blocks with four in the Western Part and five in the Eastern Part. Both without any non-domestic uses.

^[5] A Grey Water Treatment Plant at ARQD, operated by the Water Supplies Department, will collect the waste water from baths, showers, wash basins, kitchen sinks and laundry machines, etc. of various developments in ARQD, and treat and reuse those collected waste water for non-potable purposes such as toilet flush. Requirement to provide ancillary facilities within the housing developments to connect with the Government’s grey water system would be specified in the lease.

- (c) providing unobstructed views from the lookouts/viewing decks at different levels on the rock face;
 - (d) creating a human-scale environment along green pedestrian corridors;
 - (e) providing height variations to the building clusters; and
 - (f) moderating the row of tall towers along the rock face.
- 3.2 Having regard the above considerations, high-rise residential blocks are mainly planned close to the rock face and stepping down towards Jordan Valley in the west with medium-rise blocks fronting the Quarry Park (**Plan A-4**). Residential blocks along the POS are also proposed to be lower to create a human-scale environment along the corridor.
- 3.3 Based on the urban design framework mentioned above, appropriate building BHRs are incorporated for ARQD on the OZP.

Planned Developments in ARQD

- 3.4 As per the Government's Six New Housing Initiatives as announced in 2018, to increase the supply of affordable housing, six housing sites at ARQD (including the Sites) were allocated for public housing developments to be implemented by the applicant and the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS). CEDD has conducted relevant assessments (including Traffic Review, EIA, Sewerage Review and Water Supplies Review) to ascertain the feasibility of the proposed public housing development including the supporting non-domestic facilities. Population intake for these public housing development are targeted for 2023/24 to 2025/26.
- 3.5 To serve the future community in the ARQ and the surrounding areas, three sites are zoned "Commercial". Six parcels of lands are zoned "Government, Institution or Community (2)" ("G/IC(2)") for providing primary and secondary schools, social welfare block, a joint-user complex (with a multi-purpose sports centre, a community hall, a library, range of social welfare services and public vehicle park), a public transport interchange and other GIC facilities. Premise-based kindergartens, social welfare and retail facilities would also be provided at some of the public housing sites. Planned POS (of about 21.5ha) covering the Quarry Park and the district open space/civic square would be formed with target completion to tie in with the population in-take of ARQD (**Plan A-4**).

4. Compliance with the "Owner's Consent/Notification" Requirements

As the Sites involve government land only, the "owner's consent/notification" requirements as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Satisfying the "Owner's Consent/Notification" Requirements under Sections 12A and 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 31A) is not applicable to the application.

5. **Previous Application**

There is no previous application in respect of the Sites.

6. **Similar Applications**

- 6.1 There is no similar application within “R(B)” on the OZP.
- 6.2 A similar application (No. A/K14/798), submitted by HKHS for proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction for proposed ‘Social Welfare Facilities’, ‘School (not elsewhere specified)’, ‘Shop and Services’, ‘Market’ and ‘Eating Place’ uses and minor relaxation of BHR at another public housing site at ARQD, is scheduled for consideration at the same meeting (**Plan A-1**).

7. **The Site and Its Surrounding Areas** (Plans A-1 to A-4 and site photos on **Plan A-5**)

7.1 The Sites:

- (a) Site R2-5 sits on a sloping ground, where majority of it is surrounded by POS with levels between about 189mPD in the southeast and 196mPD in the northwest, and with short site frontage abutting the proposed Road H at about 195mPD (**Plan A-2**);
- (b) Site R2-8 abuts Road F in its north with increasing gradient from 181mPD to 189mPD, Road G (at 190mPD) in its east, and POS (at 182mPD) to its south and east (**Plan A-2**); and
- (c) currently under site formation and infrastructural works by the CEDD before handing over to the applicant for public housing construction works.

7.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics (**Plan A-1 to A-5**):

- (a) ARQD is planned for medium-density residential developments with supporting commercial and other GIC facilities, and intertwined with planned POS (**Plan A-4**); and
- (b) a joint-user complex (i.e. Site G2 on **Plan A-4**) is found to the south of Site R2-5 and to the northwest of Site R2-8 across Road F. A proposed primary school (i.e. Site E1 on **Plan A-4**) to the east across Road H of Site R2-5. Other GIC facilities, including a social welfare block, and primary/secondary schools, are proposed at sites to the southeast of Site R2-8 along Road G (**Plan A-4**).

8. **Planning Intention**

- 8.1 The planning intention of “R(B)” zone is primarily for medium-density residential developments where commercial uses serving the residential neighbourhood may be permitted on application to the Board.

8.2 As stated in the ES of the OZP, to provide incentive for developments/redevelopments with design merits/planning gains, and to cater for circumstances with specific site constraints, each application for minor relaxation of BHR under section 16 of the Ordinance will be considered on its own merits and the relevant criteria for consideration of such relaxation are as follows:

- (a) amalgamating smaller sites for achieving better urban design and local area improvements;
- (b) accommodating the bonus PR granted under the Buildings Ordinance in relation to surrender/dedication of land/area for use as public passage/street widening;
- (c) providing better streetscape/good quality street level public urban space;
- (d) providing separation between buildings to enhance air ventilation and visual permeability;
- (e) accommodating building design to address specific site constraints in achieving the permissible PR under the OZP; and
- (f) other factors such as the need for tree preservation, innovative building design and planning merits that would bring about improvements to townscape and amenity of the locality, provided that no adverse landscape and visual impacts.

9. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

9.1 The following Government departments have been consulted and their views on the application are summarized as follows:

Land Administration

9.1.1 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Sai Kung, Lands Department (DLO/SK, LandsD):

- (a) He has no comment on the application from land administration point of view.
- (b) The proposed public housing development site at Site R2-5 and the surrounding areas fall within the ex-ARQ, which are currently held by HKHA under Short Term Tenancy No. SX5264 for site formation, building and associated works for public housing development for a fixed term of four years commencing on 14.12.2020 and thereafter quarterly.
- (c) The proposed public housing site at Site R2-8 and the surrounding areas fall within the ex-ARQ, which are currently held by Project Manager/East, CEDD under simplified temporary land allocation GLA-TSK3479 for the purpose of site formation and infrastructural works for the term expiring on 31.12.2022. The site availability for Site R2-8 is subject to the program of the said site formation and infrastructural works by PM/E, CEDD.

Urban Design, Visual, Air Ventilation and Landscape Aspects

9.1.2 Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD):

Urban Design and Visual Aspect

- (a) For Site R2-5, the proposed development comprise of two 27-storey domestic blocks integrated with a 1 to 2-storey non-domestic podium. For Site R2-8, the proposed development comprise of three 26-storey domestic blocks integrated with a storey of non-domestic podium/semi-basement carpark. The proposed domestic blocks have adopted a stepping design, which is in general respecting the intended stepped height profile for the Sites. Accommodation of the proposed development would unlikely cause any significant adverse visual impact.
- (b) As to the additional PR, it is intended for accommodating the additional non-domestic facilities to serve the community. He has no comment on this aspect from urban design and visual perspectives.

Air Ventilation Aspect

- (c) As set out in AVA Initial Study, the proposed development at Site R2-5 has incorporated some mitigation measures including (i) 10m-wide building separation between Block A and Block B; and (ii) 12m setback from the southern site boundary, while proposed development at Site R2-8 has incorporated some mitigation measures including (i) 12m-wide building separation between Block A and Block B; and (ii) 14m-wide building separation between Block B and Block C.
- (d) According to the simulation results, the overall performances of the Baseline Scheme (i.e. notional scheme discussed in para. 2.110 above), Scenario A (i.e. Proposed Schemes) and Scenario B (Proposed Schemes and proposed scheme of similar application at Site R2-4) on the surrounding pedestrian wind environment are comparable under both annual and summer conditions. Therefore, it is anticipated that the proposed developments at the Sites would not create significant adverse air ventilation impact on the surrounding pedestrian wind environment when compared with the Baseline Scheme. Moreover, it is expected that proposed developments at the Sites together with the proposed development at Site R2-4 would not create significant cumulative air ventilation impacts on their surrounding pedestrian wind environments.
- (e) His other technical comments are detailed in **Appendix II**.

Landscape Aspect

- (f) With reference to the aerial photo of 2019, the Sites are located in an area of urban landscape character with planned high-rise residential developments, GIC facilities, commercial developments and POS in the close vicinity. No existing tree is observed within the Sites. The Proposed Schemes are not incompatible with the planned landscape character of the surrounding area.

- (g) According to the Planning Statement (**Appendix 1a**), private open space of not less than 3,200m² for Site R2-5 and 3,860m² for Site R2-8 is proposed for the estimated population of 3,200 and 3,860 respectively. Besides, as indicated the LMPs (**Drawings A-7 and A-14**), landscape treatments with trees and shrubs planting, seating and recreational facilities (such as pergolas, children play areas and ball courts etc.) are proposed on the podium of the carpark and non-domestic facilities for Site R2-5, and G/F and LG/F for Site R2-8.
- (h) In view that adverse landscape impact caused by the Proposed Schemes is not anticipated and adequate landscape provisions are proposed to improve the landscape quality of the development, he has no objection in principle to the application from landscape planning perspective.

9.1.3 Comments of the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department (CA/CMD2, ArchSD):

- (a) For Site R2-5, it is noted that proposed development consists of two tower blocks with BH ranging from 240mPD to 273mPD which may not be incompatible with adjacent residential developments with BHR ranging from 225mPD to 280mPD.
- (b) For Site R2-8, it is noted that proposed development consists of three tower blocks with heights ranging from 225mPD to 266mPD which may not be incompatible with adjacent residential developments with BHR ranging from 215mPD to 290mPD.
- (c) In this regard, he has no comment on the application from architectural and visual impact point of view.

Provision of Social Welfare Facilities

9.1.4 Comments of Director of Social Welfare (D of SW):

- (a) He supports the planning application for timely provision of the proposed NEC within the public housing developments to serve the future residents.
- (b) He will provide further comments on the requirements of the welfare facilities during the detailed design stage. Should the Board approve the application, he recommends that an approval condition on the design and provision of the social welfare facilities in the Proposed Schemes should be imposed.

Provision of Education Facility

9.1.5 Comments of Secretary for Education (S for Education):

- (a) As the location of the proposed kindergarten at Site R2-8 complies with the requirement as stated in the 'Operation Manual for Pre-primary Institutions' (the OM) that *'to ensure that children gain easy access, pre-primary institutions should, ideally, be located on the*

ground floor or the podium floor’, he has no adverse comment on the application.

- (b) In detailed design stage, the applicant is advised to observe the Schedule of Accommodation for kindergarten premises as specified in the OM. His other technical comments on the provision of L/UL facility for the proposed kindergarten are detailed in **Appendix II**.

Traffic Aspect

9.1.6 Comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T):

The Traffic Review conducted by CEDD is acceptable and he has no objection to the proposed non-domestic uses comprising social welfare facilities, kindergarten and other non-domestic facilities. He has no objection to the application from traffic engineering perspective.

Environmental Aspect

9.1.7 Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP):

- (a) It is noted that the environmental acceptability of various proposed public housing developments at the ARQD has been demonstrated in the Schedule 3 EIA Report for Development of ARQ which was approved under the EIA Ordinance in July 2014. Under the current mechanism, the Housing Department is carrying out the Environmental Assessment Study to support the latest refined scheme of the housing development for his agreement under separate cover. Also, CEDD has conducted the Sewerage Review submitted in June 2019 for the ARQD which has taken into account of the latest development for the proposed changes in this s.16 planning application.
- (b) It is noted that the key environmental issues have been reflected in the Planning Statement in **Appendix Ia** and the setback distance for Sites R2-5 (5m-wide) and R2-8 (8m-wide) is tallied with the recommendations of the EIA Report. As such, he has no comments on the application.
- (c) His other technical comments are detailed in **Appendix II**.

Fire Safety Aspect

9.1.8 Comments of the Director of Fire Services (D of FS):

He has no in-principle objection to the application subject to fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of his department. EVA shall comply with Section 6, Part D of “Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 administered by the Buildings Department. Detailed fire safety requirement will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans.

9.2 The following Government bureaux/departments have no objection/no comments on the application and the FIs:

- (a) Project Manager (East), CEDD;
- (b) Chief Building Survey/New Territories East (2) and Rail Section, Buildings Department;
- (c) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, Highways Department (CHE/NTE, HyD);
- (d) CHE/Kowloon, HyD;
- (e) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- (f) Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department
- (g) Commissioner of Police;
- (h) District Officer (Sai Kung), Home Affairs Department (HAD);
- (i) District Officer (Kwun Tong), HAD;
- (j) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;
- (k) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services; and
- (l) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD.

10. Public Comments Received During the Statutory Publication Period

On 22.12.2020, the application was published for public inspection. During the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, which ended on 12.1.2021, one public comment was received from an individual (**Appendix III**) who raised concern about the proposed community facilities being designed at the lowest floor of the domestic tower with possible poor ventilation, little natural light and shared access, and the visual impact of the Proposed Scheme. In addition, the public comment also enquired on the operation details of the proposed NEC.

11. Planning Considerations and Assessments

11.1 The application is for proposed non-domestic facilities (including social welfare facilities) with minor relaxation of PR restrictions from 4.0 to 4.35 (+9%) at Site R2-5 and from 4.0 to 4.25 (+6%) at Site R2-8, which are both zoned “R(B)3” on the OZP. The application is also for minor relaxation of BHRs from 260mPD to 273mPD (+13m (+18%)) and from 255mPD to 266mPD (+11m (+15%)) for the Eastern Parts of Sites R2-5 and R2-8 respectively. According to the applicant, the proposed minor relaxation of PR and BHR is mainly to facilitate the provision of the proposed non-domestic facilities to serve the future residents of ARQD and to accommodate the site constraints at the Sites.

Provision of Non-Domestic Facilities

11.2 The planning intention of “R(B)” zone is primarily for medium-density residential developments where uses serving the residential neighbourhood, including retail facilities, social welfare facilities and educational facilities may be permitted on application to the Board. The proposed non-domestic facilities at the public housing developments is considered generally in line with the planning intention of the “R(B)2” zone and would serve the future residents in ARQD.

11.3 The proposed provision of social welfare facilities, namely NECs, is in line with Government’s initiatives and policy to enhance the provision and planning of social welfare services. Having reviewed the existing and planned provision of

social welfare facilities in ARQD and the adjoining areas, the demand arising the future population in the area, and the site context, the SWD advised the two NECs to be provided at the Sites. DSW supports the application to facilitate the timely provision of social welfare facilities to serve the future residents, and recommends that an approval condition on the design and provision of the social welfare facilities should be imposed should the Board approve the application. The six-classroom kindergarten at Site R2-8 is proposed taking into account the design population of ARQD with reference to the HKPSG requirement, with location agreeable with EDB.

Minor Relaxation in PR Restriction for Non-domestic Facilities

- 11.4 The minor relaxation of PR restrictions being applied are to accommodate the proposed non-domestic uses at the Sites. As such, the Proposed Schemes would facilitate optimisation of the Sites to meet the demand for required social welfare, educational, and other non-domestic facilities to serve the community without compromising the supply of public housing units. This is in line with Government's overall policy to optimise scarce land resources.
- 11.5 Relevant technical assessments conducted by the CEDD confirm that the proposed non-domestic facilities is acceptable with no insurmountable impacts on technical aspects. Departments consulted, namely CEDD, EPD, TD, DSD, WSD and FSD have no adverse comments on/objection to the application.

Minor Relaxation in BHR

- 11.6 In view of site constraints and design requirements and in order to accommodate the proposed non-domestic facilities, minor relaxation of BHRs at the Sites is sought.
- 11.7 Regarding the design of the Proposed Schemes, to address the various site constraints and design considerations (**Drawings A-1 and A-8**) as discussed in paragraphs 2.2 to 2.7 above, the applicant indicates that the layouts have been optimized with no scope to enlarge the building footprint nor providing additional domestic blocks, and proposed minor relaxation in BHRs is accommodate the additional non-domestic facilities to serve the community while maintaining the same level of public housing units with sufficient private open space within the Sites to serve future residents. The Proposed Schemes have incorporated 12 to 15m building separation to enhance air ventilation and visual permeability, and have taken into account various site constraints. With its unique site context that surrounded mainly by POS with minimal street frontage, Site R2-5 is under a more stringent control over SC under SBDG. In this connection, the Proposed Schemes are considered generally meets the criteria (d) and (e) for considering application for minor relaxation of BHR as mentioned in paragraph 8.2 above. The Western Part of the Sites adjoin POSs would be developed for 1 to 2 storey podium with landscape deck top and buffer between residential blocks and the site boundary would also be reserved. Such design would enhance the public realm at POS level and serve as a better transition from the medium-density development to the POS. Thus, the Proposed Schemes generally in line with the urban design framework recommended under the Study as set out in paragraph 3.1 above.

- 11.8 In terms of BH profile for the ARQD, the photomontages submitted by the applicant, showing the cumulative visual impact of the proposed minor relaxation in the Sites and the similar application (**Drawings A-15 and A-16**), demonstrated that the Proposed Schemes would have slightly adverse visual impacts when viewed from medium range VP, yet the visual impacts when viewed from strategic VP at HKCEC would be negligible. As commented by CTP/UD&L, PlanD, the Proposed Schemes with domestic blocks adopting a stepping design would in general respect the intended stepped BH profile for ARQD and would unlikely cause any significant adverse visual impact, and has no adverse comment on the application from urban design, visual, air ventilation and landscape planning perspectives.
- 11.9 Having considered the planning merits of the inclusion of proposed social welfare and other non-domestic facilities in public housing development as discussed in paragraphs 11.2 and 11.3 above, and the design constraints and requirement mentioned by the applicant, the proposed relaxation of BHR may be considered not unacceptable.

Public Comment

- 11.10 Regarding the concerns about the possible adverse impact in respect of air ventilation, natural light and shared access on proposed community facilities at podium of the Sites, SWD and EDB have no adverse comment on the Proposed Schemes in this regard, and the detailed design of the NECs is subject to approval conditions recommended by SWD.

12. Planning Department's Views

- 12.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 11 above and having taken into account the public comment mentioned in paragraph 10, the Planning Department has no objection to the application.
- 12.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 16.4.2025, and after the said date, the permission shall cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted is commenced or the permission is renewed. The following condition of approval and advisory clauses are suggested for Members' reference:

Approval condition

the design and provision of the social welfare facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Social Welfare or of the Town Planning Board.

Advisory clauses

The recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Appendix IV**.

- 12.3 Should the Committee decide to reject the application, the following rejection reason is suggested for Member's reference:

The applicant fails to demonstrate that there are sufficient planning and design merits for the proposed relaxation of building height restriction.

13. Decision Sought

- 13.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to grant or refuse to grant permission.
- 13.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, Members are invited to consider the approval condition(s) and advisory clause(s), if any, to be attached to the permission, and the date when the validity of the permission should expire.
- 13.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicant.

14. Attachments

Appendix I	Application form with planning statement received on 14.12.2021
Appendix Ia	Planning Statement
Appendix Ib	Further Information received on 27.1.2021
Appendix Ic	Further Information received on 4.3.2021
Appendix Id	Further Information received on 13.4.2021
Appendix II	Other technical comments from Government departments
Appendix III	Public comment received during the statutory publication period
Appendix IV	Recommended advisory clauses
Drawing A-1	Site Constraints Plan (Site R2-5)
Drawing A-2	Master Layout Plan (Site R2-5)
Drawings A-3 to A-6	Floor Plans and Sections (Site R2-5)
Drawing A-7	Landscape Master Plan (Site R2-5)
Drawing A-8	Site Constraints Plan (Site R2-8)
Drawing A-9	Master Layout Plan (Site R2-8)
Drawings A-10 to A-13	Floor Plans and Sections (Site R2-8)
Drawing A-14	Landscape Master Plan (Site R2-8)
Drawings A-15 and A-16	Photomontages
Plan A-1	Location Plan
Plan A-2	Site Plan
Plan A-3	Aerial Photos
Plan A-4	Proposed Open Space and GIC Facilities in ARQD
Plan A-5	Site Photos

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
APRIL 2021**