

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**(Downgraded on 7.5.2010)**

**Minutes of 417th Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 23.4.2010**

[Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), Ms. Phoebe Y.M. Chan, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK) and Ms. Una Wang, Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Consultant, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 14**

[Closed Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to  
the Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/23  
(MPC Paper No. 10/10)

---

1. The Secretary said that as the amendments to the OZP were concerned with the Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan area, the following Members had declared interests in this item :

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Ms. Maggie Chan    | - owned a flat in Sheung Wan;                             |
| Mr. Clarence Leung | - his mother owned a flat in the area; and                |
| Mr. Roger Luk      | - being a Council Member of St. Paul's College from 1992. |

2. The Committee agreed that the interests of Ms. Maggie Chan and Mr. Clarence Leung were direct and should leave the meeting temporarily. As St. Paul College was affected by the proposed amendments to the OZP, the Committee agreed that Mr. Roger Luk's interest was direct and should also leave the meeting temporarily.

[Ms. Maggie Chan and Mr. Clarence Leung left the meeting while Mr. Roger Luk left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

3. The Committee noted that a set of replacement pages which included pages 15-18 and 27-29 of the Paper, pages 2 and 9 of the Notes for the OZP in Attachment II, page 1 of

Attachment V on BH of “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) sites, pages 6 and 7 of Attachment VI on proposed rezonings on “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) sites together with Plans 16, C1 and M/H3/10/69 was tabled at the meeting.

4. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Ms. Phoebe Y.M. Chan, STP/HK, briefed Members on the proposed amendments to the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan (SYP&SW) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

#### Background

- (a) in order to provide better planning control on the building height (BH) upon development/redevelopment and to meet public aspirations for better living condition and greater certainty and transparency in the statutory planning system, Planning Department (PlanD) had been reviewing various OZPs with a view to incorporating BH restrictions for development zones to guide future development/redevelopment. Review of BH control on OZPs would stop proliferation of tall buildings which were out-of-context with the surroundings;
- (b) on the extant SYP&SW OZP, no building height restriction was imposed for most of the development zone, except the “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) zone and the site zoned “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Commercial cum Public Transport Terminus and Public Car Park” at Chung Kong Road which were subject to BH control of 12 storeys (and maximum plot ratio of 5) and 130 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) respectively. These development restrictions would be retained;
- (c) the current review focused on the imposition of BH restrictions on the other development zones, including “Commercial” (“C”), “Commercial/Residential” (“C/R”), “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”), “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and various “OU” zones. The review also covered rezoning of the “C/R” sites and zoning amendments for the GIC sites which had been developed for residential

cum commercial uses;

#### Existing BH Profile

- (d) the majority of the existing buildings in the SYP&SW Planning Scheme Area (the Area) were either low-rise or medium-rise developments on small lots. Some sites had undergone redevelopment. Amongst the taller new buildings, some were related to urban renewal schemes, such as the Center (中環中心) (288mPD), Cosco Tower (中遠大廈) (205mPD) and Queen's Terrace (帝后華庭) (125-145mPD);

#### Existing Building Age Profile

- (e) the majority of the buildings in the Area were between 30 to 50 years of age (55.8%) with some reaching 50 years or above (16%). Buildings of 10 years or under represented only about 2.7% of the total. Relatively new developments of a larger scale tend to concentrate in Sheung Wan around Queen's Road Central and Hollywood Road. Developments with a building age of 30 years or over and with a BH of 15 storeys or below were assumed to have greater potential for redevelopment;

#### Characteristics of the Area

- (f) in general, the Area could be divided into five sub-areas and their characteristics were described below;

##### *The Waterfront*

- (i) fronting the harbour were mainly sites zoned "O", "G/IC" and "OU". This cluster on reclamation land comprised the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park, Western Wholesale Food Market, tram depot, indoor games hall, fire station, police station and sewage screening plant. These developments were relatively low-rise, ranging from 1 to 4 storeys;

*Sheung Wan Central Business District (CBD) Extension*

- (ii) in close proximity to the Central District and was highly accessible by public transport, the north-eastern portion of Sheung Wan presented great potential as an extension to the CBD for accommodating high-grade commercial/office developments. Major commercial developments including the Center (中環中心) (288mPD) and Cosco Tower (中遠大廈) (205mPD) had denoted some landmark buildings that contributed to the city skyline. Existing buildings within this sub-area mostly ranged from 20 to 30 storeys, with a few older buildings of below 10 storeys clustering around Bonham Strand and north of Queen's Road Central. The Sheung Wan MTR station and the hillside escalator link facilitated public accessibility;

*Sai Ying Pun Residential Cluster*

- (iii) this sub-area was located at the western part of the Area bounded by Connaught Road West, Eastern Street, Bonham Road, Pokfulam Road and Hill Road. Area along the waterfront was a residential area intermixed with small-scale commercial, retail or hotel uses. Clusters of old residential developments over 30 years with some over 50 years in building age were found along both sides of Queen's Road West rising uphill reaching Bonham Road. Building developments in this area were in a terrace-like pattern descending from High Street down to Des Voeux Road Central and were generally characterised by low (below 10 storeys) to medium-rise residential buildings not exceeding 30 storeys, with a few office/commercial developments at Connaught Road West reaching over 40 to 50 storeys;

*Sheung Wan Residential Cluster*

- (iv) this sub-area, located to the south of Queen's Road Central bounded

by Possession Street, Po Yan Street, Tai Ping Shan Street, Bridges Street, Staunton Street and Aberdeen Street, was the downtown residential area. This residential cluster was characterized predominantly by low-rise buildings and narrow roads. The BHs of developments in this cluster varied considerably with most sites below 10 storeys while some sites had been developed into high-rise residential buildings to over 30 storeys or even 40 storeys; and

*SOHO District and Its Immediate Adjoining Area*

- (v) this area was largely an old residential area consisting of low-rise buildings with taller commercial/office developments at the periphery. Market forces had led to its transformation to a renowned entertainment district characterised by up-market eateries, bistro restaurants and bars, commonly referred to as the SOHO/Lan Kwai Fong area. Major heritage features in the area included the Former Central Police Station Compound, the former Central School (前中央書院)/former Police Married Quarters site at Hollywood Road, and some historic premises along the Dr. Sun Yat-sen Historical Trail. There had been private initiatives to renovate some of the existing low-rise buildings for various uses such as shops, galleries and eating places. The human-scale and street-level atmosphere made this sub-area a place of character and attraction. Streets and footpaths in the area are narrow and sub-standard. Traffic congestion and vehicule-pedestrian conflicts were addressed through traffic management measures, including pedestrian flow control during festive days and special events. The planning objective was to maintain this area as a pedestrian oriented area and vehicular traffic should be discouraged.

Historic Buildings

- (g) the Area was rich in historical and cultural heritage. The Central and Western District, including the Area, was important to the history of Dr.

Sun Yat-sen. There was a heritage route (known as Sheung Wan Route), covering 35 historic buildings and sites, inclusive of the Dr. Sun Yat-sen Historical Trail. Other heritage features within the Area included streets with special character, such as Wing Lok Street, Bonham Strand and Des Voeux Road West being renowned for their dried seafood market, Hollywood Road selling antique furniture and art galleries, Lascar Row selling antique pieces of various kinds and Man Wa Lane for name chops and calligraphy brushes;

- (h) amongst the heritage buildings in the Area, three sites were Declared Monuments including the Former CPS Compound, Western Market and the Old Pathological Institute (now being used as Hong Kong Museum of Medical Sciences) at Caine Lane. There were also 18 buildings listed as Grade I, II or III Historic Buildings. The BH restrictions for all the heritage buildings mostly reflected their existing heights;

#### Local Wind Environment

- (i) an AVA by Expert Evaluation (EE) had been undertaken to provide a qualitative assessment of the wind environment within the Area. In general, the prevailing annual wind came from the east and north-east and the prevailing summer wind was mainly from the east and the southerly quarters. Wind coming from the north-east and summer sea breeze over Victoria Harbour was largely blocked by buildings along the waterfront. The weakened wind from the East over the land mass and the Central District was expected to flow along main streets such as Des Voeux Road West, Queen's Road West, Second Street and High Street. However, the efficiency of these streets as air path was low due to their non-straight alignment and narrowness;

#### Major Findings and Recommendations of AVA

- (j) buildings along the waterfront should not occupy the entire site frontage. When the background prevailing wind was weak, sea breeze from the

waterfront would be highly beneficial to the area. Introduction of non-building area (NBA) would be an effective measure in improving the local air ventilation but it should preferably be included at ground level. If not practically feasible, a NBA or building gap/separation above podium level (i.e. 15m above street level) was considered an alternative effective measure;

- (k) widening of north-south major air paths by building setback upon redevelopment and connecting north-south air paths to waterfront or open spaces were useful measures for better air ventilation;
- (l) the “G/IC” and “O” zones along the air paths should be retained. Important “air spaces” including the former Central Police Station Compound, former Police Married Quarters site at Hollywood Road, King George V Memorial Park, Caine Road Garden and Caine Lane Garden, Blake Garden, Hollywood Road Park should be maintained;
- (m) perforated building towers and podium design should be encouraged;
- (n) plaza and open spaces as those in between Cosco Tower (中遠大廈) and Grand Millennium Plaza (新紀元廣場) and the Center (中環中心) providing relief and improved air spaces at the pedestrian level were useful design features that should be encouraged in congested areas;
- (o) existing narrow roads/streets and footpaths in SOHO Area subject to traffic constraints should be widened to enhance pedestrian/traffic movements and air ventilation;

#### Non-Building Areas

- (p) taking account of the findings of the AVA, NBA were recommended within the “C”, “R(A)” and “G/IC” zones as described below;
  - (i) the existing north-south air path between Hing Hon Road and Water

Street would be retained and designated as NBA. A 2m-wide NBA was designated at the eastern corner of St. Paul's College abutting Hing Hon Road to create wider north-south air/wind path to improve air penetration and visual permeability upon redevelopment;

- (ii) a 2m-wide NBA was designated on land covering the Prince Philip Dental Hospital and Bonham Road Government Primary School abutting Eastern Street, and Tung Wah Hospital abutting Po Yan Street along major north-south through streets to create wider north-south air/wind paths; and
- (iii) the existing plaza functioning as a major air space at pedestrian level between Cosco Tower and Grand Millennium Plaza would be retained and designated as a NBA.

#### Building Gaps

- (q) taking into account the circumstances of the sites concerned and the as-built situation where NBA was not practically feasible, building gaps creating air paths by appropriate design and disposition of building blocks were proposed as follows:
  - (i) to facilitate air ventilation of the Area, the areas currently used as north-south major through streets and connected with major air spaces (e.g. open spaces and some low-rise "G/IC" and "OU" sites) would be retained and enhanced by imposing a 2m set back requirement from lot boundary above 15m measured from mean street level for sites in "R(A)" and "C" zones abutting these streets to create a wider air/wind paths for more effective air penetration and visual permeability;
  - (ii) the existing strips of land above podium level currently used as an open area connecting Queen Street with Hollywood Road Park would be retained to maintain the existing building gaps and connect the



existing north-south air/wind path along Queen Street through the Park with Po Yan Street. In this regard, a strip of land covering the 1-storey structure for retail uses with landscaped open space above which formed part of the Queen's Terrace development at 1 Queen's Road West would be subject to a BH restriction of 11mPD, and two strips of land covering the podium of Lai Yan Lau at 42-56 Queen's Road West would be subject to a BH restriction of 21mPD;

- (iii) a north-south air path would be created for better air penetration by demarcating a strip of land covering the western corner of Hang Lung House at 184-192 and 194-196 Queen's Road Central subject to a BH restriction of 23mPD to maintain the existing north-south air/wind path leading from Rumsey Street through the plaza between Cosco Tower and Grand Millennium Plaza to On Wo Lane, Mee Lun Street and Aberdeen Street; and
- (iv) the podium (including the cover) of the Center at Queen's Road Central would be retained subject to a BH restriction of 24mPD to maintain the building gap above podium level for the north-south air/wind path and visual permeability.

#### Review of the "C/R" Zone and Proposed Rezoning

- (r) about 35 ha of land was zoned "C/R" covering mainly areas along Connaught Road West, Connaught Road Central, Des Voeux Road West, Queen's Road Central, Queen's Road West (northern side), rising up to Hollywood Road (northern side) and Arbuthnot Road. These sites were proposed to be rezoned as follows:
  - (i) the north-eastern part of the Area was characterized by office and commercial developments with some entertainment uses. Located in close proximity to the Central and Sheung Wan MTR Stations, well-served by established road network and public transport, sites in this part of the Area were proposed to be rezoned from "C/R" to "C";

and

- (ii) for the remaining “C/R” sites in the western part of the Area, majority of the developments were predominantly residential in nature, with lower floors used for retail/commercial activities. As they were akin to the “R(A)” type development, these sites were proposed to be rezoned from “C/R” to “R(A)”.

#### Proposed Building Height Concept and Planning Considerations

- (s) a stepped height concept was generally adopted with BH profile gradually increasing uphill, respecting the view from major vantage point at the West Kowloon Reclamation towards the ridgeline on Hong Kong side to avoid breaching the 20% building-free zone of the ridgeline;
- (t) the proposed BH bands for the Area should aim at preserving the view to the ridgeline and from the Peak to the harbour, which provided a backdrop to the area and maintained the view to the waterbody respectively;
- (u) the height profile should be sympathetic and compatible in scale and proportion with the surrounding developments. Gradation of BH profile should not exceed the maximum BHs already stipulated for the area to the immediate south under the Mid-levels West OZP. Horizontally, the BH bands descended from east to west and echoed with the general descending profile of the mountain backdrop to the west;
- (v) in general, existing buildings exceeding the relevant BH restrictions were allowed to be redeveloped to the height of the existing buildings upon redevelopment. Moreover, existing tall buildings including the Center (288mPD), and Cosco Tower (205mPD) with heights already breaching the ridgeline of the Peak from the public vantage point at the West Kowloon Reclamation, were considered as landmark buildings forming part of the city skyline;

- (w) the proposed BH bands would ensure that the urban design principles as set out in paragraph 10.2 of the Paper would not be negated while accommodating the permissible development intensity under the OZP.
- (x) the existing “G/IC” and “OU” sites would broadly be kept to their existing heights to serve as spatial and visual relief, unless there were committed proposals. In particular, the existing GIC cluster in the central and southern part, the King George V Memorial Park as well as the low-rise character of the former CPS Compound and the former Police Married Quarters (PMQ) Site at Hollywood Road should be kept to facilitate air ventilation for the benefit of the Area;
- (y) in general, the AVA recommended that existing streets, especially those in the north-south direction serving as air paths should be widened through building set back upon redevelopment. In particular, the air paths leading from the existing valleys and the existing vegetated belts in the Mid-levels West should be maintained to provide better air ventilation;

Details of the proposed BH restrictions

- (z) Details of BH proposals were set out below:

*The Waterfront and Sheung Wan CBD Extension*

- (i) to maintain a generally low profile for waterfront developments, developments were mostly kept to their existing heights or those of committed developments, apart from the “OU”(Commercial cum Public Transport Terminus and Public Car Park)” site at Chung Kong Road already subject to 130mPD under the OZP, which formed part of the Sheung Wan CBD extension;
- (ii) maximum BH of 120mPD was proposed for the area bounded by Jubilee Street to the east, Queen’s Road Central/West to the south, Centre Street to the east and Connaught Road Central to the north. In

view of its proximity to the waterfront, excessively tall buildings were discouraged in this area;

*Sai Ying Pun Residential Cluster*

- (iii) following a stepped height concept, a relatively lower height band was proposed for area near the waterfront and a higher height band for area uphill;
- (iv) a maximum BH of 100mPD was proposed for the area bounded by Connaught Road West, Hill Road, Des Voeux Road West and Western Street, giving due regard to its location near the waterfront;
- (v) maximum BH of 100mPD and 120mPD under 2-tier height control were proposed for the area bounded by Hill Road, Queen's Road West, Western Street and Des Voeux Road West. The major north-south and east-west streets serve as the major air paths in the area including Witty Street, Water Street, Western Street and Queen's Road West. Development would be restricted to 100mPD, but a BH of 120mPD would be permitted for sites with an area of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more to encourage site amalgamation for more comprehensive development and allow flexibility for accommodating on-site parking, loading and unloading facilities and other supporting facilities;
- (vi) a maximum BH of 110mPD was proposed for the street block bounded by Western Street, Centre Street, Connaught Road West and Des Voeux Road West. It was a transition between the two BH bands of 100mPD and 120mPD to its west and east respectively, and the 2-tier BH restriction of 110mPD/130mPD to the immediate south;
- (vii) maximum BH of 110mPD and 130mPD under 2-tier height control were proposed for the area covering the street blocks at the junction of Hill Road and Queen's Road West, the area around Po Tuck Street to the immediate east of Hill road, area bounded by Queen's Road

West, Pokfulam Road, Third Street and Kwong Fung Lane, along Queen's Road West and the western section of Hollywood Road bounded by Western Street, and Possession Street and Po Yan Street;

- (viii) maximum BH of 120mPD and 140mPD under 2-tier height control were proposed for the area covering First Street, Second Street and Third Street (northern side) on the sections located to the east of Pok Fu Lam Road;
- (ix) in view of different street levels, slightly higher restrictions of 140mPD, 150mPD and 160mPD were proposed for the development sites near High Street, Hing Hon Road and Bonham Road where many sites were subject to topography constraints with different levels of building platforms. More flexibility might be required on the design of future developments and slightly higher height bands were hence recommended. Such proposed BH profile was in line with the stepped-height concept, yet recognizing the difference in topography of the various building platforms;

*Sheung Wan Residential Cluster*

- (x) this residential cluster was situated on a hilly topography with site levels ranging from 3mPD to 74mPD;
- (xi) maximum BH of 110mPD and 130mPD under 2-tier height control were proposed for the development sites bounded by Eastern Street, a GIC cluster to the south, and Po Yan Street and Possession Street to the east. Development sites with an area of less than 400m<sup>2</sup> would be restricted to 110mPD, but a BH of 130mPD would be permitted for sites with an area of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more to encourage site amalgamation for more comprehensive development and allow flexibility for accommodating on-site parking, loading and unloading facilities and other supporting facilities;

- (xii) maximum BH of 120mPD and 140mPD under 2-tier height control were proposed for the downtown residential area located to the south of Queen's Road Central, bounded by Possession Street, Po Yan Street, Tai Ping Shan Street, Bridges Street, Statunton Street and Shing Wong Street;
- (xiii) a maximum BH of 150mPD was proposed for sites on higher ground at a level of about 17mPD to 65mPD, along a section of Bonham Road near its junction with Hospital Road, as well as for a small area bounded by High Street, Hospital Road and Bonham Road; and
- (xiv) a maximum BH of 160mPD for sites on higher ground at a level of about 40mPD to 75mPD, i.e. along the section of Caine Road between its junctions with Elgin Street and Ladder Street, as well as for the a small area along the upper section of Hospital Road was proposed.

#### SOHO and Its Immediate Adjoining Area

- (aa) given the improved accessibility offered by the Central-Mid-levels Escalator, close proximity of the area to the MTR station and the availability of various kinds of public transport facilities, the planning objective was to maintain this area as a pedestrian-oriented area and vehicular traffic should be discouraged. In this regard, Transport Department (TD) advised that on-site car parking and loading/unloading requirements could be waived for sites smaller than 900m<sup>2</sup> in the area. Consideration would be given to minor relaxation of the BH restriction for sites of 900m<sup>2</sup> or larger with at least 30m street frontage on two sides to cater for the provision of on-site car parking and loading/unloading facilities through the planning permission system;
- (bb) a maximum BH of 120mPD was proposed for the area bounded by Queen's Road Central, Shing Wong Street, Aberdeen Street, Hollywood Road, Wyndham Street, Glenealy and Arbuthnot Road. Development sites with

an area of less than 900m<sup>2</sup> would be restricted to 120mPD;

- (cc) a maximum BH of 130mPD was proposed for the area located between Aberdeen Street and Old Bailey Street to the south of Hollywood Road with higher site levels. Development sites with an area of less than 900m<sup>2</sup> would be restricted to 130mPD;
- (dd) a maximum BH of 140mPD for a small area to the southwest of Elgin Street and to east of Aberdeen Street, with even higher levels was proposed. Development sites with an area of less than 900m<sup>2</sup> would be restricted to 140mPD;
- (ee) a maximum BH of 150mPD was proposed for the area to the southeast of Old Bailey Street and along Arbuthnot Road and Glenealy, which involved sites situated on even higher levels. While it would be most desirable to achieve a lower height profile for this area in view of its close proximity to the Central Police Station Compound, due regard had to be given to private development rights in formulating the BH restriction;
- (ff) streets and footpaths in the SOHO area were narrow and sub-standard. Traffic congestion and vehicular-pedestrian conflicts were common. Setback requirements were proposed to be imposed within the area to provide a minimum 2m wide footpath fronting Gough Street, northern part of Shing Wong Street, Aberdeen Street, Gage Street, Staunton Street and Elgin Street; a minimum 2.5m wide footpath fronting Wellington Street; a minimum 2.75m wide footpath fronting D'Aguilar Street; and a minimum 5.5m wide carriageway at Gough Street, Elgin Street and D'Aguilar Street, upon redevelopment. A carriageway width of 5.5m could allow one lane traffic flow with roadside loading and unloading activities. This would help preserve the character of the local roads and at the same time discourage higher speed vehicular traffic;

Former Central Police Station Compound

- (gg) the compound comprised 7 buildings and structures with BH ranging from 54.2mPD to 70.1mPD. There were 17 historic buildings, which were classified into Types A and B buildings (Plan 16-A2 of the Paper) in the gist of preservation requirements previously prepared by the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) in consultation with Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) back in 2004. Type A buildings must be conserved externally and internally including the Headquarters Block and Barrack Block of CPS Compound, Hall D (West Wing) of Victoria Prison, and the former Central Magistracy. For Type B buildings, they must be conserved externally. Construction of new buildings was restricted to the Upper Platform Area while all Type A and Type B buildings should be preserved. No new development would be allowed on the Lower Platform Area. The two existing courtyards situated at the Upper and Lower Platform Areas would be preserved. The gist of preservation requirements also set out a maximum height restriction of 77mPD for any new development within the Upper Platform Area;
  
- (hh) the CPS Compound was zoned “OU” annotated “Historical Site Preserved for Cultural, Recreational and Commercial Uses (“OU(HSPCRCU)”) on the OZP. The planning intention was to preserve, restore and convert the historic site into a heritage tourism attraction that would provide a wide range of cultural, recreational and commercial facilities for the enjoyment of local residents and tourists alike. Any new development, except alteration and/or modification to an existing building and new structure(s) for facilities that were ancillary and directly related to the always permitted uses, required permission from the Board;
  
- (ii) the BHs of the existing buildings ranged from 54.3mPD to 66.8mPD and 58.2mPD to 70.1mPD on the Lower Platform and Upper Platform respectively forming a stepped BH profile. The Lower Platform was at about 45.5mPD while the Upper Platform was at about 50mPD to 56mPD.
  
- (jj) the CPS Compound had been identified by the AVA as one of the important ‘air space’ where air ventilation could be relieved given the



dense urban morphology and should be retained;

- (kk) a more detailed BH analysis had been undertaken for the site (Attachment VIII of the Paper). Photomontages showing the visual effect of new buildings/structures of 80mPD on the Upper Platform were included in the analysis. In addition, a photomontage at Plan 16A-9 of the Paper showing an overview of the site was also prepared to illustrate the stepped height profile;
- (ll) BH restrictions of 60mPD and 70mPD were proposed mainly to reflect and contain the existing height of the historic buildings on the Lower and Upper Platform, and a BH of 80mPD is proposed to cater for new buildings/structures on the Upper Platform. The proposed BH of 60mPD, 70mPD and 80mPD are considered appropriate for reinforcing the existing stepped BH profile within the Compound while allowing some flexibility for new buildings/structures;

Former Police Married Quarters (PMQ) site at Hollywood Road

- (mm) the former PMQ site at Hollywood Road had a history relating to the Central School. In view of the heritage significance, the site had been zoned “OU” annotated “Heritage Site for Creative Industries and Related Uses”, the planning intention of which was to preserve the heritage value of the site for adaptive re-use of the site for creative industries and related uses;
- (nn) the Site comprised three main platforms descending from Staunton Street to Hollywood Road. The upper platform was at about 46mPD, while the middle platform and the lower platform were at about 44mPD and 39mPD respectively. There were three vacant Government premises of about 15,000m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area (GFA) with Block A of 8-storey (71.1mPD) and Block B of 7-storey (67.1mPD) on the middle platform, and the Junior Police Call (JPC) Club House of 2-storey (47.4mPD) and a courtyard on the lower platform. According to the AMO, the site history associated to

the PMQ was of less heritage significance and hence there were no conservation requirements on the buildings of the PMQ;

- (oo) as part of the current comprehensive review of the BH control for the Area, a maximum BH of 75mPD was proposed to be imposed on the site to ensure any development, including addition, alteration and/or modification to the existing buildings, would be compatible with the surrounding and continue to serve as a visual relief for the locality;

“G/IC” Sites

- (pp) the “G/IC” sites were intended to provide the necessary GIC facilities and to serve as breathing space and visual relief in the densely built-up environment. The Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP would be amended to reflect this planning intention clearly. To provide clarity and to ensure compatibility of future developments/redevelopments with their surroundings, it was considered appropriate to impose BH restrictions for all the “G/IC” sites basically to contain their development scale or to reflect their existing BH;
- (qq) the proposed BH restrictions were mainly to reflect the existing BHs of the various GIC developments unless there were committed proposals for known developments or a need to meet the minimum height requirement (e.g. standard requirement of eight storeys for school development);
- (rr) there were 67 “G/IC” sites in the Area. The majority of these “G/IC” sites had been developed to their designated uses including 18 for educational uses, 26 for Government uses, 12 for community uses, 8 for utility/other uses but 3 sites were yet to be developed;
- (ss) the proposed BH restrictions for the “G/IC” zones would be in terms of number of storeys for low-rise development or the buildings not taller than 13 storeys to allow some flexibility for specific functional requirements of various GIC facilities, and in terms of mPD for office or residential

(quarters) type medium- or high-rise developments. The proposed BH restrictions for “G/IC” sites ranged from 1 storey to 11 storeys (in terms of number of storeys) and 80mPD to 110mPD (in terms of mPD). Details of these BH restrictions were shown at Plan 15 of the Paper;

#### Other “OU” Sites

(tt) there were 9 “OU” sites on the OZP to provide land for specific purposes and uses. Other than the “OU” sites of CPS Compound and PMQ, the other “OU” sites were to generally reflect the BH of existing developments from 1 storey to 4 storeys and/or to cater for some possible low-rise buildings/structures. Details of the BH proposals were shown on Plan 16 of the Paper;

#### Proposed rezoning of “G/IC” sites

##### *Rezoning of No. 6-10 Sai Yuen Lane from “G/IC” to “R(A)13”*

(uu) with an area of about 430m<sup>2</sup>, the subject “G/IC” site was currently occupied by a 17-storey (51mPD) residential building known as Yuen Fai Court (源輝閣) with the lowest two floors used as the Volunteer Action Centre (義務工作發展局義工服務中心). To reflect the as-built situation, it was proposed to rezone it from “G/IC” to “R(A)13” with a BH restriction of 130mPD to tally with that proposed for the adjacent developments. A maximum GFA of 2,650m<sup>2</sup>, of which a GFA of not less than 526m<sup>2</sup> shall be provided for GIC facilities in accordance with the approved scheme would be specified in the Notes;

##### *Rezoning of No. 6 Aberdeen Street from “C/R” and “G/IC” to “R(A)14”*

(vv) the site with an area of about 326m<sup>2</sup> was currently occupied by a 28-storey (105mPD) residential building (Tung Tze Terrace 東澤臺). The site was the subject of a number of planning applications, with the latest one (No. A/H3/353) for development of a composite commercial/residential building

approved with conditions by the Board on 20.7.2004 requiring the design and provision of a public open space. Upon completion of the residential development, a public open space of 130m<sup>2</sup> on G/F had been provided and accessible from Aberdeen Street. To reflect the as-built development, the site was proposed to be rezoned from “C/R” and “G/IC” to “R(A)14” subject to a BH restriction of 120mPD to tally with that proposed for the adjacent developments. A maximum GFA of 3,432m<sup>2</sup> and the requirement for provision of a public open space of not less than 130m<sup>2</sup> in accordance with the approved scheme were proposed;

*Rezoning of No. 35 Gage Street from “C/R” and “G/IC” to “R(A)15”*

(ww) the subject site with an area of about 325m<sup>2</sup> comprised an existing 27-storey (113mPD) commercial building (Wing Fung Building 永豐大廈). The commercial building was the subject of a planning application (No. A/H3/209) approved on 23.9.1984 for development of an office building with an area of 180.7m<sup>2</sup> on G/F reserved for a cooked food centre (the open yard on site). The Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene had confirmed that the cooked food centre proposed on the site was no longer required. It was proposed to rezone the site from “C/R” and “G/IC” to “R(A)15” as it fell within a wider area intended to be rezoned to residential use. A BH restriction of 120mPD was proposed for the site to tally with that proposed for the adjacent developments. A maximum non-domestic GFA of 5,308m<sup>2</sup>, of which not less than 180m<sup>2</sup> should be provided for Government, institution or community facilities in accordance with the approved scheme would be specified in the Notes;

*Rezoning of No. 75 Caine Road from “G/IC” to “R(A)16”*

(xx) with an area of 536m<sup>2</sup>, the subject “G/IC” site was currently occupied by a 30-storey (161mPD) residential building (known as Honor Villa 翰庭軒) with the lowest 3 floors used as a kindergarten (the True Light Kindergarten). It was proposed to rezone the site from “G/IC” to “R(A)16” with a proposed BH restriction of 160mPD to tally with that proposed for

the adjacent developments. A maximum GFA of 5,949m<sup>2</sup>, of which a GFA of not less than 799m<sup>2</sup> should be provided for GIC facilities in accordance with the approved scheme would be specified in the Notes;

*Rezoning of No. 39 Bridges Street from “R(A)” and “G/IC” to “R(A)17”*

(yy) the subject site with a total area of 1,022m<sup>2</sup> was currently occupied by an existing 33-storey (137mPD) residential development (Tung Shing Terrace 東盛臺), with the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals (TWGHs) Anita Mui Day Care Centre for the Elderly on the ground floor. The site was the subject of a planning application (No. A/H3/182) for a residential development with a day care centre for the elderly approved with conditions by the Board on 22.5.1992. To reflect the as-built situation, it was proposed to rezone the site from “R(A)” and “G/IC” to “R(A)17” with a BH restriction of 140mPD to tally with that proposed for the adjacent developments. A maximum domestic GFA of 9,891m<sup>2</sup> and a non-domestic GFA of not less than 248m<sup>2</sup> provided for GIC facilities in accordance with the approved scheme would be specified in the Notes;

*Rezoning of No. 38 Tai Ping Shan Street from “R(A)” and “G/IC” to “R(A)18”*

(zz) with an area of about 411m<sup>2</sup>, the subject site was currently occupied by an existing 29-storeyed residential development, known as View Villa (順景雅庭). The site was formerly occupied by the original Shui Yuet Kung (水月宮). It formed part of a planning application (No. A/H3/258) for the development of a composite building for residential and temple uses, which was approved with conditions by the Board on 18.10.1996. On the approved building plans, an area of about 205m<sup>2</sup> on the 1/F was indicated for temple uses by Shui Yuet Kung and Kun Yum Tong (觀音堂). Subsequently, the operators of the temples surrendered the right to relocate to the reserved premises and were now operating at 34 Tai Ping Shan Street and a premises opposite to the subject site. The premises reserved for the two temples remained vacant. The subject site was proposed to be rezoned

from “R(A)” and “G/IC” to “R(A)18” to reflect the existing development. A BH restriction of 150mPD was proposed for the site to tally with that proposed for the adjacent developments. It was proposed to specify a maximum GFA of 3,828m<sup>2</sup>, of which a GFA of not less than 205m<sup>2</sup> shall be provided for GIC facilities in accordance with the approved scheme;

*Rezoning of No. 11 Po Yee Street from “R(A)” and “G/IC” to “R(A)19”*

(aaa) with a total area of about 885m<sup>2</sup>, the subject site on private land owned by TWGHs was currently occupied by a composite residential development of 30 storeys (111mPD). The existing development known as Tower 125 (世銀花苑) comprised the TWGHs Hui Mok Tak Yu Care and Attention Home with a residential tower above. To reflect the as-built situation, it was proposed to rezone the site from “R(A)” and “G/IC” to “R(A)19” with a BH restriction of 150mPD to tally with the adjacent developments. A maximum GFA of 14,104m<sup>2</sup>, of which a GFA of not less than 3,216m<sup>2</sup> provided for GIC facilities in accordance with the approved scheme should be specified in the Notes;

*Rezoning of No. 3 Lok Ku Road from “G/IC” to “R(A)20”*

(bbb) the subject site with an area of about 1,250m<sup>2</sup> zoned “G/IC” was currently occupied by a 30-storey (96mPD) residential development (known as Lascar Court 麗雅苑). To reflect the as-built situation, it was proposed to rezone the site from “G/IC” to “R(A)20”. A BH restriction of 140mPD was proposed for the site to tally with that proposed for the adjacent developments. A maximum GFA of 12,607m<sup>2</sup> and the requirement for provision of a public passage way and an open area of not less than 430m<sup>2</sup> in accordance with the approved scheme were proposed;

*Rezoning of No. 51 Centre Street from “G/IC” to “R(A)21”*

(ccc) the subject “G/IC” site with an area of about 459m<sup>2</sup> was currently occupied by a 24-storey (103mPD) composite building (known as Richsun Garden

裕豐花園) with residential flats above a 2-storey podium containing a tutorial school and shops. To reflect the as-built situation, rezoning the site from “G/IC” to “R(A)21” with a BH restriction of 140mPD to tally with that proposed for the adjacent developments was proposed. A maximum GFA of 3,480m<sup>2</sup>, of which a GFA of not less than 196m<sup>2</sup> provided for GIC facilities in accordance with the approved scheme would be specified in the Notes;

*Rezoning of No. 96 Third Street & 97-97B High Street from “G/IC” to “R(A)22”*

(ddd) with an area of about 1,122m<sup>2</sup>, the subject “G/IC” site was currently occupied by a residential block of 27 storeys (126mPD) (known as Lechler Court (麗恩閣)), with school development on G/F to 6/F. The site was owned by the Tsung Tsin Mission of Hong Kong Incorporated. It was the subject of a number of planning applications, with the scheme (No. A/H3/193) for a 30-storey composite school and residential development approved with conditions by the Board on 5.2.1993. To reflect the existing development on site, it was proposed to rezone the site from “G/IC” to “R(A)22”. A BH restriction of 140mPD was proposed for the site to tally with that proposed for the adjacent developments. A maximum domestic GFA of 6,573m<sup>2</sup>; and a maximum non-domestic GFA of 6,934 m<sup>2</sup>, of which not less than 5,531m<sup>2</sup> provided for GIC facilities in accordance with the approved scheme would be specified in the Notes. The “G/IC” site to its immediate west currently occupied by the grade III historic building Kau Yan Church would remain intact;

*Rezoning No. 35 – 43 Bonham Strand (Mandarin Building) from “C/R” and “G/IC” to “C(6)”*

(eee) the site with an area of about 700m<sup>2</sup> was currently occupied by an existing 22-storey (about 72mPD) residential building (known as Mandarin Building (文華大廈) with 18 residential floors over a 4-storey commercial podium) located at 35-43 Bonham Strand largely within the “C/R” zone. In 1974, Government agreed to the development on the site provided that the

rear portion of the ground floor was surrendered for government use upon its completion. An area of 220m<sup>2</sup> was indicated as “Area for Government Use” on the approved building plans. The building was completed in 1979. A portion of the G/F was allocated to the Hong Kong Police Force as a confidential store and was now vacant. Relevant government departments consulted, including the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) and Government Properties Agency (GPA), had no particular comment and/or confirmed that the subject portion was no longer required for government use. As the site fell within the larger CBD extension area proposed to be rezoned from “C/R” to “C”, it was proposed to rezone the subject site from “C/R” and “G/IC” to “C(6)” with a BH restriction of 120mPD to tally with the adjacent developments. The existing residential use would not be affected by the rezoning. It was proposed to specify a maximum GFA of 7,058m<sup>2</sup>, of which not less than 220m<sup>2</sup> shall be provided for GIC facilities in accordance with the approved scheme;

*Rezoning of a strip of land adjoining the Western Wholesale Food Market from “G/IC” to “OU(Wholesale Market)”*

(fff) the subject “G/IC” site with an area of 2,575m<sup>2</sup> formed part of access area to the Western Wholesale Food Market which was zoned “OU(Wholesale Market)”. For boundary adjustment and to reflect the existing use on site, it was proposed to rezone this portion of land from “G/IC” to “OU (Wholesale Market)”;

(ggg) details of the proposed rezonings were shown in Plans D to P of the Paper;

Proposed Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan, Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP

(hhh) the proposed amendments to the OZP were shown on the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/23A at Attachment I of the Paper. They were mainly related to stipulation of BH restrictions, designating NBAs and rezoning of “C/R” and “G/IC” sites;



- (iii) major amendments to the Notes included revision the notes of the “C”, “R(A)”, “G/IC” and “OU” zones to include BH restriction, deletion of the Notes of the “C/R” zone and revision of the remarks of the “C”, “R(A)”, “G/IC” and “OU” zones to incorporate development restrictions for the sub-zones “C(4)” to “C(6)”, “R(A)6” to “R(A)22” and “G/IC(1)”, and “OU” zones;
  
- (jjj) the ES of the OZP was proposed to be revised to take into account the proposed amendments to the OZP. Opportunity had also been taken to update the general information for the various land use zones to reflect the latest status and planning circumstances of the OZP;

#### Other Provisions under the OZP

- (kkk) in general, existing and committed development exceeding the proposed BH would not be affected. Minor relaxation of BH and GFA restrictions would be considered by the Board on individual merits through the planning application system. Minor relaxation of NBA and setback requirements would only be considered under exceptional circumstances;

#### Departmental Consultation

- (lll) no adverse comments were received from Government departments;

#### Public Consultation

- (mmm) since the proposals involved BH control, it was considered not appropriate to carry out prior public consultation. Any pre-mature release of the development control information might lead to people rushing in to submit building plans before the control was incorporated into the OZP. This would defeat the whole purpose of development control; and
  
- (nnn) the Central & Western District Council would be consulted on the

amendments during the exhibition period of the draft OZP.

5. Mr. Laurence Li said that he was a member of the AAB from January 2009 to December 2010 and Ms. Julia Lau said that she had previously expressed views on a s.12A application (No. Y/H3/4) regarding the CPS Compound site. This was noted by the Committee.

6. A Member asked why there were such a number of sites in the SYP&SW area that required the provision of GIC facilities but were left vacant. Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK, explained that in the 1980's and 1990's, the Board had approved a number of redevelopment proposals for residential or commercial developments on areas zoned "G/IC". In allowing for such developments, the Board had normally included a requirement for the provision of GIC facilities within the development, based on the need submitted by concerned Government department at that time. However, by the time when the development was completed, some GIC facilities might no longer be required by that department. Continuous effort had been made by Government Properties Agency (GPA) and relevant Government departments to identify alternative GIC uses or operators for these sites. The Secretary supplemented that SYP&SW area was designated as an urban improvement area in the 1960's but there was a lack of sites for GIC uses and open space in the built-up city area. In view of that, some private land had been identified for GIC uses but in zoning the sites as "G/IC", the OZP had made provision for application for residential/commercial use with/without the inclusion of GIC facilities. Government departments would be requested to submit their requirements for GIC facilities when an application for redevelopment was received. Such mechanism had catered for the need for redevelopment and the provision of GIC facilities. Given that some redevelopment projects had taken a long time to implement, the need for GIC facilities had changed in time, thus rendering some GIC sites being left vacant when the project was completed. PlanD would continue to liaise with GPA and other relevant Government departments to identify suitable GIC uses for these sites. The same Member asked if no Government department expressed interest in these sites, what would be the way forward. The Secretary replied that consideration could be given to allocate these sites to non-Government Organisations.

7. In response to another Member's enquiry, Ms. Au clarified that the area for GIC uses at 35-43 Bonham Strand was a Government premises and was currently vacant. PlanD

would liaise with relevant Government departments to identify suitable user for the premises.

8. In response to the Vice-Chairman's enquiry, the Chairman confirmed that in the proposed rezoning, the development potential of the residential development on the "G/IC" sites had been reflected in the new zoning and the GFA for the GIC use was separately included under the Notes of the respective zoning.

9. A Member expressed reservation on the proposed BH restriction of 80mPD for the Upper Platform of the CPS Compound site which would allow an increase in building bulk at a site of high preservation value and this Member cast doubt on the impact on the already congested traffic condition in the area and the compatibility of the BH of 80mPD with the surrounding areas. Ms. Au responded that Hong Kong Jockey Club (HKJC) Charities Trust had entered into partnership with the Government to revitalise the CPS Compound site into a cultural and art centre. HKJC had proposed a tall building structure within the CPS Compound two years ago which had aroused much public concern. Though the previous concept was dropped, HKJC would still need space to provide new facilities within the CPS Compound. Against this background, BH restrictions of 60mPD and 70mPD were proposed for the Lower and Upper Platform respectively to reflect and contain the existing BH of the historical buildings. Whilst most of the buildings within the CPS Compound were required to be retained, new building structures would be allowed only in two areas on the Upper Platform. These two areas were restricted to a BH of 80mPD which was slightly higher than the existing buildings within the Compound to allow some flexibility. A detailed BH analysis for the site conducted by the Urban Design and Landscape Section of PlanD at Attachment VIII of the paper concluded that the visual impact created by a building at BH of 80mPD would be similar to the existing situation and would have negligible visual impact on the retained historic buildings when viewed from the highly patronized elevated walkway, Hollywood Road and Arbuthnot Road. Though detailed designs regarding the external appearance and finishes of the new buildings at the CPS Compound were not yet available, Members should note that any new development would require planning permission from the Board. Members would have the chance to scrutinise the design of the new buildings in the consideration of the planning application.

10. The same Member asked whether relevant authority on preservation had been consulted. Noting the historical significance of the CPS Compound site, this Member raised

some concern on the part that HKJC was chosen as a partner without going through a tendering process and the public had no knowledge on the overall compatibility of the project. Ms. Au replied that the Commissioner of Heritage and Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) had been consulted on the proposed BH restrictions. She reiterated that the Board could comment on the detailed design of the new buildings including the colour scheme, external appearance and finishes and the traffic impact of the proposal under the planning application system.

11. In response to the same Member's enquiry, Ms. Au said that the CPS Compound site involved two existing platforms forming a stepped-height topography. The proposed BH of 80mPD at some parts of the site would reinforce the stepped-height profile. This Member stressed the importance of having a compatible design for the future development from a preservation point of view and this should take priority over the need for economic viability. This Member considered that the BH restriction should not exceed the BH of the existing buildings and it would be up to the project proponent to justify the need to exceed the BH restriction.

12. The Chairperson explained that the proposed BH restriction of 80mPD was only a maximum providing a reference point for the project proponent and for the public, recognising that the community showed much dissatisfaction to a previously proposed structure of some 160mPD in height. The detailed design of the proposal would need to be submitted under the planning application system whereby any member of the public could submit comment on the proposal for the Board's consideration. Another Member agreed that the 80mPD could be set as a ceiling to allow flexibility in design and the Board could determine whether the proposal was compatible with the surroundings when it was submitted to the Board for consideration. The Vice-Chairman considered that the 80mPD BH restriction would allow flexibility in design to incorporate special architectural features and as the CPS Compound was intended for art and cultural use, a BH restriction higher than the existing height would allow flexibility to accommodate the facilities required.

13. A Member considered that the BH restriction imposed should reflect the intention of the Board. Taking into account the importance of the CPS Compound in preservation of historical buildings, the BH restriction imposed should be justified by a proposal to develop the site as a preservation led project. This Member was of the view that the information

available would not justify the BH restriction which was generally 20m over the existing buildings. Ms. Au explained that the CPS Compound was one of the heritage tourism projects in 2004 and a BH restriction of 77mPD for the whole site was proposed by AMO and accepted by AAB. The rationale at that time was to allow 10% increase over the existing maximum BH of about 70mPD. Under the current OZP review exercise, PlanD had conducted a detailed BH analysis taking into account the site characteristics and compatibility with the surrounding areas. A 3-band concept to reflect a stepped-height profile was recommended. The Analysis concluded that a BH of 80mPD would not create significant visual impact. Ms. Au further said that whilst the stipulation of a BH of 80mPD on the OZP would give a clear guideline to the project proponent, Members could still consider the design of the future proposal under the planning application system. The Board would not be bound to accept a proposal even if it did not exceed the BH restriction.

14. A Member said that there was no objection to the imposition of BH restriction and suggested setting the restriction to the existing BH level and if a good proposal was submitted, the BH restriction could be relaxed.

15. The Secretary drew Members' attention to the distinction between the plan-making process and the s.16 planning application process in terms of public consultation. She said that the zoning of the CPS Compound site had gone through the plan-making process and was approved by the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C). When the Board considered the CPS Compound zoning previously, it was decided that any new buildings within the site would require the Board's approval. The current OZP review exercise was to stipulate BH restrictions for the entire SYP&SW area which included the CPS Compound site. It would be unreasonable to leave the CPS Compound site out in the BH review. The stipulation of BH restrictions on the OZP, which was a response to public aspiration for control on development, would give public a chance to submit representations on the BH restrictions and also be heard before the Board. The OZP, together with the outstanding representations would be submitted to the CE in C for consideration. The BH restrictions on the OZP, once approved by CE in C, would lay down a framework to guide future development. While the public could submit their comments to the Board for consideration at s.16 planning application stage, they did not have the opportunity to address the Board directly as in the plan-making process. Members should consider at this meeting whether the 3-band BH restrictions of 60mPD, 70mPD and 80mPD for the CPS Compound site was

considered appropriate.

16. The Vice-Chairman opined that the BH restriction could avoid excessively tall buildings such as the tall building proposed by HKJC earlier on. He agreed that the BH restriction of 80mPD for the Upper Platform was appropriate for inclusion into the OZP to solicit public view.

17. Another Member said the CPS Compound site could be considered for conversion into a theatre for performance arts and a higher BH restriction was supported to allow flexibility to meet the technical requirement of a theatre which might include a fly tower. In response to this Member's enquiry, a Member said that the height of a fly tower should be around 30m. Ms. Au supplemented that the site level of the Upper Platform was 55.8mPD. Under a BH restriction of 80mPD, a building of about 24m could be constructed on the Upper Platform.

18. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Chairperson explained the background of BH control on OZPs. In the past, BH restrictions were mostly set out in low to medium density areas. In recent years, comprehensive BH control had been imposed on OZP progressively with a view to avoiding the proliferation of excessively tall buildings which were out-of-context with the surroundings.

19. The same Member asked how the Type A and Type B buildings within the CPS Compound as shown in Plan 16A-2 of the Paper were defined and whether they were subject to statutory control. Ms. Au replied that the historical buildings were classified into Type A and Type B in the gist of preservation requirements prepared by AMO in consultation with AAB in 2004. The preservation requirements were included in the tender at that time. Ms. Au also indicated that the CPS Compound was a declared monument and was subject to statutory control under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance.

20. The Chairperson noted that two Members had reservations on the 80mPD for the CPS Compound site but other Members agreed that the BH restriction of 80mPD could be included in the OZP and the views of the public could be solicited through the submission of representations and comments to the Board after the OZP was exhibited for public inspection under the Ordinance.

21. Ms. Au informed the meeting that the site at 35 Gage Street was originally proposed to be rezoned to "R(A)15" in the paper. However, since the intention was to reflect the completed commercial development and it would be subject to a maximum non-domestic GFA in the Notes of the OZP, Members could consider rezoning it to a sub-zone of "C" instead. In terms of land use, the site was adjoining the Urban Renewal Authority development scheme at Peel Street and Graham Street, a "C" zoning would be appropriate. The remarks of the relevant sub-zone of "C" would adopt the development restrictions proposed for "R(A)15". Members agreed.

22. The Chairperson said that the Secretariat would further check the accuracy of the proposed amendments to the OZP, Notes and ES. The above documents, after incorporating the refinements (if any), would be published under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance.

23. Referring to paragraph 13.1.3 and Attachment VI of the Paper, the Secretary pointed out that the first approval date of the planning application for Tung Tze Terrace should be earlier than 2004 and the 2004 approval was an amendment to a previously approved scheme dated back to 2001.

24. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to agree that :

- (a) subject to the amendment on the zoning of the site at 35 Gage Street to a sub-zone of "C" as agreed in paragraph 21 and the refinements as described in paragraph 22 above, the proposed amendments to the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/23 and the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/23A at Attachment I (to be renumbered to S/H3/24 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 7 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) subject to the amendment on the zoning of the site at 35 Gage Street to a sub-zone of "C" as agreed in paragraph 21 and the refinements as described in paragraph 22 above, the revised ES at Attachment III of the Paper for the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/23A should be adopted

as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zones on the Plan and the revised ES would be published together with the Plan.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK, Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan, STP/HK and Ms. Una Wang, AVA Consultant, for their attendance to answer Members' enquires. Ms. Au, Ms. Chan and Ms Wang left the meeting at this point.]

[Messrs. C.W. Tse, Felix Fong and Maurice Lee left the meeting while Mr. Roger Luk returned to join the meeting at this point.]



[Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), Mr. David C.M. Lam, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK) and Ms. Una Wang, Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Consultant, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 15**

[Closed Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to  
the Approved Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H15/24  
(MPC Paper No. 9/10)

---

25. The Committee noted that Mr. K.Y. Leung had an declared interest in this item as his mother owned a flat in Ap Lei Chau and his employer, the University of Hong Kong intended to acquire a piece of land in the Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau (A&ALC) area for its development. The Committee also noted that Mr. Laurence Li owned a flat in the A&ALC area and had an declared interest in this item. As Messrs. Leung and Li had landed interests within the planning area of the OZP, the Committee agreed that they should leave the meeting temporarily.

[Messrs. K.Y. Leung and Laurence Li left the meeting at this point.]

26. The Committee noted that Mr. Roger Luk was the Independent Non-Executive Director of Wheelock Properties Limited which had a property in Heung Yip Road and had declared an interest in this item. As the proposed amendments to the OZP did not involve Heung Yip Road, the Committee considered that Mr. Luk's interest was indirect and agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

27. The Committee noted that a set of replacement plans of Plans 14A, D, E and G of the Paper was tabled at the meeting.

28. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr David C.M. Lam, STP/HK, briefed Members on the proposed amendments to the draft A&ALC OZP as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

### Background

- (a) A&ALC was a famous tourist area in Hong Kong. The gazetting of the South Island Line (East) (SIL(E)) in July 2009 provided impetus to development/redevelopment in the A&ALC area (the Area). There was a need for building height (BH) control to prevent excessively tall buildings which were out-of-context with the surroundings;
  
- (b) BH restrictions had already been imposed on “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”), “Other Specified Uses (Country Club)” zone, the eastern portion of the “OU (Electrical Supply Installation and Hotel)” zone in South Horizons, “OU (Business)” zone in Wong Chuk Hang Business Area, “OU (Commercial Development with Multi-storey Public Lorry Park)” zone, two “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) sites and an “OU (Petrol Filling Station)” site. The current BH review mainly covered the development zones in the Area, including “Commercial” (“C”), “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”), “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) and “Industrial” (“I”) zone as well as those “G/IC” and “OU” zones currently not subject to BH restrictions;

### Development Profile of the Area

- (c) buildings developments were concentrated along the east-west spine and the waterfront areas. The southern and eastern coasts were zoned for conservation purpose. The vegetated hillslopes in the north and south provided green backdrops for the Area. The part to the west of Ap Lei Chau Bridge was basically residential with an industrial area on Ap Lei Chau and some waterfront industrial/utility facilities. The eastern part, apart from the ex-Wong Chuk Hang Estate site, was less residential in nature and occupied Ocean Park, Wong Chuk Hang Business Area (WCHBA) and some GIC uses. Aberdeen sub-area was basically a densely developed residential area with some commercial and industrial buildings scattered around;

### Existing BH Profile

- (d) in general, the existing BH profile was predominantly low- to medium-rise (below 80mPD) in character except for some newer high-rise developments/redevelopments scattered around. The older low-rise tenement buildings were mainly found in the waterfront areas in Tin Wan, Aberdeen, and north-eastern Ap Lei Chau. Major high-rise developments include South Horizons, Aberdeen Centre, those newer public housing developments and those in the WCHBA;

### Existing Building Age Profile

- (e) in general, private developments in the southern part of Tin Wan, the areas along Aberdeen Main Road in Aberdeen, the northern part of Ap Lei Chau and WCHBA were older. The newer private developments (20 years or below) mainly concentrated in South Horizons and the Ap Lei Chau West industrial area, with some individual ones scattered near the waterfront in Tin Wan, Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau and along Shum Wan Road. Public housing developments were generally newer (15 years or below), except Yue Fai Court (30 years) and Yue Kwong Chuen (above 40 years) in Aberdeen as well as those on Ap Lei Chau (all above 20 years);

### Five Sub-Areas in the Area

#### *Tin Wan Sub-Area*

- (f) the northern sloping part of Tin Wan was mainly occupied by high-rise (taller than 30 storeys) and newer (less than 20 years) public housing developments. The area to their south was mainly occupied by smaller scale private residential developments with a few commercial, hotel and residual industrial developments. Existing BH ranged from 3 to 35 storeys (up to 115mPD), predominantly low- to medium-rise (below 80mPD) with low-rise tenement buildings older than 40 years along Tin

Wan Street. A number of taller buildings scattered in the area including Waterfront South (about 115mPD) near the waterfront. Low-rise industrial and utility uses were found along waterfront except for Hing Wai Ice and Cold Storage Building (53mPD) and Hing Wai Centre (113mPD);

*Aberdeen Sub-Area*

- (g) the western part was mainly occupied by a large-scale residential cum retail development, Aberdeen Centre (residential blocks of 29-32 storeys, or about 88-91mPD) and a number of scattered high-rise buildings. To the east of Aberdeen Centre were mainly low-rise tenement buildings on small sites, intermixed with some taller buildings. The higher platforms to the further east were occupied by Yue Fai Court (about 148mPD), Shek Pai Wan Estate (about 168-176mPD) and the older Yue Kwong Chuen generally lower than 10 storeys. To the south, the high-rise Ocean Court (about 99-102mPD) was located at the waterfront. There was a cluster of mainly low- to medium-rise private residential buildings ripe for redevelopment to the north of Aberdeen Praya Road;

*Wong Chuk Hang Sub-Area*

- (h) the eastern part was mainly occupied by Ocean Park, ball courts/sports ground and low- to medium-rise GIC uses (predominantly below 10 storeys). The WCHBA already subject to BH restrictions of 120mPD and 140mPD was an old industrial area under gradual transformation. The proposed rezoning for the redevelopment of ex-Wong Chuk Hang Estate site, which was proposed for SIL(E)'s property development, would be submitted to the Committee for consideration in due course while the BH restrictions of the site were covered in the current BH review. Two taller residential developments are located at Welfare Road, namely, Jumbo Court (21 storeys/about 79mPD) and one under construction (37 storeys/about 117mPD);

*Sham Wan and Brick Hill Sub-Area*

- (i) other than Ocean Park in the southern half, building developments were concentrated on the north-eastern waterfront and in the inland area. The predominant uses were GIC, recreational and low-rise industrial uses with 3 residential developments. Apart from the Marine Police Aberdeen Base (16 storeys/about 59mPD), Aberdeen Marina Club (maximum 11 storeys excluding basement) and Aberdeen Boat Club (4 storeys), the waterfront at Po Chong Wan was mainly occupied by low-rise uses not taller than 2 storeys. The inland area was occupied by low- to medium-rise GIC facilities ranging from 3 to 15 storeys. The 3 high-rise residential developments were Grandview Garden (about 112mPD), South Wave Court (about 120-136mPD) and Broadview Court (about 140-144mPD);

*Ap Lei Chau Sub-Area*

- (j) developments were mainly found in the northern and central parts and predominantly residential in nature. The north-western part was occupied by a comprehensive private housing development (South Horizons) of over 30 storeys (about 108-133mPD) with a cluster of lower buildings of commercial centres, school and electricity supply installation at the centre. To the east along the waterfront was Ap Lei Chau Estate of 18-28 storeys (72-93mPD) on a higher platform. Further east is the older built-up area on flat land mainly occupied by low- to medium-rise buildings on small sites intermixed with some taller buildings including Marina Habitat (about 139-141mPD). A high-rise residential development, Sham Wan Towers (up to about 167mPD), was located further east across Ap Lei Chau Bridge. Elevated platforms to the south of Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road accommodated 2 high-rise public housing developments (Lei Tung Estate and Yue On Court). The “R(E)” zone to their east was a high-rise residential development (about 126-136mPD) under construction;

Historic Buildings

- (k) the Wong Chuk Hang Rock Carving, the bridge, dam and valve house of

Aberdeen Upper Reservoir, and the dam of Aberdeen Lower Reservoir were declared monuments. The graded historic buildings/structures in the Area included those in Aberdeen Lower Reservoir, namely, the valve house and management office (Grade II) and the chemical house, air vents and management office (Grade III). The other graded historic buildings are Hung Shing Temple on Ap Lei Chau (Grade I), Shui Yuet Temple on Ap Lei Chau and Tin Hau Temple (both Grade III), Aberdeen Technical School (Grade III) and the Old Aberdeen Police Station (Grade II). All these buildings/structures fell within “CP”, “GB” or “Open Space” and “G/IC” zones;

#### Recommendations and Measures of Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA)

- (l) an AVA by expert evaluation (EE) had been undertaken to provide a qualitative assessment of the wind environment within the Area, to identify problem areas and propose mitigation measures;
- (m) the AVA had identified Wong Chuk Hang Road and the area parallel to Heung Yip Road/nullah from Ocean Park to the waterfront as important east-west air paths. In addition, the east-west oriented roads namely Police School Road, Welfare Road, Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road and South Horizon Drive were also the main air paths in the Area. The main north-south oriented roads in Aberdeen extended from the waterfront channelled the southerlies and sea breezes to the inland area and were also important air paths;
- (n) the natural and vegetated hills and slopes in the Area contributed to the cool and fresh air, while the major open areas like Aberdeen Sports Ground, Wong Chuk Hang Recreation Ground and Ap Lei Chau Park were important air circulation spaces;
- (o) upon redevelopment of Ap Lei Chau Estate, 2 air paths of 15-20m wide extending from Yi Nam Road and the Hong Kong Southern District Government Primary School respectively to the waterfront to channel

southerly winds and sea breezes were proposed. An AVA should be undertaken for future redevelopment of Ap Lei Chau Estate;

- (p) for Yue Kwong Chuen with a site area of about 2 ha, it was highly recommended that an AVA be undertaken for its future redevelopment;
- (q) the existing low-rise Tin Wan Shopping Centre and Tin Wan Estate car park building located in the middle part of the Tin Wan area should be respected upon their redevelopment;
- (r) future developments along the major east-west air path in the Area lying parallel to Heung Yip Road/the nullah should not disturb air ventilation potential and should be substantiated by AVAs. In particular, the future development at the ex-Wong Chuk Hang Estate site had to be carefully designed for air ventilation. Disposition of the towers should maintain the east-west air flow. Terraced podium design and voids between towers and podium to allow porosity near ground level should also be considered;
- (s) Old Main Street Aberdeen served as a useful air path for southerly wind. However, the street canyon was perpendicular to prevailing wind from the east. As the ratio of the heights of buildings along the street to the width of that street was high, it might be difficult for the easterly wind to downwash from the top of the buildings to the street level. The street would therefore need to rely on the horse-shoe vortex effect for air ventilation, which channelled the easterly wind from the streets on either side via the street junctions flowing to the inner part of Old Main Street Aberdeen. It was therefore beneficial to widen the street so as to enhance the penetration of the vortexes. Set-back of buildings for street widening was a desirable arrangement. However, by taking into account the fact that the sites along this street were mainly small lots and the imposition of non-building area restriction to achieve the set-back would impose undue constraints on the future developments on these sites, a “second-best” alternative to start a set-back of a 2m wide above the podium was acceptable;

- (t) Tang Fung Street was an important air path for Ka Wo Street and its surrounding areas providing beneficial air ventilation to the neighbourhood. Hence, a non-building area was recommended for the piece of private land adjoining the eastern end of Tang Fung Street. Exceptionally, due to practical considerations, a perforated podium not taller than 15m would be a compromise;

Urban Design Concepts for Formulating Building Height Restrictions (Plan 4 of the Paper)

- (u) a gradation of BH or stepped height profile was adopted through designation of different height bands for various parts of the Area. The urban design principle of low-lying structures along the waterfront should be respected;
- (v) the visual/green corridors in the Area should be preserved and vistas along the corridors should be opened up as much as possible. There were 4 visual/green corridors in the Area which were free from high-rise developments;
- (w) the overall height profile should soften the congested building masses to maintain openness, enhance visual connectivity and create diversity and variety in the building height profile to enhance visual interest without compromising future development in the Area. The low-rise structures within the GIC sites were intended to provide breathing space, allowing visual and spatial relief within the congested inland built-up area;
- (x) the proposed building height profile should pay particular attention to the visual impacts on Aberdeen Harbour and Ocean Park which were two key tourist attractions of territorial significance;
- (y) in general, the overall building height concept for the Area aimed at consolidating a stepped height profile where circumstances permitted. A



two-tier approach was proposed for small lots to encourage site amalgamation for better-designed developments and inclusion of on-site parking and loading/unloading and other supporting facilities. If such sites were amalgamated to exceed 400m<sup>2</sup>, a higher BH would be allowed;

Proposed BH Restrictions (Plan 11 of the Paper)

*Tin Wan Sub-Area*

- (z) 3 height bands from the north stepping down to the south to the waterfront were proposed. For the waterfront industrial and utility facilities in the west, the proposed height restrictions were to reflect the intention for low-lying structures. The BH proposals were as below:
- (i) a maximum BH of 2 storeys for the waterfront “T” site occupied by the Town Gas Aberdeen Depot to the west of the breakwater;
  - (ii) a maximum BH of 30mPD for the waterfront “T” site occupied by the Hong Kong Ice and Cold Storage (about 23mPD);
  - (iii) a maximum BH of 85mPD with two-tier provision for 2 street blocks abutting Tin Wan Street to the north of Shek Pai Wan Road and a street block bounded by Shek Pai Wan Road and Aberdeen Praya Road. Maximum BH of 100mPD would be permitted for the sites with an area of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more;
  - (iv) a maximum building height of 100mPD for the remaining sites in the southern part. Only 3 existing developments exceeded the height restriction including a hotel (about 105mPD), a residual industrial building (about 102mPD) and a residential development, known as Waterfront South (about 115mPD) near Aberdeen Praya Road;
  - (v) a maximum building height of 110mPD for the “T” site occupied by Hing Wai Ice and Cold Storage (about 53mPD) and Hing Wai Centre

(about 113mPD) to generally reflect the existing height; and

- (vi) a maximum building heights of 130mPD and 150mPD for the public housing developments of Hung Fuk Court (about 119mPD) and Tin Wan Estate (about 147mPD) on higher platforms to create a stepped height profile.

*Aberdeen Sub-Area*

(aa) a height profile stepping up from waterfront towards the north-east was proposed. The lowest band of 100mPD was proposed to cover the flat land to the west of Yue Fai Road. The BH proposals were as below:

- (i) a maximum BH of 80mPD for Pik Fai House (a Small Household Block) to the north of Shek Pai Wan was proposed to provide a height variation in the Shek Pai Wan Estate and keep the visual relief and breathing space created by it and the adjacent school building;
- (ii) a maximum BH of 85mPD with two-tier provision for the street block bounded by Yue Fai Road and Aberdeen Main Road, the street block to the north of Aberdeen Main Road, the sites bounded by Aberdeen Centre and Aberdeen Main Road and a row of sites abutting Aberdeen Praya Road in the east was proposed. Maximum BH of 100mPD would be permitted for sites with an area of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more;
- (iii) a maximum BH of 100mPD for Aberdeen Centre (about 88-91mPD), Abba House and Abba Commercial Building (about 102-103mPD), sites bounded by the cemetery and Aberdeen Main Road, an existing residential development to the north of Aberdeen Praya Road and Ocean Court (about 99-102mPD) on the eastern waterfront. This height band also covered 2 residential developments in the “R(E)” zone, namely Jade Water (about 139mPD) and Bayshore Apartments (about 130mPD) at the western tip;

- (iv) a maximum BH of 120mPD for the western part of Yue Kwong Chuen and Yue Fai Court (about 108-109mPD). The proposed height band mainly served as a transition between the 85/100mPD height band to the west of Yue Fai Road and the higher height bands behind. The proposed maximum height would also allow reasonable scope for future redevelopment of Yue Kwong Chuen;
- (v) a maximum BH of 140mPD for the eastern part of Yue Kwong Chuen on a higher platform was proposed. This provided a height variation within the estate boundary; and
- (vi) a maximum BH of 170mPD for Shek Pai Wan Estate (about 168-176mPD) sitting on an elevated platform was proposed to reflect the existing building heights.

*Wong Chuk Hang Sub-Area*

- (bb) a maximum BH of 120mPD was proposed for the two sites at Welfare Road, which were respectively occupied by Jumbo Court (about 78mPD) and a residential development (117mPD) under construction;
- (cc) a maximum BH of 155mPD for the “R(A)” site at the ex-Wong Chuk Hang Estate site was proposed. The site would be rezoned to “Comprehensive Development Area” with appropriate development restrictions. Planning Brief would also be prepared to guide the future development. The proposed BH of the property development would range from about 120mPD to 155mPD with a lower building height at the south-western side nearer to the waterfront increasing towards the north and the south-eastern side at the foothill of Brick Hill;

*Sham Wan and Brick Hill Sub-Area*

- (dd) the BH proposals for land uses other than GIC facilities and Ocean Park

were as below:

- (i) a maximum BH of 2 storeys for the boatyards at Po Chong; and
- (ii) a maximum BH of 130mPD for South Wave Court (about 120-136mPD) and Grandview Garden (about 112mPD) and a maximum BH of 140mPD (i.e. about 135m) for Broadview Court (about 140-144mPD) respectively to cap the existing height profiles.

*Ap Lei Chau Sub-Area*

- (ee) except for South Horizons, a stepped height profile from the waterfront to the higher platforms in the south could be broadly achieved. The BH proposals were as below:

Northern Waterfront and Public Housing Sites

- (i) a maximum BH of 85mPD for 2 street blocks along Main Street, Ap Lei Chau and 2 small sites to the west of this street was proposed. The height could be relaxed to 100mPD for sites with an area of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more;
- (ii) a maximum BH of 100mPD for the remainder of the area along Main Street, Ap Lei Chau, covering the Sandwiched Class Housing Marina Habitat (about 139-141mPD) was proposed;
- (iii) a maximum BH of 110mPD for Ap Lei Chau Estate was proposed to allow reasonable scope for redevelopment, avoid excessively tall buildings near the waterfront and allow a gradual transition in BH along the waterfront from the area at Main Street, Ap Lei Chau to South Horizons;
- (iv) a maximum BH of 140mPD for two blocks of Lei Tung Estate was proposed to reflect the existing BH (about 134-139mPD);

- (v) a maximum BH of 150mPD for Yue On Court was proposed to reflect the predominant existing BH of about 148mPD;
- (vi) a maximum BH of 160mPD for upper part of Lei Tung Estate to the east of the estate road was proposed to generally reflect the existing BH (about 144-163mPD);

#### South Horizons

- (vii) maximum BH of 35mPD and 40mPD were proposed for the existing local shopping centres zoned “C” to reflect their existing heights and maintain a lower inner area amidst high-rise residential towers to provide visual relief and breathing space;
- (viii) a maximum BH of 110mPD covering the eastern part of South Horizons (i.e. The Oasis) was proposed to generally reflect the predominant existing BH (about 108-121mPD);
- (ix) a maximum BH of 125mPD was proposed for the remaining part of South Horizons to contain the existing BH (about 108-133mPD) at the waterfront location;

#### Industrial Sites

- (x) a maximum BH of 2 storeys was proposed for the “I” sites mainly used as shipyards along Ap Lei Chau Praya Road in the east and a waterfront “I” site at Lee Nam Road in the south-west, in accordance with the urban design principle of low-lying structures along the waterfront areas;
- (xi) maximum BH of 100mPD and 115mPD for the Ap Lei Chau West industrial area were proposed to form a stepped height profile from waterfront to inland;

Eastern Waterfront

- (xii) a maximum BH of 120mPD was proposed for the undeveloped “R(A)” site to the south of Sham Wan Towers to avoid excessively tall buildings near the waterfront and to form a lower height band than those proposed for Yue On Court and Lei Tung Estate to the east;
- (xiii) a maximum BH of 140mPD was proposed for a residential development under construction on a “R(E)” site to reflect the BH of the approved scheme; and
- (xiv) a maximum BH of 160mPD for Sham Wan Towers on an isolated site to generally reflect the existing BH (about 164-167mPD).

“G/IC” Sites

- (ff) the proposed BH restrictions for the “G/IC” sites were shown at Plan 12 of the Paper. The GIC developments, particularly for those which were low-rise, would serve as breathing space and visual relief to the densely built-up environment. The BH restrictions would be in terms of number of storeys to allow some flexibility for special requirements (e.g. headroom) of various GIC facilities. The restrictions ranged from a maximum of 1 storey to 12 storeys mainly to reflect the existing BH of the various GIC uses;
- (gg) the 8 “G/IC” sites with existing or proposed number of storeys exceeding 13 subject to height restrictions in terms of mPD included Caritas Lodge (about 92mPD), the senior staff quarters of Grantham Hospital (about 88mPD), Singapore International School (about 77mPD) and its proposed extension (about 78mPD), Canadian International School (about 89mPD), Tin Wan Hill Road Government Staff Quarters site (proposed height of about 70mPD) and Marine Police Aberdeen Base (about 59mPD). The

proposed private hospital at Nam Fung Road and the self-financing post-secondary education institution at Police School Road were subject to BH restrictions of 50mPD and 80mPD respectively;

“OU” Sites

- (hh) there were 13 “OU” sites in the Area included in the current review. Proposed maximum BH for these sites were at Plan 13 of the Paper. Proposed BH restrictions ranging from 1 storeys to 11 storeys for 7 of them followed the existing BH including two existing petrol filling stations, Aberdeen Marina Club, Aberdeen Boat Club, the liquefied petroleum gas and oil products transit depot at Ap Lei Chau and the electricity supply installation in South Horizons;
- (ii) for the “OU (Cemetery)” zone covering the Aberdeen Chinese Cemetery, a height restriction of 2 storeys was proposed to maintain the low-rise nature with the part for a columbarium subject to a height restriction of 6 storeys to reflect the height of the approved building plan. As to the “OU” zone covering the concrete batching plant in Tin Wan, the proposed height restriction was 35mPD (including all structures) to meet the operational needs;
- (jj) the proposed BH of 2 storeys for the two “OU (Cargo Handling Area)” sites at Lee Nam Road was to maintain the low-rise character along the waterfront and cater for any possible structures to meet operational needs. The “OU (Cargo Handling Area)” zone covering the breakwater at Aberdeen West Typhoon Shelter was subject to a maximum BH of 1 storey;
- (kk) for the “OU(Ocean Park)” zone, the proposed BH restrictions were mainly to reflect the existing BH while taking into account the site topography, the operational needs and the master redevelopment plan launched in 2006 which included 3 hotels (with planning approvals). The lowland part of the Park would be subject to 4 height zones, namely, the 6-storey zone for the

proposed Ocean Hotel, 5-storey zone for the proposed aquarium, 4-storey zone for the entry plaza under construction and 2-storey zone for the remaining areas. For the summit part on Brick Hill, the proposed height zones were 14 storeys and 8 storeys for the 2 proposed hotel sites with planning approval (Fisherman's Wharf Hotel and Spa Hotel) respectively, a 6-storey zone for the new Ocean Express terminal building, a 5-storey zone for the proposed attraction of Polar Adventure, a 3-storey zone for the middle part, 2-storey zones for other existing built-up areas and a 1-storey zone for the undeveloped slopes. Amusement rides such as roller coasters would be excluded from the BH restriction;

Review of the "C/R" Zone (Plan 15 of the Paper)

- (ll) there was about 10.82 ha of land zoned "C/R" on the OZP covering southern part of Tin Wan, areas along Aberdeen Main Road and Main Street, Ap Lei Chau as well as 2 sites at Nam Long Shan Road and Welfare Road;
  
- (mm) the majority of these existing developments were predominantly residential in nature with lower three floors used for retail/commercial activities akin to "R(A)" type development. There were, however, a number of composite commercial/residential developments with more than 3 floors in the lower portion used for non-domestic purposes;
  
- (nn) in view of the predominant residential nature of the existing developments and taking into consideration their locations in predominantly residential neighbourhoods, the "C/R" sites were considered suitable for rezoning to "R(A)" or "R(A)2". The larger sites were proposed to be rezoned to "R(A)". The smaller lots were proposed to be rezoned to "R(A)2" which would be subject to the two-tier (85/100mPD) BH restriction. Commercial development and other Column 2 uses might be permitted by way of planning permission system based on individual merits. For those existing buildings with commercial uses above the lowest three floors, they would not be affected by the rezoning exercise since commercial uses such



as eating place, office and shop and services were always permitted in the purpose-designed non-residential portion of an existing building and/or could be continued with “existing use” status under the Notes for the “R(A)” zone and the Covering Notes;

#### Other Rezoning Proposals

- (oo) the “C/R” zone between Aberdeen Main Road and Yue Fai Road was proposed to be rezoned to “R(A)3” . According to the recommendation of the AVA, a minimum 2m wide set-back from the lot boundary above podium was proposed for the sites along Old Main Street Aberdeen to improve the air ventilation in the local area. Under the proposed “R(A)3” zone, a requirement for a minimum 2m wide set-back above podium would be stipulated. This zone was also subject to a BH restriction of 85/100mPD under the two-tier provision;
- (pp) according to the recommendation of AVA, a piece of land of 12m x 7m adjoining the eastern end of Tang Fung Street was designated as a NBA to ensure no blockage of flow of the easterly wind. Minor relaxation of this restriction to allow a perforated podium might be considered by the Board on application and each case would be considered on its own merits;
- (qq) a row of sites at Aberdeen Praya Road to the west of the landing of Ap Lei Chau Bridge was proposed to be rezoned from “R(A)” to “R(A)2”. This row of sites comprised predominantly tenement buildings on small lots. A two-tier BH restriction was proposed. Developments/redevelopments on these sites would be subject to a maximum BH of 85mPD while a BH of 100mPD would be permitted for sites with an area of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more;
- (rr) a free-standing bus terminus in Ap Lei Chau Estate (about 2,845m<sup>2</sup>) and 4 sites occupied by free-standing schools and a sports ground located at the periphery of the public housing estates, including Lei Tung Estate, Tin Wan Estate and Shek Pai Wan Estate, were proposed to be rezoned from “R(A)” to “G/IC” to reflect their actual use and as-built condition and to

stipulate maximum BH of 1 and 8 storeys for the bus terminus and school sites respectively;

- (ss) the northern portion of a piece of slope at Shek Pai Wan Estate currently shown as 'Road' would be rezoned to "G/IC" to form part of the adjacent school site while its southern part would be rezoned to "R(A)" as part of Shek Pai Wan Estate;
- (tt) a site occupied by a free-standing electricity sub-station and another site occupied by a public toilet and a cooked food centre building located at Ap Lei Chau West industrial area were proposed to be rezoned from "I" to "G/IC" and maximum BH restrictions of 6 storeys and 3 storeys were proposed for these sites respectively to reflect their actual use and as-built condition;
- (uu) a piece of vegetated steep slope at Shum Wan Road to the north of Ocean Park was proposed to be rezoned from "G/IC" to "GB". With no designated "G/IC" use for this site and to avoid extensive slope works and removal of the existing vegetation resulting from building development, it was proposed to rezone the site to "GB";
- (vv) details of the rezonings were shown in Plan 15 of the Paper;

Proposed Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan, Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP

- (ww) the proposed amendments to the OZP were shown on the draft A&ALC OZP No. S/H15/24A at Attachment I of the Paper. They were mainly related to stipulation of BH restrictions, designating NBAs and rezoning of "C/R" and other sites;
- (xx) major amendments to the Notes included deletion of the Notes of the "C/R" zone, revision to the notes of the "C", "R(A)", "R(E)", "G/IC", "I" and "OU" zones to include BH restrictions, revision to the notes of "R(A)"

zones to include NBA restriction and set-back requirement;

- (yy) the ES of the OZP was proposed to be revised taking into account the proposed amendments to the OZP and to include a set of criteria for the consideration of planning applications for minor relaxation of the BH restrictions (paragraph 7.8 of the ES). Opportunity had also been taken to update the general information to reflect the latest status and circumstances;

#### Other Provisions under the OZP

- (zz) in general, existing and committed development exceeding the proposed BH would not be affected. Minor relaxation of BH restrictions would be considered by the Board on individual merits through the planning application system. Minor relaxation of NBA would only be considered under exceptional circumstances;

#### Departmental Consultation

- (aaa) no adverse comments were received from Government departments;

#### Public Consultation

- (bbb) since the proposals involved BH control, it was considered not appropriate to carry out prior public consultation. Any pre-mature release of the development control information might lead to people rushing in to submit building plans before the control was incorporated into the OZP. This would defeat the whole purpose of development control; and
- (ccc) the Southern District Council would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition period of the draft OZP.

29. Noting the stipulation of a setback requirement above podium along Old Main Street Aberdeen to improve air ventilation in the local area, a Member asked if the effect on air ventilation would be impeded by the large advertisement panels hanging on the buildings

on both sides of the road. Ms. Au responded that large advertisement panels would have air ventilation impact on pedestrians but the statutory planning control on the OZP would not cover such detailed control. The installation of advertisement panel was controlled by Buildings Department under the Buildings Ordinance.

30. The Chairperson said that “G/IC” sites, apart from providing facilities to serve the community or for specific purposes, would also function as breathing space and provide visual relief in the area concerned. Such a planning intention for the “G/IC” zone should be clearly reflected in the ES of the OZP. Members agreed.

31. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP and that the draft Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP No. S/H15/24A at Attachment I (to be renumbered to S/H15/25 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment III of the Paper for the draft Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP No.S/H15/24A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board of the various land use zonings on the Plan and the revised ES would be published together with the Plan.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK, Mr. David C.M. Lam, STP/HK and Ms. Una Wang, AVA Consultant, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquires. Ms. Au, Mr. Lam and Ms. Wang left the meeting at this point.]