

**Similar s.16 Applications for Residential Use with Minor Relaxation of
Building Height Restriction within “G/IC” zone on the Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP**

<u>Application No.</u>	<u>Locations</u>	<u>Proposed Use(s)/ Development(s)</u>	<u>Decision (Date)</u>	<u>Approval Conditions</u>
A/H3/419	10-12 Mui Fong Street and 15-19 Kwai Heung Street, Sai Ying Pun	Proposed Residential Institution (Student Hostel) with a Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction from 80mPD to 81.53mPD	Approved with condition(s) (13.12.2013)	(1), (2), (3), (4), (5),
A/H3/427	6-18 Chung Ching Street, Sai Ying Pun	Proposed Composite Commercial/ Residential Development (Flat, Eating Place and Shop and Services	Approved with condition(s) (4.3.2016)	(3), (4), (6), (7), (8)
A/H3/429	6-22 Chung Ching Street, Sai Ying Pun	Uses) and Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction from 90mPD to 104.2mPD	Approved with condition(s) (23.12.2016)	(3), (4), (6), (7), (8), (9)

Approval Conditions:

- (1) the design and provision of a public toilet with a minimum Net Operating Floor Area of 55.5m²;
- (2) submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment;
- (3) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the SIA;
- (4) the submission and implementation of tree preservation and landscape proposals;
- (5) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting;
- (6) the setting back of 2.7m of the site boundary at ground level along Chung Ching Street for footpath widening;
- (7) the design and provision of a pedestrian street cum sitting-out area of not less than 214m² for public use;
- (8) the submission and implementation of a landscape master plan; and
- (9) the design and provision of internal transport facilities.

**Detailed Comments on the revised Preliminary Environmental Review (PER) and
Air Ventilation Assessment Expert Evaluation report (AVA EE)**

1. Detailed Comments on the revised PER

Air Quality Assessment (AQA)

- (1) Figure 3-1: Please show the street names. Please update.
- (2) Section 3.9.51 – 3.9.53 & Section 3.10: The height levels are not tally with the ones marked in Appendix 3-11. Please check and revise.
- (3) EMFAC Templates: Please check and clarify whether the units of vehicular emission factors should be “g/mile/veh”, instead of “g/km/veh”.
- (4) AQ Models: The NOX emission factors entered into Caline4 are significantly smaller than those listed in the report. These results are under-estimated of the contributions due to vehicular emission.
- (5) AQ Models: The heights and widths of road link listed in Appendix 3.6 (page 45-51) are inconsistent with those entered into Caline4. Please check and clarify.
- (6) AQ Models: The road link with Link ID 62 is missing in Caline4. Please check and clarify.
- (7) AQ Models: The road link of the 6th Road Group (with heights between 50m and 60m) are missing in the RSP input to Caline4. Please check and clarify.
- (8) AQ Models: Please rectify the above and re-run Caline4 model.

Noise Impact Assessment (NIA)

(A) *Road Traffic NIA*

- (9) S4.2.3 & Appendix 4-13: The occupation of the proposed development in S4.2.3 (i.e. year 2024) is different with that in Appendix 4-13 (i.e. year 2025). Please clarify.
- (10) Table 4-1: Besides meeting the relevant ventilation requirement under the Building (Planning) Regulations, according to the Practice Note on Lighting and Ventilation Requirements - Performance-based Approach (APP-130) issued by the BD, for optimum performance with the inner sliding glass panel in a closed position, the air gap should have a length of not less than 100mm and a width between 100mm and 175mm. Moreover, the claimed noise reduction for NAPs TC-C2 and TC-C3 are not justified.
- (11) Figure 4-1 & Table 4-1: Please specify the floor numbers on each noise assessment point where acoustic windows will be provided.

(B) *Fixed Plant NIA*

- (12) S4.3.11 & S4.3.12: The read of "Figure 4-3A" and "Figure 4-3B" should be reversed.
- (13) S4.3.11 & S4.3.12: Please check the reduction of SWLs of the dominant noise sources, C1, C2, C3 and MV is required to address the residual fixed noise impacts during the daytime period and advise if the proposed at-source mitigation measures such as silencers are technically feasible to reduce the residual fixed noise impact.
- (14) S4.3.11 & S4.3.12: Please determine whether corrections of tonality are necessary for the dominant noise sources, C1, C2, C3 and MV with reference to the available frequency spectrums obtained during the noise measurement.
- (15) Appendix 4-8: Please explain how to derive the SWL of the cooling tower of Kick Yick Building from the noise data sheet provided.
- (16) Appendix 4-12: The noise assessment showed that no noise reduction of 10 dB(A) of MV was applied for daytime mitigation scenario but the relevant noise criteria can be still complied with. Please check again whether at-source mitigation measures for plants at Western Police Station are necessary to address the residual fixed noise impact.
- (17) Appendix 4-12: Exceedance of fixed noise impact from the dominant noise sources, C1, C2 and C3 at the middle to high floors of TB-FE-04, TB-FF-02, TB-FG-04, TB-FH-01, TC-FB-02, TC-FC-04 are predicted, please check again whether there are direct line of sight from these noise sources to the NSRs and necessity of the barrier correction.

Water Quality Impact

- (18) S7.1.1: For "West Central", does it mean the name of Water Control Zone (WCZ)? If so, please revise (which should be Victoria Harbour Phase 3 WCZ).
- (19) S7.1.1: Besides freshwater water sensitive receivers (WSRs), sea water intakes are also WSRs. Please check if there are sea water intakes. Please mention, if any, possible water quality impacts.
- (20) S7.2.3: Impact due to demolition was mentioned in S7.2.1. Please consider if this paragraph (i.e. S7.2.3) is needed.
- (21) S7.2.4: The impact for construction workforce should not be insignificant as it is expected that a considerable number of workers will be working in the site during construction. Please revise as appropriate, and suggest mitigation measures (e.g. providing chemical portable toilets, or others as appropriate) in S7.3.
- (22) S7.3.1, last pointer: It seems the paragraph is concerning residual impact after mitigation. Operational impact per se, i.e. sewage and possible contamination of surface runoff from rubbish should be mentioned. The conclusion from Sewerage Impact Assessment should be briefly mentioned to show how sewage issue is properly handled. Installation of gullies grate, silt traps etc. and regular cleaning of

such devices should be mentioned as mitigation measures against pollution due to runoff.

(23) S8.6.2: Please modify this paragraph according to amendments made in S7.

2. **Detailed Comments on AVA EE**

Directional analysis

- (1) The consultant should compare the ventilation performance of the two studied schemes under each annual and summer prevailing winds separately. Directional analysis for each wind is still missing. The discussion should include (i) how the prevailing wind entering the site, (ii) whether wind could penetrate through the baseline scheme and proposed scheme to reach downstream areas; (iii) potential problematic areas identified and specified; and (iv) comparisons should be made between the baseline and proposed scheme and whether the proposed scheme would resolve some potential problems.
- (2) When discussing on how the wind would enter the site, the consultant should consider the surrounding building morphology instead of simply considering the layout within the site in order to achieve a comprehensive analysis.

Section 6 and Figures 5.8, 5.10 to 5.11:

- (3) The effectiveness of the two 15m ventilation corridors is not discussed.
- (4) The proposed “gaps” of 4.85m to 7.65m are actually voids between towers and the podium. Parts of the area shown as voids on Figures 5.10 to 5.11 are occupied by various uses and are not permeable.
- (5) The proposed breezeways would only mitigate/ minimise certain extent of the ventilation impact rather than enhancing ventilation.
- (6) Illustrations on the left side of Figure 5.8 do not demonstrate that cruciform buildings allow a better wind flow.

Advisory Clauses

- (a) to note the comments of D of FS to comply with the requirements of emergency vehicular access as stipulated in part VI of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 which is administered by the BD;
- (b) to note the comments of CTP/UD&L, PlanD regarding landscape treatments including shrub, groundcover and vertical greening are proposed to enhance greening provision; choosing right species such as shade-tolerant plants for the proposed tree planting areas which are likely under shadow of the building; and the approval of the application does not imply approval of tree works such as pruning, transplanting and felling under lease. Tree removal applications should be submitted direct to the District Lands Office for approval;
- (c) to note the comments of CTP/UD&L, PlanD regarding the detailed comments on the AVA EE; and
- (d) to note the comments of DEP regarding the deficiencies found in the revised PER for the future submission of NIA and AQIA.