APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION
UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

APPLICATION NO. A/K14/745

Applicant: Urban Renewal Authority (URA)

Site: URA Development Scheme Area at Kwun Tong Town Centre (KTTC) – Main Site (Area bounded by Kwun Tong Road, Hong Ning Road, Mut Wah Street and Hip Wo Street) Kwun Tong, Kowloon

Site Area: 46,294m² (about) (Plans A-1 and A-2)
Residential Sub-Area: 27,770m² (about)
Commercial Sub-Area: 18,524m² (about)

Land Status: Kwun Tong Inland Lots (KTILs) 107, 196, 198, 209, 309, 310, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, and MTRL 1PR(Part) – about 4,340 m²
New Kowloon Inland Lot (NKIL) 6514 – about 21,754 m²
Government Land – about 20,200 m²

Plan: Approved URA KTTC – Main Site Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/K14S/URA1/2

Zoning: “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) [Within the Residential Sub-Area (Plan A-2), restricted to a maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) of 7.5 and total PR of 9.
Within the Commercial Sub-Area, restricted to a maximum total PR of 12.
A maximum total gross floor area (GFA) of 401,250m² for KTTC - Main Site and Yuet Wah Street Site (YWSS), which is zoned “CDA(2)” on the approved URA KTTC- YWSS DSP No. S/K14S/URA2/2.
All Government, institution or community (GIC) and public transport interchange (PTI) facilities shall be included in GFA calculation.
Provision of at-grade integrated outdoor open-air public space of not less than 4,060m² in addition to not less than 1m² per person of the planned residential population of the KTTC– Main Site and YWSS.]

Application: Proposed comprehensive redevelopment with residential (flats) and commercial uses (including hotel, offices, retail), hawker bazaar, educational institution, public open space (POS), PTI, other GIC uses (government uses) and supporting facilities (Amendments to approved Master Layout Plan (MLP))
1. **The Proposal**

1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for amendments to the approved MLP for a comprehensive redevelopment at KTTC - Main Site (the Site) under Application No. A/K14/727 which was approved by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 18.12.2015 (Approved Scheme). The proposed comprehensive redevelopment comprises residential and commercial uses (including hotel, office, retail), POS, GIC facilities, PTI and supporting facilities. The Site is zoned “CDA(1)” on the approved URA KTTC – Main Site DSP No. S/K14S/URA1/2 (Plan A-1), and the scheme area is indicated on the draft Kwun Tong (South) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K14S/21. According to the Notes of the DSP, for development on land designated “CDA(1)”, the applicant shall prepare a MLP for the approval of the Board.

1.2 The Site covers the whole of “CDA(1)” site (about 4.62 hectare) which is divided into four Development Areas (DAs)¹, i.e. DA 2 to DA 5 (Plan A-2). The developments in DAs 2 and 3 (including four residential towers, retail facilities, PTI (bus and minibus terminus), a hawker bazaar, POS and GIC facilities) are currently under construction and, according to the applicant, is anticipated to be completed in 2021. The proposed scheme for DAs 2 and 3 under the current application is basically the same as that of the Approved Scheme, except for some minor amendments including, among others, changes in the form of the residential towers and the layout of hawker bazaar (with the GFA remains unchanged), changes in location of commercial uses within non-domestic portion, changes in the layout and configuration of the landscape deck in podium for better connection to DAs 4 and 5 at MTR level.

1.3 According to the applicant, the development proposal is prepared having regard to the Planning Brief (PB) endorsed by the Board on 7.9.2007 and the Approved Scheme. The major amendments focus on the proposed developments in DAs 4 and 5 (Plan A-2). The revised MLP, floor plans, section plans and Landscape Master Plan (LMP) submitted by the applicant as compared with the Approved Scheme are shown at Drawings A-1 to A-33. The major amendments are summarized as follows:

(a) **Revised boundary between DA4 and DA5 and implementation schedule**

The boundary between DAs 4 and 5 is revised with clear separation (Drawing A-33) to facilitate the early implementation of the elevated deck connecting Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Kwun Tong Station and the Yue Man Square rest garden (YMSRG) in DA4. The implementation programme for the two DAs is revised from 2024 to 2026 tentatively.

(b) **Changes in building design** (Drawings A-1 and A-22)

The long retail podium along Kwun Tong Road stretches across DAs 4 and 5 under the Approved Scheme is divided into two to facilitate the separation of the DAs. Two distinct buildings, namely an office/ hotel tower in DA4 and a GIC cum commercial complex in DA5, are separated by building gaps with 14-39m in width at different levels. The total GFAs for the Main Site as well as different uses remain the same as the Approved Scheme with some reshuffling

---

¹ Designation of DA aims at delineating the implementation schedule of each part of the Site. There is no statutory restriction on the development intensity for individual DA neither on the DSP nor the Planning Brief.
in commercial GFA between the Residential and the Commercial Sub-Areas due to the revised building form.

(c) **Increase in height of the landmark office/hotel tower in DA4** *(Drawing A-22)*
With slimmer tower form, the building height (BH) for the tower increases from 260mPD to 285mPD (+25m, +9.6%).

(d) **Revised LMP** *(Drawing A-25)*
The LMP is revised to reflect the above changes and the ‘essence’ of the design features as contained in the Approved MLP is maintained.

(e) **Others**
- To include ‘education institution’ use in the Commercial Sub-Area.
- To provide 500m² social welfare facilities on top of the 1,500 m² multi-purpose activity centre
- To revise the vehicular access to DA5 allowing right-turning traffic from Hong Ning Road northbound *(Drawing A-9)*, slightly increase car parking spaces and propose other traffic improvement measures.
- Improved pedestrian connections at multi-level by provision of new at-grade openings, footbridge/decks at different levels connected to the MTR Kwun Tong Station and different DAs *(Drawings A-29 to A-32)*.

1.4 A comparison of the major development parameters of the Approved Scheme and the current scheme for the “CDA(1)” zone, with changes highlighted and set out in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Parameters for the Main Site</th>
<th><strong>Approved Scheme</strong> <em>(Application No. A/K14/727)</em> (a)</th>
<th><strong>Current Scheme</strong> <em>(Application No. A/K14/745)</em> (b)</th>
<th>Difference [(b)-(a)] (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>46,294m²</td>
<td>46,294m²</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Blocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Tower</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-domestic Tower</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-domestic</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GFA (*)</td>
<td>373,420m²</td>
<td>373,420m²</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>138,980m²</td>
<td>138,980m²</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Retail</td>
<td>111,780m² (incl. 1,000m² for multi-purpose activity centre, and 1,300m² for social enterprise use)</td>
<td>111,780m² (incl. 1,500m² for multi-purpose activity centre and 1,300m² for social enterprise use)</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>65,860m²</td>
<td>65,860m²</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>32,000m²</td>
<td>32,000m²</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIC (including PTI)</td>
<td>24,800m² (incl. 500m² reserved for multi-purpose activity centre)</td>
<td>24,800m² (incl. 500m² reserved for social welfare facilities)</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum BH (mPD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Tower</td>
<td>165.4-178</td>
<td>165.4-178</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Tower</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>+25 (+9.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Parameters for the Main Site</td>
<td>Approved Scheme (Application No. A/K14/727) (a)</td>
<td>Current Scheme (Application No. A/K14/745) (b)</td>
<td>Difference [(b)-(a)] (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Storeys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Towers</td>
<td>39-43 (plus 4 storeys PTI/retail/hawker bazaar/clubhouse, 2 storeys basement car park, 1 storey refuge floor, 1 storey transfer plate and 1 storey residential lobby)</td>
<td>39-43 (plus 4 storeys PTI/retail/hawker bazaar/clubhouse, 2 storeys basement car park, 1 storey refuge floor, 1 storey transfer plate and 1 storey residential lobby)</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-domestic Towers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+6 (+10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Tower</td>
<td>58 (incl. 3 storeys refuge/E&amp;M floors, plus 1 storey mezzanine floor, and 4 storeys of basement car park/retail)</td>
<td>64 (incl. 4 storeys refuge, E&amp;M floors, plus 1 storey mezzanine floor, and 6 storeys of basement car park/retail)</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite GIC &amp; Commercial Building</td>
<td>13 (plus 4 storeys basement car park/retail)</td>
<td>13 (plus 4 storeys basement car park/retail)</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage (SC)</td>
<td>&lt;70%</td>
<td>&lt;70%</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not exceeding 15m</td>
<td>&lt;11%</td>
<td>&lt;11%</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic SC</td>
<td>&lt;52%</td>
<td>&lt;52%</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-dom SC 15m-43m</td>
<td>&lt;19%</td>
<td>&lt;19%</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-dom SC 44m-61m</td>
<td>&lt;9%</td>
<td>&lt;9%</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-dom SC &gt;61m-75m</td>
<td>&lt;9%</td>
<td>&lt;8%</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-dom SC &gt;75m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1 (-1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Flats</td>
<td>≤1,999</td>
<td>≤1,999</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Flats</td>
<td>≤400</td>
<td>≤400</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Flat size (m²)</td>
<td>About 70 (Flat size 33 to 102)</td>
<td>About 70</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population</td>
<td>4,598</td>
<td>4,598</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space – at grade (m²)</td>
<td>Not less than 9,348</td>
<td>Not less than 9,350</td>
<td>+2 (+0.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Open Space (m²)</td>
<td>Not less than 4,598</td>
<td>Not less than 4,598</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents’ Clubhouse</td>
<td>≤5% of Domestic GFA</td>
<td>≤5% of Domestic GFA</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking spaces</td>
<td>980 to 1,310</td>
<td>991-1,321</td>
<td>+11 (+0.84 to 1.12 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading/Unloading (L/UL) Bays</td>
<td>123-176</td>
<td>124 – 177</td>
<td>+1 (+0.57 to 0.81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Schedule (Drawing A-33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA 2</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA 3</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA 4</td>
<td>2024 (tentative)</td>
<td>2026 (tentative)</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA 5</td>
<td>2024 (tentative)</td>
<td>2026 (tentative)</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note:

(*) The respective GFAs for the Main Site and the YWSS are 373,420m² and 27,830m², and the total GFA is 401,250 m², which is within the restriction stipulated in the DSP.

(©) Apart from commercial/retail uses, ‘education institution’ uses is included in the Commercial Sub-Area.

(#) The 1,500m² multi-purpose activity centre would be provided and wholly managed by the applicant.

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

(a) Letter from the applicant received on 2.6.2017 with application form  (Appendix I)

(b) Planning statement  (Appendix Ia)

(c) Letter from the applicant received on 15.8.2017 providing Further Information (FI) including MLP, block plans, floor and sectional plans, LMP, photomontages, and technical assessments on traffic, sewerage, drainage, air ventilation and environment assessment (EA), and responses to public and departmental comments (FI(1)). [Accepted but not exempted from publication requirement.]

(d) Letter from the applicant received on 12.12.2017 providing FI including MLP, block plans, floor and sectional plans, LMP, photomontages, and technical assessments on landscape/tree, visual impact, air ventilation, and EA (FI(2)). [Accepted but not exempted from publication requirement.]

(e) Letter from the applicant received on 5.2.2018 providing responses to public comments, departmental comments on technical aspects and replacements pages of EA, traffic impact assessment (TIA), air ventilation assessment (AVA) and sewerage and drainage impact assessments (FI(3)). [Accepted but not exempted from publication requirement.]

1.6 The application was originally scheduled for consideration by the Committee on 28.7.2017. On 28.7.2017 and 13.10.2017, the Committee agreed to defer making a decision on the application for two months respectively as requested by the applicant in order to allow sufficient time for preparation of FI to response to the departmental comments and public comments. The applicant subsequently submitted FIs on 15.8.2017, 12.12.2017 and 5.2.2018 (Appendices Ib, Ic and Id). With the FI received on 12.12.2017 (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 are at Appendices Ia to Ic and summarized as follows:

(a) Separation of DAs 4 and 5 (Drawing A-33)

During the course of development, possible delay to the program due to the clearance and acquisition issues in DA5 is found. As DA4 would serve as a key connection between the Kwun Tong MTR Station, the future permanent PTIs in DAs 2 and 3 and the
YMSRG, DAs 4 and 5 are separated for phased developments and to include YMSRG in DA4 (Plan A-2) so as to facilitate its earlier implementation and the multi-level pedestrian network to enhance the overall connectivity.

(b) Changes in building design (Drawings A-1 and A-22)

- The elongated podium along Kwun Tong Road spins over DAs 4 and 5 under the Approved Scheme is divided into two to conform to the separation of the DAs. Sets of “urban windows” of 14-39m in width at various levels are suitably erected to enhance air ventilation, visual permeability and architectural interest. The design of current scheme is a strike of balance between minimising the wall-effect along Kwun Tong Road and mitigating road traffic and railway noise impacts on residential towers behind.

- In response to public comments, an architectural design study has been advanced by adopting an elliptical parabola form in the design of the GIC cum commercial complex, including water features in the POS, and capturing the design essence according to the Approved Scheme (Drawings A-34 to A-36).

- Similar to the Approved Scheme, the design of the GIC cum commercial complex in DA5 adopts a stepped height profile at the podium level, i.e. progressively increasing from +59mPD in the west and +75mPD in the east.

(c) Increase in height of the landmark office/hotel tower (Drawings A-22)

- The proposed increase would not only enable a higher floor-to-floor height for office floors (from 4m to 4.3m) but also the provision to fulfil 5-star hotel requirements (higher headroom at Level L10 for ballroom as instance). A higher BH will maximize the views from the observation deck at the top floor to various parts of Kowloon East and Hong Kong Island. The visual impact assessment (VIA) indicates that a landmark building of 285mPD should be identifiable as a reference point for the town centre from all vantage points, particularly from the Kai Tak Runway, Devil’s Peak and Black Hill.

- The revised scheme with a slimmer tower footprint (of 2,235m² as compared with 2,465m² with about 9.3% reduction) with more separations with surrounding buildings would enhance the air ventilation, visual permeability, day-light exposure for adjacent open spaces and buildings (Drawings A-40 to A-44). The revised scheme also fulfils the Sustainable Building Design (SBD) Guidelines.

- The proposed landscape areas open to public at reasonable hours in DAs 4 and 5 would increase from 3,000 m² to 3,230 m² (7.6% increase).

- VIA demonstrates that a BH of 285mPD on the surrounding environment is negligible to moderate (Drawings A-37a to A-37d, A-38a and A-38b). Since the existing high rise buildings in East Kowloon are already quite significant, the 285mPD building is visible from the various vantage points (such as Quarry Bay Park and Kai Tak Runway) but not visually intrusive. Besides, there is no ridgeline problem as the sections of the ridgeline at the backdrop of KTTC does not form part of the ridgeline recommended for preservation in the Urban Design Guidelines, and the existing buildings in the Kwun Tong Business Area (KTBA) are already higher than the mountain pass at the back. Moreover, it is not a waterfront site and would not affect the visual permeability from the Harbour. At a local level, the VIA reveals that the 285mPD building would have low to moderate visual impact at
street level because of a slimmer building bulk (Drawings A-39a and 39b). As compared with the Approved Scheme, the increase in BH is not very evident when sighted from afar.

- The applicant claims that should the BH for the office/hotel tower be reduced to 260mPD as same BH under the Approved Scheme would result in a fatter tower footprint and narrower view corridors when viewed from adjacent developments and from YMSRG; reduction of 230m² landscaped area (open to public at reasonable hours) and provision of office floor to floor heights below normal standard as compared to existing new offices, which are considered to be not desirable in planning considerations.

(d) **Revised LMP (Drawings A-25 to A-28)**

- The proposed scheme still captures the ‘essence’ of the design features in the Approved MLP, such as GIC cum commercial complex in an elliptical parabola form, stepped height profile and cascading water features, to meet the public aspiration (Drawings A-34 to A-36).

- At-grade POS (opens 24 hours a day) of not less than 9,350 m² is proposed in the scheme which is slightly more than that for the Approved Scheme. There are about 8,000m² landscaped areas and podium gardens² physically connected at various levels and would be open to public at reasonable hours, which is slightly above the proposed provision under the Approved Scheme by 230m².

- A greenery ratio of 30.8% has also been provided to fulfil the SBD Guidelines. Opportunities for tree planting have been maximised where possible, enhancing the shading function of the POS (Drawings A-25 and A-28).

- The setback at low zone between the GIC cum commercial complex facing Hong Ning Road and the site boundary is increased to about 38 meters (compared with about 26m under Approved Scheme), which would further enhance the air ventilation and visual permeability (Drawing A-45).

- A total of 504 nos. trees will be accommodated within the Site with 33 existing trees retained including two old and valuable trees (OVTs) preserved in-situ at YMSRG (Drawing A-25).

- While the POS is subject to further detailed design in liaison with relevant departments, different themed landscape areas, pocket spaces, benches and seating for sitting-out, gatherings, and various activities for all ages would be considered at detailed design stage.

---

² The landscaped areas to be opened to the public at reasonable hours are to be managed/maintained by the applicant and the future developer. These include the landscaped area of about 4,000m² at DAs 2 and 3 as required under the lease of NKIL 6514 (Drawing A-12) for connecting the Main Site with the older parts of KTTC across Hip Wo Street via a proposed footbridge; areas of about 3,230m² comprising the cascading garden with water features at L2 to L4 at DA4 and the roof garden at the GIC cum commercial complex at DA5; and an area of about 900 m² at the L1M to the south and east of YMSRG (see Appendix Id for details).
(e) **GIC facilities**
- Additional provision of 500m$^2$ floor space for social welfare facilities is proposed. The previously proposed 1,500m$^2$ multi-purpose activity centre for community use would be wholly managed by the applicant.
- The permanent hawker bazaar in DA3 would be accessible from Mut Wah Street in the north and Hong Ning Road in the west; thus its accessibility would not be affected during the construction of DAs 4 and 5. Upon completion of DA5, connections leading to YMSRG, Kwun Tong Road and Hip Wo Street would also be opened up.

(f) **Traffic**
- To enhance traffic circulation, the new right-turning ingress from Hong Ning Road northbound traffic to DA5 (Drawing A-9) is proposed to avoid the need to loop around the Site. Sufficient internal queuing length would be provided within the Site to minimise the queuing back issue. Technical assessments indicated that the traffic impacts and pedestrian level of service in the proposed scheme are similar to that in the Approved Scheme.
- A number of barrier-free pedestrian connections at multi-levels are propped to enhance mobility and connectivity, including a new mini-covered entrance plaza and Civic Square/entrance plazas from Hong Ning Road and Kwun Tong Road, a new double-decker covered footbridge connecting DAs 4 and 5, and footbridge/landscape deck connecting the MTR station with the landmark tower and further to DAs 2 and 3 (Drawings A-29 to A-32).

(g) Technical assessments including VIA, TIA, EA, AVA, etc. have been conducted or updated to ascertain the technical feasibility of the current proposal.

(h) The applicant has carried out a series of structured engagement exercises to consult the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) and other stakeholders from September to December 2017, and will keep close liaison KTDC on the further design details of the proposed scheme.

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

The Site comprises private lots and Government land. The applicant is one of the “current land owners” of the concerned private lots. In respect of the other ‘current land owners’, the applicant has complied with the 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) by giving notification to the concerned owners. Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members’ inspection.

4. **Previous Applications**

4.1 The Site is the subject of two previous s.16 (Nos. A/K14/576 and A/K14/727) and three s.16A applications (Nos. A/K14/576-1, A/K14/576-2 and A/K14/576-3) for the same uses submitted by the same applicant. The first s.16 application (No. A/K14/576) was approved by the Committee on 23.1.2009 with, inter alia, an approval condition
specifying that the BH of the proposed commercial development within the Site should not exceed 260mPD. A copy of the approval letter is at Appendix IIa.

4.2 While there is no BH restriction in the endorsed PB nor the DSP, it is stated in the PB that BH of the development in Commercial Sub-Area should take into account the BH of the KTBA and to achieve an iconic node for the town centre. The proposed BH should be supported by a VIA at the MLP stage. Under Application No. A/K14/576, the applicant proposed a BH of 280mPD for the office/hotel tower in DA4. In considering the application on 5.12.2008, the Members had varied views on the proposed BH of 280mPD and agreed to defer making a decision on the application and requested the applicant to provide further information to justify the proposed BH. On 23.1.2009, the Committee reconsidered the application with the FI submitted by the applicant, including VIA for options of BH ranging from 200mPD to 320mPD at an interval of 20m at 7 vantage points. The applicant argued that a BH of 280mPD for the commercial tower was visible but not intrusive when viewed from the Quarry Bay Park, and was also visually compatible with the surrounding environment and in line with the cityscape of a town centre. After deliberation, the meeting concluded that the design merits of the proposed commercial tower at 280mPD were not fully justified. However a reduced BH of 260mPD for the commercial tower would be more acceptable from planning point of view taking into account the need to strike a balance between the visual and urban design concerns as well as other non-visual functional and engineering considerations. An approval condition on BH was therefore imposed. Extracts of minutes of the two Committee meetings are at Appendices IIIa and IIIb.

4.3 The s.16A application (No. A/K14/576-1) for amending the phasing and implementation schedules of the approved MLP was approved with conditions by the Director of Planning under the delegated authority of the Board on 7.11.2011. The second (No. A/K14/576-2) for accommodating the Practice Notes on SBD Guidelines in terms of building separation, building set back and site coverage of greenery in new development was approved on 24.10.2012. The third (No. A/K14/576-3) for amendments mainly to increase the number of flats with consequential changes in flat sizes, building form and disposition of residential block, etc. was approved on 27.4.2015.

4.4 The second s.16 application (No. A/K14/727) approved on 18.12.2015, i.e. the Approved Scheme, was mainly for increasing the number of residential flats in DAs 2 and 3 from 1,869 to 1,999 units, and the associated changes in the development scheme. A copy of the approval letter is at Appendix IIIb.

5. Similar Application

There is one similar planning application (No. A/K14/577) for residential development at YWSS forming part of the URA’s KTTC project (DA1) (Plans A-1 and A-2) and zoned “CDA(2)” which was approved with conditions by the Committee on 5.12.2008. A s.16A application (No. A/K14/577-1) for Class B amendments to the approved scheme was approved with conditions under delegated authority of the Board on 9.3.2011. The approved development, involving a residential development of 39 storeys at 140mPD with a 3-storey podium accommodating GIC facilities (reprovisioning of the Kwan Tong Jockey Club Health Centre) and 1-level basement car park, was completed in 2014.
6. The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans A-1 and A-2 and photos on Plans A-3 to A-5)

6.1 The Site is:

(a) located in the town centre area of Kwun Tong;
(b) bounded by Mut Wah Street to its north, Hong Ning Road to its west, Kwun Tong Road to its south and Hip Wo Street to its east;
(c) partly under construction in DAs 2 & 3 and partly occupied by a number of low to medium-rise buildings (of about 30mPD) which are mostly vacant in DA 5. The original hawker bazaar, bus terminus and minibus termini have been temporarily relocated to an area at Tung Yan Street in DA4. These facilities will be reprovisioned to Level 1 of DAs 2 and 3 and the PTI therein upon their completion; and
(d) originally characterised by low to medium-rise commercial/residential buildings built in 1960s. The general environmental conditions and services in the Main Site are far from satisfactory and the infrastructure, in particular its drainage, sewerage, public transport and open space, have fallen below current standard.

6.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:

(a) to the north and west across Mut Wah Street and Hong Ning Road respectively are high-density residential developments (of 35-82mPD) with ground floor shops;
(b) the residential development at YWSS (of 140mPD) completed in 2014, namely Park Metropolitan, is located to the north-east of the Site across Hip Wo Street;
(c) to the east across Hip Wo Street are medium-density residential developments (of 53-71mPD);
(d) to the southeast is the MTR Kwun Tong Station which is elevated on top of Kwun Tong Road; and
(e) to the further south across Kwun Tong Road is the KTBA. APM and One Pacific Centre (commercial developments) with BH about 195mPD and 135mPD respectively, are located to the immediate south of Kwun Tong Road.

7. Planning Intention

The planning intention of the “CDA(1)” zone is for comprehensive development/redevelopment of the area for residential, Government and/or commercial uses with the provision of open space and other community and supporting facilities. The zoning aims to enhance vitality and achieve improvement in environmental and traffic conditions in the town centre through comprehensive redevelopment, restructuring the street pattern, promoting efficient land use and providing GIC facilities and POS.

8. Major Requirements under the Planning Brief

A PB for the “CDA(1)” zone was endorsed by the Board on 7.9.2007 to guide the development of the CDA and facilitate the preparation of a MLP submission by the applicant. The proposed scheme under current application generally complies with the development parameters, and planning and design requirements in the PB. A comparison of major development parameters in the PB and the current scheme is at Appendix IV.
9. **Comments from Relevant Government Departments**

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

**Land Administration**

9.1.1 Comments of the Chief Estate Surveyor / Urban Renewal, Lands Department (LandsD) (CES/UR, LandsD):

(a) No in-principle objection subject to comments given below.

(b) Comments from the Transport Department (TD), the Highways Department (HyD) and/or the relevant parties should be sought in relation to the closure of Tung Yan Street and the existing temporary bus and light bus terminus, the proposed new bus lane and lay-by along Kwun Tong Road and the vehicular ingress to DA5 at Hong Ning Road, the proposed further setback from Hong Ning Road, the replacement of the existing footbridges connecting to MTR Kwun Tong Station in DA4, and alteration works to the existing footbridge across Kwun Tong Road to Tsun Yip Lane.

(c) His office reserves comments on the proposed division of DA4 and DA5, proposed shared-use of egress point at Kwun Tong Road and car parking space by DAs 4 and 5, the proposed re-construction and/or modification works to be done on the existing two footbridge across Kwun Tong Road until details of which be provided from land administration point of view.

(d) Detailed design of the developments and GFA accountable for the Site will be examined at building plan stage.

(e) Subject to the agreement from HyD and TD to take up the street setback areas after their completion for future maintenance and management, all the setback areas to be handed over to the government should be free of any buildings and structures. No projections of any part of the developments should be protruded over the setback areas to be handed over to the government.

(f) Other comments are detailed in Appendices Id and V.

9.1.2 Comments of the District Lands Officer / Kowloon East, Lands Department (DLO/KE, LandsD):

(a) No objection subject to comments given below.

(b) Within the Application Site (i.e. CDA(1)), DAs 2 and 3 fall within NKIL 6514 held under the Conditions of Exchange No. 20238 dated 19.12.2014 (“the Conditions”). The applicant is required to ensure that the development parameters in the submission for DAs 2 and 3 tally with the Conditions. For DAs 4 and 5, his office would defer to Urban Renewal Section (URS) of LandsD in giving their comments. If the planning application is approved, the lot owner is required to apply to URS for land exchange to give effect to the proposal. However, there is no guarantee at this stage that the land exchange application would be approved. If the application for land exchange is approved by LandsD in the capacity as
landlord at its sole discretion, it will be subject to such terms and conditions including the payment of premium and fee as considered appropriate by LandsD.

(c) The area of the Site and other details submitted by the applicant has not been verified and the applicant is required to demonstrate the dimensions and calculation of the area when the land exchange application is submitted.

(d) The detailed design including but not limited to GFA, BH, pedestrian link, POS, Government Accommodation, noise barriers, greenery areas, building separation, carpark (including motor cycle) layout and the associated driveway arrangement, L/UL spaces, vehicular and pedestrian access, site formation, recreational facilities, headroom and roof-top structures, etc. and the LMP would be examined at the general building plan stage by LandsD acting in the capacity as the landlord at its sole discretion. There is no guarantee that any proposal under the planning permission, if granted, will be approved under lease.

(e) Other comments are detailed in Appendix Id.

**Traffic Aspect**

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

(a) The proposed right turning run-in at Hong Ning Road northbound to DA5 might bring adverse traffic impact on the junction performance and vehicle queue along Kwun Tong Road.

(b) As the frequent pick-up/drop-off activities at Hip Wo Street southbound bus stop might induce traffic queue, the traffic lanes along Hip Wo Street southbound from PTI access to Kwun Tong Road should be increased.

(c) The parking and L/UL facilities to be provided should at its high end provisions according to Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) requirements.

(d) Other comments are detailed in Appendix Id. Upon reviewing the applicant’s responses at FI(3) at Appendix Id, he has no further comments but requests the applicant to conduct revised TIA, should the application be approved.

9.1.4 Comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/Kowloon, HyD (CHE/K, HyD):

(a) No objection to the application subject to the comments below.

(b) Future private lot boundary shall be setback by at least 2.1m from permanent road kerbline to provide government land for public street furniture such as traffic signage unless otherwise approved by the Director of Highways.

(c) In case the existing footbridge at Tsun Yip Lane across Kwun Tong Road is to be modified/re-constructed by the applicant, the existing use of the
footbridge by pedestrian, including barrier-free access route, should be maintained at all times during the works.

(d) The applicant shall liaise with relevant government departments on the arrangement of taxi stand in DA4 especially its location and the connectivity with the PTI in DAs 2 and 3 during both interim construction stage and permanent stage.

(e) Other comments are detailed in Appendix Id.

9.1.5 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Railway Development 2-2, Railway Development Office, HyD (CE/RDO, HyD):

As the deck/footbridge proposed by the applicant linking the development to the existing MTR Kwun Tong Station may affect the MTR structure and its operation, the applicant should consult MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) on the proposal with respect to operation, maintenance and safety of the existing railway network with reference to PNAP APP-24.

Environmental Aspect

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

(a) No objection to the application in view of the following considerations:

(b) The EA Report indicates that the proposed amendments to the Approved Scheme are only on the Commercial Sub-Area in which the central air-conditioning system will be provided and would not rely on openable window for ventilation. The EA Report recommends that the location of fresh air intake of the central air-conditioning system should be situated at the area where the HKPSG’s recommended buffer distance for vehicular emission of >20m for Primary Distributor (Kwun Tong Road) and >10m for District Distributor (Hong Ning Road and Hip Wo Street). On the above basis, adverse air quality impact on the proposed development is not anticipated.

(c) The EA Report indicates that with the implementation of a number of mitigation measures proposed (e.g. provision of maximum building set-back, podium, building orientation, acoustic windows/fins, etc.), adverse traffic and railway noise impacts are not anticipated. It is considered that insurmountable noise impact on the proposed development is not anticipated.

(d) Based on the findings of the sewerage impact assessment (SIA), it is considered that insurmountable sewerage impact arising from the proposed development is not anticipated.

(e) Other comments are detailed in Appendices Id and V.

Building Aspect

9.1.7 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department (CBS/K, BD):
(a) No objection in-principle to the application subject to comments below.

(b) There is no detail to demonstrate the compliance of the SBD Guidelines. SBD requirements for GFA concessions could not be assessed. Detailed comments under the Buildings Ordinance (BO), including GFA concessions and SBD requirements, can only be provided at the building plan stage.

(c) The granting of hotel concession and exclusion of back of house area from GFA calculation under Building (Planning) Regulation 23A can only be considered upon formal submission of building plans subject to the compliance with the criteria under PNAP APP-40.

(d) All building works/change in use are subject to compliance with the BO. Detailed comments under BO can only be provided at the building plan submission stage.

**Urban Design**

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

(a) Based on the photomontages of the VIA, it does not appear that accommodation of the additional 25m BH (from 260mPD to 285mPD) for the proposed tower at DA4 will result in significant adverse impact to the townscape. Design merits in support of the proposed increase in BH, such as whether the revised scheme will provide more accessible open space for public enjoyment, and whether it will improve physical and visual permeability should be further elaborated.

(b) Other comments are detailed in Appendices Id and V.

**GIC facilities**

9.1.9 Comments of Government Property Agency (GPA):

(a) He has no comment on the application.

(b) In accordance with the Accommodation Regulations, the property management and maintenance responsibilities of the specialist/departamental buildings (SDBs) rest with the proponent/user departments. Comments from the concerned user departments should be sought.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GIC Facilities/SDBs</th>
<th>User Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTI</td>
<td>TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawker Bazaar</td>
<td>Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse Collection Point</td>
<td>Hong Kong Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>Leisure and Cultural Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space/Reprovisioned YMSRG</td>
<td>Social Welfare Department (SWD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Other comments are detailed in Appendices Id and V.
9.1.10 Comments of the Director of Social Welfare:

A 90-place early education training centre (EETC) would be provided at the GIC cum commercial complex (portion facing Hong Ning Road). The proposed location for the EETC is agreeable from service point of view. He has no comment, subject to the conditions that the location (including height) and design of the EETC would satisfy all prevailing BO and SWD requirements.

Fire Safety

9.1.11 Comments of the Director of Fire Services:

(a) He has no objection in principle to the application subject to fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of his department. Detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans.

(b) The arrangement of emergency vehicular access shall comply with Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 which is administered by BD.

Open Space and Landscaping

9.1.12 Comments of the CTP/UD&L, PlanD:

(a) He has reservation on the application from landscape planning point of view on the following grounds.

(b) To ascertain the potential constraints imposed by the proposed building bulk, assessment on its impacts on the retained trees (in particular for the OVTs at YMSRG) and identification of the sustainable tree preservation measures should be provided.

(c) Opportunities for more trees planting, in particular at ground level, as well as the provision of soft landscaping of passive open space as required under HKPSG should be explored to demonstrate “an urban oasis”.

(d) The connectivity and accessibility of the open spaces, the GIC facilities and the PTIs would be well demonstrated and meet the requirements on barrier free access.

(e) Should TPB approve the application, the conditions (g), and (i) imposed to the Approved Scheme, regarding the submission and implementation of the LMP and the at-grade POS (including tree preservation and tree replanting scheme), should also be included.

(f) Other comments are detailed in Appendix Id.

9.1.13 Comments of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS):

Noting that the re-provisioned YMSRG will sit on land unexcavated and there will not be basement floors of the development underneath, he has no comments on the application.
Air Ventilation

9.1.14 Comments of the CTP/UD&L, PlanD:

(a) With the various mitigation measures (including provisions of building separations between different DAs within the Site, an east-west aligned air path of about 14m wide between DAs 2 and 3 and DAs 4 and 5; and setback at the western boundary of the GIC cum commercial complex at DA5 facing Hong Ning Road), the AVA simulation results indicate that the Proposed Scheme has achieved the same overall ventilation performance under both annual and summer conditions as that under the Approve Scheme, except for some POSs within the Site.

(b) Other comments are detailed in Appendices Id and V.

Drainage

9.1.15 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department (CE/MS, DSD):

He has no objection to the application but adds that the SIA should be updated if the additional 500m$^2$ SWD facilities would generate additional sewage. Thus, same approval condition in relation to the submission of a revised SIA has to be imposed, should the application be approved.

Local Views

9.1.16 Comments of District Officer (Kwun Tong), Home Affairs Department (DO(KT), HAD):

For the original design in FI(1), the KTDC was dissatisfied with the applicant for revising the planning and design of the Site without consulting KTDC. The KTDC emphasized that the applicant had not secured its support on the proposed amendments to the previous approved schemes; and urged the applicant to engage KTDC for proper consultation before proceeding with further planning procedures.

9.1.17 Subsequently, the applicant has conducted series of consultations with KTDC and the local stakeholders in respect of the current submission (FI(2)) as detailed in Appendix 1c. The applicant consulted KTDC on 7.11.2017 with the refined architectural and landscape design of the proposed scheme (i.e. Drawings A-34 to A-36). Comments about the adequacy of car parking provision, the connectivity to MTR Kwun Tong Station as well as the surrounding areas, the proposed BH of the office/hotel tower, the overall design and facilities to be provided in the POS, and other design elements of the proposals were raised in the meeting. In gist, KTDC generally accepted the refined architectural design of the development but requested the applicant to make continuous efforts to foster communication with KTDC and the general public. The minutes of the KTDC meeting is at Appendix VI.

9.2 The following Government departments have no comments on/no objection to the application:

(a) Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services
10. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period

10.1 The application and the FIs (Appendices Ia, Ib and Ic) were published on 9.6.2017, 22.8.2017 and 19.12.2017 for public inspection. Within the three statutory public inspection periods, a total of 607 comments were received. During the publication of FI(1), 556 objecting views were received, mainly on the consultation process and architectural design of the proposed scheme (i.e. the spherical-shape design for the GIC cum commercial complex and cascading garden with water features) and the provision of multi-purpose activity centre in the previous approved schemes have not been included). In response, the applicant has refined the architectural and landscape design of the proposed scheme covering, inter alia, reverting of the design of the GIC cum commercial complex in spherical shape, provision of cascading garden with water and landscape features in FI(2). All the comments received are deposited at the Secretariat for Members’ inspection and are summarised in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Support only</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.6.2017 to 30.6.2017</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.8.2017 to 12.9.2017</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.2 The main points of the public comments (Appendices VII-1 to VII-38) are summarized below:

Supportive Comments (Appendices VII-1 to VII-7)

10.2.1 21 comments support the application for the following reasons:

(a) the separated development of DAs 4 and 5 would expedite the redevelopment process, as a whole upgrading the surrounding living environment;

(b) the proposed scheme would improve the heavily congested traffic conditions and alleviate the crowdedness at the MTR Kwun Tong Station;

(c) slimmer office/hotel tower with higher BH can achieve an iconic node for the KTTC and the proposed building gaps would improve air penetration; and

(d) the increase in POS under current scheme as compared with the approved MLP in 2009 would improve the environment.
Providing Comments (*Appendices VII-8 to VII-12*)

10.2.2 11 commenters, including MTRCL, member of KTDC and individuals, raised following comments:

(a) MTRCL commented that the Site is close to the MTR Kwun Tong Line and the residential developments at DAs 2 and 3 would be completed prior to the commercial and GIC developments in DAs 4 and 5, thus an interim scenario without noise screening effects from DAs 4 and 5 should be conducted in the railway noise impact assessment to ensure noise compliance during the interim period. The proposed pedestrian linkage connecting MTR Kwun Tong station should be designed in a way to encourage usage of the middle section of the station concourse via Entrance C (*Plan A-2*) in order to relieve the pressure on Entrance A (near Yue Man Square); and

(b) Other comments are mainly views and suggestions on the parking provision, traffic improvement measures, pedestrian connectivity (linkage to MTR Kwun Tong station in particular), the environmental impacts to the surroundings, introduction of ‘smart’ features, and the design of and/or the facilities to be provided in the POS, the PTI, observation deck and hawker bazaar.

Opposing Views (*Appendices VII-13 to VII-38*)

10.2.3 575 opposing comments from a Legislative Councillor, the Chairman and members of the KTDC, 工聯會議員聯合辦事處, 民主黨觀塘黨團, Green Sense, 淘大連線, Central & Western Concern Group and individuals (mostly in standard letters) were received. Their views are as follows:

(a) Public Consultation
The applicant failed to explain properly to the public on the proposed design, particular the architectural design of GIC cum commercial complex and the cascading water-featured POS, and the applicant should consult the public on the proposed scheme.

(b) Design elements of the proposed scheme
- The GIC cum commercial complex in spherical form and the cascading water-featured POS, which have been widely accepted by the general public and regarded as the iconic features of the project in the previous approved schemes, are removed from current submission and is not acceptable. The project is no different from a typical shopping mall and lacking in local character.

- The setback of DA 4 near Hip Wo Street was reduced by about 25% to 50% that would have adverse impacts on the visual and air circulation to the surrounding.

- Concerned about the glare effect of the buildings to the surrounding developments.

---

3 According to the noise impact assessments assessed under the Approved Scheme, the future residents in DAs 2 and 3 would not be subject to unacceptable railway noise impact before the completion of the DAs 4 and 5.
(c) BH of the proposed office/hotel tower
- The tower of 60 storeys is considered too high as it would have adverse impacts on the traffic, environment, air conditions, and is considered to be visual incompatible with the surrounding residential developments at Yuet Wah Street. Intrusion to the ridgeline of the Kowloon East should be minimised.

- The proposed BH of 285mPD exceeds the condition of maximum BH of 260mPD imposed under the previous approved schemes.

- While the footprint of the commercial tower is smaller, there is no increase in POS as compared with the Approved Scheme.

- The BH of 260mPD in the Approved Scheme is already exceeding 30% from the general BH restriction in KTBA. With the proposed 285mPD, the new building would be about 52.4% higher than the nearby APM (195mPD).

- The proposed increase in BH has not been fully justified. No sufficient technical assessments such as TIA, AVA and VIA to support the increase in BH.

(d) POS
- Over 30% of the proposed open spaces are for private use, and podium garden to the north of YMSRG is designated as private passage under the revised scheme making it impossible for public enjoyment.

- More POS and trees/greening should be provided.

- The landscaped area at podium level and roof gardens are not accessible to the public. The proposed POS consists mainly of landscape strips that active open space and outdoor recreation facilities for all ages are lacking.

(e) GIC facilities
- The floor spaces allocated for government uses are on the 7/F or above of the GIC complex and are not convenient to the public.

- Opposed the deletion of the multi-purpose activity centre and the resultant reduction in “G/IC” uses from 6,580m² under the Approved Scheme to 6,080m² in current submission.

- The hawker bazaar to be permanently located to a site within DAs 2 and 3 near Hong Ling Road, where the only entrance will be provided at DA 5. Any delay in the completion of DA 5 would hamper the accessibility and hence the business operation of the hawker bazaar.

(f) Vehicular/Pedestrian Traffic
- Further increase of population and pedestrian flow would worsen the heavily trafficked traffic conditions in the district as well as the aggravate crowdedness in the MTR Kwun Tong Station.
Pedestrian connections between the MTR Kwun Tong Station and the areas to the north of the Site through the covered PTI, the shopping arcade or the backyard of the resident development are not pedestrian friendly.

11. Planning Considerations and Assessments

11.1 The current application is for amendments to the Approved Scheme mainly in respect of the phased implementations of DAs 4 and 5 and associated change in the building form, and the increase in BH of the office/hotel tower from 260mPD to 285mPD. The assessments below focus on the comparison of the merits of the Approved Scheme and the current scheme (Drawings A-1 to A-32).

11.2 The planning intention, land use and development density and GFA as stipulated in the DSP and PB remain unchanged in the current scheme including the overall and mix of domestic/non-domestic (office, hotel, commercial/retail/institution and GIC) GFA, provision of GIC facilities (such as PTI, refuse collection point and hawker bazaar), and maximum BH and building form in Residential Sub-Area (Plan A-2). Key planning and urban design features, such as stepped height profile, building gaps serving as urban breezeway and visual corridors, building setbacks to enhance pedestrian circulation, terraced podium design, extensive greening and landscaping, accessible POS, segregation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic and pedestrian linkages, are retained with changes in layout and building form mainly on Commercial Sub-Area (DAs 4 and 5). The current scheme generally complies with the planning and design requirements as set out in the PB (Appendix IV). The planning considerations on the amendments and technical assessments of the current scheme are provided below.

Amendments in the Current Scheme

Revised boundary between DA4 and DA5 and change in podium design

11.3 Under the Approved Scheme, the commercial podium of DAs 4 and 5 are integrated and connected (upper plan in Drawing A-22), and the two phases are originally intended to be developed in one go. In view of the possible delay arising from the land acquisition issue for the existing properties in DA 5\(^4\), the applicant has proposed to separate the podium for DAs 4 and 5, so that the two phases could be capable of separate development in a flexible manner based on their individual progress and schedule. The boundary of the two phases is also adjusted to transfer YMSRS from DA 5 to 4. With such amendments, the implementation of DA 4 would enhance the connectivity between the MTR Kwun Tong Station, the office/hotel tower and YMSRG in DA 4 as well as the permanent PTI in DAs 2 and 3 which are under construction. The implementation programme for the two phases is accordingly amended from 2024 to 2026. Such design and phasing change is considered acceptable as it would allow the provision of two major building gaps along the long commercial podium along Kwun Tong Road, while generally keeping the stepped BH profile for the podium (paragraph 11.8 below), and facilitate more flexible implementation arrangement of the two phases with a view for earlier implementation of the DA4, which is a key connection between MTR Kwun Tong Station, the permanent PTI and the YMSRG. The development programme for DAs 2 and 3 remain unchanged, and the concerned departments have no adverse comments on the change.

\(^4\) During the course of land acquisition process, illegal occupancies by some unauthorized structures in DA5 are found. One case involving claim of adverse possession by an occupant of a property is being scheduled for court trial.
BH and design

11.4 The PB for the “CDA(1)” site states that the BH of the commercial development proposed in Commercial Sub-Area should achieve an iconic node for the town centre. As highlighted in paragraph 4.2 above, a BH of 280mPD was once proposed for the office/hotel tower in DA4 in the first s.16 planning application (No. A/K14/576) for the site submitted in 2008. While noting that such BH was not intrusive when viewed from Quarry Bay Park and visually compatible with the surrounding environment, the Committee was of the view that the design merits of the proposed BH were not fully justified, and a reduced BH of 260mPD would be more acceptable upon review of relevant factors. As a result, an approval condition on a maximum BH of 260mPD was imposed in the planning permission.

11.5 Under the current application, the BH of the office/hotel tower in DA 4 has increased from 260mPD to 285mPD (+25m, 9.6%) and from 58 storeys above ground to 64 (comprising 32 floors for office, 18 for hotel, 9 for commercial floors, 1 observation deck on the top, and 4 for refuge/E&M floors). The proposed increase in BH is primarily attributable to the additional 5 office floors to achieve the same approved GFA in the Approved Scheme with a slimmer tower and the increase in floor to floor height for office. To support the proposed increase, the applicant has provided justifications on various aspects including the planning and design as well as building and functional requirements. With a taller BH, the tower can achieve a slimmer tower footprint (reduced from 2,465m² to 2,235m²). The shape and disposition of the tower has been designed to allow improvement on air ventilation, visual permeability and day-light penetration to the YMSRG (Drawings A-40 to A-44). The revised tower design also fulfils the SBD Guidelines for environmental improvements. Room is also allowed for increasing the typical floor to floor height for office floors from 4m to 4.3m to meet the modern requirements for Grade A office, and a higher floor height of 9m for the lobby and ball room floors for the hotel.

11.6 Option to put more commercial uses underground is examined, however, as the major pedestrian desire lines of the Site is at-grade or at MTR level and a total of 6 basement floor (including one level of commercial floor and other for taxi-stand and parking) is proposed under current scheme, the applicant considers the further use of underground space may not be desirable.

11.7 In support of the proposed BH for the tower, a set of photomontages is prepared by the applicant to demonstrate the visual impact of 260mPD and 285mPD at 7 vantage points, which were adopted in the assessment of previous application. CTP/UD&L considers that with the proposed increase in BH of 25m for the proposed tower, there is no significant adverse impact to the townscape. Taking into account the reduction in the tower footprint for better visual and air permeability, the functional need for higher floor height for office and the insignificant change in visual impact, the proposed moderate increase in BH of the tower is considered acceptable.

11.8 As for the GIC cum commercial complex in DA5, the podium along Kwun Tong Road with sets of “urban windows” of 14-39m in width at various levels are suitably erected to enhance air ventilation, visual permeability and architectural interest. The design of proposed scheme is to strike a balance between minimising the wall-effect along Kwun Tong Road and serving as buffer to mitigate road traffic and railway noise. The respective BH is proposed to slightly increase from 55mPD – 75mPD under the Approved Scheme to 59mPD – 75mPD. The stepped feature is generally maintained.

5 The assumed floor to floor height for office floors in new commercial development under the planning and design studies on the redevelopment of government sites at Sai Yee Street and Mong Kok East Station and Queensway Plaza, Admiralty is 4.2m.
though the degree of variation is reduced. The GIC cum commercial complex facing Hong Ning Road is in spherical form (Drawings A-34 to A-36), which generally follows the previous approved schemes, and supported in public comments (see paragraph 10 above).

**Revised Landscape Master Plan**

11.9 Similar to the Approved Scheme, at-grade POS of not less than 9,350m² would be provided to meet the requirement under the DSP. These POS include the YMSRG, Civic Square, entrance piazzas and the newly proposed semi-covered mini pizza (Drawings A-25). The POS is easily accessible from Hong Ning Road, Kwun Tong Road and Hip Wo Street, and integrates with the retail podia in the Residential and Commercial Sub-Areas. Apart from these POS, there are about 8,000m² landscaped areas and podium gardens physically connected at various levels which would be open to public at reasonable hours. The current scheme would accommodate total greenery areas of not less than 30.8% of the Site, which is slightly higher than 30.04% in the Approved Scheme.

11.10 DLCS has no objection to the application. While CTP/UD&L of PlanD has reservations on the application from landscape point of view, he considers that approval conditions in relation to the LMP and quarterly tree monitoring report same as those imposed under Approved Scheme should be retained, should the application be approved.

**Technical Assessments**

**Urban Design, Visual Permeability and Air Ventilation**

11.11 The current scheme involves modification to the building layout of commercial podium and the office/hotel tower in DA 4. The visual impact of the changes in layout, building form and massing of the development are similar to the Approved Scheme, and the visual changes brought about by the current scheme would be relatively similar (Drawings A-37a to A-39b). Both CTP/UD&L, PlanD and CA/CMD, ArchSD have no adverse comments from urban design perspective. The proposed amendments involves mainly the separation of the long podium along Kwun Tong Road under the Approved Scheme into two distinct buildings and the increase in BH of the office/hotel tower, while the deposition of the developments would remain unchanged. With the proposed mitigation measures such as the building separations and setbacks, the AVA concludes that both the proposed scheme and the Approved Scheme have achieved the same overall air ventilation performance. CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no objection to the application. Noting that the air conditions may be affected under the proposed scheme at some locations within the Site, he considers that the previous approval condition to require the submission of a revised AVA and implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein should be imposed.

**Environmental aspects**

11.12 The submitted EA demonstrates that the proposed scheme is acceptable in air quality, traffic and railway noise aspects. With careful layout design and provision of mitigation measures (such as sufficient setback in accordance with HKPSG) and the fact that commercial developments within DAs 4 and 5 would be equipped with central air-conditioning system, it is revealed that the future occupants would not be subject to any adverse air and noise impacts.

11.13 With the incorporation of appropriate noise mitigation measures similar to the Approved Scheme (such as noise barriers, vertical fins, acoustic window and balcony,
etc.), it is found that the revised building form of the commercial complex can still provide sufficient shielding effect for the residential towers within DAs 2 and 3 behind. The traffic noise compliance rate of 89% achieved in the Approved Scheme can still be maintained. DEP has no objection to the current scheme and considers that the previous approval condition to require the applicant to submit a revised noise impact assessment and implement the identified noise mitigation measures should be imposed.

Traffic and Transport

11.14 To support the application, a TIA is conducted and demonstrates that the road network surrounding the Site, with proposed traffic measures (such as road widening, junction improvement, etc.) would operate within the capacity. The proposed grade-separated and at-grade pedestrian facilities would be adequate to accommodate the pedestrian demand. A new right-turning ingress from Hong Ning Road to DA5 is proposed to avoid looping of the traffic around the Site. The number of car parking spaces increases slightly by around 1%. C for T and CHE/K of HyD have no adverse comments on the TIA but consider that further assessment to support the proposed vehicular access and other traffic improvement measures is required. Thus the previous approval condition to require the applicant to submit a revised TIA should be imposed.

Other Technical Aspects

11.15 The relevant Government departments consulted have no objection to or no adverse comments on the application on sewerage, drainage and waterworks aspects, subject to the incorporation of appropriate approval conditions.

Public Comments

11.16 The 21 supportive comments are noted. For the remaining 575 opposing and 11 general comments, the applicant’s responses at Appendices Ib to Id and paragraphs 2 and 10.3 above are relevant. In particular, the Applicant has retained the spherical-shape form of the GIC cum commercial complex and the cascading garden with water features in the revised design in the FI(2). Regarding the concerns on the BH of the office/hotel tower, POS and GIC facilities and pedestrian connectivity, paras 11.5–11.7, 11.9–11.10 and 10.3 above are relevant. Relevant Government departments have no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. For the comments related to railway noise impacts, relevant approval condition is recommended to be imposed in paragraph 12 below requiring the submission of revised noise impact assessment to the satisfaction of DEP. The applicant claims that there will be continuous liaison with government departments on the design requirements and accessibility issues of the facilities to be provided within the POS, GIC cum commercial complex/hawker bazaar. In short, should the application be approved, detailed designs on the PTI, LMP, retail podium façade, the pedestrian deck and the setback proposal would be submitted, and revised technical assessments would be carried out/updated as appropriate for fulfilments of the approval conditions.

12. Planning Department’s Views

12.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 11 and having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 10, the Planning Department has no objection to the application.
12.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application on the terms of the application as submitted to the Board, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 9.2.2022, 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.

12.3 The recommended conditions of approval are largely the same as those imposed under Application No. A/K14/727 (Appendix IIb) except that condition (b) is revised to reflect the changes in permissible BH and condition (t) is added in relation to the new provision of social welfare facilities in the Site. The previous advisory clauses (d), (f) to (h) and (n) are revised and new clauses (o), (u) to (y) are added as suggested by concerned departments to reflect the current circumstances. They are as follows:

Approval Conditions

(a) submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan (MLP) to take into account the approval conditions as stated in paragraphs (b) to (t) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;

(b) the building height of the proposed commercial development within the application site should not exceed 285mPD;

(c) the proposed observation deck should be opened for public enjoyment;

(d) submission of detailed breakdown of the site area and Gross Floor Area for each of the Development Package Areas to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;

(e) submission and implementation of the public transport interchange proposal to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB;

(f) submission and implementation of detailed setback proposal to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB;

(g) submission and implementation of a Landscape Master Plan (LMP) including tree preservation scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;

(h) submission of the quarterly tree monitoring report to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;

(i) submission and implementation of a LMP for the proposed at-grade public open space and a tree preservation and tree replanting scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB;

(j) submission of a revised air ventilation assessment and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;

(k) submission of a revised drainage impact assessment and revised sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services and the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
(l) submission of a revised traffic impact assessment and implementation of traffic mitigation measures (i.e. roads, footpaths and junctions improvement) identified therein for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB;

(m) submission of a revised water impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB;

(n) submission and implementation of interim sewerage diversion scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection and the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;

(o) provision of a refuse collection point and a hawker bazaar to the satisfaction of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene or of the TPB;

(p) provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;

(q) submission and implementation of a detailed risk assessment and contingency plan on potential road unsettlement of Hip Wo Street, Mut Wah Street, Hong Ning Road, and Kwun Tong Road arising from construction activities of the proposed car park and sunken bazaar to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB;

(r) submission and implementation of a design proposal for the retail podium façade and the pedestrian deck along Kwun Tong Road to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;

(s) the submission of a revised Noise Impact Assessment and implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and

(t) provision of social welfare facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Social Welfare or of the TPB.

Advisory Clauses

The recommended advisory clauses are at Appendix VIII.

12.4 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, the following reason for rejection is suggested for Members’ reference:

the applicant fails to demonstrate that there are sufficient planning and design merits to justify the proposed increase in building height in Commercial Sub-Area of the comprehensive development.

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 Alternatively, 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 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 and letter received on 2.6.2017
Appendix Ia Planning statement
Appendix Ib Letter from the applicant received on 15.8.2017 providing FI
Appendix Ic Letters from the applicant dated 12.12.2017 providing FI
Appendix Id Letters from the applicant dated 5.2.2018 providing FI
Appendix IIa Approval letter for s.16 Application No. A/K14/576
Appendix IIb Approval letter for s.16 Application No. A/K14/727
Appendix IIIa Minutes of the Metro Planning Committee meeting on 5.12.2008
Appendix IIIb Minutes of the Metro Planning Committee meeting on 23.1.2009
Appendix IV Comparison of main development parameters with PB
Appendix V Comments from Government Departments on F.I. submitted on 5.2.2018
Appendix VI Minutes of the KTDC meeting on 7.11.2017
Appendices VII-1 to VII-38 Public comments
Appendix VIII Recommended advisory clauses

Drawings A-1 to A-45 MLP, floor layout plans, section plans, LMP, pedestrian circulation plans, development package plan, artist image of the landmark GIC complex, photomontages submitted by the applicant

Plans A-1 and A-2 Location Plan and Site Plan
Plans A-3 and A-5 Site Photos

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
February 2018