

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION
UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

APPLICATION NO. A/K15/121

- Applicant** : Global Glory Development & Property Limited represented by Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited
- Plan** : Approved Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K15/25
- Application Site** : Yau Tong Marine Lot (YTML) Nos. 58, 59, 60, 61 and 62, and adjoining Government Land (GL), 18 Tung Yuen Street, Yau Tong, Kowloon
- Site Area** : About 4,630m² (including about 293m² (6.3%) of GL)
- Lease** : Applicant's lots (1,617m² (34.9%))
YTML Nos. 58, 59 and the Extensions Thereto
(a) Restricted to industrial and/or godown purposes excluding offensive trades
(b) Maximum total gross floor area (GFA) of 6,465.85m² for each lot
- Lots not owned by the Applicant (2,720m² (58.8%))
YTML Nos. 60, 61 & 62
(a) Restricted to industrial and/or godown purposes excluding offensive trades
(b) Maximum building height (BH) of 100 feet above the Hong Kong Principal Datum (HKPD)
(c) Maximum height of structure for use of concrete batching plant not exceeding 36.98m above HKPD for YTML Nos. 60 and 61
- Zoning** : “Comprehensive Development Area (4)” (“CDA(4)”) and area shown as ‘Road’
- [Subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 5.0 and a maximum BH of 80 meters above Principal Datum (mPD) and a public waterfront promenade (PWP) of not less than 15m wide on land designated ‘Waterfront Promenade’ on the OZP.]
- Application** : Proposed Residential Development with Shop and Services Use

1. The Proposal

- 1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for a proposed residential development with commercial uses at the application site (the Site) which is mainly zoned “CDA(4)” on the approved Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun OZP No. S/K15/25 (**Plan A-1**). According to the Notes of the OZP, an applicant seeking permission for development on land designated “CDA” shall prepare a Master Layout Plan (MLP) with the required information and technical assessments for the approval of the Town Planning Board (the Board). The Site also covers a piece of GL at adjoining Yan Yue Wai which is shown as ‘Road’ and designated for ‘Waterfront Promenade’ on the OZP (**Plan A-1**). As required in the ‘Planning Brief for the five “CDA” zones at Tuen Yuen Street and Yan Yue Wai’ (the PB), which covered the subject “CDA”, endorsed by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) on 20.11.2015 (**Appendix IIa**), the design of the PWP for “CDA(4)” should cover the area shown as ‘Road’ on Yan Yue Wai and be included in the MLP submission. The southeastern portion of the Site (lots not owned by the applicant) is currently occupied by two concrete batching plants (CBPs), while the Applicant’s lots is occupied by a CBP that had recently ceased operation (**Plans A-2 and A-3**).
- 1.2 As indicated on the MLP submitted by the applicant, the proposed development comprising two residential blocks for providing about 224 flats will be developed with total PR of 5 and maximum BH of 80mPD (the Proposed Scheme). The Site would be developed in two phases, with the portion owned by the applicant as Phase 1 and the remaining portion as Phase 2 (**Drawing A-9**), and would be served by two separate vehicular accesses at Tung Yuen Street.
- 1.3 The MLP, typical floor plans, section and elevation plans, phasing plan, Landscape Master Plan (LMP), urban design proposals, photomontages and artist illustration submitted by the applicant are shown in **Drawings A-1 to A-16**. Major development parameters are set out in the following table:

| Development Parameters | Proposed Scheme | | |
|--|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Total | Phase 1 | Phase 2 |
| Gross Site Area | about 4,630m ² (including GL of about 293m ² for PWP at Yan Yue Wai) | | |
| Net Site Area (excluding GL) (countable for GFA calculation) | 4,337m ² | 1,617m ² | 2,720m ² |
| Total GFA (about) ^[a] | 21,683m² | 8,083m² | 13,600m² |
| - Domestic | 21,583m ² | 8,083m ² | 13,500m ² |
| - Non-Domestic | 100m ² | - | 100m ² |
| Total PR | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Site Coverage (SC) | Not more than 65% | | |
| - Below 15 m | Not more than 33% | | |
| - Above 15 m | | | |
| BH (main roof) | 80mPD | | |
| No. of Blocks | 2 | 1 | 1 |

| Development Parameters | Proposed Scheme | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | Total | Phase 1 | Phase 2 |
| No. of Storeys | - | 24 storeys (including 2-level lobby/clubhouse and 2-level basement carpark ^[a]) | 21 storeys (including 2-level lobby/clubhouse, 1-level E&M and 2-level basement carpark ^[a]) |
| No. of Flats | 224 | 96 | 128 |
| Design population (about) | 627 | 269 | 358 |
| Public Open Space (PWP) | 1,653m ² (including 293m ² at GL) | 498m ² ^[b] | 1,155m ² (including 293m ² at GL) |
| | (minimum width of 15m) | | |
| Private Open Space (Not less than) | 627m ² | 269m ² | 358m ² |
| Greenery coverage ^[c] | 663m ² (22.3%) | 233m ² (20.8%) | 430 m ² (23.1%) |
| Parking Provision | | | |
| Private Car | 148 ^[d] | 58 ^[d] | 90 ^[d] |
| Motorcycle | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Loading/unloading (L/UL) bays | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Tentative Completion Year | 2022 | 2022 ^[e] | 2022 ^[f] |

Remarks:

- ^[a] While the applicant indicates that the parking spaces to be provided at basement levels are not included in the GFA calculation, the GFA accountability of the semi-sunken carparks is subject to the discretion of the Building Authority (BA) under PNAP APP-2.
- ^[b] A flight of public landing step of about 24m² is included.
- ^[c] The greenery coverage is calculated based on net site area excluding the PWP.
- ^[d] Including 2 and 5 nos. of parking spaces for disabled persons and visitors respectively for each development phase (i.e. total 4 nos. for disabled persons and 10 nos. for visitors for the whole Site)
- ^[e] The applicant claims that Modular Integrated Construction (MiC) method would be adopted that would shorten the construction time as compared with traditional construction method.
- ^[f] Indicative only and subject to the closing down of the existing CBPs by others.

1.4 Key design components of the Proposed Scheme are summarized as follows:

(a) PWP

A 15m-wide PWP for public enjoyment on 24-hour daily basis will be provided along the sea frontage as required in the OZP and the PB. Phase 1 is sandwiched between Phase 2 and the approved development at the adjoining “CDA(3)”. To facilitate accessibility to the PWP, a temporary at-grade public pedestrian access of 1.5m-wide, with opening hours from 7am to 11pm, connecting the PWP to Tung Yuen Street would be provided at Phase 1 prior to the opening of the sections of PWP within Phase 2 and “CDA(3)” (**Drawing A-9**). 1.2m-wide landscape area along the sea frontage within the Site would be provided as a buffer to soften the building mass of the raised platform of

the proposed development (+6.5mPD) and the PWP level (+4.4mPD) (**Drawings A-6 to A-7, A-11 to A-12 and A-14**). The applicant and the future developer of Phase 2 will take up the management and maintenance (M&M) responsibilities of the PWP at Phase 1 and Phase 2 (including the portion within Yan Yue Wai) respectively before surrendering to the Government upon request, and such responsibilities would not be transferred to the future individual flat owners.

(b) Public Landing Steps (PLS)

To enhance the vibrancy of the PWP, the applicant proposes to provide a flight of PLS of about 24m² at the PWP at Phase 1 which would be opened to public from 9am to 6pm (**Drawings A-1, A-10 and A-14**). The M&M responsibility of the PLS would be borne by the applicant at his own cost without transferring to the future individual flat owners.

(c) Commercial Use along PWP

To enhance the vibrancy at the waterfront area and serve as a continuation of the shop and services uses under the approved application at the adjoining "CDA(5)", shop and services uses (about 100m²) at PWP level is proposed at the southeastern side of Phase 2 with frontages accessible from PWP and Yan Yue Wai (**Drawings A-2 and A-8**).

(d) Setback

Setback in full height from Tung Yuen Street fronting the Site to provide a public footpath with a minimum width of 3.5m as required under the PB are incorporated (**Drawing A-1**).

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

- (a) Letters received on 12.3.2019 enclosing the application form (**Appendix I**)
- (b) Planning Statement (including Landscape Proposal, LMP and reports on Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), Environmental Assessment (EA), Drainage and Sewerage Impact Assessment (DIA and SIA), Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) and Visual Impact Assessment (VIA))
- (c) 1st Further information (FI) via letters dated 26.4.2019 and 29.4.2019 providing responses to departmental comments (R-to-C), revised MLP and LMP, and supplementary information to the TIA^(*)
- (d) 2nd FI via letters dated 14.6.2019 and 17.6.2019 providing R-to-C, revised MLP, LMP, photomontages and TIA, and clarifications on SIA, DIA, VIA and AVA^(*)

(**Appendices Ia and Ib**^[1])

^[1] Two consolidated reports containing finalized technical assessments (**Appendix Ia**) and R-to-C tables (**Appendix Ib**) are submitted by the applicant on 18.6.2020 and 19.6.2020 respectively which consolidate all the previous submissions; thus the relevant FIs are not attached in this Paper.

- (e) 3rd FI via letter dated 15.10.2019 providing R-to-C, revised LMP, TIA, SIA and EA, and clarifications on AVA and Urban Design Proposal (*)
 - (f) 4th FI via letter dated 4.12.2019 providing R-to-C and revised SIA and EA
 - (g) 5th FI via letters dated 3.1.2020 and 8.1.2020 providing R-to-C, revised section plans and EA (*)
 - (h) 6th FI via letter dated 25.2.2020 providing R-to-C, revised LMP, photomontages and Urban Design Proposal
 - (i) 7th FI via letter dated 6.5.2020 providing R-to-C, revised MLP, floor plans, LMP, TIA, EA, SIA and development schedule, and a phasing plan (*)
 - (j) 8th FI via letter dated 2.6.2020 providing R-to-C and revised sections plans
 - (k) 9th FI via letters dated 12.6.2020, 15.6.2020 and 17.6.2020 providing R-to-C, minor refinement to MLP, floor/section plans and artist illustration and alternative access arrangement
- (Appendices Ia and Ib^[1])
- (Appendix Ic)

[(*) FIs accepted but not exempted from publication and recounting requirement]

- 1.6 On 16.8.2019, 13.12.2019 and 6.3.2020, the Committee agreed to defer making a decision on the application for two months respectively as requested by the applicant in order to allow sufficient time for preparation of FI to response to the departmental comments. With the 7th FI received on 6.5.2020, 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 as detailed in the consolidated technical assessments/R-to-C tables and the 9th FI at **Appendices Ia to Ic** are summarized as follows:

Planning Intention and Compliance with PB

- (a) The proposed residential development at the Site is in line with the planning intention of the “CDA(4)” zone to facilitate comprehensive development and to phase out the industrial use. It complies with the statutory restrictions under OZP and the requirements of PB.
- (b) The industrial uses surrounding the Site have been gradually phased out. Planning applications for three out of the five “CDA” zones in Yau Tong Industrial Area (YTIA) have been approved by the Board and there are some completed residential developments in the vicinity of the Site. The proposed development facilitates

transformation of the YTIA and contributes to meeting the pressing need for housing supply in Hong Kong.

Planning and Design Merits

- (c) The 15m-wide PWP will contribute to creation of a continuous PWP along the YTIA that will connect to Lei Yue Mun to the east and Yau Tong Bay to the west, and enhance living environment for future residents and the existing/future community in the surroundings (**Drawings A-10 and A-13**).
- (d) To enhance walkability and create a pleasant walking environment, full-height setback along Tung Yuen Street fronting the Site would be provided to allow a 3.5m-wide public footpath as required under the PB (**Drawing A-1**).
- (e) To enhance vibrancy at the waterfront, commercial use of about 100m² at Phase 2 and a flight of PLS (to be opened to public from 9am to 6pm) at Phase 1 are proposed (**Drawings A-1 and A-10**). A longer opening hour of the PLS is not recommended for avoiding any possible nuisance to the future residents and marine safety incident associated with the use of PLS during the night time.
- (f) A wide variety of landscaped components and amenity treatment (minimum greenery coverage of not less than 20% of net site area excluding PWP) with adequate local open space will be provided for the future residents, along with a well-designed PWP for public enjoyment (**Drawing A-10**).
- (g) A 20m-wide building separation between residential towers 1 and 2 is reserved as a visual and wind corridor to enhance the visual and air permeability and allow a more effective air path from the waterfront area to the inland area (**Drawing A-13**).

Environmentally Acceptable Development Scheme

- (h) The Site should be developed in two phases, the development at Phase 2 will only commence after cessation of operation of the two existing CBPs. To address the potential industrial/residential (I/R) interface issues during the interim phase that the residential development may co-exist with the CBPs in the Site, the Proposed Scheme adopts sensitive building design at Phase 1 (namely with raised first residential floor at 18.8mPD and no residential uses below 10/F (at 43.28mPD which is higher than the two existing CBPs) in the façade facing the CBPs (**Drawings A-4 and A-8**), together with various mitigation measures (such as acoustic/fixed window, acoustic balcony, fixed glazing and elevated fresh air intake points), the EA demonstrates that any potential environmental impacts on air quality and noise impacts during both the interim and the full completion stages will be acceptable.
- (i) The “Specified Processes” Licences (SPLs) granted for the two CBPs within the Site expired in late-2019 and mid-2020 respectively. The applicant considered that the renewal of SPLs should not be permitted in view of the complaints received from the residents in the area^[2]. As such, the applicant anticipated that Phase 2 would be

^[2] According to the Air Pollution Control (Specified Processes) Regulations, any application for a renewal of a SPL shall be made not earlier than 120 days and not later than 60 days before the expiry of the licence. The SPL in question shall continue in force until the renewal application is approved or refused before or after the date of its expiry.

completed in 2022.

- (j) The future property management office of the proposed development shall provide a channel for handling the complaints from future residents on the potential I/R interface issues, if any.

Technically Feasible

- (k) As the Site would be developed in two phases, self-contained parking facilities that meet the high-end requirement under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and with two separate vehicular accesses along Tung Yuen Street (about 25m apart) are proposed. An alternative access at Yan Yue Wai for Phase 2, instead of along Tung Yuen Street as currently proposed, together with associated improvement measures in Yan Yue Wai to allow for turnaround of 11m-long vehicles is assessed and demonstrated to be technically feasible which could be further explored by the future developer of Phase 2 development in detailed design stage (**Appendix Ic**). TIA as submitted concludes that the proposed residential development will not impose adverse traffic impact on the surrounding road network and thus is feasible from the traffic engineering point of view.
- (l) Taking into account the anticipated sea level rise of around 0.3m to 0.4m for the next 50 years (referring to Corrigendum No. 1/2018 of Port Works Design Manual) and the estimated sea water level may go up to about +5.25mPD during storm surges, a level difference of about 2m between the PWP (at around +4.4 to +4.6mPD) and the proposed development (+6.5m) is proposed to safeguard from potential flooding during severe typhoons.
- (m) The proposed development would not have adverse impacts to its surroundings on the sewerage, drainage, air ventilation and visual aspects.

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

The Site comprises private lots (93.7%) and GL (6.3%). The applicant is one of the “current land owners” who owns two of the five private lots within the Site (37.3%). In respect of the other “current land owners” (two owners who own the remaining three private lots within the Site (62.7%)), the applicant has complied with the requirements as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Satisfying the “Owner’s Consent/Notification” Requirements under Sections 12A and 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 31A) by publishing newspaper notices and posting site notices. Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members’ inspection. The remaining land in the Site is GL and owner’s consent/notification is not applicable.

4. Town Planning Board Guidelines

- 4.1 According to the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Designation of “CDA” zones and Monitoring the Progress of “CDA” developments (TPB PG-No. 17A), the key objective of designating “CDAs” is to facilitate urban restructuring and to phase out incompatible development and non-conforming uses.

4.2 For “CDA” sites which are not under single ownership, if the developer can demonstrate with evidence that due effort has been made to acquire the remaining portion of the site for development but no agreement can be reached with the landowner(s), allowance for phased development could be considered. In deriving the phasing of the development, it should be demonstrated that:

- (a) the planning intention of the “CDA” zone will not be undermined;
- (b) the comprehensiveness of the proposed development will not be adversely affected as a result of the revised phasing;
- (c) the resultant development should be self-contained in terms of layout design and provision of open space and appropriate Government, institution or community (GIC), transport and other infrastructure facilities; and
- (d) the development potential of the unacquired lots within the “CDA” zone should not be absorbed in the early phases of the development, access to these lots should be retained, and the individual lot owners’ landed interest should not be adversely affected.

5. Previous Application

There is no previous application in respect of the Site.

6. Similar Applications

6.1 There are four similar planning applications (Nos. A/K15/114, 122, 119 and 120) at YTIA for proposed residential developments with PWP at the “CDA(1)”, “CDA(3)” and “CDA(5)” zones. The application at “CDA(5)” zone also included commercial uses and public vehicle park (PVP). All of them were approved with conditions by the Committee on 5.2.2016, 24.4.2020, 15.6.2018 and 11.8.2017 respectively (**Plan A-1**).

6.2 Two applications (Nos. A/K15/96 and 112) for proposed comprehensive commercial/residential development with GIC uses, PWP, PVP and PLS, and minor relaxation of PR restriction at the “CDA” at Yau Tong Bay were approved with conditions by the Committee on 8.2.2013 and 16.1.2015 respectively, and a s.16A application (No. A/K15/112-1) for extension of commencement for four years for the latter application was approved with conditions on 16.1.2019 (**Plan A-1**).

7. The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans A-1 and A-2 and photos on Plans A-3 to A-5)

7.1 The Site is:

- (a) a waterfront site at the southwestern part of YTIA;
- (b) bounded by Victoria Harbour to its west, Tung Yuen Street to its east, Yan Yue Wai to its south, and an existing 6-storey industrial building (IB) for cold

storage on its north; and

- (c) the southeastern portion (not owned by the applicant) is currently occupied by two CBPs requiring SPLs under the Air Pollution Control Ordinance (APCO) for their operations^[3]. The Applicant's lots is occupied by a CBP that had recently ceased operation.

7.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:

- (a) YTIA is being gradually transformed and is currently with a mix of residential and industrial uses. The area to the north of the “CDA” cluster is mainly zoned “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) with the intention to phase out the non-conforming industrial uses through redevelopment. Planning approvals have been granted for some “R(E)” sites for residential developments, of which four were completed, namely Canaryside, Ocean One, the Spectacle and Peninsula East, and one at Sze Shan Street under construction (**Plan A-2**);
- (b) planning permissions (Nos. A/K15/114, 122, 119 and 120) for proposed comprehensive residential developments were granted to the adjoining “CDA(1)”, “CDA(3)” and “CDA(5)” sites on 5.2.2016, 24.4.2020, 15.6.2018 and 11.8.2017 respectively (**Plan A-1**). Development for the approved residential development with commercial uses at the adjacent “CDA(5)” zone is currently under construction;
- (c) the “CDA(2)” zone, to the further northwest across “CDA (3)” and Shung Wo Path, is occupied by Kwun Tong Wholesale Fish Market (KTWFM), a Salt Water Pumping Station and Tung Yuen Street Cooked Food Market^[4] (**Plan A-2**); and
- (d) MTR Yau Tong Station is about 500m to the northeast of the Site (**Plan A-1**).

8. **Planning Intention**

The “CDA” zone is intended for comprehensive development/redevelopment of the area for residential and/or commercial uses with the provision of open space and other

^[3] When the CBP operators applied for SPLs under the APCO, they had submitted an air pollution control plan to the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) to confirm that the CBPs would adopt the best practicable measures to control air pollutants emission in order to meet the air quality objectives and to avoid impact on the surrounding users. The CBPs have to comply with the requirements of the licences, including proper operation of the plants for strict compliance with the measures for controlling air pollution. The EPD will inspect the CBPs from time to time and also follow up on-site upon receipt of complaints, ensuring that the plants have taken practicable measures to minimize air pollution impact on the nearby environment in accordance with the requirements of the licences. They will carry out prosecution to the operators if violation of requirements of the SPL found.

^[4] The Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) has commenced a Technical Study on Potential Sites for Relocation of Wholesale Markets and Other Industrial Uses to North West Tsing Yi, which will cover the provisioning of the KTWFM. The study is expected to be completed in Q3 2020. According to the endorsed PB, the Yau Tong Salt Water Pumping Station and Tung Yuen Street Cooked Food Market should be re-provisioned within the future development at “CDA(2)” zone and handed back to the Water Supplies Department (WSD) and the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) respectively upon completion.

community and supporting facilities. The zoning is to facilitate appropriate planning control over the development mix, scale, design and layout of development, taking account of various environmental, traffic, infrastructure and other constraints. The Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP set out that suitable commercial uses, especially shop and services and eating place, should be provided in the future developments along the PWP to enhance the vibrancy and for public enjoyment.

9. Major Requirements under the Planning Brief

To facilitate the preparation of MLPs for the comprehensive developments in the five “CDA” zones, a PB setting out the broad planning parameters and development requirements was endorsed by the Committee on 20.11.2015. To ensure the developments will be implemented in a comprehensive manner and compatible with each other, a co-ordinated approach of redevelopment of individual “CDA” zone in terms of development scale, design layout, provision of PWP as well as visual and air corridors should be adopted. The PB covered the general planning principles and development requirements for all “CDA” zones in YTIA as well as specific requirements for individual zones. Major design considerations set out in the PB include adoption of descending BH towards the harbourfront with variation in the BH profile with 100mPD for the inland portion and 80mPD for the waterfront portion, paying attention to compatibility and congruity with surrounding developments and waterfront setting, provision of visual and ventilation corridors to enhance visual and air permeability, provision of commercial uses along waterfront to enhance vibrancy of PWP etc. A copy of the PB is attached at **Appendix IIa**. A comparison of major development parameters and planning requirements of the PB and the subject application area set out in **Appendix IIb**.

10. Comments from Relevant Government Bureau/Departments

10.1 The following Government bureau/departments have been consulted and their views on the application are summarised as follows:

Land Administration

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

- (a) He has no objection to the application.
- (b) The Site affects YTML Lots 58 and the Extension Thereto, 59 and the Extension Thereto, 60, 61 and 62 (“the subject lots”) and a portion of the public road at Yan Yue Wai which falls within the Green Area of YTIM No. 44. The key restrictions specified in the lease conditions of the subject lots are at **Appendix III**.
- (c) The proposed residential use on the above five lots is in contravention of the lease restrictions that are for industrial and/or godown purposes. Should the application be approved, the lot owners are required to apply to LandsD for a lease modification/land exchange to give effect to the proposal.

However, there is no guarantee at this stage that the lease modification/land exchange application would be approved. If the application for lease modification/land exchange is approved by LandsD in the capacity as landlord at his sole discretion, it will be subject to those terms and conditions including the payment of premium and fees as considered appropriate by LandsD.

- (d) Other detailed comments on PWP, public access to promenade and the PLS are in **Appendix III**.

Traffic Aspect

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

- (a) Having reviewed the TIA and technical clarifications at 7th and 9th FI respectively (**Appendices Ia** and **Ic**), he has no in-principle objection to the application from traffic engineering perspective.
- (b) Two vehicular accesses at Tung Yuen Street serving the two individual phases are proposed. However, to address his comment and for better traffic circulation along Tung Yuen Street with anticipated increase in traffic/pedestrian movements upon completion of the planned residential developments therein, the applicant has demonstrated that it is technically feasible for the future developer of Phase 2 to provide the access at Yan Yue Wai, instead of Tung Yuen Street as currently proposed, with associated improvement to Yan Yue Wai for allowing turnaround of 11m-long vehicles for public use which is also demonstrated to be feasible by the applicant.
- (c) He suggests that approval conditions for (i) the submission of a revised TIA and implementation of the mitigation/improvement measures (including provision of a u-turning facility for 11m long heavy goods vehicles at Yan Yue Wai under Phase 2), (ii) the design and provision of vehicular access (with ingress/egress to Phase 2 development located at Yan Yue Wai), and vehicle parking/L/UL facilities separately for the both Phase 1 and Phase 2 developments, and (iii) the design and provision of a full height setback for a minimum width of 3.5m for footpath along Tung Yuen Street as stated in paragraph 12.2 below should be imposed should the application be approved by the Board.

Environmental Aspect

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

- (a) While it is noted that the planning intention of the five “CDA” zones along Tung Yuen Street is to phase out existing industrial uses with residential and/or commercial uses in YTIA, environmental complaints in relation to the I/R interface problems in YTIA have

been received from time to time in recent years, in particular from the Peninsula East since its first population intake in 2017.

- (b) Portion of the Site is occupied by CBPs and other incompatible industrial uses (including the KTWFM, recycling depot, IBs, etc.) are found in the vicinity to the Site, any I/R interface issues arising from the co-existence of the existing industrial uses should be properly addressed particular during the interim stage if the two CBPs within the Site are still in operation when the residential development in Phase 1 become occupied. The EA has assessed both the Interim Scenario (residential co-existed with 2 CBPs) and Ultimate Scenario (all CBPs within the Site phased out). The applicant has proposed various mitigation measures in the Proposed Scheme for Phase 1 in order to address the environmental issues as follows :

(i) Building Disposition and Orientation

In order to reduce the potential impacts of noise and air quality, the residential tower for Phase 1 has been orientated in such a way to minimise direct line of sight between sensitive uses and the CBPs.

(ii) Podium / Internal Layout

To minimise the potential air quality impact on the future residents, building design of having 18.8m height podium for the Phase 1 building (i.e. 14.3m above ground level) is proposed. The lower floor levels (i.e. 2/F-9/F) directly facing the CBPs are not for residential use while the upper floors (i.e. 10/F-21/F) are residential uses. The level of 10/F is about 43.3mPD and is higher than the building structures of the 2 nearby CBPs.

(iii) Acoustic /Fixed Window

In order to mitigate the noise from the 2 CBPs, acoustic balcony, acoustic window and/or fixed window design have been adopted as noise mitigation measures.

- (c) The EA demonstrates that the Proposed Scheme for both Interim Scenario and Ultimate Scenario has incorporated various mitigation measures and the relevant air quality and noise standards as stipulated under the relevant Ordinances/Regulations/HKPSG have been met. The EA concluded that there will be no insurmountable environmental issues for the captioned application. Hence, he has no objection to the application.

- (d) Having said that, it is noted that the land owners of Phase 2 site have (YTML Nos. 60, 61 & 62) objection to the application mainly on the ground that the applicant has not obtained their consent nor notified them in writing before submitting the application (**Appendices IV(3)** and **(4)**). Phase 2 may not be able to be implemented in tandem with Phase 1. Without the commitment of implementation of Phase 2 development, the I/R interface would exist in the interim term within

the Site, which might not be fully in line with the planning intention of “CDA(4)” zone.

- (e) Should the Board holistically considers it appropriate to approve the application having regard to the planning intention of the “CDA(4)” zone and the anticipated I/R interface issues within the Site in the interim term, DEP has no objection from environmental perspective and suggests that relevant approval conditions requiring the submission of Land Contamination Assessment, revised SIA and revised EA (covering air quality and noise impacts) to address the outstanding environmental issues and to cater for potential changes in project design, layout, and mitigation measures, including but not limited to air quality and noise impacts; potential land contamination, and implementation of environmental and sewerage mitigation measures identified therein as stated in paragraph 12.2 below should be imposed.

Urban Design, Visual and Landscape Aspects

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

Urban Design and Visual Aspects

- (a) The Site is at the waterfront portion and forms part of the five “CDA” subzones at YTIA planned for transformation into a residential area. The proposed two-phased development is mainly for residential uses involving two towers, one at each phase, built to a PR of 5 and BH of 80mPD as permitted under the OZP. A commercial area of about 100m² is incorporated at the south-eastern part of Phase 2 (**Drawing A-2**).
- (b) He has no comment on the revised MLP from the urban design/visual impact points of view.
- (c) It is noted that the raised platform for the G/F of the Proposed Scheme would create a level difference above the PWP by around 2m (**Drawing A-6 to A-7, A-11 to A12 and A-14**). Such design is not consistent with that of other approved development schemes in the adjoining waterfront sites and may induce negative visual impacts to the future visitors to PWP. The applicant claims that such design is proposed having regard to the storm surges and waves during extreme weather. Given that 1.2m-wide landscaped buffer would be provided within the Site at PWP level to soften the visual impact of the raised platform, he has no adverse comments in this regard.

Landscape Aspect

- (d) The Site is situated in an area of industrial landscape character dominated by low to medium-rise IBs, warehouses and typhoon

shelter etc. No existing tree is found within the Site and along its boundary. The proposed comprehensive development is not incompatible with the planned use and significant impact on existing landscape resources and character is not anticipated. Besides, it is noted that 15m wide PWP, local open space provision and hard and soft landscape treatments including active/passive recreational facilities (e.g. seating and swimming pool etc.) are proposed on G/F and podium level for future residents.

- (e) Having reviewed the LMP as submitted (**Drawings A-10 to A-12**), he has no in-principle objection to the application from landscape planning point of view but suggests that should the application be approved, an approval condition requiring the submission and implementation of revised LMP as stated in paragraph 12.2 below should be imposed.

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

- (a) It is noted that the proposed development consists of two residential blocks with BH of 80mPD which may not be incompatible with adjacent developments with BHs ranging from 80mPD to 100mPD. In this regard, he has no comment from visual impact point of view.
- (b) It is noted that some façade area of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the proposed development are facing west. Solar control devices should be considered to reduce solar heat gain and avoid glare affecting adjacent buildings as far as practicable.

Air Ventilation Aspect

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

- (a) An AVA Initial Study (IS) using computational fluid dynamic modelling has been carried out to support the application (**Appendix Ia**). Two schemes, the Baseline Scheme^[5] and the Proposed Scheme, have been studied. In terms of the design features for air penetration, both the Baseline and Proposed Schemes have incorporated the 15m-wide PWP. The Proposed Scheme has further incorporated a 20m-wide building separation. According to the simulation results in the AVA IS, both schemes have resulted in the same SVR and LVR under both annual and summer conditions. The performance of both schemes is comparable. The applicant also confirms that only low-rise (maximum 3m-high) kiosks with building permeability of not less than 70% is proposed at the commercial area (**Appendix Ic**).

^[5] To demonstrate the effectiveness of the design features for air ventilation under the Proposed Scheme, an OZP compliant notional Baseline Scheme is adopted in the AVA-IS for comparison purposes.

- (b) Based on the above consideration, he has no adverse comment on the AVA IS from air ventilation perspective, and it is not anticipated that the Proposed Scheme would generate any significant adverse impact on the pedestrian wind environment.

Harbourfront Planning

- 9.1.7 Comments of the Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau (PAS (H), DEVB):

The Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (the Task Force) of Harbourfront Commission was consulted on the application by circulation in July 2019. Comments from the Task Force members have subsequently been sent to the applicant which were mainly on the opening hours, design, connectivity and M&M arrangement of the PWP/PLS. R-to-C at 3rd FI from the applicant (**Appendix Ib**) was forwarded to members of the Task Force and no further comments were received by his office.

Building Matters

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

- (a) He has no in-principle objection to the application under Buildings Ordinance (BO) subject to the submission of building plans (BPs) to demonstrate compliance of BO and regulations.
- (b) If the PWP within lots is to be surrendered to the Government before the application for occupation permit for the proposed development, area of the PWP shall be deducted from the site area calculation and shall not form part of the Site for the proposed development under BO.
- (c) Detailed comments will be given at BP submission stage.

Seawall Engineering Matter

- 9.1.9 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Port Works, CEDD (CE/PW, CEDD):

- (a) He has no objection to the application but reminds the applicant to note the following aspects in detailed design stage:
 - (i) In view of the potential coastal hazards at the shoreline, the applicant should ensure that the proposed PLS and any affected seawall should be designed to meet the requirements in the latest version of the Port Works Design Manual and all the features to be provided at the PWP should be designed to take into account the possible coastal flooding.
 - (ii) To enhance the protection of public lives and properties during

extreme weather, the applicant should carefully review the potential impact under extreme weather to the development which is located at or close to the coastline, in particular pier facility, seawalls, promenade, basement, carpark, pump house, electricity room or ancillary facilities, etc. They should be designed or enhanced to protect the development from possible damage or coastal flooding as a result of extreme wave action.

- (b) Regarding the raised platform as proposed, he advises that it is common for a development to build a wall at the seafront to reduce potential risk of coastal flooding or wave overtopping during extreme weather. In general, the higher the top level of the wall, the higher the protection against coastal flooding/wave overtopping, however, there is no standard on the height of the proposed wall.

Interface with KTWFM

9.1.10 Comments of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC):

He has no objection to the application but reminds the applicant that any potential impact arising from the daily operation of KTWFM including visual, traffic and environmental (e.g. air quality, odour and noise) impacts, to the future residents of the proposed development should be duly acknowledged by the applicant. The applicant is advised to incorporate appropriate measures in the proposed development to mitigate the impacts concerned, if any.

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

- (a) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS);
- (b) Chief Highway Engineer/Kowloon, Highways Department (CHE/K, HyD)
- (c) Project Manager/Kowloon, CEDD;
- (d) Director of Marine;
- (e) Chief Engineer/Construction, WSD;
- (f) Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department (CE/MS, DSD);
- (g) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD (H(GEO), CEDD);
- (h) Director of Fire Services (D of FS);
- (i) FEHD;
- (j) Commissioner of Police; and
- (k) District Officer (Kwun Tong), Home Affairs Department.

10. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period

- 10.1 The application and the subsequent FIs were published for public inspection. During the statutory public inspection periods, a total of nine public comments were received (**Appendices IV (1) to (9)**), including two supporting comments

from two individuals, two opposing comments from the other lot owners of the Site, and five comments expressing concerns from two individuals.

- 10.2 The supporting comments are on the ground that the Proposed Scheme with PWP would phase out polluting industries and improve the existing environment. The two opposing comments are from the lot owners of YTML Nos. 60 and 61, and YTML No. 62 (lots within the Site but not owned by the applicant) who stated that they did not receive notification of the application and the applicant had not obtained their consent for submitting the application. One individual raises concerns about the transport planning in the area, and the other comments on the over-provision of parking spaces in view of close proximity of the Site to MTR station, insufficient provision of active outdoor recreational facilities, and inappropriate design with E&M on the lower residential floors in Phase 1 that would have adverse ventilation impacts to the future residents, and has queries on the calculation of proposed open space and greenery and the appropriateness to have residential units along PWP with anticipated night-time noise complaints from the future residents.

11. Planning Considerations and Assessments

- 11.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for a proposed residential development with a PWP and commercial use at the Site which is zoned “CDA(4)” for providing 224 residential units. As the Site is under multiple ownership and that two CBPs within the Site is currently in operation, a two-phased development is proposed with the lots owned by the applicant in the western portion as Phase 1 and the remaining portion as Phase 2 (with respective flat no. of 96 units and 128 units) (**Drawing A-9**).

Planning Intention and Development Intensity

- 11.2 The planning intention of the “CDA(4)” zone is for comprehensive development/redevelopment of the area for residential uses with the provision of open space, commercial uses along PWP, and other community and supporting facilities. The proposed residential/commercial development with provision of a 15m-wide PWP is generally in line with the planning intention of the “CDA(4)” zone.
- 11.3 The proposed development at each phase would be developed to a maximum PR of 5 based on their individual site areas and a maximum BH of 80mPD, which do not exceed the statutory restrictions under the OZP.

Land Use Compatibility

- 11.4 To facilitate phasing out the existing industrial operations, the YTIA had been rezoned from “Industrial” zone to zonings for residential and commercial uses in 1998. Since then, the area has been gradually transformed from a traditional industrial area to an area mixed with residential, commercial and industrial uses (**Plan A-2**). The gradual changes in land use over the past decades have unleashed the development potential to meet the changing development need of the society and the waterfront sites will be gradually opened up for public enjoyment.

Industrial uses of some sites had ceased operation with planned residential uses, including the CBPs in the waterfront portion of the "CDA(1)" and at the Applicant's lot within the Site, as well as the recycling depots and open-air storage.

- 11.5 The transformation of the "CDA" cluster will gradually take shape with an approved residential development under construction on the "CDA(5)" site and planning permissions granted for residential developments at the "CDA(1)" and "CDA(3)" zones. The remaining areas of the YTIA are zoned "R(E)" and "Commercial" with the intention of phasing out industrial uses. Planning approvals have been granted for some "R(E)" sites for residential developments, of which some were completed or under construction (**Plans A-1 and A-2**).
- 11.6 The proposed comprehensive residential development with shop and services use at the Site is considered compatible with the long term planned land use of the area and would facilitate the gradual transformation of the area for residential use in long run.

Interim Phase

- 11.7 While a number of residential developments were approved at "R(E)" and various "CDA" zones, phasing out of polluting industrial use and the land use transformation takes time to fully complete. During the interim period, co-existence of residential developments and industrial installations is unavoidable. It is vital to ensure through the planning application mechanisms that appropriate measures are adopted in the proposed residential development to address the possible I/R interface issues in the interim period.
- 11.8 The applicant has proposed various mitigation measures/design in the Proposed Scheme to address the possible I/R interface issues with the nearby CBPs as detailed in paragraph 2(h) above. According to the EA, the Proposed Scheme meets the relevant air quality and noise standards and would be environmentally acceptable during both the interim and full completion stages. DEP has no adverse technical comment on the EA.
- 11.9 In addition, the operation of CBPs are subject to statutory control under the APCO in that the operators are required to adopt the best practicable measures to control air pollutants emission in order to meet the air quality objectives and to avoid impact on the surrounding users, and DEP will monitor the operations of the CBPs to ensure compliance with the relevant requirement. DEP will consider the renewal application of a SPL of CBPs according to prevailing statutory requirements and circumstances.
- 11.10 Having regard to the planning intention of the "CDA(4)" zone and the applicant has demonstrated technical feasibility of the proposed scheme from environmental perspective, DEP has no objection from environmental perspective should the application be approved by the Board and suggests imposition of approval conditions requiring the submission of Land Contamination Assessment, revised SIA and EA and implementation of environmental and sewerage mitigation measures identified therein in paragraph 12.2 below.

Phased Development and Comprehensiveness of the Proposed Scheme

11.11 Whilst noting that the applicant only owns a minor portion (i.e. 35%) of the Site and owners in the remaining portion had not indicated intention to redevelop at this juncture, it may not be fully in line with the planning intention of a comprehensive development on the Site in the interim period. Nevertheless, the MLP submitted by the applicant covers the whole Site with the lots owned by the applicant as Phase 1 and the remaining as Phase 2 (**Drawing A-9**). The proposed development at each phase would be developed to a maximum PR of 5 based on their individual site areas, as such, the rights of owners of the Phase 2 will not be affected. As such, the proposed phased development is generally in line with the principles stated in the TPB PG-No.17A as set out in paragraph 4 above that development of an earlier phase will not take up the development potential of other phases and the comprehensiveness of the development has not been undermined in long run.

Compliance with PB

11.12 The Proposed Scheme generally complies with the main planning and design requirements under the PB (including full height setback along Tung Yuen Street for widening of footpath to 3.5m wide, 1.2m landscape buffer between the proposed development and the PWP, minimum 20% greenery coverage, provision of commercial use (100m² as proposed by the applicant), and provision of private open space with 1m² per resident as per HKPSG, etc.) (**Appendix IIb**).

11.13 The Proposed Scheme incorporates a 15m-wide PWP for 24-hour daily public enjoyment as required under PB. The applicant and the future developer of Phase 2 will take up the M&M responsibilities of the PWP at Phase 1 and Phase 2 (incl. the portion within Yan Yue Wai) respectively, and such M&M responsibilities would not be transferred to the future individual flat owners before surrendering to the Government upon request. A 1.5m-wide temporary public access, with opening hours from 7am to 11pm, leading from Tung Yuen Street to the PWP is proposed in Phase 1 if the proposed PWP at the adjoining sites are yet to be opened during the interim stage (**Drawing A-9**). The proposed PLS (to be opened to public from 9am to 6pm) will be constructed, managed and maintained wholly by the applicant. To avoid any possible nuisance to the future residents and marine safety incident associated with the use of PLS during the night time, a shorter opening hour for PLS as proposed by the applicant may not be unacceptable. The relevant Government departments and the Task Force has no adverse comment in this regard. CE/PW, CEDD suggests imposition of an approval condition requiring the submission and implementation of the proposed PLS in paragraph 12.2 below. The opening hours of PWP and PLS as well as the M&M responsibility would be specified in the relevant document in the subsequent lease modification stage.

Urban Design and Landscape Aspects

11.14 The proposed development with a BH of 80mPD, in the context of the inland portion of "CDA(3)" site with an approved BH of 100mPD, can generally blend in with the overall stepped BH profile of the area descending from the inland area to the waterfront (**Drawing A-8**). Also, the proposed 20m-wide building separation

between the two blocks generally aligns with building disposition under the approved scheme of “CDA(3)” for better air ventilation and visual permeability (**Drawings A-1 and A-13**). With the aid of photomontages (**Drawings A-15 to A-16**), the VIA demonstrates that there will be no significant visual impact to the surrounding areas. Both CTP/UD&L, PlanD and CA/CMD2, ArchSD have no adverse comment on the application from visual and urban design points of view.

- 11.15 On landscape aspect, a LMP (**Drawings A-10 to A-12**) is submitted by the applicant. The proposed development would provide the 15m-wide PWP as required by the OZP, 1.2m-wide landscape buffer within the residential development, and the proposed provision of private local open space also meet the requirement of HKPSG. CTP/UD&L, PlanD and DLCS have no adverse comment on the application from landscaping and open space provision points of view. CTP/UD&L, PlanD suggests to impose an approval condition for the submission and implementation of revised LMP in paragraph 12.2 below, should the Board approve the application.

Other Technical Aspects

- 11.16 The applicant has submitted concerned technical assessments to demonstrate that the proposed development would not cause any insurmountable problems on traffic and parking provision, sewerage/drainage and air ventilation aspects and concerned Government departments have no adverse comment on the application from those technical aspects, subject to imposition of relevant conditions as set out in paragraph 12.2 below.

Public Comments

- 11.17 Nine public comments were received, amongst them, the two supportive comments are noted. Regarding the opposing comments from the owners of the YTML Nos. 60 & 61 and YTML No. 62, the applicant has complied with the requirements as set out in the TPB PG-No. 31A by publishing newspaper notices and posting site notices. On traffic, parking and open space provision, air ventilation and urban design aspects, the assessments above are relevant. Regarding concerns on possible nuisance from the PWP to the future residents, there are many examples of residential developments with adjoining PWP and the relevant government departments have no adverse comments in this respect.

12. Planning Department’s Views

- 12.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 11 and having taken into account the comments as mentioned in paragraph 10, the Planning Department has no objection to the application.
- 12.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application on the terms of the application as submitted to the Board, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 26.6.2024, 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 a revised Master Layout Plan, taking into account the approval conditions (b) to (n) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a development programme indicating the timing and phasing of the comprehensive development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the submission and implementation of a revised Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (e) the submission of a revised Drainage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (f) the implementation of the sewerage and drainage facilities identified in the revised Sewerage Impact Assessment under approval condition (d) and the revised Drainage Impact Assessment under approval condition (e) to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (g) the submission of a revised Environmental Assessment to address the potential air quality and noise impacts and industrial/residential interface environmental problems, and the implementation of the environmental mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (h) the submission of a Land Contamination Assessment and the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed therein prior to the commencement of the construction works to the satisfaction of Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (i) the submission of a revised Traffic Impact Assessment and implementation of traffic mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (j) the design and provision of vehicular access, parking spaces, and loading/unloading facilities and ancillary carpark provisions should be provided to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (k) the design and provision of a full height setback to allow a minimum width of 3.5m for footpath along Tung Yuen Street, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and Director of Highways or of the Town Planning Board;

- (l) the design and provision of the Public Waterfront Promenade, including pedestrian access arrangement, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (m) the Public Waterfront Promenade should be opened 24 hours every day as proposed by the applicant, and maintained and managed by the applicant before surrendering to the Government, to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (n) the design and provision of the public landing steps which should be opened from 9am to 6pm, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Civil Engineering and Development or of the Town Planning Board.

Advisory Clauses

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

- 12.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, the following reason for rejection is suggested for Members' consideration:

the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed comprehensive residential development would not be subject to unacceptable industrial/residential interface impact.

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.

14. Attachments

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Appendix I | Letters received on 12.3.2019 enclosing the application form |
| Appendix Ia | Consolidated Report dated 18.6.2020 |
| Appendix Ib | Consolidated R-to-C tables dated 19.6.2020 |
| Appendix Ic | Letters dated 12.6.2020, 15.6.2020 and 17.6.2020 from the applicant (9 th FI) |
| Appendix IIa | Planning Brief endorsed by MPC on 20.11.2015 |
| Appendix IIb | Comparison of major parameters with requirements in Planning Brief |

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Appendix III | Detailed comments from Government departments |
| Appendices IV(1) to IV(9) | Public comments |
| Appendix V | Recommended advisory clauses |
| Drawing A-1 | Master Layout Plan |
| Drawings A-2 to A-5 | Floor plans |
| Drawings A-6 to A-8 | Section plans |
| Drawing A-9 | Phasing plan |
| Drawings A-10 to 12 | Landscape Master Plan |
| Drawing A-13 | Urban Design Proposal |
| Drawing A-14 | Artistic Rendering on the Proposed Public Waterfront Promenade |
| Drawings A-15 to A-16 | Photomontages |
| Plan A-1 | Location plan |
| Plan A-2 | Site plan |
| Plan A-3 | Aerial photo |
| Plans A-4 to A-5 | Site photos |

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
JUNE 2020**