

**Minutes of 370th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held on 28.3.2008**

[Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK), Mr. Louis K.H. Kau, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK) and Mr. Ng Tak-wah, Senior Town Planner/Urban Design (STP/UD), of the Planning Department (PlanD), as well as Professor Edward Ng, Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Consultant, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 9

[Closed Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the

Approved Tsim Sha Tsui Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K1/22

(MPC Paper No. 17/08)

1. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in this item as the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) project at Hanoi Road, the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU), 54-56 Hillwood Road, 42 Carnarvon Road as well as the Hung Hom Station and some other uses of the Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL) were subject to the proposed amendments under consideration :

- | | |
|---|---|
| Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng
as the Director of Planning | - being a non-executive director of the URA; |
| Ms. Margaret Hsia
as the Assistant Director(2) of
the Home Affairs Department | - being a co-opt member of the Planning,
Development and Conservation
Committee of the URA; |
| Mr. James Merritt
as the Assistant Director (Kowloon)
of the Lands Department | - being an assistant to the Director of
Lands who was a non-executive
director of the URA; |
| Mr. Walter K.L. Chan | - being a non-executive director of the
URA; |
| Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong | - having current business dealings with
the URA; |
| Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim | - having current business dealings with
the URA and PolyU; |

- | | |
|---|---|
| Mr. K.Y. Leung | - being the part-time lecturer of the Department of Civil and Structural Engineering of PolyU; |
| Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan | - having a property at 54-56 Hillwood Road; |
| Dr. Daniel B.M. To | - his office being located at 42 Carnarvon Road and owned by his company; and |
| Mr. Anthony Loo
as the Assistant Commissioner of
Transport Department | - being an alternate member for the Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) ¹ who was a member of the Board of the MTRCL. |

2. The Secretary said that the URA project at Hanoi Road had already been approved by the Town Planning Board (the Board) and was near completion. Besides, this item was for the consideration of proposed amendments to an Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and related to the plan-making process. According to the Board's procedure and practice, Members connected to the URA project site should declare interests, but they could stay at the meeting and participate in the discussion of and deliberation on the item. However, if representation relating to the URA project site was received upon gazetting of the proposed amendments to the OZP, the concerned Members would need to withdraw from the meeting. In addition, Members who had business dealings, were a staff member or being a chairman/member of the executive board/board of directors of the concerned bodies/companies would need to withdraw from the meeting in accordance with the established practice of the Board.

3. The Committee agreed that the Chairperson and the above Members with interests declared, except Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan and Dr. Daniel B.M. To who had landed interests, could stay at the meeting. The Committee noted that Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan and Dr. Daniel B.M. To had already left the meeting whereas Ms. Margaret Hsia had tendered apology for not being able to attend the meeting.

4. Noting that Professor Edward Ng of the Department of Architecture of the Chinese University of Hong Kong was the AVA Consultant for this item, Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim declared an interest as he worked in the same department, but he was not involved in the AVA study. The Committee considered his interest was indirect and remote

and agreed that Professor Lim could stay at the meeting.

5. Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan, DPO/TWK, said that replacement pages 11, 24, 25 and 37 of the Paper, replacement page 13 of Attachment III of the Paper, replacement pages 3 and 4 of Attachment V of the Paper and an extract plan showing the replacement building height (BH) restriction of 57mPD for a “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) site covering the Hermes Building were tabled at the meeting. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms. Chan then briefed Members on the item as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

Background

- (a) being a key commercial node and a territorial business centre, the Tsim Sha Tsui Planning Scheme Area (the Area) had been subject to immense redevelopment pressure. Except for some sites zoned “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) protruding into the Victoria Harbour, no BH restriction had been stipulated on the OZP. In the absence of height control, there was a proliferation of out-of-context tall buildings in the Area. In order to avoid further proliferation of incompatible high-rise buildings in the Area and to effect better planning control, appropriate BH restrictions were recommended for all zones in the Area, except for the “OU(Gun Club Hill Barracks)” zone garrisoned by the People’s Liberation Army. The BH review for this military site would have read across implications on other military sites and involved security and legal considerations. As such, it would be considered together with that of the other military sites in the territory. In addition, opportunity was taken to review the zoning or other development restrictions of some sites in the Area, taking into account the specific site context and circumstances;

Context of the Area

- (b) the Area was located at the southern tip of Kowloon Peninsula and bounded by the Victoria Harbour (the Harbour) to the south, southwest and southeast. It had long been developed as a key commercial node with retail, office and

hotel facilities. It also served as a territorial business centre as well as district/regional retail centres which attracted both local and overseas visitors. The predominant land uses in the Area included medium to high-rise commercial developments, intermixed with residential, cultural, leisure and recreational uses. The existing building age, BH profile and spatial attributes of the Area were highlighted as per paragraph 4.3.4 to 4.3.6 of the Paper;

Local Wind Environment

- (c) an AVA by expert evaluation had been undertaken to assess the likely impacts of the proposed BH restrictions on pedestrian wind environment in the Area. The major findings and recommendations of the AVA were highlighted as per paragraphs 4.3.7 to 4.3.10 of the Paper. In brief, the prevailing annual wind of the Area came from the east and northeast whereas the prevailing summer wind came from the east with a high probability also from the southwest and southeast. Chatham Road South, Nathan Road and Salisbury Road were the main air paths in the Area. While there was no major air ventilation issue in areas around the Hung Hom Station, PolyU, Gun Club Hill Barracks, Tsim Sha Tsui East and the area to the south of Salisbury Road, the hinterland in the inland area was poor in air ventilation. Given the congested building environment of the Area and the presence of very tall buildings, BH restrictions by itself might not be the most effective planning consideration for air ventilation. Introducing air paths, non-building area, building gaps, limiting site coverage, widening roads/streets and preserving open spaces were considered some of the more effective mitigation measures. The air ventilation issues and the above measures had been taken into account in formulating the BH restrictions, other development restrictions and rezoning proposals for the Area;

Urban Design Objectives and Key Guiding Principles

- (d) the urban design objectives and key guiding principles for the BH review

were highlighted as per paragraph 4.4 of the Paper. One of the urban design objectives was to preserve public views to the ridgelines. Four key vantage points at Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park at Sai Ying Pun, Viewing Deck of Pier 7 at Central, the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre at Wan Chai and the planned waterfront open space at Tin Hau which were within reasonable proximity of the Area were identified as shown in Plan 4 of the Paper. Only the fringe of the Area near Bowring Street and the Hung Hom Station fell within the view fan of these key vantage points;

Overall BH Concept

- (e) taking cognisance of the number of super-tall existing and committed developments in the Area in the time, Tsim Sha Tsui had been identified as a “high-rise node” under the Study on Urban Design Guidelines for Hong Kong completed in 2002/03 which had undergone extensive public consultation. Referring to two photomontages extracted from the Study showing the panoramic views of the Area as seen from the vantage points of the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre New Wing at Wan Chai and the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park at Sai Ying Pun (Plans 10B and 10C of the Paper), some developments in the Area such as the URA Hanoi Road project, the development at Peking Road (currently known as One Peking) and the redevelopment projects at Gateway III and New World Centre which were either relatively massive in scale or tall in height, were taken as committed developments and recognised in the Study;
- (f) based on the urban design principles, the overall BH concept for the Area was that the highest buildings would be centred at the URA site at Hanoi Road (the central core) with the BH stepping down towards the harbourfront to enhance the visual openness at the Harbour. Medium- to high-rise developments were proposed to the further north and south of the central core. Medium-rise developments were proposed in areas around the traditional composite commercial/residential area at Bowring Street, Tsim Sha Tsui East, PolyU and areas near the Hong Kong Observatory.

The area bounded by Cox's Road, Austin Road and Chatham Road South was proposed for low-rise developments;

- (g) as a general rule, a BH band for an area that was commensurate with the planning intention and reflecting the majority of the existing buildings/committed proposals was proposed. There were a few existing or approved tall developments in the Area. Though taken as committed developments in the BH review, they were considered as exceptions in formulating the BH control;
- (h) three major existing/committed developments were highlighted as per paragraph 5.5 of the Paper, including :
 - (i) the New World Centre Complex which comprised the New World Centre, New World Apartments, AIA Tower, New World Renaissance Hotel, New World Office Building with car park and Hotel Inter-Continental Hong Kong. In 1996, the District Lands Conference (DLC) approved an additional gross floor area (GFA) of 91,820.4m² for a 34-storey hotel with a BH of 112mPD to be built on a strip of land fronting the Harbour and BH ranging from 52-61mPD for the remaining site. The total GFA for the whole site amounted to 324,078m² and the lease modification was executed in 1998. In 2001, the lot owner proposed to further modify the lease conditions, among others, by deleting the BH restriction for the whole site except for the area designated for hotel use with a BH of 112mPD. PlanD did not support the proposal. After a series of deliberations, a BH zonal plan ranging from 30-265mPD was agreed taking into account the urban design consideration at that time. The variations in BH and the stepped height profile would create an opportunity for an urban icon with distinctive visual identity and, at the same time, maintain a smooth transition to the low-rise developments to the west of the site. In 2003, the DLC approved the lease modification for incorporating the BH zonal plan into the lease conditions with further slight variations subsequently approved in 2005. Since then, the lot

owner had taken the BH zonal plan as a basis to formulate the redevelopment proposal of the site;

- (ii) the Harbour City redevelopment proposal (i.e. Gateway III) with a set of building plans consisting of a non-domestic tower up to a BH of 386.7mPD at main roof on top of a podium structure of 6-9 storeys approved by the Building Authority in 1999 with subsequent minor amendment plans approved in 2002 and 2004. The building plans were still valid;
- (iii) the URA Hanoi Road project with the Master Layout Plan (MLP) first approved by the Board in 1997. Although the maximum BH of the development under the approved scheme was 282mPD, the BH under the approved building plans was 250.05mPD as the bonus plot ratio claimed was substantially less than that in the approved scheme. The development was near completion now and had a BH of 250.05mPD in accordance with the approved building plans; and
- (iv) given the fact that Tsim Sha Tsui had been identified as a high-rise node, it was proposed that the height of these existing/committed developments should be allowed to reflect the character of a high-rise node;

[Ms. Starry W.K. Lee and Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

Proposed BH Restrictions, Other Development Restrictions and Rezoning Proposals

- (i) except the existing/committed high-rise buildings as mentioned in paragraph 5.5 of the Paper and some other high-rise buildings at or near the central commercial area, various BH bands from 60-130mPD were proposed for the “Commerical” (“C”), “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) and “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) zones in the Area, taking into account the topography, existing BHs, local character, proposed overall BH

concept and urban design principles. To provide certainty and clarity of the planning intention, the proposed BH restrictions for the above zones would mainly be specified in terms of mPD;

- (j) the proposed BH restrictions for the “G/IC” and “OU” zones were mainly to reflect the existing or planned BH of the developments and to provide visual and spatial relief to the Area. The BH control for the low-rise government, institution or community (GIC)/OU facilities, normally with a height of not more than 8 storeys, would mainly be stipulated in terms of the number of storeys to allow for design flexibility, unless such developments fell within visually prominent locations. For the GIC/OU facilities with more than 8 storeys, the BH control would mainly be stipulated in terms of mPD to avoid the cumulative effect of high floor height;
- (k) the proposed BH restrictions, other development restrictions and the related rezoning proposals for the nine sub-areas of the Area were detailed as per paragraph 5.6 of the Paper;

Southern Waterfront – South of Salisbury Road Area (Sub-area A)

- (l) to respect the design and uniqueness of the Cultural Centre, a maximum BH of 61mPD was proposed to reflect its existing BH. In order to maintain a low-rise character along the waterfront, the eastern part of the “OU(Ferry Concourse, Public Pier and Cultural Complex including Space Museum, Auditoria, Museum of Arts, Open Space and Car Park)” zone would be subject to a maximum BH of 30mPD. To facilitate air penetration to the hinterland along Hankow Road and Canton Road, a maximum BH of 15mPD was proposed for a strip of land between Cultural Centre and Space Museum and the area outside the Star Ferry Pier;
- (m) to reflect the development restrictions permitted under the lease and to contain the scale of redevelopment, maximum BH restrictions ranging from 30mPD to 265mPD and a maximum GFA restriction of 324,078m² were proposed for the New World Centre Complex site. Since part of the

proposed development and/or redevelopment up to a height of 265mPD would be among the tallest in the Area, provision for application for minor relaxation of the BH restrictions would not be made. Besides, any redevelopment of the existing buildings at the site had to follow the stipulated BH restrictions and could not claim existing heights. Given the strategic waterfront location of the site, the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP would specify that a visual and/or view corridor aligning with Chatham Road South should be maintained for any future development and/or redevelopment at the site which would serve as the breezeway as well. The site was proposed for rezoning to “C(7)” to effect the proposed restrictions;

Western Waterfront – West of Canton Road Area (Sub-area B)

- (n) the redevelopment of the Harbour City (Gateway III) would be subject to a maximum BH restriction of 386.7mPD which reflected the BH of the redevelopment proposal under the approved building plans;
- (o) the existing BHs of Gateway I and Gateway II were 126.3mPD and 126.1-126.3mPD respectively. Taking into account the redevelopment proposal of the Harbour City (Gateway III) and the waterfront location, they would be subject to a maximum BH restriction of 85mPD;
- (p) as recommended by the AVA study, two strips of land at a width of 30m in an east-west direction with a maximum BH restriction of 15mPD were proposed at Gateway II and III with a view to enhancing air ventilation in the area;
- (q) Gateway I, II and III were proposed for rezoning to “C(8)” to effect the proposed restrictions. Since the height of the proposed non-domestic tower (i.e. 386.7mPD) would be the tallest in the Area, provision for application for minor relaxation of the BH restrictions would not be made. Besides, any redevelopment of the existing buildings had to follow the stipulated BH restrictions and could not claim existing heights;

- (r) to achieve a stepped transition to the future West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) to the north which was capped at 70mPD, the China Hong Kong City site would be subject to a maximum BH restriction of 85mPD, with a strip of land at a width of 30m in an east-west direction at a maximum BH restriction of 15mPD to enhance air ventilation in the area. Redevelopment of the existing buildings had to follow the stipulated BH restrictions and could not claim existing heights. The site was proposed for rezoning to “C(9)” to effect the proposed restrictions;

Eastern Waterfront – Tsim Sha Tsui East Area (Sub-area C)

- (s) according to the AVA Study, Tsim Sha Tsui East was a major window for the prevailing wind from the east to the inland area around Hanoi Road. Given that majority of the existing buildings along Mody Road and south of Granville Road were in the range of 48-53.8mPD, a maximum BH of 60mPD was proposed for the “C” sites in Tsim Sha Tsui East in order to maintain the area as a key window for air penetration. The “C(4)” site covering the Concordia Plaza would be subject to a maximum BH of 98.3mPD to reflect its existing height;
- (t) a maximum BH restriction of 30mPD was proposed for the “OU (Museums)” zone covering the Hong Kong Museum of History and the Hong Kong Science Museum. To address the Board’s concerns in considering the proposed amendments to the then draft OZP No. S/K1/2 in 1986, it was proposed to incorporate a maximum site coverage restriction of 60% and a minimum building setback of 7m from the site boundary abutting Chatham Road South. With the proposed development restrictions, the requirement for the submission of a layout plan for any development within this zone for the Board’s approval as stipulated in the Remarks of the Notes would no longer be required and hence should be deleted;
- (u) the “G/IC” site covering the proposed PolyU Teaching Hotel and Staff

Quarters would be subject to a maximum BH of 111.5mPD to reflect that under the approved scheme (Application No. A/K1/216) whereas the other “G/IC” sites in this sub-area were restricted to their existing BHs;

South of Kowloon Park Area (Sub-area D)

- (v) this sub-area was characterised by narrow streets bounded by medium to high-rise mixed use developments. According to the proposed overall BH profile, the buildings facing onto Kowloon Park and in the area to the north of Middle Road were proposed to be capped at 110mPD. However, for One Peking and the redevelopment of Hyatt Regency Hotel, it was proposed to cap their maximum BH at 143.4mPD and 134.4mPD respectively to reflect their existing BH and/or that approved by the Building Authority;
- (w) to maintain an open vista and preserve the spatial prominence of the heritage buildings at the former Marine Police Headquarters (FMPHQ) site under the “CDA” zoning, a maximum BH of 14.5mPD was proposed for any new development at the southern part of the site to tally with the requirements of the Planning Brief, the latest approved scheme (Application No. A/K1/206) and the lease, whereas a maximum BH of 29.2mPD was proposed for the northern part of the site to reflect the height of the existing historic buildings;
- (x) Hotel Peninsula and its office tower would be subject to a maximum BH of 45.9mPD and 120mPD respectively to reflect the existing heights. Being a “G/IC” site in proximity to the FMPHQ site and the waterfront, the YMCA building was proposed to be restricted to a maximum BH of 90mPD, rather than 110mPD as proposed for the commercial sites north of Middle Road;
- (y) to improve air ventilation along the narrow streets, the proposed “C(6)” zone covering the redevelopment of Hyatt Regency Hotel, One Peking and other developments around Hankow Road and Peking Road as shown on

Plan 11A of the Paper would be subject to the requirement for a minimum of 1.5m wide non-building area from the lot boundary abutting public road(s), except Nathan Road;

At or around Kowloon Park Area (Sub-area E)

- (z) the existing tall buildings of the Victoria Towers at 201.5mPD were considered out-of-context and visually incompatible with the low-rise character of the adjacent Kowloon Park. According to the overall BH profile, a maximum BH restriction of 90mPD was proposed for the “R(A)” site covering the Victoria Towers and the “G/IC” site covering the Hong Kong Scout Centre. As they fell outside the view fan from key vantage points, they could still be built to a height not exceeding that of the existing building upon redevelopment;

South of Granville Road Area (Sub-area F)

- (aa) the URA Hanoi Road project site under the “CDA(1)” zoning would be subject to a maximum BH restriction of 250mPD to reflect the height of the development which was nearing completion. Since the height of 250mPD was among the tallest in the Area, provision for application for minor relaxation of the BH restrictions would not be made;
- (bb) except Hotel Panorama, the Pinnacle and the Mariners’ Club which would be subject to a maximum BH of 146mPD, 140.1mPD and 175.5mPD respectively to reflect their existing heights or that under the approved scheme, the commercial sites surrounding the URA Hanoi Road project would be subject to a maximum BH of 130mPD, which would be stepped down to a maximum BH of 110mPD for the commercial sites to the further north and south. To provide a transition to the low-rise development at the waterfront, the Sheraton Hotel and Middle Road Car Park would be subject to a maximum BH of 90mPD;
- (cc) to improve air ventilation along the narrow streets, the existing “C(1)” zone

and the proposed “C(6)” zone covering the developments between Cameron Road and Mody Road, between Granville Road and Cameron Road as well as between Mody Road and Middle Road as shown on Plan 11A of the Paper would be subject to the requirement for a minimum of 1.5m wide non-building area from the lot boundary abutting public road(s), except Chatham Road South and Nathan Road;

Observatory Hill and Adjacent Areas (Sub-area G)

- (dd) Observatory Hill provided a unique vegetated backdrop to its immediate surrounding with the presence of historic buildings such as the Hong Kong Observatory, St. Andrews Church and the Heritage Resources Centre of the Antiquities and Monuments Office. The developments encircling the “G/IC” zone should be sympathetic to the scale and size of these historic buildings. As such, the “G/IC” zone covering the Hong Kong Observatory and the historic buildings would be subject to a BH restriction of 45mPD to reflect the prevalent height of the historic buildings. The commercial sites surrounding the “G/IC” zone would then be capped at a maximum BH of 90mPD to preserve the visual openness, maintain the local setting and help reinforcing the image of Nathan Road as the entrance corridor to the Area. Except the commercial site covering the former Tung Ying Building which would be subject to a maximum BH of 156mPD to reflect that approved by the Building Authority, the commercial area to the south of Kimberley Road would be subject to a maximum BH of 110mPD to provide a transition to the high-rise developments at or around Hanoi Road;
- (ee) to improve air ventilation along the narrow streets, the existing “C(2)” zone and the proposed “C(6)” zone covering the redevelopment of Tung Ying Building and other developments between Kimberley Road and Granville Road as shown on Plan 11A of the Paper would be subject to the requirement for a minimum of 1.5m wide non-building area from the lot boundary abutting public road(s), except Chatham Road South and Nathan Road;

Between Austin Road, Jordan Road and Jordan Path Area (Sub-area H)

- (ff) the “R(A)” sites mainly along Bowring Street would be subject to a maximum BH of 80mPD to preserve the ridgeline of Kowloon Peak and Lion Rock as viewed from Sai Ying Pun and Central;
- (gg) according to the overall BH profile, the “C” sites on both sides of Nathan Road north of Austin Road would be subject to a maximum BH of 100mPD whereas the residential sites along Tak Shing Street, Tak Hing Street and Cox’s Road would be subject to a maximum BH of 80mPD to provide a transition towards the vegetated areas as well as the sports and recreation clubs to the east;

Hung Hom Station and HKPolyU Area (Sub-area J)

- (hh) a maximum BH of 45mPD was proposed for the “G/IC” site covering the PolyU to reflect the prevalent BHs of the campus;
- (ii) taking into account the findings of the Hung Hom District Study and the need to preserve the ridgeline of Tze Wan Shan, Tate’s Cairn and Middle Hill as viewed from Wanchai, the portion of the “OU(Railway Terminus, Bus Terminus, Multi-storey Car Park, Indoor Stadium, Commercial Facilities and Railway Pier” zone south of Hung Hom Bypass would be subject to a maximum BH of 15mPD. The northern portion of the “OU” zone up to the existing platform of the Hong Kong Coliseum would be subject to a maximum BH of 75mPD with a maximum BH of 25mPD in the middle in order to maintain visual access to the Harbour and to facilitate air ventilation. The remaining portion of the “OU” zone would be subject to maximum BHs of 45mPD and 55mPD to reflect the existing heights of the Hong Kong Coliseum and the Hung Hom Station respectively;
- (jj) the “G/IC” zone covering the International Mail Centre would also be subject to maximum BHs of 25mPD and 75mPD in accordance with the

recommendations of the Hung Hom District Study;

Other Rezoning Proposals

(kk) opportunity had been taken to review the zoning of the following sites:

- (i) to allow for effective land use, an area shown as 'Road' underneath the Kowloon Park Drive was proposed for rezoning to "G/IC(1)". Due to the physical constraints and environmental conditions of the site, only selected GIC uses were proposed under the Schedule of Uses for the "G/IC(1)" zone. As it was underneath an elevated road, no BH restriction was considered necessary; and
- (ii) to reflect the as-built situation, the Scout Path in between the Victoria Towers and the Hong Kong Scout Centre was proposed for rezoning from "G/IC" to an area shown as 'Road';

Photomontages Showing the Proposed BH Profile

(ll) four photomontages presenting the possible BH profile of the Area with and without the proposed BH restrictions as viewed from Sai Ying Pun, Central, Wan Chai and Tin Hau were shown;

Proposed Amendments to the OZP

(mm) amendments to the OZP, its Notes and ES as detailed in paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of the Paper as well as Attachments I, II and III of the Paper respectively were proposed to reflect the above proposed amendments. Opportunity was also taken to incorporate some technical amendments and to reflect the latest planning circumstances in the Notes and ES of the OZP respectively. The proposed amendments might be further revised to take into account the Members' views and discussions at the meeting where appropriate;

Departmental Comments

(nn) the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West commented that the proposed BH restrictions would have implication on Government's revenue upon lease modification to effect development as the premium payable would have to reflect the less design flexibility, building orientation, etc. In response, PlanD considered that the proposed restrictions were necessary to prevent the proliferation of out-of-context developments. Imposing BH restrictions on the OZP would allow certainty and transparency in the planning control system. Comments from other relevant Government departments, where appropriate, had been taken into consideration in recommending the proposed amendments to the OZP; and

Public Consultation

(oo) prior public consultation was not appropriate since pre-mature release of the intention to impose the restrictions might lead to people rushing in to submit building plans, which would defeat the purpose of incorporating the control. The public could provide their views on the proposed amendments upon exhibition of the amendments under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. The Yau Tsim Mong District Council would also be consulted during the exhibition period.

6. With the aid of a fly-through animation, Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan illustrated the BH profile of the Area under the proposed amendments.

7. Members then had a lengthy discussion on the proposed amendments and the following was a summary of the discussion and views expressed by individual Members.

Redevelopment Proposal of the Harbour City (Gateway III) and the New World Centre Complex

7.1 A Member asked whether the redevelopment proposal of the Harbour City (Gateway III) and the New World Centre Complex as stated in paragraph 5.5 of the Paper required planning permission from the Board. Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan replied in the negative as

their proposed uses were Column 1 use of the concerned “C” zone and there was no BH/GFA restrictions stipulated under the “C” zone of the existing OZP. The same Member recalled that in considering the proposed amendments to the approved Hung Hom OZP No. S/K9/20 on 22.2.2008, the BH of the existing Harbourfront Landmark at about 212.4-228.4mPD was considered very excessive and totally out-of-context with the surrounding developments. As such, the Committee decided that the Harbourfront Landmark should be subject to a maximum BH restriction of 100mPD without the claim for existing BH upon redevelopment in order to convey a clear message to the public regarding the intended BH for that site.

7.2 In addition, that Member said that for the proposed amendments to the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/13 and the approved Ma Tau Kok OZP No. S/K10/18 considered by the Committee on 14.1.2008, there were sites with building plans approved with BH exceeding the proposed BH restrictions. Notwithstanding, the Committee had agreed to the proposed BH restrictions with provision in the Notes of the OZP to allow redevelopment to the existing BHs. Such an approach would not affect the BH on the approved building plans while at the same time could convey a clear message to the public about the intended BH for the sites.

7.3 In light of the above, that Member raised concern on whether it was justifiable to allow the maximum BH restriction of 386.7mPD for the Harbour City (Gateway III) site and 30-265mPD for the New World Centre Complex site based on the BHs under the approved building plans and the lease respectively. That Member asked whether the above BHs for the two sites were considered acceptable by PlanD. Explanation for not adopting similar approach as in the case of the Wong Nai Chung and Ma Tau Kok OZPs was also sought.

7.4 In reply, Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan and Mr. Ng Tak-wah, STP/UD, made the following main points :

- (a) Tsim Sha Tsui had been identified as a “high-rise node” under the Study on Urban Design Guidelines for Hong Kong completed in 2002/03. With good urban design, it might not be inappropriate to allow tall buildings in the high-rise node to create a punctuating effect in the Hong Kong skyline. Besides, both the Harbour City and the New World Centre Complex fell outside the view fan of the key vantage points and hence the preservation

of public views to ridgeline was not a concern of these two sites; and

- (b) the Harbour City site was long and narrow in shape. A lower BH limit at the site might create impermeable building masses, blocking the flow of wind from the waterfront to the inland area. On the other hand, a higher BH limit might result in taller and narrower buildings at the site which would facilitate air penetration and hence might not necessarily be undesirable from air ventilation perspective.

[Professor Paul K.S. Lam left the meeting at this point.]

7.5 To supplement, the Chairperson said that the redevelopment proposal for the Harbour City (Gateway III) with a BH of 386.7mPD had been taken as committed development when it was included in the extensive public consultation and made known to the public under the Study on Urban Design Guidelines for Hong Kong. Given that Tsim Sha Tsui had already been developed as a key commercial node and was identified as a “high-rise node” under the Study, the presence of high-rise buildings in the Area was generally not unacceptable to the community under the public consultation of the Study.

7.6 In response to a Member’s question on whether the BH of 30-265mPD for the New World Centre Complex had also been included in the Study on Urban Design Guidelines for Hong Kong for public consultation, the Chairperson replied in the negative. Referring to Plan 10B of the Paper, the Chairperson said that the original redevelopment proposal involving a hotel development with a BH of 112mPD was shown in a photomontage extracted from the Study on Urban Design Guidelines for Hong Kong. As stated in DPO’s presentation (paragraph 5(h)(i)), a BH zonal plan ranging from 30-265mPD for the site had been subsequently agreed with the lot owner taking into account urban design consideration at that time and incorporated into the lease. Instead of having an impermeable “wall” along the harbourfront, a varying BH profile would be created under the BH zonal plan with the strip of land edging the harbourfront promenade restricted to a maximum BH of 30m.

[Mr. Anthony Loo left the meeting at this point.]

View Corridor from the Hong Kong Observatory to the Harbourfront

7.7 A Member asked whether a view corridor from the Hong Kong Observatory to the harbourfront to the further west of Canton Road through the Kowloon Park Administration Building, Lai Chack Middle School and Canton Road Government School could be provided under the proposed amendments and whether the BH restriction for the northern most part of the China Hong Kong City had to be reduced in order to provide/preserve the view corridor.

7.8 With the aid of a photograph showing the view of the harbourfront in that direction as seen from the Hong Kong Observatory, Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan replied that a view gap would be provided between the Victoria Towers and the China Hong Kong City. The same Member said that the view corridor offered by that gap should be preserved and enquired about the planned land uses to the west of the Lai Chack Middle School and Canton Road Government School which would have a bearing on the preservation of the above view corridor.

7.9 The Secretary said that the land concerned had been planned for the WKCD. On 20.2.2008, the Government had introduced the WKCD Authority Bill into the Legislative Council. According to the Bill, the WKCD Authority would be tasked with the responsibility to implement the WKCD project from its planning to the operational stages. A Development Plan for the WKCD project would be prepared by the WKCD Authority. To guide the WKCD Authority to take forward the WKCD project, proposed amendments to the draft South West Kowloon OZP No. S/K20/20 involving, among others, the proposed development parameters for controlling developments within the WKCD site had been agreed by the Town Planning Board on 14.3.2008. According to the approved development parameters, Sub-area C covering the eastern portion of the WKCD site would be subject to a maximum BH restriction of 70mPD. Besides, a waterfront promenade of not less than 20m in width would be provided to enhance public accessibility to and enjoyment of the Harbour. In vetting the Development Plan for the WKCD, Member's view relating to the preservation of the view corridor from the Hong Kong Observatory to the harbourfront would be duly taken into consideration.

Breezeway in Tsim Sha Tsui East

7.10 A Member noted that a central open space stretching from the harbourfront was

provided in Tsim Sha Tsui East. However, due to the presence of the East Ocean Centre, the central open space could not be extended to link up with the open spaces at the “OU(Museums)” zone across Granville Road. As Tsim Sha Tsui East had been identified as a key window for air penetration to the inland area under the AVA Study, it was worth considering lowering the BH on the western portion of the East Ocean Centre site which had currently blocked the central open space and allowing taller building to be erected on the eastern portion of the site upon redevelopment. This could provide a breezeway to channel the air flow from the harbourfront to the open spaces at the “OU(Museums)” zone, and possibly further inland to the Hong Kong Observatory. Although the above suggestion would result in a taller building at the eastern portion of the East Ocean Centre site, a stepped height profile could be created in the area, adding variation to the skyline.

7.11 Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan said that the existing BH of the East Ocean Centre was 51mPD and most commercial sites in the Area had been built to the maximum permissible plot ratio of 12 under the Buildings Ordinance. If the existing plot ratio had to be fully accommodated on about one-third of the site, the resultant BH on the eastern portion of the site would be very high.

7.12 The same Member said that the said breezeway could be achieved by different means. For example, an “urban window” in the form of a hollow arch allowing air flow through the archway could be provided at the East Ocean Centre site upon redevelopment. The East Ocean Centre site might also be amalgamated with the adjacent alley and/or the Harbour Crystal Centre site so as to allow more flexibility in incorporating the said breezeway within the larger amalgamated site.

7.13 Drawing reference to an application (No. A/K1/216) for the proposed PolyU Teaching Hotel and Staff Quarters with a BH of 111.5mPD at 17 Science Museum Road approved by the Board on review on 12.1.2007, a Member commented that consideration could be given to introducing special design to the development in future, which could serve the function of creating a breezeway to enhance air ventilation.

7.14 The Chairperson said that the East Ocean Centre site was held under multiple ownership and hence in reality, redevelopment of the site was unlikely in the foreseeable future. Instead of imposing a statutory requirement in the Notes of the OZP, it was suggested to

stipulate in the ES of the OZP that consideration might be given to relaxing the maximum BH restriction of the “C” site covering the East Ocean Centre if the breezeway from the harbourfront to the inland area through the central open space in Tsim Sha Tsui East could be enhanced. Members agreed.

8. Members had no further questions on the proposed amendments.
9. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree that :
 - (a) the draft Tsim Sha Tsui OZP No. S/K1/22A (to be renumbered as S/K1/23 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachments I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance, subject to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C)’s decision on the reference back of the approved OZP to the Board for amendments under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
 - (b) subject to the amendments relating to the “C” site covering the East Ocean Centre as agreed in paragraph 7.14 above, the revised ES at Attachment III of the Paper should be adopted as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP under the name of the Town Planning Board, subject to the CE in C’s decision on the reference back of the approved OZP to the Board for amendments under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan, DPO/TWK, Mr. Louis K.H. Kau, STP/TWK, Mr. Ng Tak-wah, STP/UD, and Professor Edward Ng, the AVA Consultant, for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.]