

**Proposed Residential Development with Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio, Building Height and Site Coverage Restrictions
at 44 Stanley Village Road in Stanley**

**- S16 Planning Application (TPB Ref.: A/H19/87) –
Further Information No. 4**

RESPONSE-TO-COMMENT TABLE

Proposed Residential Development with Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio, Building Height and Site Coverage Restrictions
at 44 Stanley Village Road in Stanley

- S16 Planning Application (TPB Ref.: A/H19/87) –
Further Information No. 3

Comments	Response
<p><u>Comments from Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department:</u></p> <p>Urban Design and Visual Perspectives (Contact Person: Ms Vanessa TSANG, Tel: 3565 3942)</p> <p>1) Paragraph 2 of our previous email dated 10.12.2024 remains valid. Please use ‘public viewers’ as adopted in TPB PG-No.41 instead of ‘VSRs’. Please revise accordingly (esp. paras. 2.1.3, 5.1.2, and 6.2.2 of the revised planning statement)</p> <p>2) VP6 - As per the tele-conversation between UD unit of this office and the consultant on 10.12.2024 regarding the selection of VP6, the consultant may wish to relocate VP6 to the sidewalk between the exit of Stanley Plaza and the bus stop, which offers a better viewing angle to the proposed development and is frequented by more visitors/pedestrians.</p> <p>3) It is noted that the ratings on ‘sensitivity of the public viewers’ of the 9 VPs range from ‘Low’ to ‘High’, and those on ‘magnitude of visual change’ range from ‘Negligible’ to ‘Moderate’, whilst the overall ‘visual impact’ of the 9 VPs are largely rated ‘Slightly Adverse’. For example, VP3 and VP6 have different ratings on ‘sensitivity of public viewers’ and ‘magnitude of visual change’, but both lead to the same rating (i.e. ‘Slightly Adverse’) on overall ‘visual impact’. The consultant may wish to review and provide a logical discussion on the relationship between the ratings of ‘sensitivity of the public viewers’, ‘magnitude of visual change’, and overall ‘visual impact’.</p>	<p>Noted, the relevant text in the Visual Impact Assessment has been revised accordingly (<i>Appendix II</i> refers).</p> <p>Your comment is well noted. The Application Site appears naturally within the normal field of vision vertically at the adopted location which is a little bit further away as compared with the suggested location of VP6. Not least, the adopted VP6 also represents the visitors of the viewing deck behind, which is considered more visually sensitive.</p> <p>Noted that the sensitivity of VP3 is high and the magnitude of change is moderate (comparatively higher than other viewpoints), the overall impact to VP3 has been adjusted. Please refer to revised Chapter 7 of the VIA in <i>Appendix II</i>.</p>

**Proposed Residential Development with Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio, Building Height and Site Coverage Restrictions
at 44 Stanley Village Road in Stanley**

- S16 Planning Application (TPB Ref.: A/H19/87) –
Further Information No. 3

Comments	Response
<p>4) It is noted that all the VPs are outside the Initial Assessment Area (3H zone). The consultant may consider delineating of ‘visual envelope’ according to TPB PG-No. 41 in Figure 5.1. The visual envelope is expected to cover the fields of view from all sensitive viewers in direct sight of the proposed development.</p> <p>5) Comments from our Landscape Unit have been provided under separate cover.</p>	<p>Figure 5.1 has been revised accordingly (<i>Appendix II</i> refers).</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p><u>Comments from Hong Kong District Planning Office, Planning Department:</u></p> <p>(Contact Person: Ms Maggie WU, Tel: 2231 4945)</p> <p>1. According to the supplementary planning statement, the proposed development comprises 3 blocks, including the main building at the upper platform, the new residential building at the lower platform and the guard house near the entrance. According to Table 5.1, there are 23 units within the proposed development. In this regard, please provide number of flats in each building block of the proposed development.</p> <p>2. The proposed total gross floor area (GFA) of the development is 6,881.019m² (including Maryknoll House building of 2,661.621m² and additional GFA for the new blocks of 4,219.398m²). Please clarify what facilities/elements are assumed to be GFA exempted and not included in the GFA calculation. Please also specify the proposed use of Building 3 on the drawings.</p>	<p>Under the current schematic design, there will be 12 units and 11 units in the upper and lower platform respectively.</p> <p>Subject to approval by the Building Authority, floor area to be used for clubhouse and E&M plant rooms shall be exempted from GFA calculation under PNAP APP151, B(P)R23(3b) and other relevant guidelines and regulations.</p> <p>The Master Layout Plan has been updated to annotate the use of Building 3 (<i>Appendix III</i> refers).</p>

**Proposed Residential Development with Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio, Building Height and Site Coverage Restrictions
at 44 Stanley Village Road in Stanley**

- S16 Planning Application (TPB Ref.: A/H19/87) –
Further Information No. 3

Comments	Response
<p>3. Please clarify whether Building 3 has been included in the site coverage calculation.</p>	<p>Building 3 has been included in the site coverage calculation.</p>
<p>4. Compared to the approved scheme under A/H19/82, the provision of heritage gallery under the current scheme has been increased by about 254m² (i.e. from about 44m² to about 298m²) and the number of public tours has been increased from 8 times per year to 12 times per year. However, it has been observed that the total GFA has increased by 1,146.836m² (i.e. from about 5,734.183m² to about 6,881.019m²). The applicant is advised to provide further justifications on the improvements in planning and design merits, as well as public gains that have been incorporated into the project.</p>	<p>The Applicant has made tremendous effort in providing more planning gain to the public. Firstly, the size of the proposed Heritage Gallery has been increased by sixfold (i.e. 677% from about 44m² to about 298m²). Secondly, the frequency of the public tours has increased by 150% from 8 times per year to 12 times per year. This is considered a balanced approach between the opportunity for public appreciation of the heritage asset and the maintenance of privacy of the future residents.</p> <p>In addition, the quality of the heritage interpretation would also be significantly improved. Instead of erecting interpretation panels at 2 small corners within the future clubhouse under the approved scheme, the Applicant has reserved the entire Chapel Wing for the use of a Heritage Gallery. Not to mention there will be more space for exhibiting the salvaged heritage items, visitors will be able to enjoy the religious ambience right at the former chapel. This is going to be a completely different experience. From the perspective of the future residents, this would also help to safeguard their privacy.</p>
<p>5. Please confirm if there will be any roof top features.</p>	<p>The new block at the lower platform would have a lift overrun.</p>

Consolidated by: **KTA Planning Limited**

Date: **7 March 2025**

List of Appendices

- Appendix I Replacement Pages of the Supporting Planning Statement
- Appendix II Replacement Pages of the Visual Impact Assessment
- Appendix III Updated Master Layout Plan