

Response to Comments (1)

S.16 Planning Application No. A/H10/97

Submission of Layout Plan and Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Flat Use at The Ebenezer School and Home for the Visually Impaired, 131 Pok Fu Lam Road, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong (RBL 136RP)

Further Information (1)

March 2024

Response to Comments S.16 Planning Application No. A/H10/97

Submission of Layout Plan and Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Flat Use at The Ebenezer School and Home for the Visually Impaired, 131 Pok Fu Lam Road, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong (RBL 136RP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Response to Departmental Comments of GEO, CEDD | 3 |
| Response to Departmental Comments of HyD | 3 |
| Response to Departmental Comments of TD..... | 6 |
| Response to Departmental Comments of EPD..... | 8 |
| Response to Departmental Comments of DSD | 9 |
| Response to Departmental Comments of AMO..... | 12 |
| Response to Departmental Comments of UD&L, PlanD | 14 |
| Response to Departmental Comments of PlanD..... | 16 |
| Response to Departmental Comments of BD | 18 |
| Response to Public Comments..... | 19 |
| Miscellaneous Remarks..... | 19 |

Attachments

Attachment 1: Replacement Pages of Geotechnical Planning Review Report

Attachment 2: Feasibility Study of Bus Lay-By

Attachment 3: Replacement Pages of Traffic Impact Assessment Study

Attachment 4: Replacement Architectural Drawings

Attachment 5: Replacement Pages of Environmental Assessment

Attachment 6: Replacement Pages of Sewerage Impact Assessment

Attachment 7: Email Correspondence with AFCD and EPD on Drainage

Attachment 8: Replacement Pages of Drainage Impact Assessment

Attachment 9: Replacement Page of Visual Impact Assessment

Attachment 10: Replacement Pages of Tree Preservation Proposal

Attachment 11: Replacement Pages of Landscape Master Plan

Response to Departmental Comments of GEO, CEDD

| Comments from Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department via memo dated 19.12.2023 (ref.: PLN-50-2005-2-H10) (Contact Officer: Ms. Candy YM CHO, tel: 2762 5383) | Response(s): |
|---|---|
| 2. Paragraph 6 of GPRR Section 2.2 and Paragraph 3 of GPRR Section 4.3 – Feature No. 11SW-C/C87 is partly within the site. Please ask the applicant to check and revise the heading. | Report text on Section 2.2 and Section 4.3 amended. (Attachment 1) |
| 3. Paragraph 5 of GPRR Section 4.3 – Feature No. 11SW-C/R474 is wholly within the site. The effects arising from the proposed development on the feature or vice versa, should be further studied in the future assessment. | Report text on Section 4.3 amended. (Attachment 1) |
| 4. It is noted that the subject site is located at the crest of sloping terrain. A review of how the sloping terrain may affect, or be affected by, the proposed development should be included in the report. | Report text on Section 2.3 and Section 4.3 amended. (Attachment 1) |

Response to Departmental Comments of HyD

| Comments from Chief Highways Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department via email dated 20.12.2023 (Contact Officer: Joseph LING, tel: 2231 5626) | Response(s): |
|---|---|
| Observing from the drawings in this TIA report, the proposed development will involve some road works affecting existing footpath, highways structure no. H123, and slope feature no. 1SW-C/C87. | Noted |
| Please note the following comments on the proposed works from highways structure maintenance viewpoint: 1. Please seek comments from TD. | Noted. TD’s comments had been sought. |
| 2. Please seek comments from B&S division. | Noted. B&S Division’s comments had been sought. |
| 3. As the proposed widening of the footpath will partially fall within the boundary of private lot, this office will not be responsible to maintain the portion of footpath and its supporting structures within the private lot. | Upon further review, it will be more practicable and feasible for the Government to maintain and manage the new portion of footpath and its supporting structures based on the following justifications: - the footpath will be outside of the development boundary wall of the private lot; |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the new portion of footpath would be integrated with the existing one, and would be dedicated for public passage; and - Access within the development lot is proposed to facilitate government B/Ds to carry out inspection and routine maintenance works for the footpath and its supporting structures. This proposal is subject to further discussion with relevant government B/Ds during detailed design stage. |
| 4 The proposed new structures to support the widened footpath should be designed not to affect the routine monitoring and maintenance works for existing highway structure H123. | The new structures (if any) to support the widened footpath will be designed to minimize the disturbance to the routine monitoring and maintenance works for existing highway structure H123. |
| 5. The proponent should demonstrate that such road works proposal would not impose adverse impact to the nearby existing highway structure. This assessment should be checked and certified by the Registered Structural Engineer of the development and submitted to this Regional Office for information. | While the road works proposal may inevitably interfere with the nearby existing highway structure, such structural assessment will be checked and certified by the Registered Structural Engineer of the development and submitted to your office during the detailed design stage. |
| 6. The proposed road works should not be designed to impose additional loading on the existing highway structure (H123). | Additional loading on the existing highway structure (H123) will be minimized at the time of our design of the proposed road works. |
| 7. The proponent should check the as-built records of the nearby highway structures and ascertain the location of nearby sub-structures with trial pits before commencing the construction works. | Noted. As-built records will be obtained and trial pits will be carried out prior to the commencement of works to ascertain the location of nearby sub-structure. |
| 8. Extreme care should be taken to prevent damage to the existing highway structures during the proposed road works. The works should be stopped in case of any adverse settlement/effect. This Regional Office should be informed immediately. Any damage to the existing highway structures shall be made good by the proponent at their own cost and to the satisfaction of this Regional Office. | Noted. |
| 9. The proponent should carry out condition survey on the existing structure H123 and submit a set of photo record to this office before the commencement of works. | Noted. Condition survey will be carried out prior to the commencement of works. |
| 10. For protection of the concerned highway structures, appropriate monitoring measures and the proposed contingency plan (Action/Alarm/Alert) should be carried out during the course of the subject construction works. | Noted. Monitoring measures for the proposed works on existing highway structures. |
| 11. Unless otherwise approved by this Regional Office, no plant, equipment, fixture or attachment such as lighting, electric cable, poster and | Noted. |

| | |
|--|---|
| commercial display shall be fixed to the highway structures and its supporting structures including columns. | |
| 12. The proponent should ensure that the risk of fire damage is kept to a minimum and shall take all necessary measures to prevent fire damage to the highway structures. | Noted. |
| 13. Officers, his contractors, servants, agents, workmen of this Regional Office or any persons so authorized by this Office with or without tools, equipment, machinery or maintenance vehicles and subject to reasonable notice and supervision, shall from time to time be permitted free access to the area for inspection, maintenance and repairing of the concerned highway structures. The user shall receive no compensation or other payments in this respect. | Noted. |
| 14. Any affected highway structures should be reinstated to a permanent condition acceptable to this Regional Office and in compliance with Highways Standards. | Noted. |
| Please note the following comments from our slope maintenance team: 1. Proper access shall be reserved in the Land Lease Condition to allow public officers (in particular HyD's staff and contractor) to carry out inspection and routine maintenance works for feature no. 11SW-C/C87(sub-division 2). | Noted. Access would be proposed for HyD to carry out inspection and routine maintenance works for feature no. 11SW-C/C87(sub-division 2) during the detailed design stage, subject to further discussion with relevant government B/Ds. |
| 2. The proponent shall seek the GEO's comments on the geotechnical stability impact to the feature no. 11SW-C/C87 due to the proposed development and carry out the slope improvement works, if any, at his own cost. | Noted, this will be looked at during the detailed design stage. |
| 3. Further comments will be provided upon receiving the detailed engineering design of the development. | Noted. |

| Comments from Chief Highways Engineer/ Bridges & Structures, Highways Department via email dated 21.12.2023 (Contact Officer: Wayne S H LAW, tel: 3903 6519) | Response(s): |
|--|--|
| 1. It is noted that the proposed works will be conducted on top of existing highway structure no. H123 (bridge). In this connection, please provide justification to demonstrate that structural integrity of existing highway structure no. H123 (bridge) will not be adversely affected by the proposed works; and | Justification will be provided in the detailed design stage to demonstrate that structural integrity of existing highway structure no. H123 (bridge) will not be adversely affected by the proposed works. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>2. Apart from the existing highway structure no. H123 (bridge), please clarify whether the proposed works will be in conflict with other existing highway structure. If affirmative, please provide justification to demonstrate that structural integrity of the existing highway structure concerned will not be adversely affected by the proposed works.</p> | <p>Justification will be provided in the detailed design stage to demonstrate that structural integrity of any other existing highway structure will not be adversely affected by the proposed works.</p> |
|---|---|

Response to Departmental Comments of TD

| <p>Commissioner for Transport via memo dated 28.12.2023 (received by this office on 8.1.2023) (ref.: (HPNDR) in TD HR 182/193-2) (Contact Officer: Vincent Tam Szewai, tel: 2829 5407)</p> | <p>Response(s):</p> |
|--|---|
| <p>2. Please find our following comments on the subject submission from the traffic engineering viewpoint:</p> <p>i. In the previous S12A application for the subject development, it was noted that the applicant would provide the bus layby subject to further feasibility study in the detailed design stage to improve the traffic condition at Pok Fu Lam Road. Please advise the result of the study and the proposed arrangement for the bus layby in the latest design;</p> | <p>Please refer to Figure A in Attachment 2 regarding the result of the feasibility study and the proposed arrangement for the concerned bus layby, which illustrates a minimum 1.5m wide bus layby and a minimum 1.3m wide footpath. The local widening of footpath shall be subject to HyD's agreement.</p> |
| <p>ii. Please take into account the proposed bus layby when designing the location of vehicular access. We have no objection in principle for the proposed installation of traffic cylinders to restrict the right turn movements to/ from the subject development;</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| <p>iii. The applicant should clarify whether they will carry out management and maintenance of the footpath within the private land or they will propose to surrender the widened footpath at Pok Fu Lam Road to the Government;</p> | <p>Upon further review, it will be more practicable and feasible for the Government to maintain and manage the new portion of footpath and its supporting structures based on the following justifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the footpath will be outside of the development boundary wall of the private lot; - the new portion of footpath would be integrated with the existing one, and would be dedicated for public passage; and - Access within the development lot is proposed to facilitate government B/Ds to carry out inspection and routine maintenance works for the footpath and its supporting |

| | |
|--|--|
| | structures. This proposal is subject to further discussion with relevant government B/Ds during the detailed design stage |
| iv. The applicant has submitted the revised Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) report under the captioned submission. Please find our comments as follows: a. According to Table 2-2, no visitor parking space is proposed. The applicant should review their proposed provision of car parking spaces and ensure that it complies with the requirements of HKPSG; | Total of 4 nos. of visitor parking spaces (i.e. 1 no. per block) will be provided same as the proposed provision in S12A application. Table 2-2 is updated accordingly. (Attachment 3) Relevant architectural drawings have also been amended accordingly to incorporate the proposed visitor parking spaces. (Attachment 4) |
| b. Please advise the date of traffic survey in Table 3-3; | Noted. The survey date (5 Sep 2023) was added into Table 3-3. (Attachment 3) |
| c. For Table 5-1, please review the assessment result for junction J7B in 2037 which was better than the existing situation in Table 3-3 without any junction improvement works; | For 2023 junction capacity assessment in the calculation sheets, the following two capacity indexes are calculated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R.C.(P) is calculated based on the existing signal timings observed on-site in which the green times are not optimized with reference to the observed flows. • R.C.(C) is calculated based on optimal green times with reference to the observed flows. <p>Table 3-3 presents the calculated R.C.(P) which are based on observed green times in order to reflect actual traffic conditions.</p> <p>As indicated in the calculation sheets of J7B, the existing reserve capacity R.C.(P) of 24.8% and 23.5%, can be improved to R.C.(C) of 67.5% and 47.9% for AM and PM peak hour respectively by optimizing the green times.</p> <p>For 2037 junction capacity assessment in Table 5-1, the calculated R.C.(C) which are based on optimal green times are presented. For J7B, the R.C.(C) is 32.2% and 22.1% for AM and PM peak hour respectively.</p> |
| d. For para 5.2.2, please clarify if the study year is 2037 or 2031; | Typo. The study year is 2037. Para 5.2.2 is corrected accordingly. (Attachment 3) |
| e. For Table 5-3, please provide the assessment on the level of service of the footpath for consideration; and | Noted. The level of service (LOS) at the concerned footpath is included in Table 5-3. (Attachment 3) |
| f. Given that the proposed vehicular access will be connected to Pok Fu Lam Road, please check if there is any level difference between the | As shown on the architectural drawings (Layout Plan – UG/F, Layout Plan – B2/F, Section W-W and Section Z-Z), the maintenance walkway is located below the footpath along Pok Fu Lam Road. In terms of spot level, the maintenance |

| | |
|---|---|
| maintenance walkway and the footpath along Pok Fu Lam Road. | walkway is at +132.2mPD, and Pok Fu Lam Road is at +138.8mPD (about). |
|---|---|

Response to Departmental Comments of EPD

| Comments from Director of Environmental Protection via email dated 20.12.2023 (Contact Officer: Mr. Kelvin Choi, tel: 2835 1594) | Response(s): |
|--|---|
| 2. The EA and SIA reports have concluded no insurmountable problem and mitigation measures have been identified for the relevant environmental aspects. However, we have found that further technical information/data is needed to be included in the reports to demonstrate the validity of the findings. Our comments / observations on the EA and SIA reports are attached below, and please ask the proponent to revise the reports to address the comments / observations. | Noted, please see below responses. |
| <p><u>Technical Comments</u> Air Quality</p> <p>1. Please revise and supplement Figure 3 to show that the buffer distance is met for all air sensitive uses, and indicate the blank wall/fixed glazing of the habitable rooms within the buffer zone.</p> | Please see revised Figure 3a, 3b of the EA report in Attachment 5 . |
| <p>Noise</p> <p>2. Please provide noise model to demonstrate the validity of the assessment results.</p> | As per the tele-conversation between the project environmental consultant (Ramboll) and EPD, noise modelling files will be provided separately to EPD after the submission of this Further Information. |
| 3. Please provide written proof of TD's endorsement on traffic forecast data in Year 2049. | Revised pages and Appendix 2 of EA report with TD's endorsement is attached at Attachment 5 . |
| <p>Sewerage</p> <p>4. Table 3 Estimation of Exiting Sewage Flow – 497 ppl should refer to the School Student; while 269 ppl Community, Social & Personal Services (J11), please revise.</p> | Table 3 has been revised. |
| 5. For Appendix A and Appendix B, please update the latest sewage flow generation estimation from Hong Kong Jockey Club Riding School to be 97.53m ³ /day and incorporate into the hydraulic calculation. | Sewage flow generation estimation from Hong Kong Jockey Club Riding School has been updated and incorporated into Appendix A and B. (Attachment 6) |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>6. Please conduct the hydraulic assessment up to the manhole FMH7022415 to assess the sewerage impact of Proposed Development to further downstream.</p> | <p>Hydraulic assessment has been updated in Appendix A, B and C. The sewerage system up to the manhole FMH7022415 can have adequate freeboard to cater for the additional sewerage generated from our development.</p> |
|---|--|

Response to Departmental Comments of DSD

| <p>Chief Engineer/Hong Kong and Island, Drainage Services Department via email dated 4.1.2023) (Contact Officer: Derrick KWOK, tel: 3101 2361)</p> | <p>Response(s):</p> |
|--|--|
| <p>Please find enclosed comments on SIA and DIA from drainage maintenance view point for your consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant should be reminded that the SIA shall meet the full satisfaction of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) as the planning authority of sewage disposal and sewerage infrastructure. Comments of this department on the SIA are subject to views and agreement of EPD. | <p>Noted. Sewerage Impact Assessment Report (Issue 1) was circulated to EPD, and their comments have been properly addressed and incorporated in Sewerage Impact Assessment Report (Issue 2). (Attachment 6)</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consent from EPD and AFCD should be sought on the proposed discharge to existing stream course. | <p>Noted. EPD's and AFCD's replies are attached at Attachment 7. AFCD has no comments on the proposed discharge to existing stream course.</p> <p>As advised by EPD, the drainage issue is outside their purview as such they are not in the position to provide their comment. Meanwhile, the proposed discharge shall follow the environmental protection regulation (e.g. Water Pollution Control Ordinance).</p> <p>The design of the proposed discharge would also follow relevant government regulations accordingly.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For surface drainage within the site, a sand trap/desilting type catchpit should be provided prior to connection to the proposed stormwater terminal manhole or to the downstream public stormwater drainage system. The sand trap/desilting type catchpit should be regularly desilted by the lot owner. | <p>Noted. A catchpit with trap would be provided prior to connection to the downstream public stormwater drainage system as supplemented in Section 3.4 and Appendix C. (Attachment 8)</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project Proponent (PP) is required to liaise with relevant utility undertakers to obtain the latest records, plans and alignments of their utilities in order to ensure the feasibility of the proposed drainage works. The PP is also required to excavate inspection pits and | <p>Noted.</p> |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| <p>conduct utility detection to verify the alignments of utilities shown in such utility records if considered necessary.</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PP is required to ensure that no construction debris, silt and sediments, untreated site runoff or cementitious materials will be discharged to or deposited inside the public stormwater drains (SWD) or sewers within or in the vicinity of the development site. The PP shall monitor the internal conditions of the existing public SWD/sewers within or in the vicinity of the development site by CCTV surveys (or other alternatives to be agreed by DSD), prior to commencement and upon completion of the construction works to our satisfaction. The PP shall propose the detailed arrangement including the timing, methodology and extent of the public SWD/sewer to be surveyed by CCTV (or by other alternatives) for DSD's agreement. Nevertheless, such CCTV surveys (or other agreed alternatives) serve no intention to relieve the PP's liabilities on any damage to other SWD/sewers that are not included in the survey. Any pipe blockage or damage arising from the construction works shall be made good at the cost of the PP and to our satisfaction. In case the CCTV survey is abandoned for any section of SWD/sewers, the PP shall notify DSD by the following working day and arrange joint site inspection with DSD prior to the formal submission of CCTV report for considering the follow-up actions required from the PP. In addition, the PP shall also seek DSD's agreement on the proposed discharge point(s) of site runoff and the detailed discharge arrangement before application of the discharge license for approval by EPD. During the process, DSD might request the PP to arrange joint-site inspection to facilitate determination of the suitable discharge point(s). | <p>Noted.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is the PP's responsibility to identify/locate the existing government sewers and stormwater drains to which drainage connections from his site are to be proposed. The PP should verify the existence of any drains/sewers/utilities and also their exact locations, levels and alignments on site in order to ascertain the positions and levels of the proposed manholes and the associated | <p>Noted.</p> |

| | |
|---|--------|
| <p>connection works. The PP should also verify that the existing government drains/sewer, to which connections are proposed, are in normal working conditions and capable for taking the discharge from the site. Besides, for any excavation works over or in close vicinity to existing government drains/sewers, the PP should notify DSD in writing at least 14 working days before backfilling the excavation works and arrange joint site inspection with DSD prior to covering up.</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PP is also reminded that any person willfully, except with the permission in writing of the Authority, or negligently damages, alters, disconnects or otherwise interferes with any public sewer or drain or any connection therewith, shall be guilty of an offence under Section 6 of Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance (Cap 132). | Noted. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should any undue settlement or damage of the existing public drainage installations be detected, the piling/foundation/excavation works should be stopped immediately by the PP who shall report the matter to the relevant departments and this Department as soon as possible. In the event of any damage caused to the existing public drainage installations by the above works, the PP should be responsible for making good the damage at his own cost and to our satisfaction. | Noted. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the Water Pollution Control Ordinance (Cap 358), discharge of wastewater into stormwater drains is not permitted. The PP shall ensure that the proposed sewerage works shall convey all wastewater, including but not limited to those wastes generated by the domestic use of toilets, water closets, baths, showers, sinks, basins and other sanitary and kitchen fitments, through the sewage terminal manhole(s) to the public sewers. Besides, to ensure the sustainability of the public sewerage network, the PP shall ensure that the surface runoff within the development site will be collected and discharged via a stormwater drainage system and not be drained to the public sewerage network. | Noted. |

This is a coordinated reply of DSD's Land Drainage Division and Hong Kong and Islands Division.

Response to Departmental Comments of AMO

| Comments from Antiquities and Monuments Office via email dated 27.12.2023 (Contact Officer: Ms. Alice YU, tel: 3460 2970) | Response(s): |
|---|--|
| <p>2. Kindly be informed that the following graded historic buildings (“Graded Buildings and Structure” hereunder) are in the vicinity of the application site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Pok Fu Lam Conduit (Grade 2); (ii) Alberose, Nos. 132A & 132B Pok Fu Lam Road, Pok Fu Lam (Grade 2); and (iii) No. 128 Pok Fu Lam Road, Pok Fu Lam (Grade 3). <p>Details of the Graded Buildings including their location, extent and heritage appraisal, are available at the website of Antiquities Advisory Board (https://www.aab.gov.hk/en/historic-buildings/search-forinformation-on-individual-buildings/index.html).</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| <p>3. As the application site is in the vicinity to the Graded Buildings and Structure, the applicant is advised to assess the potential impact, both physical and visual, to the Graded Buildings and Structure arising from the proposed development. Appropriate protective measures should be devised and submitted to AMO for comment before commencement of the proposed development.</p> | <p>The three Graded Buildings and Structure listed above are noted. Though, considering the application site’s location in relation to the Graded Buildings and Structure (Graded Buildings), as well as the maximum building height proposed, there will be no impacts on the Graded Buildings.</p> <p><u>Location of the application site in relation to the Graded Buildings</u></p> <p>The three Graded Buildings are located further uphill, on the opposite side of Pok Fu Lam Road. The Graded Buildings are at a considerable distance away from the application site, in particular, Jessville and Alberose are almost 100m away. Alberose is also located further south.</p> <p>Whilst Pok Fu Lam Conduit is located slightly closer to the application site, it is on the middle of the hill and is blocked/separated from the application site by existing buildings such as Radcliffe and Royalton. This is a similar case for Jessville, with Dor Fook Mansion in the front.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p><u>Proposed Maximum Building Height</u></p> <p>The proposed maximum building height of 164mPD is a minor relaxation of the building height restriction, and a minor increase in building height of the existing Ebenezer buildings at the application site. The proposed development being on the lower side of Pok Fu Lam Road, will remain a lower building height than the residential towers (e.g. Radcliffe, Royalton and Dor Fook Mansion) on the opposite side of the road. As such, the existing residential towers will maintain the physical and visual separation between the Graded Buildings and proposed development.</p> <p>Considering the above factors, there will be no impact on the Graded Buildings and Structure.</p> |
| <p>4. According to the applicant's response in the Further Information 3 of the rezoning application no. Y/H10/14, we are given to understand that the applicant would consider the means of preservation for the Ebenezer Old Age Home (built in 1955), Old Wing of Ebenezer School & Home for the Visually Impaired (built in 1962) and the Carport (built in 1962). In this connection, please advise the latest preservation plan for the aforementioned buildings.</p> | <p>Preservation of the buildings is found to be infeasible. However, the Applicant would like to document the history of the occupation of the site. They will retain records, photographic and video recordings, both to the interiors and exteriors of the existing buildings, and their setting. This site is very significant to the development and operation of the Ebenezer School & Home for the Visually Impaired. It is intended that the history be incorporated in a display at the new campus in Tung Chung. A copy of relevant information can be provided to the AMO, for their records.</p> |

Response to Departmental Comments of UD&L, PlanD

| Comments from Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department via email dated 20.12.2023 (Contact Officer: Mr. Danial Tang, tel: 3565 3942) | Response(s): |
|---|--|
| (c) Figure 3.1 of VIA – In one of the urban design considerations on responsive building form, the applicant should check whether the building height should be revised as 164mPD instead of 168mPD. | Noted. The building height on figure 3.1 has been revised to 164mPD. (Attachment 9) |

| Comments from CTP/UD&L, PlanD via email dated 28.12.2023 (Contact Officer: Mr. NGAI Chakman, tel: 3565 3955) | Response(s): |
|--|---------------------|
| <p><u>Landscape Observations and Comments</u></p> <p>3. Based on the aerial photo of Dec 2022, majority of the Site is situated in an area of residential urban fringe landscape character with minor western portion in settled valleys landscape character. The Site is surrounded by medium-rise residential developments and road to its east, and dense vegetated slope to its west. The proposed development is not incompatible with the surrounding landscape setting.</p> | Noted. |
| <p>4. With reference to the aerial photo of Dec 2022 and the site photos provided by the applicant, the Site is currently occupied by an existing building with some existing trees within and along the periphery of the Site. According to the Tree Preservation Proposal submitted by the applicant, among the approximate 127 existing trees of common species surveyed within and immediately outside the Site, 8 nos. are proposed to transplanted within the Site, 30 nos. (including 3 nos. of invasive weed species) are affected by the proposed development and proposed to be removed. The remaining trees are retained in-situ. 27 nos. of new trees and palms in heavy standard size are proposed within the Site to mitigate the loss of existing trees arising from the development.</p> | Noted. |
| <p>5. Landscape treatments, such as tree and shrub plantings of native species, 2.5m high vertical greening of proprietary system along the fence wall facing Pok Fu Lam Road, and Terrace Garden with lawn area, are proposed to integrate the development with its surrounding. It is noted that no less than 20% green coverage and no less than 400 sq.m of uncovered open space (i.e. no less</p> | Noted. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>than 1sq.m per person) would be provided. Significant adverse impact on the landscape resources arising from the proposed development is not anticipated. We have no objection to the application from landscape planning perspective.</p> | |
| <p><u>Detailed Comments</u></p> <p><i>Appendix 8 – Tree Preservation Proposal</i></p> <p>6. Para. 4.8 – It is noted that the tree T58, which will not be affected, is considered as a potentially registrable OVT. The applicant should carefully review if it is appropriate to classify the unaffected tree outside the application boundary as potentially registrable OVT and suitably revise the paragraph to avoid misleading information.</p> | <p>Noted the text has been amended accordingly. (Attachment 10)</p> |
| <p>7. Table 5.1 – Trees within and outside the application boundary should be indicated separately.</p> | <p>Noted, the table has been revised to indicate the trees inside and outside the application site boundary. (Attachment 10)</p> |
| <p>8. Para. 6.4 and Table 6.1 – Noting that 27 new trees are proposed to achieve a new tree planting ratio of no less than 1:1 in terms of tree numbers, the applicant should maximise the greening areas and tree planting opportunity for planting more new trees within the Site as far as practicable.</p> | <p>Noted, the proposed scheme has sought to achieve the minimum 1:1 in terms of new trees planted compensating for the proposed felling of existing trees and maximise the area of green coverage. The proposals will be reviewed at the detailed design stage of the project.</p> |
| <p>9. Para. 6.5 and Table 6.2 - The applicant should consider to plant more native tree species to enhance the biodiversity of the Site and its surrounding. Please review the spacing for <i>Delonix regia</i> which will have a large tree canopy in mature size.</p> | <p>Noted, the <i>Delonix regia</i> has been removed from the species list owing to its mature size and concerns over its robustness during typhoons. It is replaced with <i>Cinnamomum burmannii</i>. The planting palette will also be reviewed during detailed design. (Attachment 10)</p> |
| <p><i>Appendix 9 – Landscape Master Plan</i></p> <p>10. Para. 8.8 – The street tree for providing shaded pedestrian environment and tree avenue effect could not be observed from the LMP. Please review and suitably revise this paragraph.</p> | <p>Noted the text has been revised accordingly. (Attachment 11)</p> |
| <p>11. Para. 9.4 and Table 9.1 – The applicant should consider to maximize the greening areas as far as practicable and plant more native tree and shrub species to enhance the biodiversity of the Site and its surrounding. The proposed native species should be indicated in Table 9.1 for information. Please review the spacing for <i>Delonix regia</i> which will have a large tree canopy in mature size.</p> | <p>Noted, the design has sought to maximize greening areas as far as possible given the constraints of the site and the need for access and activity areas. The proposed native species are shown in Table 9.1 as suggested.</p> <p><i>Delonix regia</i> has been removed from the list and replaced with <i>Cinnamomum burmannii</i>. (Attachment 11)</p> |
| <p>12. Figure 4.1 – The “Transplanted Trees” is unclear on the plan and should be indicated with a clear symbol.</p> | <p>Noted the symbol for the transplanted trees has been made more apparent on the LMP. (Attachment 11)</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>13. Figure 5.1 & 5.2 – It is noted from Section 14 that due to geotechnical concern, a 2.5m wide slope maintenance access is needed along the eastern boundary. This maintenance access is about 7m below the pedestrian level at Pok Fu Lam Road and forms a linear gap adjoining the pedestrian walkway. While taking into consideration of the slope maintenance responsibilities, the applicant is advised to explore alternative design to improve the development scheme. Besides, the width of the slope maintenance access should be indicated on all cross sections and the applicant is reminded to review and ensure the width of the maintenance access is sufficient for carrying out routine vegetation maintenance in front of the proprietary green wall system.</p> | <p>Please note the maintenance access has been requested by HyD to allow for the inspection and maintenance of the existing slope works. The arrangement of the maintenance access path will be reviewed during the detailed design stage of the project.</p> <p>The sections showing this maintenance footpath have been updated and dimensions indicated on the sections. (Attachment 11)</p> |
| <p>14. Figure 5.4 – The section is not tallied with the section cut line. Please review.</p> | <p>Noted, the section line has been relocated. (Attachment 11)</p> |
| <p>15. Figure 5.6 – According to para. 8.12 and Figure 4.1, the Terrace Garden is planted with lawn. The legend “Proposed Grasscrete” is incorrect and should be revised.</p> | <p>Noted. Each terrace of the Terrace Garden is covered with grasscrete. Para. 8.12, Figure 4.1, 5.2, 5.6 and 9.1 have been revised accordingly. (Attachment 11)</p> |
| <p><u>Advisory Comments to the Applicant</u></p> <p>16. The applicant is reminded that approval of the application does not imply approval of tree works, if any, such as pruning, transplanting and felling. Tree removal applications should be submitted direct to the relevant authority for approval before the commencement of works.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |

Response to Departmental Comments of PlanD

| <p>Comments from District Planning Officer/ Hong Kong, Planning Department (contact officer : Ronald CHAN, TP/HK6, tel 2231 4913)</p> | <p>Response(s):</p> |
|--|--|
| <p>1. The applicant claims that the bonus GFA (about 200m²) is subject to the approval of Buildings Department at the detailed design stage, and is excluded from the proposed domestic GFA of 12,274m² (equivalent to a PR of 1.9). As there is currently no provision stipulated in the Notes of the “R(C)” zone for permitted PR to be increased by additional PR approved under B(P)R 22(1) or (2), a separate planning application for minor relaxation of PR restriction for the bonus GFA of 200m²</p> | <p>The applicant will apply for about 200sqm of bonus GFA at the detailed design stage, which will be subject to the approval of Buildings Department (BD).</p> <p>With reference to Joint Practice Note No.4 (JPN4), under paragraph 7 relating to <i>Compliance Checking of the Maximum PR / GFA Restriction</i>, it states that where there is no specific provision in the statutory plan regarding GFA accountability, PlanD will</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>(equivalent to a PR of 0.3) would be warranted in due course. The applicant may wish to confirm the position.</p> | <p>determine the compliance based on BD's verified GFA and follow BD's practice in GFA calculation and granting of GFA concession.</p> <p>It is understood that it is premature to determine whether the proposed bonus GFA is acceptable or not, as it could only be determined at the formal building plans submission stage (as per BD's comments below relating to the Dedication of Land for Public Footpath Widening). However, according to JPN4, should BD accept the proposed bonus GFA and that the bonus GFA is non-accountable, then in such a case, a planning application for minor relaxation of PR restriction would not be required.</p> |
| <p>2. For clarity sake, please indicate the building separations (8m between T3 and T4, 20m from Ebenezer New Hope School) and building setback (10m to 20m) from Pok Fu Lam Road on the layout plan. (File: A_H10_97_S16_DrawingsPlans_1 pdf page 2).</p> | <p>Please see Appendix 1 of the Air Ventilation Assessment which includes a UG/F layout plan with the proposed building separations and setback indicated (i.e. separation of 8m between T3 and T4, and 20m from Ebenezer New Hope School; and setback of at least 10m from Pok Fu Lam Road).</p> <p>The 20m building setback is related to traffic noise mitigation. Please also refer to Figure 3a and 3b of the Environmental Assessment. (Attachment 5)</p> |
| <p>3. Please provide information about the progress of the relocation plan for the Board's reference (para 22 of minutes of meeting held on 6.5.2023 (https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Minutes/m694mpc_e.pdf) refers).</p> | <p>As noted during the Section 12A stage, Ebenezer will only be relocated after the satisfactory completion of the new campus at the Tung Chung site.</p> <p>The implementation of the new campus is in progress. Revised General Building Plans were submitted in Q4 2023 to address Governmental departmental comments.</p> <p>With regards to the land exchange application, basic terms negotiation with DLO/I is currently in progress. Upon the execution of the land grant, it is estimated that the construction of the new campus will be completed and the Occupation Permit obtained within a timeframe of approximately 30 months.</p> |

Response to Departmental Comments of BD

| <p>Comments from Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department via memo dated 19.12.2023 (ref.: BC BD/TP(HK)/10) (Contact Officer: Choy Hei-yeung Kevin, tel: 2626 1380):</p> | <p>Response(s):</p> |
|---|---|
| <p><u><i>Dedication of Land for Public Footpath Widening</i></u> In considering whether or not to permit the proposed bonus plot ratio or GFA under regulation 22 of the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) arising from the proposed dedication of land for public passage or surrender of land for street widening, many factors will be taken into account, e.g. the actual layout, density of the redevelopment, comments from the relevant departments, etc. In this connection, it is premature to determine whether the proposed bonus GFA is acceptable or not. Detailed comments could only be made at formal building plans submission stage. Applicant's attention is drawn to regulation 22 of B(P)R, PNAP APP-20 and APP-108 in this regard.</p> | <p>Noted. We agree that at this stage it is premature to ask for the bonus GFA and we understand that formal building plans will need to be submitted. However, in preparing this application we have made allowance for the GFA to be accommodated should it be granted.</p> |
| <p><u><i>Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction</i></u> No objection in principle under the Buildings Ordinance.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| <p><u><i>Compliance with Sustainable Building Design Guidelines and Building Setback Requirements</i></u> If the applicant intends to apply for GFA exemptions for the green / amenity features and non-mandatory / non-essential plant rooms, the pre-requisites and the sustainable building design guidelines as stipulated in PNAP APP-151 and 152 should be complied with. Detailed comments would be given upon a detailed demonstration according to PNAP APP- 152 is submitted.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |

Response to Public Comments

The significant amount of supportive public comments is noted and appreciated. The public comments that raised suggestions, concerns and objections are also noted, and it is considered that these are adequately addressed by our response to the Government departmental comments.

Miscellaneous Remarks

For consistency with the Environmental Assessment, the typical floor plan of the proposed scheme has been amended to indicate the vertical acoustic fin, which is proposed as a noise mitigation measure. (**Attachment 4**)