

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

**APPLICATION NO. A/H15/276**

<b><u>Applicant</u></b>	Estate Office, The University of Hong Kong (HKU) represented by KJL Limited
<b><u>Site</u></b>	Police School Road, Wong Chuk Hang, Hong Kong
<b><u>Site Area</u></b>	About 4,306m <sup>2</sup>
<b><u>Land Status</u></b>	Government Land
<b><u>Plan</u></b>	Approved Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H15/33
<b><u>Zoning</u></b>	Largely “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) (97.2%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- maximum building height (BH) restriction of 80mPD or the height of the existing building, whichever is the greater</li><li>- provision for application for minor relaxation of the BH restriction</li></ul> Partly “Green Belt” (“GB”) (2.8%)
<b><u>Application</u></b>	Proposed Residential Institution (Student Residences) and Minor Relaxation of BH Restriction from 80mPD to 90mPD

**1. The Proposal**

- 1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for student residences, which is regarded as ‘Residential Institution’ use, and relaxation of the BH restriction from 80mPD to 90mPD (main roof) at the application site (the site) which is mainly zoned “G/IC” with a minor portion zoned “GB” on the approved Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP No. S/H15/33 (**Plan A-1**). According to the Notes of the OZP, ‘Residential Institution’ use within the “G/IC” and “GB” zones requires planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). As the proposed development with a BH of 90mPD exceeds the BH restriction of 80mPD stipulated under the OZP, planning permission from the Board for relaxation of BH restriction is also required.
- 1.2 The proposed scheme involves two 17-storey student residence towers on top of a common 3-storey podium providing not more than 1,224 hostel places for students and 33 accommodations for management staff. The average unit size for student residence is about 6.6m<sup>2</sup> and 40.1m<sup>2</sup> for staff. Common spaces and other supporting facilities including canteen, common rooms, recreation space,

landscape deck, management office, laundry room and car park will be provided in the podium.

- 1.3 The site is the subject of a previous application (No. A/H15/268) which was approved with conditions by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board on 18.3.2016. A comparison of the major development parameters of the current scheme and previously approved scheme are summarized below:

<b>Development Parameters</b>	<b>Approved Planning Scheme (A/H15/268)</b>	<b>Current Submission</b>	<b>Summary of Changes</b>
<b>Site Area</b>	About 4,361m <sup>2</sup>	About 4,306m <sup>2</sup>	-55 m <sup>2</sup> (-1.26%)
<b>Total Plot Ratio (PR)</b>	Not more than 5.74	5.97	+0.23 (+4% due to reduced site area and GFA increase)
<b>Gross Floor Area (GFA)</b>	About 25,035 m <sup>2</sup>	About 25,700m <sup>2</sup>	+665m <sup>2</sup> (+2.65% due to the double wall of the modules)
<b>Site Coverage</b> - Tower - Podium	About 30% About 52%	About 30% About 53%	No change +1%
<b>No. of Units</b> - Student Hostel Room - Staff Accommodation	Not more than 1,224 Not more than 33	Not more than 1,224 Not more than 33	No change
<b>BH (main roof)</b>	67.25m/ 87mPD (at street level of 19.75mPD)	70.25m/ 90mPD (at street level of 19.75mPD)	+3m (+4.46%)
<b>No. of Storeys</b>	20	20	No change
<b>Storey Height</b> - Typical Floors - Transfer Plate - 2/F - 1/F - G/F	3.0m 2.0m 5.0m 4.25m 5.0m	3.15m 2.0m 5.0m 4.25m 5.0m	+0.15m No change No change No change No change
<b>Transport Facilities</b> - Private car parking spaces - Private car parking space (disabled) - Lay-by for taxi and private car	11 1 1	11 1 1	No change No change No change

- Loading / unloading bay (L/UL) for goods vehicle	1	1	No change
- L/UL bay for refuse collection vehicle	1	1	No change
<b>Proposed Floor Uses</b>			
<b>G/F</b>	Residential Institution / Ancillary Amenities / E&M Facilities / Landscape Area / Parking and Loading & Unloading Area	Residential Institution / Ancillary Amenities / E&M Facilities / Landscape Area / Parking and Loading & Unloading Area	No change
<b>1/F</b>	Residential Institution / Ancillary Amenities / Open Area	Residential Institution / Ancillary Amenities / Open Area	No change
<b>2/F to 19/F</b>	Residential Institution / Ancillary Amenities	Residential Institution / Ancillary Amenities	No change
<b>R/F</b>	E&M facilities	E&M facilities	No change

- 1.4 The application is submitted due to the adoption of Modular Integrated Construction (MiC) System in the construction of the towers resulting in an increase of building height to 90mPD which is 3m in excess of the approved scheme of 87mPD and increase in GFA. Moreover, a small portion of area zoned “GB” (about 120m<sup>2</sup>) was also included in the land grant. A fresh planning permission from the Board is therefore required.
- 1.5 Same as the previously approved scheme, there will be a 15m building separation between the two student residence towers and a 5m setback of the podium from Police School Road. Main entrance of the proposed development is provided at Police School Road. Vehicular access is also via Police School Road. According to the applicant, no works will be carried out in the portion zoned “GB”. The block layouts, sections, photomontage of the current scheme and provision of private open space and greenery area are at **Drawings A-1 to A-17**, while comparisons between the current and previously approved scheme submitted by the applicant are at **Drawings A-18 to A-26**.
- 1.6 In support of the application, the applicant has submitted the following documents:
- Application form received on 17.9.2018 (Appendix I)
  - Planning Statement (Appendix Ia)
  - Further information dated 3.10.2018 providing clarification (Appendix Ib) on Planning Statement

- (*exempted from publication and recounting requirements*)
- (d) Further information dated 6.11.2018 providing response to (**Appendix Ic**) comments and revised drawings  
(*exempted from publication and recounting requirements*)
- (e) Further information dated 7.11.20018 providing response (**Appendix Id**) to comments from Urban Design and Layout Unit of Planning Department  
(*exempted from publication and recounting requirements*)

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

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application are detailed in the Planning Statement and further information (**Appendices Ia to Id**) which are summarized as follows:

### Changes and Adoption of MiC System

- (a) The adoption of MiC System is in line with the policy agenda as the government is committed to promote and lead the adoption of the System in the construction industry. In the Policy Address of 2017, it is stated that the government would support non-profit making organizations to explore the feasibility of constructing pre-fabricated modular housing;
- (b) due to the technical characteristic of modular construction, modules stacking on top of each other resulting in a double-beam arrangement between the lower module and the modular above. This double beam system would increase the floor height while keeping the original clear headroom unchanged. As a result it will increase the overall building height. Moreover, the walls of the modules will also be doubled resulting in an increase in total GFA;
- (c) the reduction of the internal floor to floor height of the module has also been considered. However, the internal floor to floor height of a typical student bedroom is at 2.675m, the internal floor to floor height for bathroom/toilet will be 2.15m by allowing 600mm at the ceiling for possible building services installation. As the floor height of another student residence of the same university in Lung Wah Street is 3.15m, the University considered that the reduction of the floor to floor height in the current proposal would reduce the living quality of the student residence;
- (d) instead of increasing BH, an option involving basement was also reviewed but was not considered as an economically viable option for a student residence development due to the substantial increase in cost for permanent site formation works;

### Pilot Project for MiC Application in Hong Kong and Benefits of MiC System

- (e) the project is earmarked as a pilot project in Hong Kong to adopt MiC application and the use of MiC System in the proposed development would have the following benefits:
- (i) student hostels are ideal for the application of MiC;

- (ii) the size and dimension of a tentative modular unit is suitable to the local traffic characteristics in the locality;
- (iii) improved site safety with some works procedure to be carried out off-site in a controlled environment;
- (iv) less construction waste and a more tidy construction site;
- (v) more environmentally friendly, particularly on the reduction in carbon footprint; and
- (vi) less disturbance and nuisance to the neighbourhood during construction;

#### Planning Intention Considerations

- (f) the proposed residential institution (i.e. student residences) is in line with the planning intention of the “G/IC” zone and the “GB” zone. While the site covers a small portion of land about 120m<sup>2</sup> in the “GB” zone, no works will be carried out in that portion of land;

#### Tree Felling and Provision of Open Space Considerations

- (g) the proposed changes of the design scheme will not increase the number of trees to be felled and there is no change to the area of the private open space and site coverage of greenery;
- (h) the minor change of site boundary based on the approved Lease Plan might lead to change in the number of trees located within the site with potential reduction in tree felling. The landscape proposal will also be adjusted accordingly due to the reduction in gross site area;

#### Environmental Considerations

- (i) the environmental review report covering noise, air quality and air ventilation have been addressed by the previously approved scheme. The report confirmed the feasibility of the proposed development from an environmental point of view and the scheme is acceptable in environmental terms;

#### Visual Impact Considerations

- (j) the proposed towers will have a BH of 90mPD, which is an increase of 3m, when comparing with the previously approved scheme. The proposed scheme is compatible with the existing and future developments in the surrounding area;

#### Will Not Cause Undesirable Precedent Case

- (k) the proposed changes are considered in line with the planning intention with the land use zoning. It will not cause any adverse environmental impact and visual impacts on the surrounding area. The proposed changes of the approved scheme will not cause an undesirable precedent case.

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

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

### **4. Town Planning Board Guidelines**

Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 16 for ‘Application for Development/Redevelopment within “G/IC” zone for uses other than G/IC Uses under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ (TPB PG-No. 16) is relevant to this application. The relevant extract of the Guidelines are as follows:

- (a) as a general rule, for sites zoned “G/IC”, a major portion of the proposed development should be dedicated to Government, institution and community (GIC) and other public uses including public open spaces. Otherwise, the proposed development is considered to constitute a significant departure from the planning intention of the “G/IC” zone and, unless with very strong justifications and under special circumstances, planning permission for such development would not be granted;
- (b) in general, sites zoned “G/IC” are intended to be developed or redeveloped solely for GIC uses unless it can be established that the provision of GIC facilities would not be jeopardised;
- (c) the proposed development should not adversely delay the implementation of the planned GIC facilities;
- (d) the proposed development should be compatible in land-use terms with the GIC uses on the site, if any, and with the surrounding areas. The scale and intensity of the proposed development should be in keeping with that of the adjacent area. The proposed scale and design should have regard to the character and massing of the buildings in the surrounding areas and should not cause significant adverse visual impact on the townscape of the area;
- (e) the proposed development should be sustainable in terms of the capacities of existing and planned infrastructure. There should be adequate provision of parking and loading/unloading facilities to serve the proposed development in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and to the satisfaction of the Transport Department; and
- (f) the proposed development should not cause, directly or indirectly, the surrounding areas to be susceptible to adverse environmental impacts, otherwise adequate environmental mitigation, monitoring and audit measures must be provided.

### **5. Previous Application**

The site is the subject of a previous approved application (No. A/H15/268) for the same proposed residential institution use with minor relaxation of BH restriction from

80mPD to 87mPD. The application was approved with conditions by the Committee on 18.3.2016. Details of the previous application are at **Appendix II**.

## **6. Similar Application**

There is no similar application within the “G/IC” and “GB” zones for ‘Residential Institution’ use within the Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau planning area. There is, however, an application (No. A/H15/266) for proposed flat (Government staff quarters) use and minor relaxation of BH restriction from 70mPD to 76.67mPD for the Correctional Services Department’s staff quarters at Tin Wan Street which was approved with conditions by the Committee on 8.1.2016. Another application (No. A/H15/252) for proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction from 6 storeys to 7 storeys for the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals’ Jockey Club Rehabilitation Complex at 4 Welfare Road, Wong Chuk Hang was approved with conditions by the Committee on 15.6.2012 (**Plan A-1**).

## **7. The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans A-1, A-2, aerial photo on **Plan A-3** and site photos on **Plan A-4**)**

7.1 The site is:

- (a) an open slope mainly covered by natural vegetation; and
- (b) abutting and accessible via Police School Road.

7.2 The surrounding area has the following characteristics:

- (a) to its immediate south are natural slopes under “GB” zone;
- (b) to its immediate west is the Singapore International School and its extension building which is zoned “G/IC” and subject to a maximum BH restriction of 80mPD;
- (c) to its northeast along Police School Road is the Police College (Aberdeen) Rank & File Married Quarters which is zoned “G/IC” and subject to a maximum BH restriction of 11 storeys. The Hong Kong Police College is located further to the northeast;
- (d) to its north across Police School Road is the MTR Wong Chuk Hang Station, including the MTR Wong Chuk Hang Depot and the top-side commercial cum residential development, currently under construction. The site is zoned “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) and subject to maximum domestic and non-domestic GFA restrictions and a maximum BH restriction of the domestic towers of 150mPD. According to the approved scheme under Application No. A/H15/254, a total of 11 domestic towers with a BH profile generally stepping down from east to west will be built above the podium; and
- (e) to its further west along Nam Long Shan Road and Welfare Road are two residential developments zoned “Residential (Group A)” and subject to a maximum BH restriction of 130mPD and some low to medium-rise GIC developments including San Wui Commercial Society Chan Pak Shan

School, Pao Yue Kong Swimming Pool, the Little Sisters of the Poor St. Mary's Home for the Aged, and the Jockey Club Yee Yeung Care and Attention Home.

## **8. Planning Intention**

- 8.1 The planning intention of the "G/IC" zone is primarily for the provision of Government, institution or community 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, organizations providing social services to meet community needs, and other institutional establishments.
- 8.2 While there is a general presumption against development in the "GB" zone which is intended to protect the natural landscape and environment, residential institution in "GB" zone may also be permitted on application to the Board.
- 8.3 According to the Explanatory Statement of the Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP, BH restrictions are imposed on "G/IC" zones in terms of mPD or number of storeys, which mainly reflect the existing BHs of developments and provide visual and spatial relief to the densely built-up environment. A minor relaxation clause in respect of the BH restrictions is incorporated into the Notes of the OZP 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 BH restrictions will be considered on its own merits and the relevant criteria for consideration of such relaxation are as follows:
- (a) amalgamating smaller sites for achieving better urban design and local area improvements;
  - (b) accommodating the bonus plot ratio granted under the Buildings Ordinance in relation to surrender/dedication of land/area for use as a public passage/street widening;
  - (c) providing better streetscape/good quality street level public urban space;
  - (d) providing separation between buildings to enhance air and visual permeability;
  - (e) accommodating building design to address specific site constraints in achieving the permissible plot ratio under the OZP, and
  - (f) other factors such as need for tree preservation, innovative building design and planning merits that would bring about improvements to the townscape and amenity of the locality and would not cause adverse landscape and visual impacts.

## **9. Comments from Relevant Government Departments**

- 9.1 The following government departments have been consulted and their views on the application and the public comments received are summarized as follows:



### **Policy Support**

- 9.1.1 The Secretary for Education (SED) and University Grants Committee (UGC) support the application as the site will be used by HKU for Wong Chuk Hang hostel project. According to HKU, they have met all the Southern District Council members in March and August 2018 and the proposal was supported by all members.

### **Land Administration**

- 9.1.2 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West & South, Lands Department (DLO/HKW&S, LandsD):
- the site falls within unleased and unallocated government land and has been proposed for a private treaty grant to the University of Hong Kong for the purpose of a student residence. Should the planning application be approved by the Board, the applicant should obtain the necessary policy support from the SED on the revised development proposal and apply to his office for necessary amendments of the proposed private treaty grant which is currently under processing by LandsD. However, there is no guarantee that the application will eventually be approved and if approved, it will be subject to such terms and conditions as may be imposed by LandsD at its sole discretion. DLO/HKW&S reserves his comments on the design of the proposed development which will be considered in details in the building plan submission stage.

### **Traffic**

- 9.1.3 Comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T):
- (a) the design of car parking spaces, loading/unloading bays and internal access roads should comply with PNAP No. APP-111 “Design of Car Parks and Loading/Unloading Facilities” and Building (Planning) Regulation CAP 123F; and
  - (b) no objection to the application as there is no changes in the number of units of student hostel rooms, staff accommodation and the proposed floor uses.

### **Environmental**

- 9.1.4 Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP):
- (a) the proposed student residence at the site is the subject of a previous planning application (No. A/H15/268) which was approved with conditions by the Committee on 18.3.2016. Comparing the approved scheme, the BH of the proposed development under the current scheme has increased by 3m due to the adoption of MiC construction method, while other development parameters are essentially the same;

- (b) since the potential environmental impacts of the proposed development have been addressed in the previous assessments (including Air Quality Impact Assessment, Noise Impact Assessment, waste management and Sewage Impact Assessment) submitted for the approved planning application (No. A/H15/268) back in 2016, and there is only minor change to the BH (i.e. about 3m) with other development parameters essentially the same under the current planning application, he maintains his previous stance on the application i.e. no objection to the planning application and no approval condition is required by EPD.

### **Urban Design and Visual**

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

- (a) the site is the subject of a previous application (Application No. A/H15/268) approved by the Board on 18.3.2016. Major differences between the current proposal and the approved scheme include increase in building height from 87mPD to 90mPD, an increase in GFA by 665m<sup>2</sup> to 25,700m<sup>2</sup> and slight increase in site coverage to 53%;
- (b) the site is bounded by Police School Road to the north, Singapore International School to the west with BH of about 79mPD, and vegetated slopes zoned “GB” to the south and east. A comprehensive residential development at the ex-Wong Chuk Hang Estate site is located to north of the site across Police School Road subject to BH restriction of 150mPD on the OZP;
- (c) judging from the photomontages submitted, the proposed minor relaxation of BH would bring about slight loss of sky view to the public viewers of Police School Road and Nam Long Shan Road, but is not expected to cause significant adverse impact to the visual context. An approval condition on visual aspect is not required; and
- (d) according to the planning statement, the main reason for minor relaxation of BH restriction and increase in GFA is due to adoption of the MiC construction method. The previously proposed design features including building separation of 15m between towers, reduced site coverage of podium mass, open landscaped areas on 1/F and varying orientation of towers have largely been maintained.

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

- (a) no comment from visual point of view;
- (b) it is noted that the site proposed development consists of 2 nos. tower blocks with a height of 90mPD which may not be

incompatible with adjacent CDA development with BH ranging from 120mPD to 150mPD; and

- (c) the development at the southeastern side is facing a steep slope of Nam Long Shan Road and may be susceptible to flooding problem during rainy season.

### **Air Ventilation**

#### 9.1.7 Comments of the CTP/UD&L, PlanD:

- it is considered that the increment in BH is not anticipated to cause significant adverse air ventilation impact on the surrounding area.

### **Landscape**

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

- 20% greenery to be provided to comply with PNAP APP-152.

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

- (a) compare to the approved application, there are changes in the proposed development in this application such as reduction of gross site area (from 4,361m<sup>2</sup> to 4,306m<sup>2</sup>) and increase of building height (from 87mPD to 90mPD) due to the adoption of MiC Construction;
- (b) the site is situated in an area of urban landscape character. Medium to high rise residential and industrial buildings are common in the surrounding areas. Considering the above and the future development in the "CDA" zone, the proposed development is considered not incompatible with the landscape character;
- (c) based on the FI submission, it is noted that despite that the tree survey for the 2016 approved scheme was carried out in 2015, it is adopted as the baseline information for assessing potential impact arising from the current application. With reference to the summary sheet for the comparison on 2016 approved proposal and the current application, there are approximate 331 nos. of existing trees on the concerned slope and it is anticipated that the proposed number of trees to be felled in the current application will be reduced from 288 no. to 273 no. as compared to that in the 2016 approved Landscape & Tree Preservation Proposal, with the compensatory tree proposal remains unchanged, i.e. 41 nos. of heavy standard trees, 110 nos. of light standard trees and 116 nos. of whips;
- (d) as compared to the previous application, the current application involved minor change of the site boundary which may lead to change in the number of trees located within the site. However,

it is committed by the applicant that the number of trees to be felled will not be increased due to the current scheme;

- (e) in view of the information submitted, the current scheme is considered not inferior to the 2016 approved proposal. However, the applicant is strongly advised to update the tree survey report to facilitate the design and construction of the proposed residential institution; and
- (f) should the Board approve the application, a landscape condition is suggested to be included with the planning approval, i.e. submission and implementation of a landscape and proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Board.

### **Geotechnical**

9.1.10 Comments of the Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (H(GEO), CEDD):

- (a) no comment from geotechnical point of view;
- (b) it is noted that a Geotechnical Planning Review Report (GPRR) was not included in the captioned submission. Upon request to the representative of the geotechnical consultants, it is confirmed that the GPRR for the previously approved planned application (Application No. A/H15/268) remains valid for this submission. The geotechnical consultants also confirmed that the detailed assessment of slope features affecting and being affected by the proposed development have been discussed in the previously approved excavation and lateral support and site formation plans; and
- (c) it is noted in the previously approved GPRR that a Natural Terrain Hazard Study and suitable mitigation measures, if found necessary, will be conducted at the detailed design stage.

### **Building**

9.1.11 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department (CBS/HKW, BD):

- (a) no objection in principle under the Buildings Ordinance; and
- (b) detailed comments on the proposal could only be made at formal building plans submission stage.

### **Fire Safety**

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

- (a) 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;

- (b) detailed fire services requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans; and
- (c) the applicant is advised to observe the requirements of emergency vehicular access as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 which is administered by BD.

### **Electrical Safety**

#### 9.1.13 Comments of the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services:

- in the interest of public safety and ensuring the continuity of electricity supply, the parties concerned with planning, designing organising and supervising any activity near the underground cable or overhead line under the application should approach the electricity supplier (i.e. HK Electric) for the requisition of cable plans (and overhead line alignment drawings, where applicable) to find out whether there is any underground cable and/or overhead line within and/or in the vicinity of the concerned site. They should be reminded to observe the Electricity Supply Line (Protection) Regulation when carrying out works in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines.

### **District Officer's View**

#### 9.1.14 Comments of the District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department (DO(S), HAD):

- (a) the proposed student residence was discussed at the District Development and Housing Committee (DDHC) of the Southern District Council at 1.2.2016. Minutes of the DDHC Meeting is at **Appendix III**; and
- (b) no comment on the application and no comment was received by his office from the public during the public inspection period.

#### 9.2 The following Government departments have no comment on the application:

- (a) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- (b) Chief Highway Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department;
- (c) Commissioner of Police;
- (d) Director of Drainage Services; and
- (e) Project Manager/South, Civil Engineering and Development Department.

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

On 28.9.2018, the application was published for public inspection. During the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, which ended on 19.10.2018, 1 public comment objecting to the application was received (**Appendix IV**) and the reasons for objection are summarised below:

- (i) the increase in BH of 10m to 90mPD is excessive and would impact on the view to the ridge line; and
- (ii) without information on unit size and floor layout, the increase in BH might facilitate the provision of penthouse accommodation with unobstructed views for staff quarters.

## **11. Planning Considerations and Assessments**

- 11.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for the proposed student residences and the proposed relaxation of the BH restriction from 80mPD to 90mPD (+12.5%) for the site. The site is also the subject of a previous approved planning application (No. A/H15/268) for the same use with minor relaxation of the BH restriction (i.e. from 80mPD to 87mPD). As compared with the previously approved scheme, the main changes in the current scheme are (i) reduction of the site area by 55m<sup>2</sup> (-1.26%) (i.e. from 4,361m<sup>2</sup> to 4,306m<sup>2</sup>); (ii) increase in total GFA by 665m<sup>2</sup> (+2.65%) (i.e. from 25,035m<sup>2</sup> to 25,700m<sup>2</sup>); and (iii) increase in BH by 3m (+4.46%) (i.e. from 87mPD to 90mPD). There is no change to the number of student hostel rooms and staff accommodation, the number of storeys, the provision of internal transport facilities and the floor uses. SED and UGC have maintained their policy support to the proposed development at the site. Concerned departments such as TD and EPD have no adverse comments on the application.
- 11.2 According to the applicant, the reduction of the site area is mainly due to the setting out of the development site in the land grant after the approval of the previous application. While a small portion of land in the “GB” is included, no works will be carried out by the applicant in that portion of land. In this regard, the change in the site area is considered acceptable.
- 11.3 According to the applicant, the increase in BH by 3m and the increase in total GFA by 665m<sup>2</sup> is due to the adoption of MiC System in the construction of the residence towers. Although other design options such as construction of basement level to reduce the overall BH have been considered by the applicant, they were not accepted as an economic viable option for the development of a student residence. Given the adjoining Singapore International School and the planned MTR Wong Chuk Hang Depot “CDA” development subject to maximum BH restrictions of 80mPD and 150mPD respectively, the proposed BH of 90mPD is not expected to be visually incompatible with the surrounding areas. In this regard, CTP/UD&L, PlanD and CA/ASC, ArchSD have no adverse comment on the proposed development from urban design, visual and air ventilation points of view. To address the concerns of CTP/UD&L, PlanD, an approval condition is recommended in paragraph 12.2(b) below requiring the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal, should the Committee approve the application.
- 11.4 As for the adverse public comment, the planning assessments above are relevant.

## 12. Planning Department's Views

- 12.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 11 and having taken into account the public comment mentioned in paragraph 10, PlanD has no objection to the application.
- 12.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 16.11.2022, 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. The following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are also suggested for Members' reference:

### Approval conditions

- (a) the design and provision of parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces and internal access roads for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (c) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board.

### Advisory clauses

- 12.3 The recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Appendix V**.
- 12.4 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, the following reasons for rejection are suggested for Members' reference:
- (a) there is no strong justification nor planning and design merit in support of the proposed relaxation of building height restriction; and
  - (b) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for relaxation of building height restriction without sufficient justifications or planning and design merits in the area.

## 13. Decision Sought

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

- 13.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicant.

### **Attachments**

<b>Appendix I</b>	Application form received on 17.9.2018
<b>Appendix Ia</b>	Supplementary planning statement received on 17.9.2018
<b>Appendix Ib</b>	Further information dated 3.10.2018
<b>Appendix Ic</b>	Further information dated 6.11.2018
<b>Appendix Id</b>	Letter from applicant date 7.11.2018
<b>Appendix II</b>	MPC Paper on previous application No. A/H15/268
<b>Appendix III</b>	Minutes of DDHC Meeting held on 1.2.2016
<b>Appendix IV</b>	Public comment
<b>Appendix V</b>	Advisory clauses
<b>Drawings A-1 to A-11</b>	Block layouts and sections submitted by the applicant
<b>Drawings A-12 to A-15</b>	Photomontages submitted by the applicant
<b>Drawings A-16 to A-17</b>	Provision of private open space and greenery area
<b>Drawings A-18 to A-26</b>	Comparison of block layouts and sections submitted by the applicant
<b>Plan A-1</b>	Location plan
<b>Plan A-2</b>	Site plan
<b>Plan A-3</b>	Aerial photo
<b>Plan A-4</b>	Site photos

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
NOVEMBER 2018**