

Comment from Chief Architect/Architectural Services Department: [Mr. Sherman SUM, Tel: 2582 5314]	Response to Comments
For the particular issue mentioned in the Para. 5 of your memo, the images of the additional vantage points of VP06, VP07 and VP08 shown in revised Visual Impact review are not clear for the subject site. In order to enable us to comment on whether the proposal could enhance the visual compatibility with the existing surrounding environment, it would be useful to have some images/photomontages showing the full height of the proposed development in its immediate surrounding context from different vantage points to demonstrate whether the proposal would be visually compatible with the existing surrounding environments (i.e. adjacent buildings in the "R(C)5" zone.	Further substantiate our justification, photomontages showing the full height of the proposed development comparing to permitted scheme in its immediate surrounding context (Aerial View 01) and overall view with Victoria Peak (Aerial View 02) are added to the Visual Impact Review. (Attachment 1). Furthermore, as per the agreed additional vantage point VP07a (Figure 6.7a) along the footpath at Bonham Road (outside the Rest Garden) reveals visually compatible in the existing dense urban context (Attachment 1). The proposed residential building fully blends in the surrounding building clusters and harmonize with the environment.
Comment from Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department: [Mr. Richard NG, Tel: 3101 2360]	Response to Comments
Note 2 of the calculation – In general, Table 8 in Chapter 2 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) is used for assuming the initial flat size in various residential density zones for different areas in Hong Kong. Therefore the applicant should review his calculation in accordance with Figure 2 in Chapter 2 of the HKPSG for the residential density zones in urban areas.	Noted. The UFF used in the sewerage review calculation for the proposed development and Woodland Gardens are based the private housing type 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. As there is no additional sewerage impact from the proposed development. The available capacities in the existing facilities are sufficient to support the application scheme. Nevertheless, a calculation of hypothetical case is carried out as per comment (i.e. UFF for Private R2 is now adopted for the proposed development and Woodland Garden) and provided herewith. (Attachment 2)

Comments from Environmental Protection Department: [Mr. Kelvin CHOI, Tel: 2835 1594]	Response to Comments
General Comments: Based on EPD's preliminary estimation, the proposed development will likely give rise to surcharge to the existing sewerage system. A Sewerage Impact Assessment should be properly conducted and any mitigation measures identified therein should be implemented.	The purpose of this S.16 Planning Application is to increase building height only. The number of flats remains the same (i.e. 217 flats in total) so there is no additional sewerage impact from the proposed development. None the less, there would be no insurmountable problem arising from the proposed development. An approval condition is acceptable and Sewerage Impact Assessment will be conducted to identify appropriate mitigation measures if needed subject to the satisfaction of relevant authorities.
Technical Comments on RtC: RtC 4(a) – please adopt the unit flow factor 0.27m³/day (Private R2), instead of 0.19m³/day (Private R1) for the proposed development and Woodland Garden.	The UFF used in the sewerage review calculation for the proposed development and Woodland Gardens are based the private housing type 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. As there is no additional sewerage impact from the proposed development. The available capacities in the existing facilities are sufficient to support the application scheme. Nevertheless, a calculation of hypothetical case is taken as per comment (i.e. UFF for Private R2 is now adopted for the proposed development and Woodland Garden) and provided herewith. (Attachment 2) According to the calculation of hypothetical case, there will be surcharge condition under peak discharge condition along segments FWD7007266 & FWD7007264 (i.e. down to FMH7005712 as per the comment.)

	For the purpose to mitigate the theoretical impact, a retention tank is proposed on-site for storage of sewage generated from the proposed development and discharged during non-peak hour only. The tank size shall be designed to cater for the daily sewage discharge amount (i.e. 155.4m ³), which will be located in the E&M floor, before discharge to the existing public sewer in Robinson Road.
RtC 4(b) – please conduct calculation covering the downstream manhole FMH7005712. The calculations just reaching manhole FMH7005538 do not reflect the sewerage impact on sewers downstream of this manhole. The sewerage impact assessment should take into account the cumulative flow due to the flow from the proposed development and the current flow from nearby catchment(s).	Noted and calculation shown in Attachment 2. Based on UFF for Private R2, the estimated ADWF for the proposed development is 155.4 m³ /day and the peak flow is 14.4 L/s. UFF for Private R2 is also adopted for other residential buildings in the catchment area.
RtC 4(c) and the table “Capacity Utilization AFTER development” – calculation of flow from swimming pool backwash from Beauty Court is incorrect. Please incorporate the correct value into hydraulic calculations. It is anticipated that after the correction and with the proposed development, there will be surcharge condition. Please review your calculations and propose the relevant mitigation measures.	Noted and revised calculations with swimming pool backwash from Catchment Areas are now provided as a hypothetical case. According to the calculation, there will be surcharge condition occurs during peak flow condition. Under the worst scenario, an on-site retention tank could be installed to hold the generated sewage flow from the Site and to avoid discharge into the downstream sewerage system during peak flow period. The tank size shall be designed to cater for the daily sewage discharge amount (i.e. 155.4m³), which will be located in the E&M floor, before discharge to the existing public sewer in Robinson Road.

Comments from Hong Kong District Planning Office, Planning Department [Miss Karmin Tong, Tel: 2231 4932]	Response to Comments
1. With reference to Table 1 in the Supplementary Planning Statement, please clarify the site coverage of the proposed tower (1/F to 28/F) and the podium (E&M floor to G/F) under both the s.16 application scheme and under the approved GBP.	<u>s.16 Scheme</u> The site coverage is about 19% for the proposed tower (1/F to 28/F) and about 68% for the podium (including E&M floor to G/F) under the s.16 application scheme. Please be confirmed the provided open space is 565m2 under the s.16 application scheme. <u>Approved GBP (compared with s16 Scheme)</u> The site coverage under approved GBP is about 35% (reduced by 16%) for the domestic towers and about 50% (increase by 18%) for the podium (E&M floor to G/F as more parking provision required).
2. Please advise the floor-to-floor height of the E&M floor, LG2/F, LG1/F and G/F, and the thickness of the transfer plate between G/F and 1/F under both the s.16 application scheme and under the approved GBP.	<u>s.16 Scheme</u> The floor-to-floor height is 4250mm for E&M floor, 2900mm for LG2/F and LG1/F, 3500mm for G/F and the thickness of the transfer plate is 2900mm under the s. 16 application scheme. <u>Approved GBP</u> The floor-to-floor height is 4250mm for E&M floor, 2900mm for LG2/F and LG1/F, 2900mm at general area for G/F, 4200mm at loading/unloading area for G/F under tower 2, the thickness of the transfer plate is 1600mm (for tower 2 only) and there is no transfer plate for tower 1 under the approved GBP. The increase in thickness of the transfer plate is due to the increase in number of storeys in the domestic block. The 3500mm floor-to-floor height at G/F which is 350mm more than typical floor-to-floor height had been taking into account a modest building services zone below the transfer plate. This floor also serves residential recreational facilities,

	the proposed headroom is considered reasonable to foster a quality environment for the general benefit of future residents.
3. Please confirm whether (and how much and for what facilities) GFA concession has been assumed in the GFA calculation.	Approximate 1060 sqm of GFA concession for Green Features (balcony, utility platform, etc.) and Amenity Features (plant room, pipe ducts, guard room, residential recreational facilities, etc.) had been assumed in the GFA calculation for the s.16 application scheme, which is same as GFA concession subject to the overall cap of 10% under approved GBP. Floor space used solely for parking motor vehicles and loading/ unloading of motor vehicles are also disregarded for GFA calculation, which follow the same principle of approved GBP.
Comment from Transport Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport Department: [Mr. Eric LO, Tel: 2829 5429]	Response to Comments
The owner shall propose and implement effective traffic management plan and contingency plan for scheduled 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. It is part of the DMC to maintain the livability of the residential building and on-site estate management to ensure traffic warden will enforce effective traffic management plan during the routine and/or emergency maintenance of car lifts.
The applicant shall ensure proper sightline and vehicular maneuverability at run-in/out and within the lot.	Noted.
The applicant should ensure that the design of car parking spaces, loading & unloading bay and internal access roads has complied with PNAP No. APP-111 "Design of Car Parks and Loading/Unloading Facilities" and Building (Planning) Regulation, Cap 123F.	Noted.
Two (2) nos. car lifts are proposed in this submission, please amend typo in Section 3.2.1 accordingly.	Noted. Typo amended in Section 3.2.1, refer replacement page attached. (Attachment 3)