

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION
UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

APPLICATION NO. A/K22/28

- Applicant** : Sanon Limited represented by Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited
- Site** : New Kowloon Inland Lot (NKIL) No. 6607, Shing Kai Road, Kai Tak, Kowloon
- Site Area** : About 11,276m²
- Lease** : (a) for a term of 50 years commencing from 9.9.2019
(b) restricted to non-industrial (excluding residential, godown and petrol filling station but including hotel) purposes
(c) the total gross floor area (GFA) for hotel purpose shall not be less than 14,400m² and shall not exceed 16,000m²
(d) the total GFA for office purpose shall not be less than 9,600m²
(e) the total GFA for retail shops or entertainment facilities or both shall not exceed 1,600m²
- Plan** : Approved Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/6
- Zoning** : “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Stadium” (“OU(Stadium)”) subject to a maximum building height of 55mPD
- Application** : Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Proposed Hotel and Permitted Office and Commercial Development

1. The Proposal

- 1.1 The applicant, Sanon Limited, represented by Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited, seeks planning permission for minor relaxation of building height restriction (BHR) for the proposed hotel and permitted office and commercial development at the application site (the Site). The Site adjoins the Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP)¹ development, and are together zoned “OU(Stadium)” on the approved Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/6 (**Plan A-1**).
- 1.2 The Site (about 11,276m²) is subject to a maximum BH of 55mPD under the “OU(Stadium)” zone. The applicant proposes to relax the maximum BH by 5.15m to 60.15mPD, which is equivalent to an increase of 9.36%. The application is for proposed hotel use (that requires planning permission from the

¹ The KTSP site covers areas zoned “OU(Stadium)”, “Open Space” (“O”) and “O(1)” and area shown as ‘Road’ on the approved Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/6.

Town Planning Board (the Board)) and for permitted ‘Office’, ‘Eating Place’ and ‘Shop and Services’ uses. The Site together with the KTSP site is subject of an approved planning application No. A/K22/17 for minor relaxation of BHR from 55mPD to 70mPD (for the Main Stadium at KTSP) and for proposed ‘hotel’ and ‘eating place’ and permitted ‘office’ uses. (**Plans A-1 and A-5**).

- 1.3 The proposed scheme has a total GFA of about 32,000m² which is equivalent to a plot ratio (PR) of about 2.838. It comprises (i) a 14-storey hotel block (with a GFA of about 15,415m², guest rooms of not more than 440 and a BH of 60.15mPD), (ii) a 11-storey office block (with a GFA of about 16,585m² and a BH of 57mPD), and (iii) ‘Eating Place’ and ‘Shop and Services’ uses within the terraced podium and G/F and 1/F of the office block, that are built over 1 basement level of car park (**Drawings A-1 to A-8**). The blocks and the terraced podium are connected at deck level (i.e. 2/F of the office and hotel blocks at 15.35mPD (deck level)). As compared to the approved scheme (for portion covering the Site), the current application proposes an increase in hotel rooms (from 300 to 440), the same total GFA with slight reduction in hotel GFA and corresponding increase in office GFA, increase in BH of the hotel and office blocks (which were in compliance with the OZP restriction under the approved scheme), and reduction of site coverages of podium.
- 1.4 The Block Plan, Section Plan, Floor Plans, Pedestrian Connection Plans and Visual Illustrations of the proposed scheme are in **Drawings A1 to A-14**, a comparison of the approved and proposed schemes is in **Drawing A-15**, and the major development parameters as compared with the approved scheme (the portion covering the Site only) are set out below:

| Development Parameters | Approved Scheme (A/K22/17) | Proposed Scheme (A/K22/28) | Difference |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Area | About 11,276m ² (a) | About 11,276m ² | - |
| PR | About 2.838 | About 2.838 | - |
| Total GFA | About 32,000m ² | About 32,000m ² | - |
| Hotel (b) | 16,000m ² | 15,415m ² | - 585m ² |
| Office (b) | 16,000m ² | 16,585m ² | + 585m ² |
| Maximum Site Coverage of Podium | 100% | Not more than 65% | - 35% |
| No. of Blocks | 2 | 2 | - |
| Maximum BH | | | |
| Hotel | Not exceeding BHR at 55mPD | 60.15mPD (14 Storeys) (c) | 5.15m above BHR (+ 9.36%) |
| Office | Not exceeding BHR at 55mPD | 57mPD (11 Storeys) (c) | 2m above BHR (+ 3.64%) |
| No. of Rooms (For Hotel) | Not more than 300 | Not more than 440 | + 140 |
| Car Parking Provision | | | |
| Private Car | | | |
| Hotel | 83 (d) | 13 | + 35 |
| Office | | 105 | |
| Loading/Unloading | | | |

| Development Parameters | Approved Scheme (A/K22/17) | Proposed Scheme (A/K22/28) | Difference |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Hotel | 10 ^(d) | 3 | + 8 |
| Office | | 15 | |
| Lay-bys | | | |
| Hotel | 7 ^(d) | 5 | - 1 |
| Office | | 1 | |

Remarks:

- (a) The approved scheme has a larger application site covering the KTSP site (see **Plan A-5**).
- (b) Including shop and services/eating place uses.
- (c) Excluding one storey of basement carpark.
- (d) Shared by the hotel and office blocks.

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

- (a) Application Form received on 7.1.2020 (Appendix I)
- (b) Supplementary Planning Statement (Appendix Ia)
- (c) Further Information received on 20.3.2020 [FI(1)] (Appendix Ib)
(accepted but not exempted from publication)
- (d) Further Information received on 9.4.2020 [FI(2)] (Appendix Ic)
- (e) Further Information received on 24.4.2020 [FI(3)] (Appendix Id)
- (f) Further Information received on 29.4.2020 [FI(4)] (Appendix Ie)

1.6 The Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board agreed on 6.3.2020 to defer the consideration of the application for two months as requested by the applicant. After receiving the further information from the applicant on 20.3.2020, 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 set out in the supplementary planning statement and further information at **Appendices Ia to Ie**. They are summarised as follows:

Reinforces the Planning Intention

- (a) The proposed scheme satisfies the planning themes and urban design framework of Kai Tak. With the enhanced design features and connectivity with the surrounding, the proposed scheme will provide a more attractive environment for pedestrians and visitors and better connect with the surrounding neighborhood and the planned open space network in Kai Tak. Besides, through sustainable building design and sensible building articulation, a more celebrated and attractive built-form would be created.

Compatible BH

- (b) The proposed development, which involves minor relaxation of BH from 55mPD to not more than 60.15mPD, is minor and is fully in line with the latest development context of Kai Tak.

Satisfies Criteria of Applying for Minor Relaxation

- (c) Innovative design as well as sensible building articulation in the office and hotel blocks will enhance the visual attractiveness and air ventilation of the proposed scheme. By reducing the site coverage of hotel and office blocks above the deck level, it would allow a wider building separation with the Main Stadium (about 64m from the office block and about 40m from the hotel block) (**Drawing A-15**). The unique building disposition can facilitate the eastern and southeastern prevailing winds to penetrate to other parts of Kai Tak.
- (d) The podium mass between the office and hotel blocks will be broken down into a permeable terracing design with landscaping and few overhead structures. A spacious open plaza contributing to a sense of arrival is proposed at G/F which would serve as a social hub of the proposed development.
- (e) Seamless connections with the surrounding developments in the form of escalators, staircases, footbridge, podium garden and at-grade connections would be provided to connect with the KTSP and future open space (**Drawings A-10 and A-11**).

Slight Increase in BH is Necessary

- (f) In order to ensure a smooth transition with the Main Stadium and other parts of the KTSP, the deck level connecting the landscape deck of KTSP is increased from 13.25mPD in the approved scheme to 15.35mPD in the proposed scheme to match with the latest design of the KTSP. Reasonable floor to floor heights are adopted. The site coverage of the podium is reduced from 100% in the approved scheme to 65% in the proposed scheme. A podium garden (with about ~~5.8m~~ 6.2m in height) is proposed at the deck level of the office block.
- (g) As for the hotel block, the building footprint is reduced to provide a wider separation with the Main Stadium comparing with the approved scheme. To achieve this design intent, the BH of the hotel block is increased from not exceeding 55mPD (with a floor to floor height of 4.05m) under the approved scheme to 60.15mPD (with a lower floor to floor height of 3.5m) under the proposed scheme.

Better serves Future Hotel Demand

- (h) The proposed hotel development in the Site with not more than 440 rooms is considered reasonable and comparable with the overseas and local examples of hotels locating within 1km walking distance from major sports facilities.

- (i) The proposed hotel could provide accommodations for visitors, athletes, officials and spectators of the KTSP as well as the future business visitors of the Central Business District 2 (CBD 2).

Commits to the Harbour Planning

- (j) The proposed scheme has paid full attention to the requirements related to harbour planning in view of its relationship to the harbourfront as well as the Victoria Harbour.

Sustainable in Technical Aspects

- (k) Relevant assessments and proposals on landscape, visual, traffic, environmental, engineering, air ventilation impacts are submitted to support that the proposed scheme would be sustainable with no insurmountable problems.
- (l) The façade length of the proposed development would comply with the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) (PNAP APP-152) to improve air ventilation, enhance environmental quality at pedestrian level and mitigate heat island effect. The provision of greenery would also comply with the said SBDG as greenery coverage of not less than 30% of the area of the lot is proposed.

Responses to Public Comments

- (m) Regarding the public comments on the potential blockage of emergency routes of the Main Stadium by the pedestrian flow generated by the proposed development, measures such as movable barriers, stationing of security guards, provision of signage and public announcement system would be arranged during major events at the common boundary with KTSP to control pedestrian flow.
- (n) As for the concern on possible glare nuisance of the glass curtain walls, the glass of curtain walls would strictly follow and fulfil the requirements outlined in the PNAP APP-2, which stated that external reflectance of curtain wall glass should be limited to 20% or less.

3. Compliance with the “Owner’s Consent/Notification” Requirement

The applicant is the sole “current land owner”. Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members’ inspection.

4. Previous Application (Plan A-5)

The Site is covered by a previous planning application (No. A/K22/17), submitted by the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB), covering the Site and KTSP for minor relaxation of BHR for the proposed Main Stadium at the southern portion of the KTSP, as well as for proposed hotel and permitted office, shop and services/eating place at the Site, that was approved with condition by the Committee of the Board on 17.3.2017. The Committee approved the application on consideration that the proposed minor relaxation of BHR

for the Main Stadium from 55mPD to 70mPD was considered acceptable from planning perspective; and that the proposed hotel was compatible with the surrounding uses and could be considered as a supporting and complementary use to the KTSP.

5. Similar Application

There is no similar application for proposed hotel development and minor relaxation of BHR within the “OU(Stadium)” zone on the OZP.

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

6.1 The Site:

- (a) bounded by KTSP at its northeast, southeast and southwest. The construction works of KTSP commenced in the first quarter of 2019 and are scheduled for completion in 2023;
- (b) abuts Shing Kai Road at its northwest;
- (c) a planned pedestrian footbridge (at 15.35mPD) runs along the southwestern boundary of the Site and KTSP;
- (d) abuts the landscaped deck of the KTSP (at 15.35mPD) along its eastern boundary (**Drawing A-12**); and
- (e) abuts a large open space area at its ground level (at 5.35mPD) further west of the pedestrian footbridge that connects Metro Park to the South and Sung Wong Toi Park to the north (**Drawings A-12 and A-13**).

6.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:

- (a) further north and east of the KTSP are sites of existing/planned residential and commercial uses; and
- (b) further south of KTSP is the planned Metro Park.

7. Planning Intention

7.1 The planning intention of “OU(Stadium)” zone is primarily for the provision of a multi-purpose stadium complex including a main stadium, a secondary stadium, an indoor sports arena and other ancillary leisure and recreational facilities.

7.2 According to the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP, minor relaxation of BHR will be considered by the Board taking into account its own merits and the relevant criteria for consideration of such application for relaxation are as follows:

- (a) amalgamating smaller sites for achieving better urban design and local area improvements;
- (b) accommodating the bonus PR granted under the Buildings Ordinance (BO) in relation to surrender/dedication of land/area for use as public passage/street widening;
- (c) providing better streetscape/good quality street level public urban space;
- (d) providing separation between buildings to enhance air and visual permeability;
- (e) accommodating building design to address specific site constraints in achieving the permissible PR under the OZP; and
- (f) other factors, such as the need for tree preservation, innovative building design and planning merits that would bring about improvements to townscape and amenity of the locality and would not cause adverse landscape and visual impacts.

8. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

8.1 The following government departments have been consulted and their views on the application are summarised as follows:

Land Administration

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

- (a) He has no objection to the application.
- (b) The Site falls within New Kowloon Inland Lot No. 6607 (the Lot) which is held under Conditions of Sale No. 20352 dated 9.9.2019. The Lot shall not be used for any purpose other than for non-industrial (excluding residential, godown and petrol filling station but including hotel) purposes. The Lot is subject to a total maximum GFA of 32,000m² with development conditions including GFA restrictions for individual uses like hotel, office, etc. and parking requirements for respective permissible uses. There is no height restriction in the existing lease conditions.
- (c) The proposed commercial development is not in conflict with the existing lease conditions. However, detailed development will be considered at building plan submission stage and it is not guaranteed that the detailed figures and schematic design as mentioned or shown in the planning application must be considered acceptable under lease.

Urban Design, Air Ventilation and Landscape

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

Urban Design

- (a) The top of the elongated podium will be integrated with the landscaped deck in KTSP at 15.35mPD level, and the proposed development has incorporated an open plaza at G/F, an elevated walkway network at 1/F and 2/F with a footbridge and multiple vertical connections, a podium garden at 2/F of the office block, and landscape treatments at G/F, 1/F, 2/F and R/F. Active retail and eating places have been provided along the development edges at the buildings' low zone. Building separations of minimum 15m have been provided between the hotel and office blocks, and between the two blocks and the Main Stadium of the KTSP, and building voids have been provided at the building's low zone. The built form of the proposed development has also been articulated to promote visual interest. It is noted that provision of loose furniture within the outdoor spaces is proposed and will be explored at detailed design stage. Technically speaking, incorporation of the above design measures, apart from the podium garden, the voids at the buildings' low zone and the articulation of the built form, do not necessarily require additional BH. Nonetheless, they may promote pedestrian connectivity, visual interest and building permeability, as well as contribute to a pleasant and vibrant public realm.

Air Ventilation

- (b) It is noted that the good design features of the approved scheme as per the approved Air Ventilation Assessment report have generally been maintained or enhanced in the proposed scheme, including: (i) further reduction of podium coverage; (ii) proposed hotel with a smaller footprint is situated at the leeward side under prevailing southeastern wind direction; (iii) building separations of at least 15m have been provided between the proposed hotel and office blocks, and between the two blocks with the Main Stadium of the KTSP; and (iv) opportunity to provide landscaping and greening. Given the above, it is unlikely that the proposed scheme would induce significant adverse impact on the surrounding pedestrian wind environment as compared to the approved scheme.

Landscape

- (c) She has no in-principle objection to the application from landscape planning point of view.

- (d) The Site is located on vacant land and situated in an area of urban landscape character dominated by planned “OU(Stadium)” and “O” zones located adjacent to the Site. Four existing trees of common and weed species with poor form and health condition are proposed to be felled due to conflicts with the proposed development. Hard and soft landscape treatments with 11 new tree planting are proposed on G/F, 2/F and R/F as indicated in the Landscape Master Plans.
- (e) More greening and tree planting opportunities on G/F, particularly along Shing Kai Road, and podium level should be further explored to enhance the landscape quality of the development.
- (f) Seating and/or recreational facilities are recommended to be provided at landscape areas on G/F and 2/F for public enjoyment.
- (g) Should the Board approve the application, an approval condition requiring the submission and implementation of landscape proposal from G/F to 2/F of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Board is suggested.

8.1.3 Comments of Kai Tak Sports Park Section, HAB:

- (a) He has no objection to the application.
- (b) Appropriate pedestrian connections on deck level and other levels between the proposed development and the KTSP, with the aim to create a universally accessible neighbourhood environment, are supported subject to further discussion and agreement with relevant parties and HAB in the process of design development.

Traffic

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

- (a) He has no in-principle objection to the application.
- (b) To address his comments on the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), approval conditions requiring the submission of a revised TIA and the design and provision of vehicular access, parking spaces and loading/unloading facilities to the satisfaction of C for T or of the Board are suggested.

Environment

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

She has no objection to the application subject to the imposition of approval conditions requiring the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the DEP or of the Board and implementation of sewerage facilities identified in the revised SIA to the satisfaction of Director of Drainage Services or of the Board.

Building Matters

8.1.6 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department (CBS/K, BD):

- (a) He has no objection to the application.
- (b) All building works are subject to compliance with the BO.
- (c) Application for hotel concessions under Building (Planning) Regulation 23A will be considered upon formal submission of building plans subject to compliance with criteria under PNAP APP-40.
- (d) Detailed fundamental checking on the building proposal of the development could only be made in the building plans submission stage.

Fire Safety

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

- (a) He has no in-principle objection to the application subject to fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of his Department. 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.
- (b) Detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans.
- (c) Regarding the public concern on potential blockage of emergency routes of the Main Stadium, he has no adverse comment noting that the KTSP and the proposed development at the Site would have their own evacuation plans to ensure safety evacuation of pedestrians in case of emergency.

Harbourfront Planning

8.1.8 Comments of the Harbour Office, Development Bureau (DEVB):

The Site falls within the harbourfront area under the purview of Harbourfront Commission's Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (KTTF). The gist and relevant information of the application have been circulated to Members of KTTF on 20.1.2020. No comment on the application was received from Members of the KTTF.

Other Aspects

8.1.9 Comments of the Head of Energising Kowloon East Office (EKEO):

- (a) According to the applicant, the landscaped deck of KTSP and the planned pedestrian connection to be constructed by HAB would serve as a major pedestrian link and most of the visitors would use the landscaped deck to and from between the Main Stadium and the MTR Sung Wong Toi Station instead of via the Site.
- (b) Notwithstanding, the 5m-wide footbridge for connection between the two podia of the proposed development may not be sufficient to cater for the pedestrian flow that will go through the development. The applicant is advised to further review the width of the footbridge between the two podia of the proposed development at the detailed design stage to cater for the future pedestrian flow.

8.1.10 Comments of the Commissioner for Tourism (C for Tourism):

- (a) He has no objection to the proposed hotel development provided that it is agreeable to all relevant government departments and that the applicant is able to comply with all requirements laid down by the relevant departments.
- (b) The proposed hotel development will help increase the provision of hotel facilities, broaden the range of accommodation for visitors and support the development of convention and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries.

8.1.11 Comments of the Chief Officer (Licensing Authority), Office of the Licensing Authority, Home Affairs Department (CO(LA), HAD):

- (a) He has no objection to the application.
- (b) The applicant should submit a copy of the occupation permit for the proposed hotel when making an application under the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation (HAGAO), Cap 349.

- (c) The licensing requirements will be formulated after inspections by the Building Safety Unit and Fire Safety Team upon receipt of application under HAGAO.

District Officer's Comments

8.1.12 Comments of the District Officer (Kowloon City), Home Affairs Department (DO(KC), HAD):

He has no comment on the application and notes that PlanD has notified the interested Kowloon City District Council (DC) members as well as the Owners' Committee/Mutual Aid Committees/Management Committees of buildings near the Site about the planning application. The Board should take into account all the comments gathered in the consultation exercise in the decision making process. Should the application be eventually approved, the applicant should take appropriate measures to address the concerns of relevant stakeholders.

8.2 The following government departments have no objection to or no adverse comment on the application:

- (a) Project Manager (East), Civil Engineering and Development Department;
- (b) Chief Highway Engineer/Kowloon, Highways Department;
- (c) Chief Architect/CMD2, Architectural Services Department (CA/CMD2, ArchSD);
- (d) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD);
- (e) Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department (CE/MS, DSD);
- (f) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services;
- (g) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;
- (h) Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene; and
- (i) Commissioner of Police.

9. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Periods

9.1 On 17.1.2020 and 31.3.2020, the application was published for public inspection. During the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection periods, a total of 15 public comments (**Appendix II**) submitted by a company and individuals were received. One of the comments supported the application, 12 provided adverse comments and 2 provided views. The main points of the public comments are summarised below.

Supportive Comment [Appendix II-1]

9.2 There was one public comment supporting the application. The commenter stated that the proposed commercial uses and hotel facilities can enhance the attractiveness and infrastructure of Kai Tak.

Adverse Comments [Appendix II-2 to II-13]

- 9.3 12 public comments from individuals provide adverse comments on the application mainly for the reasons that:
- (a) the proposed building height is too high and may cause wall effect. It would also affect the harbour view and undermine the role of the Main Stadium as a city landmark;
 - (b) the proposed development would generate additional traffic and cause traffic congestion;
 - (c) the pedestrian flow generated by the proposed development may block the emergency routes of the Main Stadium and threaten public safety;
 - (d) the proposed development is a commercial operation which deviates from the original intention of KTSP as a multi-purpose sports venue mainly for recreation; and
 - (e) the glass curtain walls of the proposed development may cause glare and create nuisance to the nearby residents, drivers and visitors of KTSP.

Providing Views [Appendix II-14 to II-15]

- 9.4 Two comments from a company and an individual raised the following points:
- (a) the applicant should indicate how the activities inside the proposed development will be managed to minimize the interference with the operations and evacuation of KTSP;
 - (b) the landscape design of the proposed development should be in line with that of KTSP; and
 - (c) the proposed retail and eating places should be reduced to minimize the possible hygiene issue, pedestrian and traffic congestion.

10. Planning Considerations and Assessments

- 10.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for minor relaxation of BHR for the proposed hotel and permitted office, eating place and shop and services uses at the Site. The proposed hotel has not more than 440 guest rooms and a BH of 60.15mPD (relaxation of BHR by 5.15m or 9.36%). The office block has a BH of 57mPD (relaxation of BHR by 2m or 3.64%).
- 10.2 The Site was subject of a previous planning application (No. A/K22/17) that also covered the KTSP as set out in paragraph 4 above, the application was approved by the Committee of the Board on 17.3.2017. The Site was then sold to the applicant through public tender on 9.9.2019 for non-industrial (excluding residential, godown and petrol filling station but including hotel) uses.

Land Use Compatibility

- 10.3 The proposed 'Office', 'Eating Place' and 'Shop and Services' uses are always permitted within the "OU(Stadium)" zone. 'Hotel' use was approved in the previous application by the Committee considering that hotel use was compatible with the surrounding uses and could be considered as a supporting and complementary use to the KTSP by providing accommodations for athletes, officials and staff participating in the events within KTSP. According to the applicant, the proposed hotel could provide accommodations for visitors, athletes, officials and spectators of the KTSP as well as the future business visitors of the CBD2.

Development Intensities

- 10.4 As compared to the approved scheme, the number of hotel rooms is increased from not more than 300 to not more than 440. There is no PR or GFA restriction under the "OU(Stadium)" zoning, the total development intensity (i.e. total GFA of 32,000m²) is same as the approved scheme, and the applicant has submitted relevant assessments to demonstrate that the proposed increase in hotel rooms will have no adverse impacts. Relevant departments consulted, including HAB, C for T, DEP, CE/MS of DSD and CE/C of WSD have no objection to or no adverse comment on the application and considered that significant adverse impacts in terms of traffic, environment, sewerage, drainage and water supply are not anticipated.
- 10.5 The C for Tourism considers that the proposed hotel development will help increase the provision of hotel facilities, broaden the range of accommodation for visitors and support the development of convention and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries.

Minor Relaxation of BHR

- 10.6 The office block is proposed at 57mPD involving minor relaxation of the BHR by 2m (3.64%) (**Drawings A-1, A-2, A-9, A-12 and A-14**). According to the applicant, to improve connectivity with KTSP, the deck level of the proposed development connecting to the landscape deck of KTSP is increased by about 2m from 13.25mPD in the approved scheme to 15.35mPD in the proposed scheme to provide same level connection with the landscape deck (at 15.35mPD) in the latest design of KTSP. The applicant also indicated that the proposed BH would allow a podium garden with about ~~5.8m headroom~~ **6.2m in height** at the deck level of the office block. The minor relaxation of BH of 2m for the office block is considered acceptable taking account that the proposed relaxation in BH is minor, can accommodate better connections with the KTSP, and allow a podium garden at the deck level to enhance permeability and pedestrian circulation.
- 10.7 The hotel block is proposed at varying BHs with major parts of the building within the BHR of 55mPD. The proposed minor relaxation of BH of the hotel block from 55mPD to 60.15mPD is considered acceptable noting that the minor relaxation in BH of 5.15m (i.e. 9.36%) only involved the highest two floors (i.e. 12/F and 13/F) which have been designed in stepped form with reduced

footprints to enhance visual attractiveness (**Drawings A-1, A-2, A-8, A-9 and A-12**). It is also noted that the applicant had made efforts to minimize the increase in building height by adopting a lower floor to floor height of 3.5m for typical hotel floor as compared to 4.05m in the approved scheme.

- 10.8 The relaxation of BHs would also allow for terraced design on all facades and at different levels of the office and hotel blocks which may be considered as innovative design with design merits. Other design merits of the proposed scheme as compared to the approved scheme include breaking down of the podium mass with lower site coverage at podium level, introduction of a 2 to 3-storey low-rise belt of shop and services and eating place on the eastern portion of the Site which provide a harmonious interface with the Main Stadium, better building disposition (i.e. main buildings about Shing Kai Road) to create wider building separation with the Main Stadium and provision of an open plaza within the development. The applicant advises that the proposed scheme complies with the SBDG in terms of building separation and greenery coverage (i.e. 30.05%). In view of the above, the proposed scheme generally meets the criteria for minor relaxation of BH. CTP/UD&L of PlanD and CA/CMD2 of ArchSD have no adverse comment on the application.
- 10.9 To address the comments of CTP/UD&L of PlanD on enhancement of landscape treatment, an approval condition requiring the submission and implementation of landscape proposal from G/F to 2/F of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Board is recommended in paragraph 11.2 below.

Public Comments

- 10.10 Regarding the public comments, the planning considerations and assessments as set out above are generally relevant. As for the public concern on potential blockage of emergency routes of the Main Stadium, FSD has no adverse comment in this regard. Any possible glare nuisance of the glass curtain walls will be dealt with at general building plan submission stage and the applicant had committed that low reflectance curtain wall glass will be used.

11. Planning Department's Views

- 11.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 10 and having taking into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 9, the Planning Department has no objection to the application.
- 11.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 15.5.2024, and after the said date, the permission shall cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted is commenced or the permission is renewed. The following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are suggested for Members' reference:

Approval Conditions

- (a) the submission and implementation of landscape proposal from G/F to 2/F of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board (TPB);
- (b) the submission of a revised Traffic Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the design and provision of vehicular access, parking spaces and loading/unloading facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (e) the implementation of sewerage facilities identified in the revised SIA to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.

Advisory Clauses

- 11.3 The recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Appendix III**.
- 11.4 There is no strong planning reason to recommend rejection of the application.

12. Decision Sought

- 12.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to grant or refuse to grant permission.
- 12.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, Members are invited to consider the approval conditions and advisory clauses, if any, to be attached to the permission, and the date when the validity of the permission should expire.
- 12.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, Members are invited to advise what reasons for rejection should be given to the applicant.

13. Attachments

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Appendix I | Application Form received on 7.1.2020 |
| Appendix Ia | Supplementary Planning Statement |
| Appendix Ib | Further Information received on 20.3.2020 [FI(1)] |
| Appendix Ic | Further Information received on 9.4.2020 [FI(2)] |
| Appendix Id | Further Information received on 24.4.2020 [FI(3)] |
| Appendix Ie | Further Information received on 29.4.2020 [FI(4)] |
| Appendix II | Public Comments |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Appendix III | Advisory Clauses |
| Drawing A-1 | Block Plan |
| Drawing A-2 | Section Plan |
| Drawings A-3 to A-8 | Floor Plans |
| Drawing A-9 | Plan Showing Building Footprint over 55mPD |
| Drawings A-10 to A-11 | Pedestrian Connection Plans |
| Drawings A-12 to A-14 | Visual Illustrations |
| Drawing A-15 | Comparison of the Approved and Proposed Schemes |
| Plan A-1 | Location Plan |
| Plan A-2 | Site Plan |
| Plan A-3 | Aerial Photo |
| Plan A-4 | Site Photos |
| Plan A-5 | Approved Scheme under Application No. A/K22/17 |
| Plan A-6 | Site Context Plan |

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
May 2020