

CONFIDENTIAL

(Downgraded on 9.12.2011)

**Minutes of 454th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held on 18.11.2011**

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

[Mr. W.W. Chan, Chief Town Planner/Outline Zoning Plan (CTP/OZP), Ms. Kitty K.Y. Chiu, Senior Town Planner/Outline Zoning Plan (STP/OZP), Mr. K.T. Ng, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), Mr. Rupert Y.K. Lo, Town Planner/Outline Zoning Plan (TP/OZP) and Dr. Justin Zhengjun He, Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Consultant, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 17

[Closed Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the

Approved Tsuen Wan West Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TWW/17

(MPC Paper No. 13/11)

1. Professor P.P. Ho declared an interest in this item as the consultant of the AVA study for the Tsuen Wan West area was the School of Architecture, the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) and Professor Ho was working in CUHK. The Committee considered that the interest of Professor Ho was indirect as he was not involved in the AVA study and he could be allowed to stay in the meeting.

2. Ms. Kitty K.Y. Chiu, STP/OZP, reported that a replacement page for page 12 of the Paper was tabled at the meeting for Members' information. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation and a fly-through animation, Ms. Kitty K.Y. Chiu, STP/OZP presented the proposed amendments to the approved Tsuen Wan West Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TWW/17 as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

Background

- (a) under the current OZP, “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”), Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”), “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”), “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) zones were not subject to building height (BH) restrictions. To prevent excessively tall and out-of-context buildings in the waterfront areas and to ensure that new developments were compatible with the character of the locality, there was a need to incorporate development restrictions in the OZP to achieve appropriate development intensity and building bulk;
- (b) land use reviews had been conducted for the “Open Space” and “Undetermined” (“U”) zones in the Tsuen Wan West OZP to examine appropriate land use zoning;
- (c) it was considered necessary to extend the planning scheme area boundary to cover a piece of vegetated slope (about 0.5 ha) near the tunnel portal of Tsing Long Highway, which was neither within the Tai Lam Country Park nor covered by any OZP, for statutory planning control;
- (d) it was also proposed to amend the zoning boundaries along the south coast to tally with the alignment of the High Water Mark and existing coastal features. Four existing government piers were proposed to be zoned “OU” annotated “Pier”;

Existing Building Height Profile

- (e) the Area was divided into three sub-areas, namely Ting Kau, Sham Tseng and Tsing Lung Tau, with different characteristics as described in paragraphs 4 and 5 and shown on Plans 2A to 2D of the Paper. Low-rise house developments/village settlements ranging from 1 to 3 storeys were found along the coastal area and in the inland area. Medium-rise (30 storeys or below) residential developments were mostly found in Tsing Lung Tau. Three high-rise residential developments including Bellagio (193mPD), Ocean Pointe (176mPD) and Lido Garden (110mPD) were found on the Sham Tseng waterfront. Other high-rise developments

scattered in the three sub-areas comprised Rhine Terrace (133mPD), Rhine Garden (117mPD), Anglers' Bay (150mPD), Sea Crest Villa Phase 1 (161mPD), Phase 2 (143mPD) and Phase 3 (126mPD);

Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA)

- (f) an AVA by expert evaluation had been undertaken to assess the likely impact of the proposed BH restrictions of the development sites. As a general principle, buildings on the waterfront should be carefully designed with good gaps between towers to maintain permeability of air ventilation to its wake areas. From the planning perspective, it was recommended to maintain the gap between Bellagio and Ocean Pointe and to widen the gap at Sham Tsz Street in Sham Tseng to improve permeability and thus air ventilation in the waterfront areas. Besides, the existing "G/IC" and "OU" sites with low-rise buildings and greeneries that were connected to or next to the air paths should be maintained. Strips of non-building areas (NBAs) were proposed at the waterfront of Sham Tseng to enhance air ventilation performance in that locality. Future developments were encouraged to adopt suitable design measures to minimize adverse air ventilation impacts;

[Mr. Clarence W.C. Leung left the meeting at this point.]

Urban Design Principles

- (g) the formulation of the BH restrictions had taken into account a list of urban design principles as detailed in paragraph 8 of the Paper. In particular, a stepped height concept with lower developments and more open setting along the waterfront and gradation of height profile should be adopted. The view to the Area from major vantage points at Pak Wan of Ma Wan and Tsing Yi Viewing Platform, and selected vantage points at hiking trail/catchwater at Tai Lam Country Park and Sunny Bay of Lantau Island should be taken into account. The views to Ting Kau Bridge from the vantage point of Tsing Yi Viewing Platform should be preserved. Open spaces and low-rise "GIC" or "OU" sites should be retained as visual and spatial relief;

Proposed BH Concept

- (h) a stepped BH concept was adopted with BH gradually increasing from the waterfront to the uphill areas. Respect was given to the BH profile of the various existing residential clusters along Castle Peak Road. The proposed BH concept for the three sub-areas as detailed in paragraph 9 and Plan 13 of the Paper were summarised below :
- (i) Sham Tseng was proposed to continue to serve as the ‘sub-urban core’ with a ‘gourmet/tourist precinct’ and concentration of high-rise residential developments. Excessively tall and out-of-context buildings on the waterfront should be avoided and redevelopment of existing buildings at the Sham Tseng waterfront should conform to the BH restrictions under the OZP;
 - (ii) Ting Kau was proposed to maintain its low-rise low-density character with leisure and aquatic activity areas along the coastline. The existing low-rise low-density character of Ting Kau and the BH of Royal View Hotel not exceeding the lowest soffit level of the bridge should be retained; and
 - (iii) Tsing Lung Tau was proposed to maintain its medium-rise and medium-density character with low-rise villa type developments;

Proposed BH Restrictions

- (i) the proposed BH restrictions for the three sub-areas as detailed in paragraph 10 and Plans 13A, 13B and 13C of the Paper respectively were summarised below :

Ting Kau Sub-area

- (j) the current BH restrictions for the “Village Type Development” (“V”), “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) and its sub-zones, and the “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zone for Royal View Hotel with a BH restriction of 76.77mPD which was the lowest soffit level of Ting Kau

Bridge, should remain unchanged to preserve the low-rise and low-density character of this sub-area;

Sham Tseng Sub-area

- (k) a stepped height concept with a BH of 85mPD from the waterfront and gradually increasing to 160mPD in the uphill areas was adopted. The BH restriction of 85mPD had taken into account the maximum PR of 5 permitted for domestic use under the OZP for the “R(A)” zone and “R(E)” zones and the requirements for provision of promenade and NBAs where appropriate. The proposed BH restrictions for various development zones were as follows :

Proposed BH Restrictions for “R(A)” Sites

- (i) maximum BHs of 30mPD, 100mPD and 120mPD were proposed for the “R(A)3” site (i.e. Bellagio). The existing BH of Bellagio (193mPD) was considered excessively tall and out-of-context with the waterfront setting of the site. In the Notes of the OZP, the site was subject to a maximum domestic GFA of 257,234m² (equivalent to a plot ratio (PR) of 4.89 based on the total site area of 52,591m² under an approved scheme) and a maximum non-domestic GFA of 2,872m². As a considerable portion (about 23%) of the site was required for the provision of public transport terminus, public walkway, promenades and NBAs, the net PR would be in excess of 7. Hence, a higher height band of 100mPD was proposed at the southern part of the site and stepped up to 120mPD in the inner area with a view to catering for the GFA permissible under the OZP. A maximum BH of 30mPD was proposed for the existing public transport terminus and Bellagio Mall. The provision for redevelopment to the existing BHs was not allowed;
- (ii) a maximum BH of 85mPD was proposed for the “R(A)2” site (i.e. Ocean Pointe). The existing BH of Ocean Pointe (176mPD) was considered excessively tall and out-of-context with the waterfront setting. In the Notes of the OZP, the site was subject to a

maximum GFA of 45,660m² (equivalent to a PR of 5 based on the site area of 9,132 m² under an approved scheme). A BH restriction of 85mPD which could cater for the GFA permissible under the OZP was proposed. The provision for redevelopment to the existing BH was not allowed;

- (iii) a maximum BH of 100mPD was proposed for Lido Garden which was to be rezoned from “R(A)” to “R(A)4”. The existing BH of Lido Garden (110mPD) was considered incompatible with the waterfront setting of the area. In the Notes of the OZP, the site was subject to a maximum domestic and non-domestic PR of 5/9.5. To cater for redevelopment up to the existing development which had a PR of 8 and having regard to the site configuration, a higher height band of 100mPD was proposed. The provision for redevelopment to the existing BH was not allowed;

[Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee and Professor C.M. Hui arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (iv) a maximum BH of 130mPD was proposed for the “R(A)1” site (i.e. Rhine Garden) which was located further inland on the northern side of Castle Peak Road. The existing BH of Rhine Garden was 117mPD;
- (v) maximum BHs of 140mPD and 160mPD were proposed for two “R(A)” sites (i.e. Rhine Terrace and Sea Crest Villa Phase 1) which were on the uphill areas to the north of Castle Peak Road. The existing BH of the two developments were 133mPD and 161mPD respectively;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “R(B)” Sites

- (vi) maximum BHs of 150mPD, 145mPD and 125mPD were proposed for three “R(B)” sites (i.e. Anglers Bay, Sea Crest Villa Phase 2 and Phase 3) which were on the uphill areas north of Castle Peak Road. The existing BHs of the three developments were 150mPD, 143mPD

and 126mPD respectively;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “R(C)” Sites

- (vii) the existing BH restriction for the “R(C)” zone (3 storeys including car park) was considered appropriate for the three sites along the coastal area;

- (viii) the ex-Kowloon Textile Family Dormitory, with an existing BH of 6 storeys and a PR of about 3.3, was considered incompatible with the surrounding rural environment and village house developments. To maintain a compatible BH profile, it was proposed to rezone the site from “R(C)” to “R(C)4” with a maximum PR of 0.4 and a maximum BH of 3 storeys including car park. The provision for redevelopment to the existing PR and BH should not be allowed. Renovation works to the existing building would be allowed as long as there was no addition of GFA and/or BH;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “R(E)” Sites

- (ix) a maximum BH of 85mPD was proposed for the site at Lot 194 in D.D. 390 (currently occupied by Garden Co. Ltd. with an existing BH of 73mPD). In the Notes of the OZP, the site was subject to a maximum domestic and non-domestic PR of 5/9.5. As the site was located close to the waterfront area, a BH restriction of 85mPD which could cater for the GFA permissible under the OZP was proposed;

- (x) a maximum BH of 100mPD was proposed for the inland site at Lot 193 in D.D. 390 (currently occupied by Garden Co. Ltd. with an existing BH of 23mPD). In the Notes of the OZP, the site was subject to a maximum domestic and non-domestic PR of 5/9.5. Taking into account the further inland location of the site, a BH restriction of 100m which could cater for the GFA permissible under the OZP was proposed; and

Proposed Development Restrictions for “C” Sites

- (xi) there was one “C” zone which comprised a nullah, a 3-storey Commercial Centre, a youth centre and village houses of 2 storeys. It was proposed that the existing BH restriction under the OZP (3 storeys above one level of car park) should remain unchanged. However, since there was at present no PR control for this “C” zone under the OZP, the permissible BH restriction of 3 storeys would result in a building up to a PR of 3 with full site coverage (SC) without any setback at ground or upper level. Taking into account the exclusion of the area of the existing nullah on the western part of the zone and the intensity of the existing developments, a maximum PR of 2.15 was proposed for the site to achieve more visual permeability in the locality though building setback at ground or upper level;

Tsing Lung Tau Sub-area

- (l) a stepped height concept with BH gradually increasing from the waterfront (60mPD) in the uphill areas (120mPD) was adopted. Excessively tall and out-of-context buildings on the waterfront should be avoided. The proposed BH restrictions for various development zones were as follows :

Proposed BH Restriction for “R(B)” Sites

- (i) maximum BHs of 60mPD, 90mPD, 95mPD and 120mPD were proposed for Hong Kong Garden which was to be rezoned from “R(B)” to “R(B)1”. The existing BHs of the domestic blocks at the waterfront varied from 23mPD to 86mPD, while the existing BHs of the domestic blocks at high grounds varied from 83mPD to 124mPD. The site was subject to a maximum PR of 2.1 and SC of 17.5% under the “R(B)” zone and a maximum PR and GFA of 1.575 and 214,706m² respectively under the lease. The permissible PR under OZP was one-third higher than that under the lease. To avoid excessive development intensity for the site, a new sub-area “R(B)1” with four BH bands (60mPD, 90mPD, 95mPD and 120mPD) and a maximum GFA of 214,706m², which was the permissible domestic

GFA of the whole development under the lease, was proposed;

- (ii) a maximum BH of 95mPD was proposed for a site surrounded by Hong Kong Garden (government land and Lots 15, 16, 18 and 19 in D.D. 388) which was to be rezoned from “R(B)” to “R(B)1”. The site was currently vacant and was subject to a maximum PR of 2.1 and SC of 17.5% under the “R(B)” zone. It was proposed to rezone the site from “R(B)” to “R(B)1” with a BH band of 95mPD and a maximum GFA of 2,898m² (equivalent to a PR of 2.1);
- (iii) a maximum BH of 60mPD was proposed for three sites at the waterfront, namely Lung Tang Court, a vacant site in Lot 94 in D.D. 388 and the government land currently used as a temporary open car park. The site currently used as temporary open car park was proposed to be rezoned from “U” to “R(B)” for private residential use;
- (iv) a maximum BH of 90mPD was proposed for Royal Sea Crest which was located inland. The existing BH of Royal Sea Crest was 93mPD;
- (v) a maximum BH of 130mPD was proposed for Sea Crest Villa Phase 4 which was on the uphill areas north of Castle Peak Road. The existing BHs of Sea Crest Villa Phase 4 ranging from 119mPD to 136mPD;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “R(C)” Sites

- (vi) the existing BH restriction for the “R(C)” zone (3 storeys including car park) was considered appropriate for seven “R(C)” sites along the coastal area; and

Proposed Development Restrictions for “C” Site

- (vii) there was one “C” site currently occupied by Hong Kong Garden Commercial Complex with an existing BH of 3 storeys above one

level of basement car park. It was proposed that the existing BH restriction (3 storeys above one level of car park) should remain unchanged. However, since there was at present no PR control for this “C” zone under the OZP, the permissible BH restriction of 3 storeys would result in a building up to a PR of 3 with full SC without building setback at ground or upper level. In this regard, a maximum PR of 1.75 (equivalent to the GFA of about 4,180m² permitted under the lease) was proposed for the site to achieve more visual permeability in the locality through building setback at ground or upper level;

“G/IC” and “OU” Sites

- (m) in formulating the proposed BH restrictions for the “G/IC” and “OU” sites, due regard had been given to the nature of the existing uses on the sites, their as-built conditions, any known or committed development proposals, the height restrictions on the land allocation/lease and the need to meet the operational requirements. The proposed BH restrictions for “G/IC” and “OU” sites as detailed in paragraphs 10.5 to 10.8 and Plans 15A to 15C of the Paper were summarised below :

Proposed BH Restrictions for “G/IC” Sites

- (i) there were a total of 20 “G/IC” sites in the Area. In general, maximum BHs of 1 to 3 storeys were proposed for the existing and planned GIC uses. A maximum BH of 6 storeys was proposed for the existing fire station cum ambulance depot to meet its functional requirement. Besides, a maximum BH of 8 storeys was proposed for school development which was the general requirement for standard school, and a possible use of a site within Hong Kong Garden in Tsing Ling Tau for education purpose;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “OU” Sites

- (ii) a maximum BH of 1 storey was proposed for the “OU” annotated “Tourism and Recreation Related Uses” zone to protect the existing single-storey ex-Government quarters building, Homi Villa, a Grade

3 historic building located near Hoi Mei Beach in Sham Tseng. It was currently used as the Airport Core Programme Exhibition Centre. The planning intention in the Notes was also revised to reflect its intention to preserving the building for adaptive tourism and recreation and related uses;

- (iii) a maximum BH of 5 storeys was proposed for the “OU” annotated “Sewage Treatment Plant” zone to meet the functional requirement of the existing Sham Tseng Sewage Treatment Plant; and
- (iv) it was considered not necessary to impose BH restriction for the “OU” annotated “Amenity Area” zone as it was intended primarily for the development of amenity area;

Designation of NBAs

- (n) according to the findings of the AVA undertaken for the Area, the following five strips of NBA (as indicated in Plan B-2 of the Paper) were proposed at the waterfront areas of Sham Tseng to ensure wind to filter through to the inland area and enhance air ventilation performance of the locality :
 - (i) a 25m wide strip of NBA and a 20m wide strip of NBA were proposed in the northwestern and eastern parts of Bellagio respectively to facilitate air flow from the south to the inland area; and
 - (ii) three 3m wide strip of NBAs were proposed to align with Sham Tsz Street in Sham Tseng to facilitate air flow from the south to the inland area. The three NBAs were located along the eastern part of Ocean Pointe, the western portion of a “R(E)” site at Lot 194 in D.D. 390 and the eastern portion of a “R(E)” site at Lot 193 in D.D. 390 respectively;

- (o) according to the AVA Study, the permeability provided by these NBAs was useful for maintaining and improving air ventilation of the surrounding areas;

Appraisal of Visual Impact

- (p) the visual impacts of the proposed BH restrictions were described in paragraph 12 and Attachment VIII and shown in the photomontages on Plans 16A to 16D of the Paper. The proposed BH restrictions of 85mPD and 100mPD at the waterfront of Sham Tseng and 60mPD at the waterfront of Tsing Lung Tau would help ensure that future developments would be compatible with the waterfront setting of the area. A stepped BH profile in Sham Tseng was achieved with BH restrictions of 85mPD/100mPD at the waterfront stepping up to 130mPD/140mPD towards the uphill area in the north. The stepped BH concept was also adopted for Tsing Lung Tau with BH restrictions of 60mPD at the south stepping up to 120mPD towards the northern part. The existing excessively tall buildings in Sham Tseng which were incompatible and out-of-context with the waterfront setting would be phased out upon redevelopment. The proposed BHs would result in an overall enhancement of visual quality and complement the visual character of the Area as seen from the vantage points;

Other Rezoning Proposals

Rezoning of "O" Site at Sham Hong Road

- (q) the "O" site at Sham Hong road was mainly occupied by squatter structures with the central part occupied by culverts with boulder trap. The Civil Engineering and Development Department and Drainage Services Department advised that the site was susceptible to flood risk after rainstorm and improvement works were proposed to alleviate the flood hazards. The Leisure and Cultural Services Department also advised that there was no development programme for the "O" site. The "O" site and the adjoining area in the "GB" zone with a total area of 0.72 ha was proposed to be rezoned to "Residential (Group D)" ("R(D)") (as indicated

in Plan F-2 of the Paper) with the planning intention for improvement and upgrading of the existing temporary structures into permanent buildings. A maximum PR of 0.4 and a maximum BH of 2 storeys (6m) were proposed for the “R(D)” zone;

Rezoning of “U” Site to the west of Hong Kong Garden

- (r) an area of about 10 ha to the west of Hong Kong Garden was zoned “U” and it was intended to be a highway reserve for a proposed bridge linking Tsing Lung Tau to Kwai Shek at Northeast Lantau which would form part of Route 10. However, there was no definite implementation programme. The area was currently occupied by a temporary car park and a temporary works area and covered by some vegetated slopes. A site of 0.49 ha at the northeastern portion, which might not be required for the proposed highway project, was proposed to be rezoned to “R(B)” for private residential use (as indicated in Plan G-2 of the Paper). The site would be subject to a maximum BH of 60mPD and the current PR and SC restrictions of 2.1 and 17.5% respectively;

Extension of Planning Scheme Area Boundaries

- (s) a piece of vegetated slope of about 0.5 ha near the tunnel portal of Tsing Long was neither within the Tai Lam Country Park nor covered by any OZP. To achieve better land use control, it was proposed to extend the planning scheme area boundary to include this area and zone it as “GB” (as indicated in Plan J-2 of the Paper);
- (t) the zoning boundaries of the “O” and “GB” zones along the southern coast were amended to tally with the alignment of the High Water Mark and existing coastal features where appropriate; and
- (u) there were four existing government piers that were not covered by the OZP. It was proposed to include these piers in the OZP and zoned them as “OU” annotated “Pier”. A BH restriction of one storey was proposed to allow flexibility for the provision of possible minor structures;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (v) the proposed amendments to the Notes were shown in Attachment II of the Paper. The proposed amendments mainly included :
- (i) the incorporation/revision of BH/PR/GFA restrictions, incorporation of NBA requirements, and incorporation/revision of the minor relaxation clause on maximum BH/PR/GFA/NBA restrictions as appropriate in various development zones;
 - (ii) the transfer of 'Hotel' use from Column 1 to Column 2 in the Schedule of Uses for the "C" zone to better reflect the planning intention of the existing local commercial centres in the Area;
 - (iii) the incorporation of a set of Notes for the proposed "R(D)" zone and "OU" annotated "Pier" zone and the revision of the planning intention of the "OU" annotated "Tourism and Recreation Related Uses" zone; and
 - (iv) technical amendments to the Covering Notes were also incorporated in accordance to the revised Master Schedule of Notes;

Proposed Amendments to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP

- (w) opportunity was taken to revise the Explanatory Statement as detailed in Attachment III of the Paper to take account of the proposed amendments and to reflect the latest planning circumstances of the OZP; and

Departmental and Public Consultation

- (x) comments of the concerned government bureaux and departments had been incorporated into the proposed amendments as appropriate. To avoid pre-mature release of the development control information, the proposed amendments to the OZP would be exhibited under section 5 of the Ordinance for public representation, which was a statutory channel to solicit views. The relevant Area Committee of the Tsuen Wan District Council would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition

period of the draft Tsuen Wan West OZP.

3. Members had no question on the proposed amendments to the approved Tsuen Wan West OZP.
4. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:
 - (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Tsuen Wan West OZP No. S/TWW/17 and that the draft Tsuen Wan West OZP No. S/TWW/17A (to be renumbered as S/TWW/18 upon exhibition) at Attachment I of the Paper and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
 - (b) agree to adopt the revised Explanatory Statement at Attachment III of the Paper as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the TPB for the various land use zonings of the OZP and that the revised Explanatory Statement was suitable for exhibition together with the draft OZP and its Notes under the name of the Town Planning Board.

[The Vice-chairman thanked Mr. W.W. Chan, CTP/OZP, Ms. Kitty K.Y. Chiu, STP/OZP, Mr. K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, Mr. Rupert Y.K. Lo, TP/OZP and Dr. Justin Zhengjun He, AVA Consultant, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]