

**APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION**  
**UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICATION NO. A/K14/827**

<b><u>Applicant</u></b>	: Project Management Branch 2 Division 203 of the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD), represented by KTA Planning Limited
<b><u>Site</u></b>	: Government Land to the west of On Yu Road, Anderson Road Quarry Development (ARQD), Kowloon
<b><u>Site Area</u></b>	: About 3,202m <sup>2</sup>
<b><u>Land Status</u></b>	: Government Land (GL)
<b><u>Plan</u></b>	: Approved Kwun Tong (North) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K14N/15
<b><u>Zoning</u></b>	: “Government, Institution or Community(2)” (“G/IC(2)”) <i>[Restricted to a maximum building height (BH) of 230 metres above Principal Datum (mPD)]</i>
<b><u>Application</u></b>	: Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Government Use (Fire Station-cum-Ambulance Depot) and Proposed Flat (Departmental Quarters)

**1. The Proposal**

- 1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for proposed minor relaxation of building height restriction (BHR) from 230mPD to 249.95mPD (+19.95m, i.e. +8.7% in terms of mPD or +44.8% in terms of absolute BH<sup>1</sup>) for permitted government use (fire station-cum-ambulance depot (FSAD)) and proposed flat (departmental quarters (DQ)) use (collectively referred to as the Proposed Scheme) at a GL site to the west of On Yu Road, ARQD (the Site) on land zoned “G/IC(2)” on the OZP (**Plan A-1**). According to the Notes of the OZP for the “G/IC” zone, ‘Government Use (not elsewhere specified)’ (to which ‘FSAD’ is subsumed under) is always permitted, while ‘Flat’ is a Column 2 use which requires planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). Since the height of the Proposed Scheme will exceed the prevailing BHR of 230mPD for the Site, planning permission from the Board for minor relaxation of BHR is also required.
- 1.2 According to the applicant, the Site was originally planned for fire station only under the ‘Planning Study on Future Land Use at ARQ – Feasibility Study’ (the Study). To optimise site utilisation, 11 storeys of DQ is now proposed atop the planned five-storey FSAD and one basement level for communal carpark (**Drawing A-10**). The

---

<sup>1</sup> Increase in absolute BH from 44.5m to 64.45m (+44.8%), inclusive of one basement floor.

FSAD portion mainly consists of a sub-divisional FSAD with office accommodation and divisional training facility of the Fire Services Department (FSD). The DQ portion would provide 113 DQ units for eligible married rank and file (R&F) FSD staff. The composite building will be accessible via On Yu Road (**Drawing A-2**).

- 1.3 The indicative floor plans, sections, site constraint plan, drawings showing the BH profile of the area, landscape master plan (LMP) and photomontages of the Proposed Scheme submitted by the applicant are at **Drawings A-1 to A-20**. The major development parameters of the Proposed Scheme are summarised as below:

Major Development Parameters	Proposed Scheme
Site Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	About 3,202
Plot Ratio (PR)	About 4.7
<i>Non-domestic (FSAD Portion)</i>	<i>About 2.22</i>
<i>Domestic (DQ Portion)</i>	<i>About 2.48</i>
Gross Floor Area (GFA) (m <sup>2</sup> )	About 15,053
<i>Non-domestic (FSAD Portion)</i>	<i>About 7,108</i>
<i>Domestic (DQ Portion)</i>	<i>About 7,945</i>
Site Coverage (SC)	
<i>Non-domestic (FSAD Portion)</i>	Not more than 60%
<i>Domestic (DQ Portion)</i>	Not more than 26%
BH	249.95mPD (+19.95m)
Number of Storeys	18 storeys (incl. one storey for podium garden and one level of basement carpark)
Number of DQ units	113
Average Unit Size (m <sup>2</sup> )	About 55.5
Design Population	339
Private Open Space (POS) (m <sup>2</sup> )	About 1,816.92
Underground Parking Spaces	
<i>Private Car</i>	66
<i>Motorcycle</i>	8
<i>Reserve Ambulance</i>	1
<i>Multi-purpose Vehicle</i>	2
Loading/unloading Space	
<i>Heavy Goods Vehicle</i>	1
Target Completion Year	2028

**Note**

The figures exclude the 10% GFA and SC concessions for floors adopting Modular Integrated Construction (MiC) method permissible under Joint Practice Note (JPN) No. 8 and Section 42 of the Buildings Ordinance (BO). Nevertheless, the proposed BH has taken into account the increase in floor-to-floor height (FTFH) due to adoption of MiC method for the DQ floors.

- 1.4 The mean site formation level of the Site is 185.5mPD. To avoid the need for additional basement floor(s), the proposed one-storey communal basement carpark will have a FTFH of 6.5m to accommodate double-decked mechanical parking. The five-storey FSAD<sup>2</sup> will be sited on the G/F (192mPD) for operational need and

<sup>2</sup> Consisting of a 5-bay appliance room for fire engines (on G/F with headroom up to the M/F, FTFH of 7.55m), E&M facilities (M/F), ancillary offices (1/F and 3/F, FTFH of 3.7m) and divisional training facilities (2/F to 4/F, FTFH of 4.8 to 5m). A separate drill tower will occupy part of the proposed building from G/F to 8/F within the BHR of 230mPD. According to the applicant, the proposed FTFHs are consistent with the standard headroom and structural requirements of modern FSAD facilities.

will have a BH of 24.75m, with the uppermost facility (excluding the separate drill tower) occupying part of the 4/F podium garden beneath the transfer plate (216.75mPD). The 11 storeys of DQ, with FTFH of 2.8m, will be built atop the 2.4m transfer plate resulting in an absolute BH of 64.45m with main roof level at 249.95mPD, i.e. 19.95m above the prevailing BHR (**Drawings 10 and 11**).

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

- (a) Application Form received on 7.9.2023 (**Appendix I**)
- (b) Supporting Planning Statement (SPS) (**Appendix Ia**)
- (c) Further Information (FI) received on 16.10.2023 and 18.10.2023<sup>[\*]</sup> (**Appendices Ib and Ic**)
- (d) FI received on 24.10.2023<sup>[\*]</sup> (**Appendix Id**)

*Remarks:*

<sup>[\*]</sup> *accepted and exempted from publication and recounting requirement*

## **2. Justifications from the Applicant**

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application are set out in the SPS and FIs at **Appendices Ia to Id**, which are summarised as follows:

### **Meeting Government Policies with Site Optimisation**

- (a) The acute shortage in DQ units has resulted in an average waiting time for DQ accommodation of nearly 5 years for eligible married R&F FSD staff. The proposed DQ is in line with the initiative under the Chief Executive's 2014 Policy Address (PA) to expedite the construction of DQ projects for the disciplined services.
- (b) The 2018 PA also announced that the Government will strive to optimise utilisation of suitable "G/IC" sites under the 'Single Site, Multiple Use' (SSMU) principle. The co-location of FSAD and DQ under SSMU principle could optimise the use of scarce land resources and meet the acute demand for DQs. Under the extant BHR of 230mPD, only 44 DQ units could be provided atop the FSAD, which is not ideal in building efficiency terms and does not represent best use of land resources. Minor relation of BHR to 249.95mPD could allow an additional 69 DQ units to be provided. The proposed 113 DQ units have struck a balance between optimising site utilisation and avoiding the need to excavate a further basement floor for car parking, and are considered the optimal amount for the Site.

### **Site Constraints and Design Requirements**

- (c) The site layout is constrained by the following operational and building design considerations, which limit the building footprint and disposition of the elongated DQ block to the On Yu Road frontage (**Drawing A-12**):
  - (i) a 5-bay appliance room for fire engines with associated facilities warrants an elongated building along On Yu Road. The Proposed Scheme has limited the continuous projected façade length to 60m in line with the requirement under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG), otherwise the building would need to comply with building separation requirements;

- (ii) accommodation of an uncovered drill yard of about 681m<sup>2</sup> in size to the rear of the FSAD, which is already significantly smaller than the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines standard of 1,225m<sup>2</sup>. Part of the G/F will also be occupied by the basement carpark ramp; and
- (iii) compliance with the lighting and ventilation requirements of domestic uses (i.e. the DQ units) as stipulated under the Building (Planning) Regulations.

#### Planning and Design Merits

- (d) Despite the operational and site constraints, the Proposed Scheme will provide about 821m<sup>2</sup> of greenery (about 25.6% of the Site), including 10 new trees and greening on G/F along On Yu Road, podium garden on 4/F, terraced garden on 12/F and roof garden on 15/F, which would help enhance the quality of the adjoining streetscape (**Drawing A-2** and **A-15**). Building setbacks from the south-eastern and north-western boundaries at upwards of 5.9m and 10.6m respectively, as well as a podium garden on the 4/F, would help reduce the overall building bulk and enhance wind permeability to the surrounding area (**Drawing A-12**). Taking into consideration the factors and design merits in paragraphs 2(a) to (d), the proposed minor relaxation in BHR generally meets the relevant criteria set out in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP (see paragraph 8.2).

#### Land Use Compatibility and Urban Design Considerations

- (e) The Site is located at a Government, institution or community (GIC) cluster surrounded by planned residential and open space developments. The proposed DQ is considered compatible with the planned context of the surrounding area. The Proposed Scheme, at a BH of 249.95mPD, would maintain a stepped BH profile with the residential developments to its southwest (On Tat Estate, at about 279mPD) and northeast (On Sau Court, with a BHR of 290mPD), without compromising views to/from the Tai Sheung Tok ridgeline (**Drawings A-13, A-14** and **A-18**).

#### No Adverse Impact on the Surrounding Area

- (f) Various technical assessments, including Traffic Impact Assessment, Drainage Impact Assessment, Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA), Preliminary Environmental Review (PER), Visual Impact Assessment, LMP and Geotechnical Planning Review, concluded that the proposed development would not result in any adverse or unacceptable impacts to the surrounding area with implementation of mitigation measures. While the Site abuts a major wind corridor as identified in the Study (**Plan A-7**), the submitted Air Ventilation Assessment-Expert Evaluation (AVA-EE) concluded that no significant air ventilation impact is anticipated.

### **3. Compliance with the “Owner’s Consent/Notification” Requirements**

As the Site involves GL only, the “owner’s concern/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.

#### 4. **Background**

- 4.1 Planning Department (PlanD) commissioned the Study in 2011 with a view to examine the after use of the former ARQ. The Study was completed in 2014, which recommended the ARQD be developed as a community with a target population of 25,000. Beneath the rock face of Tai Sheung Tok, the ARQD broadly includes four distinct areas, including a 17-hectare Quarry Park, a Civic Core with low-rise commercial and GIC facilities, and the Northern and Southern Residential Communities (to which the Site is located) with supporting commercial and GIC facilities (**Plan A-6**).
- 4.2 As recommended in the planning and urban design concept for ARQD (**Plan A-7**), a stepped BH profile is adopted for the Residential Communities with a view to:
- (a) respecting the Tai Sheung Tok ridgeline as viewed from the strategic vantage point at the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre;
  - (b) preserving an existing view corridor between the Tai Sheung Tok summit and Jordan Valley;
  - (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.

Based on the above considerations, within the Southern Residential Community (where the Site is located), high-rise residential blocks are mainly planned close to the rock face with medium-rise blocks fronting the Quarry Park to the west of On Yu Road. The Site is located to the west of On Yu Road and was originally planned for a low-rise sub-divisional fire station under the Study (**Plan A-6**).

#### 5. **Previous Application**

There is no previous application in respect of the Site.

#### 6. **Similar Applications**

There are two similar applications (No. A/K14/812 and 813) involving proposed minor relaxation of BHRs for various permitted GIC uses within/straddling the “G/IC(2)” zones on the OZP<sup>3</sup> (**Plan A-1**). Both application sites were initially designated for singular GIC uses under the Study, but were subsequently subject to site optimisation initiatives under the SSMU principle which warranted increases in BHs. Both applications were approved with conditions by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board on 4.3.2022 on the considerations that the proposed increase in BH was in line with the SSMU policy and the proposals would not result in any adverse visual and air ventilation impacts on the surrounding area.

---

<sup>3</sup> Application No. A/K14/812 involved minor relaxation of BHR from 200mPD to 211.95mPD (+11.95m, i.e. +6.0% in terms of mPD or +44.3% in terms of absolute BH) for permitted joint-user complex with proposed public vehicle park (excluding container vehicles) use, while application no. A/K14/813 involved minor relaxation of BHR from 200mPD to 206.35mPD (+6.35m, i.e. +3.2% in terms of mPD or +58.0% in terms of absolute BH) for permitted refuse collection point (RCP)-cum-recyclable collection centre (RCC).

## **7. The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans A-1 to A-6)**

### **7.1 The Site:**

- (a) abuts On Yu Road to its northeast and adjoins a planned public open space (POS) to its south, as well as a planned RCP-cum-RCC (under application No. A/K14/813) and a planned police station to its immediate southeast and northwest respectively within the same “G/IC(2)” zone; and
- (b) is currently undergoing site formation works by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) before handing over to the applicant for construction works.

### **7.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:**

- (a) ARQD is planned for medium-density residential developments with supporting commercial and other GIC facilities, intertwined with planned POS. The Site is located in the Southern Residential Community of the ARQD, which is a residential neighbourhood with supporting GIC facilities; and
- (b) to the northeast of the Site across On Yu Road is a high-rise public housing development (On Sau Court, with BHR of 290mPD) under construction. To the further east of the Site is another “G/IC(2)” zone earmarked for a primary school and a secondary school (with BHR of 8 storeys).

## **8. Planning Intention**

8.1 The planning intention of the “G/IC” zone is primarily for the provision of GIC facilities serving the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district, region or the territory. It is also intended to provide land for uses directly related to or in support of the work of the Government, organisations providing social services to meet community needs, and other institutional establishments.

8.2 As stated in the ES of the OZP, a minor relaxation of BHR clause is incorporated to provide incentive for developments/redevelopments with planning and design merits and to cater for circumstances with specific site constraints. Each application for minor relaxation of BHR will be considered on its own merits and the relevant criteria for consideration of such application are as follows:

- (a) amalgamating smaller sites for achieving better urban design and local area improvements;
- (b) accommodating the bonus PR granted under the BO 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 and would not cause adverse landscape and visual impacts.

## 9. Comments from Relevant Government Bureaux/Departments (B/Ds)

- 9.1 The following B/Ds have been consulted and their views on the application are summarised as follows:

### Policy Support

- 9.1.1 Comments of the Secretary for Security (S for Security):

it is the Government's established policy to provide DQs to married disciplined services staff subject to the availability of resources. He supports the application as the Proposed Scheme can provide more DQ units to satisfy existing demand, which aligns with his policy objective and the wider Government policy directive to optimise the use of land.

### Land Administration

- 9.1.2 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Sai Kung, Lands Department:

given that the Site only comprises GL, he has no comment on the application from land administrative point of view.

### Urban Design, Visual and Landscape Aspects

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

- (a) she has no adverse comment on the application from urban design, visual impact, landscape planning and air ventilation perspectives. The applicant should note her advisory comments at **Appendix III**;

#### *Urban Design and Visual Aspects*

- (b) judging from the submitted photomontages (**Drawings A-16 to A-20**), the proposed development with minor relaxation of BHR from 230mPD to 249.95mPD might not compromise the townscape of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the intended stepped height profile at the Southern Residential Community of the ARQD will be maintained (**Drawings A-13 and A-14**), while incorporation of the building setbacks and landscaping measures in paragraph 2(d) above might promote visual interest of the Proposed Scheme;

#### *Landscape Aspect*

- (c) the Site is situated in an area of quarry landscape character predominated by vacant land. There are residential buildings in the downhill areas to its southwest. Having considered the proposed landscape measures under paragraph 2(d) above, the Proposed

Scheme is considered not incompatible with the surrounding landscape setting. Significant adverse landscape impact due to the proposal is not anticipated; and

*Air Ventilation Aspect*

- (d) an AVA-EE has been s to demonstrate the ventilation performance under the Baseline and Proposed Schemes. Various air ventilation measures under paragraph 2(d) above have been incorporated in the Proposed Scheme to facilitate wind penetration and circulation. Significant adverse impact on the surrounding pedestrian wind environment is not anticipated.

**Environmental Aspect**

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

- (a) he has no in-principle objection to the application; and
- (b) based on the submitted PER and SIA, insurmountable environmental and sewerage impacts are not anticipated with the implementation of mitigation measures. Should the application be approved by the Board, the approval conditions under paragraph 12.2 below should be stipulated.

9.2 The following B/Ds have no objection to/no adverse comment on the application:

- (a) Commissioner for Transport (C for T);
- (b) Project Manager (East), CEDD;
- (c) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD;
- (d) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- (e) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, Highways Department;
- (f) Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department (CE/MS, DSD);
- (g) Chief Architect/Advisory and Statutory Compliance, ArchSD (CA/ASC, ArchSD);
- (h) Commissioner of Police;
- (i) District Officer/Kwun Tong, Home Affairs Department (HAD);
- (j) District Officer/Sai Kung, HAD;
- (k) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services;
- (l) Director of Fire Services; and
- (m) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services.

**10. Public Comments Received During the Statutory Publication Period**

On 19.9.2023, the application was published for public inspection. During the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, one public comment was received from an individual objecting the application on the grounds that the minor relaxation in BHR was excessive and would create adverse air ventilation and visual impacts on the surrounding area (**Appendix II**).



## 11. Planning Considerations and Assessments

- 11.1 The application is for proposed minor relaxation of BHR from 230mPD to 249.95mPD (+19.95m) for permitted FSAD and proposed flat (DQ) use at the Site zoned “G/IC(2)” on the OZP. Apart from the permitted FSAD, the minor relaxation in BHR and proposed DQ use require planning permission from the Board.

### Policy Support

- 11.2 The 2014 PA announced that the Government will expedite DQ projects for disciplined services departments, while the 2018 PA mentioned that the Government would strive to optimise utilisation of suitable GIC sites under SSMU principle. The proposed 113 DQ units could help meet the acute demand in DQs and help shorten the waiting time for DQ accommodation for eligible married R&F FSD staff. S for Security supports the application as the Proposed Scheme will meet the aforesaid policy initiatives through better utilisation of the Site in providing much-needed GIC and DQ facilities to meet the needs of the community and the disciplined services.

### In line with the Planning Intention

- 11.3 The Site is zoned “G/IC(2)” on the OZP and has been reserved for fire station use as recommended by the Study. The permitted sub-divisional FSAD will provide essential emergency services to cope with the population demand in the area and is in line with the planning intention of the “G/IC” zone, which is intended primarily for provision of GIC facilities serving the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district. As for the proposed DQ use, given that the Site is located within the Southern Residential Community of the ARQD which is planned for residential developments with supporting GIC facilities intertwined with POS, the proposed residential use is considered not incompatible with the surrounding area.

### Minor Relaxation of BHR

- 11.4 The proposed minor relaxation in BHR (+19.95m) is for accommodating 113 DQ units in addition to the planned FSAD. Having due regard to the operational and site constraints discussed in paragraph 2(c) above, the applicant indicates that the building footprint of the Proposed Scheme has been optimised (**Drawing A-12**). The proposed FTFHs are consistent with the prevailing requirements for FSAD facilities and the proposed DQ floors will adopt MiC method, which according to JPN No. 8 on ‘Enhanced Facilitation Measures for Buildings Adopting MiC’, proposals involving increase in BH to accommodate MiC should be favourably considered.
- 11.5 In terms of the stepped BH profile for ARQD envisioned by the Study, the Proposed Scheme (with BH of 249.95mPD) is still considerably lower than the BHR of 290mPD for On Sau Court to its uphill northeast and lower than the existing buildings at On Tat Estate (about 280mPD) to its downhill southwest (**Drawing A-14**). The Proposed Scheme will not undermine the stepped BH profile envisioned for the area nor would it obstruct the planned view corridors between the Tai Sheung Tok summit and Jordan Valley (**Plan A-7**). Moreover, the Proposed Scheme has incorporated various landscape and design measures as detailed in

paragraph 2(d) above, notably building setbacks and podium garden, to enhance the visual outlook and air ventilation performance of the proposed development. As illustrated in the photomontages (**Drawings A-16 to 20**), the Proposed Scheme would not result in any adverse visual impact on the surrounding area. CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no adverse comment on the application from urban design, visual impact, landscape planning and air ventilation perspectives, while CA/ASC, ArchSD has no comment on the application.

- 11.6 Setting aside the policy intent for providing needed GIC facilities under the SSMU principle, the Proposed Scheme generally meets criteria (c), (d) and (f) for considering application for minor relaxation of BHR as mentioned in paragraph 8.2 above (i.e. providing better streetscape at the pedestrian level; providing building separations to enhance air ventilation and visual permeability; and catering to unique operational requirements and site constraints for FSAD development at the Site).

#### Other Technical Aspects

- 11.7 The applicant has submitted various technical assessments confirming the technical feasibility of the Proposed Scheme. Relevant concerned departments, including DEP, C for T and CE/MS, DSD, have no objection to/no adverse comment on the application. Adverse environmental, traffic and drainage impacts on the surrounding area are not envisaged. Furthermore, approval conditions are recommended in paragraph 12.2 below to address the concerns of relevant department.

#### Similar Applications

- 11.8 While each application for minor relaxation of BHR will be considered on its own merits, the Committee has approved two similar applications involving minor relaxation of BHRs of about 44% and 58% (in terms of increase in absolute BH) for various permitted GIC uses within “G/IC(2)” zones at ARQD (**Plan A-1**). The applications were approved mainly on the considerations that the proposed increase in BHs (to provide additional facilities above and beyond those originally envisioned under the Study) was in line with the SSMU policy and would not result in any adverse visual and air ventilation impacts on the surrounding area. Such considerations are generally applicable to the current application with proposed minor relaxation of BHR of 44.8% (in terms of increase in absolute BH terms).

#### Public Comment

- 11.9 One objecting public comment was received during the statutory publication period. Regarding the concerns on visual and air ventilation aspects, the assessment in paragraph 11.5 above is relevant.

### **12. Planning Department’s Views**

- 12.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 11 above, and taking 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 27.10.2027, 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 conditions of approval and advisory clauses are suggested for Members' reference:

Approval Conditions

- (a) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (b) in relation to (a) above, the implementation of the local sewage upgrading/ sewerage connection works identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board.

Advisory Clauses

The advisory clauses are attached at **Appendix III**.

- 12.3 There is no strong reason to recommend rejection of the application.

### **13. Decision Sought**

- 13.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to grant or to 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**

<b>Appendix I</b>	Application Form received on 7.9.2023
<b>Appendix Ia</b>	SPS
<b>Appendices Ib and Ic</b>	FI received on 16.10.2023 and 18.10.2023
<b>Appendix Id</b>	FI received on 24.10.2023
<b>Appendix II</b>	Public Comment
<b>Appendix III</b>	Recommended Advisory Clauses
<b>Drawings A-1 to A-9</b>	Indicative Floor Plans
<b>Drawings A-10 and A-11</b>	Sections
<b>Drawing A-12</b>	Site Constraints Plan
<b>Drawings A-13 and A-14</b>	Building Height Profile
<b>Drawing A-15</b>	LMP
<b>Drawings A-16 to A-20</b>	Photomontages (extracted)

<b>Plan A-1</b>	Location Plan
<b>Plan A-2</b>	Site Plan
<b>Plan A-3</b>	Aerial Photo
<b>Plans A-4 and A-5</b>	Site Photos
<b>Plan A-6</b>	Recommended Land Uses per the Study
<b>Plan A-7</b>	Planning and Urban Design Concept per the Study

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
OCTOBER 2023**