

TD's comments on traffic engineering issues via PlanD's email dated 19.1.2024.	Response to Comments
According to the Further Information (FI) enclosing the revised layout plans and revised "Traffic Review Report" (TRR), the no. of flats in the proposed redevelopment remains unchanged (i.e. 217 nos.) and the no. of car parking space is increased from 33 nos. to 56 nos.	Noted.
We have no comment on the proposed 56 nos. residential car parking spaces in the development.	Noted.
The owner shall propose and implement effective traffic management plan and contingency plan for schedule maintenance or emergency maintenance of the car lifts to ensure smooth traffic circulation and avoid tail-back of queuing vehicles to public roads and/or affecting other traffic.	Noted and appropriate management will be in place for the maintenance of the car lifts.
Please provide the calculation for your car lift queuing analysis in Table 3.4.	Noted. Enclosed please find the calculation in Section 3.3.7 of the revised Traffic Review Report in the attachment.
Please review if on more (total 2 nos.) designated waiting space should be provided for the event of scheduled or emergency maintenance of car lifts.	2 waiting spaces are shown in Figure 3.1 of the revised Traffic Review Report.
For swept path analysis of P50, it involves a lengthy reverse movement which is undesirable. Please review.	Figure SP7 refers in the revised Traffic Review Report.
Please also review swept path analysis for P23, P39 & P50.	Figures SP7, SP8 and SP9 refer in the revised Traffic Review Report.
The project team of the redevelopment had submitted proposals to demolish the existing retaining wall(s) between L/P 33850 to L/P 32295 such that the existing footpath of Robinson Road (with ~1m) can be widened with a provision of a new lay-by. However, such design was not mentioned or indicated on the layout plan appended in this application.	Please be noted that the voluntary road improvement works at Robinson Road does not form part of this application and under separate building submission.

Responses to departmental comments on 1.2.2024

Departmental comments	Responses
Comments from Landscape Architect, Planning Department: [Mr. Chak Man NGAI, Tel: 3565 3955]	
1(a)The applicant should provide relevant information to demonstrate the provision of open space would comply with the requirements under Chapter 4 of HKPSG.	Landscape layout plans with Dwg. No. LP-02 is provided in Annex 1 to demonstrate the provision of open space.
1(b) The applicant should be advised that approval of the application does not imply approval of tree works such as pruning, transplanting and felling under lease. The applicant is reminded to seek approval for any proposed tree works from relevant departments prior to commencement of the works.	Noted.
1(c)The applicant is reminded that approval of the application does not imply approval of the site coverage of greenery requirements under APP PNAP-152. The site coverage of greenery calculation should be submitted separately to BD/LandsD for approval.	Noted.
Comments from Town Planner/Urban Design, Planning Department: [Mr. Daniel TANG, Tel: 3565 3942]	
<u>Urban Design Perspective</u>	
2(a) Section 5.1 Planning and Design Considerations – It is noted from	Noted.

Figure 5.1 that about 25m setback from the western site boundary is provided as compared to the Baseline Scheme due to reduction from two blocks to one block. The applicant may wish to include it as one of the design merits to facilitate air and visual permeability.	
<u>Visual Impact Assessment</u>	
<p>For the Visual Impact Review, the applicant should observe para. 4.3 and 4.4 of the TPB PG No. 41 and provide:</p> <p>2(b) An assessment area to cover the area of visual influence within which the proposed development is pronouncedly visible from the key sensitive viewers and</p> <p>2(c) The visual envelope to cover the fields of views from all sensitive viewers in direct sight of the proposed development.</p>	Noted, please refer to the update Visual Impact Review in Annex 2.
<p>2(d) It is noted that the five viewpoints (VPs) selected are either strategic VPs or long-ranged VPs, which result in negligible visual impact as rated by the applicant. The applicant should explore some short and/or medium-ranged VPs, such as bus stop along Park Road, Bonham Road or Robinson Road, after delineating the visual envelope.</p>	Noted, please refer to VP06, VP07 and VP08 of the updated Visual Impact Review in Annex 2.
<p>2(e) VP1 – It should read as “West Kowloon <u>Cultural</u> District” instead of “West Kowloon Culture District”. Please revise accordingly.</p>	Noted, the relevant part had been revised, please refer to the updated Visual Impact Review in Annex 2.
<p>2(f) VP2 – It is noted that the location of SVP for the Cultural Complex at Tsim Sha Tsui is not accurate. Please refer to the PlanD’s website on the Strategic VPs for details.</p>	Ditto.

2(g) VP3 – It is understood that the SVP at the waterfront promenade at Kai Tak Development is under construction and the applicant has explored an alternative location at Kai Tak Cruise Terminal. The applicant is advised to spell it out clearly in the VIA.	Ditto.
2(h) The rating of VP1 and VP5 – Given that the increase in BH of the proposed development is visible at these VPs, the applicant may wish to consider if the rating should be revised as <u>slight</u> , instead of negligible.	Ditto.
Comment from Chief Architect/Architectural Services Department: [Mr. Sherman SUM, Tel: 2582 5314]	
3(a)The vantage points of the images shown in the Visual Impact review are too far from the subject site. In order to enable ArchSD to comment on the visual impact, it would be useful to have some images/photomontages of the proposed development in its immediate surrounding context from different vantage points to demonstrate whether the proposal and the design features would be visually compatible with the existing surrounding environment.	Noted, please refer to VP06, VP07 and VP08 of the updated Visual Impact Review in Annex 2.

Comment from Environmental Protection Department: [Mr. Kelvin CHOI, Tel: 2835 1594]	
<u>Sewerage Calculations and Sewerage Impact Review</u>	
4(a) Please review the UFF for the proposed development and Woodland Gardens.	<p>The UFF used for the proposed development and Woodland Gardens are based on private permanent housing type R1 on Table T-1 of Guidelines for Estimating Sewage Flows for Sewage Infrastructure Planning (GESF) published by Environmental Protection Department (EPD).</p> <p>As the estimated GFA per flat for the proposed development and Woodland Gardens are approx. 50m², the housing type is considered to be R1 as defined in Chapter 2 Residential Density of the Hong Kong Planning Standard and Guidelines (HKPSG) by the Planning Department, according to the Initial Flat Size Assumptions in Table 8.</p>
4(b) Please include the hydraulic assessment in the nearby catchments and conduct the assessment until the downstream manhole FMH7005712.	The current site is of residential use, same use as the proposed scheme. The sewerage review

	<p>calculation had been submitted as FI on December 29, 2023 based on current application scheme, the calculation included downstream manholes with feature no. FMH7005730, FMH7005537, FMH7005734, FMH7005733 and FMH7005538 at Robinson Road, which is considered sufficient to demonstrate the available capacities in the existing facilities are sufficient to support the application proposal, with same number of units to the compliant scheme.</p>
4(c) The peak flow from the backwash of swimming pool at Beauty Court is missing from the calculation. Please review.	<p>The estimated sewage flow from swimming pool at Beauty Court had been provided in FI on December 29, 2023 but is being calculated separately with reasonable assumption that the backwash will be carried out during non-peak hour.</p>
4(d) Please suggest mitigation measures if necessary	<p>Based on the sewage review calculation provided in FI on December 29, 2023, it is considered the available capacities in the existing facilities are sufficient to support the application scheme.</p>

Comment from Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department: [Mr. Richard NG, Tel: 3101 2360]	
<u>Sewerage Calculations:</u>	
5(a) Note 2 of the calculation – The applicant should refer to Figure 2 in Chapter 2 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and guidelines for the residential density zones in urban areas.	As the estimated GFA per flat for the proposed development and Woodland Gardens are approx. 50m ² , the housing type is considered to be R1 as defined in Chapter 2 Residential Density of the Hong Kong Planning Standard and Guidelines (HKPSG) by the Planning Department, according to the Initial Flat Size Assumptions in Table 8.
5(b) The applicant should review the additional flow rate from the swimming pool of Beauty Court.	Refer to 4(c) above.
Comment from Chief Highway Engineer/Highways Department: [Mr. Jacky HO, Tel: 2231 5630]	
6(a) Regarding the captioned application further information (FI3), the maintenance responsibility of the slope feature nos. 11SW-A/CR386(2) and 11SW-A/FR200(1) should be LandsD instead of HyD. The applicant should amend the corresponding information in the Geotechnical Planning Review Report accordingly.	Noted. Please refer to updated GPRR in Annex 3.

