

**FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATION NO. A/K14/766**  
**UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for  
Permitted Office, Shop and Services & Eating Place Uses in  
“Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone,  
41 King Yip Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon**

**1. Background**

- 1.1 On 8.2.2019, the applicant, Uni Trinity Development Limited represented by Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited, submitted the current application seeking planning permission for minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) restriction from 12 to 14.4 (i.e. +2.4 or +20%) as well as relaxation of building height restriction (BHR) from 100 meters above Principal Datum (mPD) to 126mPD (i.e. +26m or +26%) for a proposed 32-storey (including 3 basement levels) commercial/office (C/O) building with permitted office, shop and services and eating place uses (the Proposed Scheme) on a vacant site at 41 King Yip Street (the Site) (**Plans FA-1 to FA-3**)<sup>[1]</sup>. The Site falls within an area zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) on the approved Kwun Tong (South) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K14S/22.
- 1.2 On 31.5.2019, the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) considered the application. Members were in support of the Policy Initiatives of Revitalisation of IBs (the Policy) to incentivise the redevelopments of pre-1987 IBs, i.e. to allow relaxation of the maximum permissible non-domestic PR as specified in an OZP by up to 20% for redevelopment of pre-1987 IBs subject to the Board’s approval<sup>[2]</sup>. However, Members considered that there was inadequate information to demonstrate strong justification and planning merits for the proposed minor relaxation of BHR. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application, pending submission of further information (FI) for further consideration. The required FI included:
- (a) the planning and design merits of the proposed scheme, taking into account the site specific characteristics and local context;

---

<sup>[1]</sup> The Site was previously occupied by an industrial building (IB) constructed with Occupation Permit issued on 18.1.1965, i.e. a pre-1987 IB. The IB was demolished in 2009 and the Site is now left vacant.

<sup>[2]</sup> The relaxation of PR is subject to approval by the Board on a case-by-case basis and the maximum non-domestic PR permissible under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R).

- (b) design of street level on pedestrian accessibility, connectivity and comfort;
  - (c) compliance with relevant provisions of Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG); and
  - (d) consideration of green building design.
- 1.3 The Committee also agreed that, an analysis of similar approved and rejected applications should be provided to facilitate Members' consideration of the application. This analysis is provided in section 3 below.
- 1.4 For Members' reference, the following documents are attached:
- (a) MPC Paper No. A/K14/766 considered on 31.5.2019 **(Appendix F-I)**
  - (b) Extract of minutes of the MPC meeting held on 31.5.2019 **(Appendix F-II)**
  - (c) Secretary of the Board's letter dated 21.6.2019 informing the applicant of the deferment of the Committee's decision **(Appendix F-III)**
  - (d) Applicant's letter dated 26.6.2019 providing FI(1) on the planning and design merits of the Proposed Scheme **(Appendix F-IVa)**  
*(accepted but not exempted from publication and recounting requirements)*
  - (e) FI(2) vide letter dated 4.7.2019 providing clarification on the site coverage **(Appendix F-IVb)**
  - (f) FI(3) vide letter dated 23.7.2019 providing clarification on the vehicular access arrangement **(Appendix F-IVc)**  
*(FI(2) and FI(3) are exempted from publication and recounting requirements)*

## **2. Further Information Submitted by the Applicant**

- 2.1 On 26.6.2019, 4.7.2019 and 23.7.2019, taking into account the Committee's comments, the applicant submitted FI on the planning and design merit of the proposed development (**Appendices F-IVa to IVc**). As compared with the scheme considered at the Meeting on 31.5.2019, the applicant has made the following key refinements to the Proposed Scheme:
- G/F and 1/F – with further 1.2m setback along King Yip Street; corner setback at King Yip Street; repaving the public lane; and setback/non-building area (NBA) areas with vertical greening/planting areas (**Drawings FA-3 and 4**).
  - Tower – adopting curvilinear building envelope at Low Zone (2/F to 7/F) and High Zone (18/F to 23/F) with five layers of edge plantings (**Drawing FA-1**).
  - Greenery features – increase in greenery from about 420m<sup>2</sup> (20.5%) to about 530m<sup>2</sup> (26%).
- 2.2 The applicant's FI in responses to Members' concerns as submitted in **Appendices F-IVa to IVc** are summarized as follows:

(a) Planning and Design Merits of the Proposed Scheme, Taking into Account the Site Specific Characteristics and Local Context

*Enhancing Wind/Visual Permeability by Providing a Curvilinear Building Envelope with Further Setback*

- 2.3 Full-height setback of 1.2m along King Yip Street and 1.5m full-height setback plus 1.5m NBA (from ground level with clear headroom of 5.1m) along the back alley are provided in accordance with the requirements in the adopted Kwun Tong (Western Part) Outline Development Plan (ODP) No. D/K14A/2. In addition to the ODP requirements, the scheme proposes no aboveground structure within the entire height of the NBA and additional 1.2m setback and corner setback along King Yip Street (G/F and 1/F with 10.5m in height) for further enhancing natural ventilation and visual permeability to the surrounding area (**Drawings FA-1 to 5**).
- 2.4 By adopting a curvilinear façade in its north-eastern frontage at Low Zone and High Zone with further setbacks at these levels, the Proposed Scheme would amplify the efficacy of wind permeability, and the interesting built form would enhance vibrancy among the monotonous building mass in Kwun Tong Business Area (KTBA). (**Drawings FA-1, FA-6 to 8, FA-11 and 12**).

*Achieving Visual Benefits by Incorporating Communal Sky Garden and Various Greenery Features*

- 2.5 Combination of greenery features (namely vertical greening and planters at street level, greenery on the flat roof at 1/F and five layers of edge planting) would not only offer aesthetic improvements to the surrounding areas and soften the building mass, but also improve air quality and alleviate heat island effect (**Drawings FA-1, FA-3 to 5, FA-11 to 12**). The sky garden with clear height of 4.5m would allow planting shrubs and trees of appropriate size. It would be opened for visitors' use at reasonable hours. The open-sided (above parapet) communal sky garden on refuge floor (the sky garden) (8/F) (**Drawing FA-7**) and mechanical floor (17/F) would allow cross ventilation and increase permeability of the building, which would enhance air circulation to the surrounding area and mitigate heat island effect.

*Compatibility of the Proposed BH with the Surroundings*

- 2.6 The proposed BH of 126mPD is considered compatible with the adjoining developments and the overall BH profile in the "OU(B)" zone. The intention of progressive increment in BH from the waterfront to Kwun Tong Road would not be jeopardized (**Drawings FA-9 to 10**).

(b) Design of Street Level on Pedestrian Accessibility, Connectivity and Comfort

- 2.6 Further setback along King Yip Street and corner setback at G/F to 1/F (about 10.5m in height) are proposed which would enhance the pedestrian connectivity and integrate into the pedestrian network of the KTBA (**Drawings FA-2 to 5**). The further setback areas, which would be repaved/furnished with greenery/plantings and maintained by the owner, would provide opportunity to facilitate pedestrian flow and create a large covered space for public use (e.g. serve as a shelter for public waiting at the bus stop outside the Site).
- 2.7 The corner setback would enhance natural ventilation to public lane by increasing

permeability of the building on street level which would then reduce the street canyon effect. It would also improve the visual permeability at pedestrian level.

2.8 The 3m setback/NBA at the back lane would be provided, managed and maintained by the applicant and would be opened for 24-hour public passage and vehicular access. Together with the existing 3m back lane, the total width for vehicular movement therein would be increased to 6m wide, which will bring about improvement to vehicular access and loading/unloading (L/UL) activities in the vicinity (**Drawings FA-2**).

(c) Compliance with Relevant Provisions of SBDG

2.9 The three key building design elements<sup>[3]</sup> established in the SBDG are incorporated in the Proposed Scheme, where applicable.

(i) Building separation – To reduce undesirable screening effect of long building and to improve air ventilation, the continuous projected façade length of the proposed building is less than 60m; as such, the requirement on building separation in SBDG is not applicable to the Site.

(ii) Building setback – The Proposed Scheme complies with the setback requirement of ODP with further setbacks, and that no part of building is within 7.5m from the centreline of King Yip Street, thus the Site complies with this requirement in SBDG.

(iii) Site coverage of greenery – Site coverage of greenery of about 26% exceeds the minimum requirement of 20% in the SBDG.

(d) Consideration of Green Building Design

2.10 The Proposed Scheme incorporates green building devices including (i) vertical solar shading devices on south-eastern and north-eastern façade to reduce solar-heat by direct sunlight, which in turn lower the building heat gain and cooling load, and improve the natural lighting quality of building interiors; (ii) ‘Low-E Glass’ which has low thermal conductivity at curtain wall to reduce light pollution and glare to the surrounding areas; and (iii) rainwater recycling system to reduce fresh water demand for non-potable applications. In addition, the design and construction would adopt measures that enhance energy efficiency by having suitable Overall Thermal Transfer Value (OTTV)<sup>[4]</sup> for compliance with the Building (Energy

---

<sup>[3]</sup> The three key building design elements, with the objectives to achieve better air ventilation, enhance the environmental quality of living space, provide more greenery particularly at pedestrian, and mitigate heat island effect, are set out under Practice Notes for Authorized Persons (PNAP) APP-151 “Building Design to Foster a Quality and Sustainable Built Environment” and APP-152 “Sustainable Building Design Guideline”. Compliance with SBDG is one of the pre-requisites for granting Gross Floor Area concessions for green/amenity features and non-mandatory/non-essential plant rooms and services by the Buildings Authority (BA).

<sup>[4]</sup> OTTV is a measure of the energy consumption of building envelope components such as type of glazing, window size, external shading to windows, wall colour and wall type. Legislative control over OTTV has been incorporated in the B(EE)R, administered by the Buildings Department, which aims at reducing heat transfer through the building envelope thus saving the electricity consumption for air-conditioning by requiring the external walls and roofs of a commercial or hotel building to be designed and constructed to have a suitable OTTV.

Efficiency) Regulation (B(EE)R), and follow the Building Energy Code (BEC)<sup>[5]</sup>.

- 2.11 Apart from the FI as required by the Committee, the applicant provides further elaborations in support of the proposed minor relaxation of BHR.

Fulfilling Criteria for Minor Relaxation of BHR

- 2.12 The Proposed Scheme would achieve multiple design merits that fulfils the following five criteria for consideration of minor relaxation of BHR in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP:

- (a) *accommodating the bonus PR of 0.574* (or about GFA of 1,171.185m<sup>2</sup> that broadly equivalent to one office storey of 4.025m), subject to approval of the BA under the Buildings Ordinance (BO) in relation to surrender of land/area for use as public passage/street widening<sup>[6]</sup>;
- (b) *providing better streetscape/good quality street level public urban space* with the greenery features, and the mandatory and the further setback provisions as set out in paragraphs 2.5, 2.7 to 2.8 above;
- (c) *providing separation between buildings to enhance air ventilation and visual permeability* associated with the mandatory and the further setback provisions as set out in paragraphs 2.7 to 2.8 above and the curvilinear façade design with further setbacks at tower levels (2/F to 7/F and 8/F to 23/F) as set out in paragraph 2.4 above;
- (d) *accommodating building design* with site coverage of about 59% at tower as compared with the permissible 60% under B(P)R, the BH under application is the minimal in achieving the applied 20% minor relaxation in PR restriction; and
- (e) *Other factors that would bring about improvements to townscape and amenity of the locality* including the sky garden with greenery proposal that would break up the visual bulkiness, opening of the setback areas for public use, minimal floor-to-floor height for achieving a BH that would accommodate the minor relaxation of PR under application in respect of the Policy while blend-in well with the BH profile in the vicinity, and that the Visual Impact Assessment concluded that there will be no adverse visual impact from short- to long-range vantage points.

---

<sup>[5]</sup> BEC sets out the technical guidance and details in respect of the minimum energy efficiency requirements governing the building services installations (namely air-conditioning installations, electrical installations, lift and escalator installations and lighting installations and energy audits in respect of several types of buildings (including commercial buildings)) defined in the Buildings Energy Efficiency Ordinance.

<sup>[6]</sup> Under the Policy, any bonus floor area claimed under B(P)R 22(1) or (2) is not to be counted towards the proposed relaxation of PR restriction by 20% for redevelopment projects. The bonus PR permitted under B(P)R 22(2) is permitted as of right under the Notes of the “OU(B)” zone, but can only be considered by the BA upon formal submission of BPs. In this regard, the bonus PR as included represents the worst case scenario for the purpose of technical assessments and should not be taken as approved under the subject application.

### Other considerations

- 2.13 Similar application (No. A/K14/763) at 350 Kwun Tong Road with minor relaxation of BHR by 25.9% (from 100mPD to 125.9mPD) was approved by the Committee on 22.3.2019, the proposed minor relaxation of BHR by 26% (from 100mPD to 126mPD) is of similar magnitude and therefore the minor relaxation of BHR of 126mPD under current application is considered acceptable.
- 2.14 The proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction of the Site by 20% is an immediate response to the policy initiative to encourage owners to redevelop pre-1987 IBs for providing more floor area to meet the social and economic needs, and making better use of valuable land resource. There was no adverse comment from relevant departments on relevant technical aspects.

### **3. Similar Approved and Rejected Applications**

- 3.1 Since March 2019, the Committee has considered seven minor relaxation applications in the Metro Area relating to the Policy. Three of the applications in San Po Kong, Hung Hom and Kwai Chung only involved relaxation of PR whilst the other four in KTBA involved minor relaxation of both PR and BH (see **Appendix F-V** for details). For the three applications that only involved minor relaxation of PR (A/K9/274, A/K11/233 and A/KC/460), they were all approved with conditions. For the four applications involving both minor relaxation of PR and BH, one was approved (A/K14/763), one was rejected (A/K14/764)<sup>[7]</sup> and two were deferred (A/K14/766 and A/K14/771) and will be further considered at this meeting. Applications A/K14/764 and A/K14/771 involved the same site (**Plan FA-1**).
- 3.2 On minor relaxation of PR restriction aspect, all but one of the applications proposed minor relaxation of PR of 20% which is the maximum relaxation promulgated under the Policy, and one application involved minor relaxation of PR of 6.52% (A/K9/274). The Committee generally indicated support for the Policy as it provides incentives to encourage redevelopment of pre-1987 IBs and had no objection regarding the minor relaxation of PR being applied for noting the applicants had provided technical assessments to support the technical feasibility of their proposal and there was no adverse comment from relevant government departments.
- 3.3 On minor relaxation of BHR aspect, two applications were considered at the same Committee meeting on 22.3.2019, A/K14/763 was approved considering that the proposed relaxation of BHR from 100mPD to 125.9mPD was not unacceptable but A/K14/764 was rejected considering that the proposed relaxation of BHR from 100mPD to 130.2mPD was without sufficient planning and design merits, approval would create undesirable precedent that will lead to cumulative visual impacts in the area. At the meeting on 31.5.2019, the Committee deferred decision on A/K14/766 (the subject application) and A/K14/771 and requested the applicant to provide further information to justify the planning and design merits for the

---

<sup>[7]</sup> The applicant of Application No. A/K14/764 applied for a review of the Committee's decision to reject the s.16 application. The Board agreed on 12.7.2019 to defer making a decision on the review application for two months as requested by the applicant.

proposed relaxation of BH (from 100mPD to 126mPD and 119.7mPD respectively).

- 3.4 Another application in Tsuen Wan (A/TW/505) for minor relaxation of PR by 20% is scheduled for consideration at the same meeting.

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

- 4.1 Comments on the Proposed Scheme made previously by the relevant Government bureaux/ departments are stated in paragraph 9.1 and 9.2 of **Appendix F-I**.
- 4.2 For the current FI, the following government departments have been consulted and their comments are summarized as follows:

##### **Building matters**

- 4.2.1 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department:

The Proposed Scheme is acceptable in principle under BO and detailed comments under the BO will be given at the building plan submission stage. His other technical comments as given in paragraph 9.1.3 of the MPC Paper No. A/K14/766 in **Appendix F-1** are still valid.

##### **Traffic**

- 4.2.2 Comments of the Commissioner for Transport:

He has no adverse comment on the FI from traffic engineering perspective and maintains his suggestion that should the application be approved by the Board, approval conditions should be imposed for submission of revised Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) (including a traffic management plan for the vehicular access arrangement) and implementation of mitigation measures, if any, identified in the TIA, and provision of the parking facilities, L/UL spaces and vehicular access.

##### **Urban Design, Visual and landscape Aspects**

- 4.2.3 Comments of the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department:

He notes that the applicant has reasonably responded to the issues of planning and design merits and has no comment from architectural and visual impact point of view.

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

- (a) In addition to the sky garden, the applicant has provided FI on design merits in support of the relaxation of BH, including the full-height setback for the 1.5m NBA along the public back lane and G/F and 1/F setback at the corner abutting King Yip Street. Moreover, information on other design measures have also been provided, such as paving treatment for the public lane and setback area, vertical greenery at the building's low zone and planting at

different levels of building edge and flat roof, though delivery of such other design measures may not require relaxation of BHR. Nevertheless, such measures will promote visual interest and enhance the streetscape, in particular along King Yip Street and its adjoining public lane.

- (b) He has no comment from landscape planning perspective and his previous comment is still valid that adverse landscape impact caused by the proposed development is not anticipated.

### **Pedestrian Walkability**

#### 4.2.5 Comments of the Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office (Head of EKEO), Development Bureau:

The full height setbacks and NBA proposals are in line with the requirements stipulated in the ODP. The setbacks would improve the pedestrian environment and promote walkability as advocated by his office.

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

- 5.1 On 9.7.2019, the FI was published for public inspection. During the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, which ended on 30.7.2019, three public comments were received from a member of the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) (**Appendix F-VI(1)**), the owners of 86 Hung To Road (**Appendix F-VI(2)**), and an individual (**Appendix F-VI(3)**). The KTDC member objected the application mainly on the grounds that the proposed relaxation of PR and BH restrictions would have adverse traffic impacts and jeopardize the BH profile of KTBA. The owners of 86 Hung To Road objected the application as the proposed vehicular access arrangement might affect their right to use the existing back lane. The individual noted some improvements to the general design of the Proposed Scheme but concerned that the greenery proposal may be difficult to maintain.
- 5.2 A total of 14 public comments, including ten objecting comments and four supportive comments, were received during the previous public inspection periods as detailed in paragraph 10 of **Appendix F-I**.

## **6. Planning Considerations and Assessments**

- 6.1 The application is for minor relaxations of PR restriction from 12 to 14.4 (by 20%) and BHR from 100mPD to 126mPD (by 26%) for a proposed redevelopment of the Site into a 32-storey (including 3 basement carpark levels) C/O development. At the MPC meeting on 31.5.2018, Members were in support of the policy to incentivise the redevelopment of pre-1987 IBs, which allow relaxation of PR by 20% subject to the Board's approval. However, Members considered that there was inadequate information to demonstrate strong justification and planning merits for the proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction of the application. In response to information requested by the Committee as detailed in paragraph 1.2 above, the applicant has submitted FIs to justify the proposed BH of 126mPD as detailed in Section 2.



- 6.2 The applicant further refines the Proposed Scheme as discussed in paragraph 2.1 above and provides elaborations of the planning and design merits of the Proposed Scheme that reasonably address Members' concerns. On local context, streetscape enhancement works along King Yip Street would be carried out as part of the Revitalization of Tsui Ping River project that aims at providing a greener environment and improving the environment for building a liveable city. Besides, the public back lanes to the southeast and northeast of the Site would be included in the Stage 2 Back Alleys Project @ Kowloon East currently under review by EKEO. As such, it is considered that the setback and greenery proposals of the Proposed Scheme would generally integrate with the above planned improvement proposals for building a coherent pedestrian network in the area. Head of EKEO advises that the setbacks would improve the pedestrian environment and promote walkability. CTP/UD&L, PlanD comments that the design measures as proposed would promote visual interest and enhance the streetscape along King Yip Street and the adjoining back lane. The applicant claims that the Proposed Scheme adopts various design elements as given in Section 2 above that would in turns meet the objectives of SBDG on achieving better air ventilation, enhancing the environmental quality of living environment, and mitigating the heat island effect. The requirements on the provisions of the setback areas/NBA for public use as well as the greenery area would be incorporated in lease modification document governing the Lot as appropriate. Regarding the green building design as proposed by the applicant, these measures could be implemented via existing centralized processing system of building plans in the detailed design stage.
- 6.3 Having considered the applicant's FI in response to the Committee's concerns and the departmental comments as set out in Section 4 above, the planning considerations and assessment as stated in paragraph 11 of MPC Paper No. A/K14/766 at **Appendix F-I** remain valid. In gist, the proposed BH of 126mPD (+26%) may be considered generally proportionate to the applied 20% minor relaxation in PR restriction and to accommodate the sky garden, and may not be unreasonable. Considering that the Site is near the edge of the "OU(B)" cluster subject to BH of 100mPD and the BHR for the sites across Hung To Road is 130mPD (**Plan FA-4**), the proposed BH may not be incompatible with the planned stepped height profile for KTBA.
- 6.4 Regarding the public concerns on the potential adverse visual and traffic impacts, the planning assessments in paragraphs 11.4 and 11.8 of MPC Paper No. A/K14/766 at **Appendix F-I** and departmental comments in paragraph 4.2 above are relevant. As for the concern on the use of the back lane, the applicant indicates that the 3m setback/NBA at the back lane would be provided, managed and maintained by the applicant and will be opened for 24-hour public passage and vehicular access. Besides, an approval condition requiring the submission of a revised TIA including the traffic management plan on the vehicular access arrangement would be imposed, should the application be approved. On the maintenance of the vertical greening, relevant clause requiring the provision and maintenance of the landscaping and greenery proposal could be considered at lease modification stage.

## 7. Planning Department's Views

- 7.1 Based on the assessment made in paragraph 6 above, PlanD maintains its previous view of having no objection to the application.
- 7.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 16.8.2023, 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) submission of sewerage impact assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the sewerage impact assessment for the proposed development in condition (a) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) submission of a revised traffic impact assessment, including a traffic management plan for the vehicular access arrangement, and implementation of the traffic management proposal and the mitigation measures, if any, identified in the revised traffic impact assessment, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (d) provision of parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces and vehicular access for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board.

### Advisory clauses

The recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Appendix VII**.

- 7.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, the following reason for rejection is suggested for Members' reference:
- (a) the applicant fails to demonstrate that there are sufficient planning and design merits to justify the proposed minor relaxation of building height restriction; and
  - (b) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for minor relaxation of building height restriction in the area, the cumulative effects of approving similar applications would have adverse visual impact on the area.

## 8. Decision Sought

- 8.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to grant or to refuse to grant permission.
- 8.2 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.

- 8.3 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.

**9. Attachments**

<b>Appendix F-I</b>	MPC Paper No. A/K14/766
<b>Appendix F-II</b>	Extract of minutes of the MPC meeting held on 31.5.2019
<b>Appendix F-III</b>	Secretary of the Board's letter dated 21.6.2019 informing the applicant of the Committee's decision
<b>Appendix F-IVa</b>	Further Information submitted by the applicant on 26.6.2019
<b>Appendix F-IVb</b>	Further Information submitted by the applicant on 4.7.2019
<b>Appendix F-IVc</b>	Further Information submitted by the applicant on 23.7.2019
<b>Appendix F-V</b>	Similar applications register
<b>Appendix F-VI(1) to (3)</b>	Public comments on the Further Information received during the statutory publication period
<b>Appendix F-VII</b>	Recommended advisory clauses
<b>Drawing FA-1</b>	Design Merits of the Proposed Scheme
<b>Drawings FA-2 to FA-5</b>	Design Merits of the Proposed Scheme – G/F and 1/F
<b>Drawings FA-6 to FA-8</b>	Typical Floor Plans
<b>Drawing FA-9</b>	Schematic Section of the Proposed Scheme
<b>Drawing FA-10</b>	Illustration Drawing of Stepped Building Height Profile
<b>Drawings FA-11 and FA-12</b>	Architectural renderings submitted by the applicant
<b>Plans FA-1 and FA-2</b>	Location plan Outline Zoning Plan and Outline Development Plan
<b>Plan FA-3</b>	Site plan
<b>Plan FA-4</b>	Height of existing buildings in Kwun Tong Business Area
<b>Plan FA-5</b>	Site photos

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
AUGUST 2019**