

CONFIDENTIAL

(Downgraded on 20.4.2012)

**Minutes of 463rd Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held on 30.3.2012**

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

[Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK), Ms. M.L. Leung, Senior Town Planner/Special Duties (STP/SD), Ms. Fannie F.L. Hung, Senior Town Planner/Kwai Tsing (STP/KT), Ms. Ivy C.W. Wong, Town Planner/Special Duties (TP/SD) and Mr. Calvin K.F. Chiu, Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Consultant, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 19

[Closed Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the
Approved Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/KC/25
(MPC Paper No. 6/12)

1. The Secretary reported that Ms. Olga W.H. Lam had declared an interest in this item as she owned a property in this district and Mr. Clarence W.C. Leung had declared an interest in this item as he owned an office in this district. The Committee considered that the interests of Ms. Lam and Mr. Leung were direct but noted that they had left the meeting.

2. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation and a fly-through animation, Ms. M.L. Leung, STP/SD presented the proposed amendments to the approved Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/KC/25 as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

Background and Scope of Review

- (a) the Kwai Chung Planning Scheme Area (the Area) was located to the

northwest of Kowloon, comprising a mix of residential, commercial, industrial, government, institution or community (GIC) uses, as well as major territorial facilities such as the container port. About half of the buildings in Kwai Chung were over 30 years and many of them, particularly the residential and industrial buildings, were ripe for redevelopment;

- (b) under the current OZP, building height restrictions (BHRs) were stipulated in the “Residential (Group B)1” (“R(B)1”) zone of Chung Shan Terrace and the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Ha Kwai Chung Village. The current OZP review was to propose appropriate BHRs for the remaining development zones. Moreover, non-building areas (NBAs) and building gaps were proposed in appropriate sites to improve air ventilation;
- (c) the exercise also involved rezoning of free-standing GIC facilities in public rental housing estates and other existing GIC facilities to “G/IC” zone. Moreover, an assessment had been undertaken to review the “Open Space” (“O”) zone in the district. Opportunity had also been taken to adjust the zoning boundary of some sites to reflect the latest circumstances;

Existing BH Profile

- (d) the Area was well-defined by a continuous green backdrop to the north, east and northwest, viz. the foothills of Tai Mo Shan and Golden Hill and was characterised by a valley-like topography. The existing BH profile as detailed in paragraph 4.2 and shown on Plans 4A and 4B of the Paper were summarised below :
 - (i) residential developments on the valley floor varied between 40mPD to 120mPD, and progressively step up to the east and west. The high-rise residential developments nearest to Golden Hill and the hilltop of the knoll were as high as about 200mPD (e.g. Yi Fung Court and High Prosperity Terrace). In the south, medium- and

high-rise residential developments were found at the foothill of Golden Hill, including Lai King Estate (about 57mPD to 100mPD) at the foothill and Wonderland Villas on the highest platform (with a maximum BH of about 340mPD). The small valley at the southeastern corner of the Area accommodated 1- to 3-storey houses at Kau Wa Keng and Chung Shan Terrace and high-rise estates (75mPD to 121mPD) along Ching Cheung Road; and

- (ii) business/industrial buildings occupied larger footprints and have slightly lower BHs of about 36mPD to 96mPD in the core, except Metroplaza (173mPD) and Kowloon Commerce Centre (150mPD). Due to higher elevation, the business/industrial clusters along Castle Peak Road and Wo Yi Hop Road were generally taller than those in the core, with BHs of about 100mPD to 181mPD. The “Industrial” (“I”) zone along Tsuen Wan Road comprised medium-rise buildings (about 50mPD to 143mPD). The waterfront area was occupied by a few large-scale logistics centres (about 60 to 110mPD);

Proposed BH Concept

- (e) a stepped height concept was adopted to exemplify the valley-like terrain, with lower height bands in the central urban core and gradually ascending height bands towards the foothill of Golden Hill to the east and the knoll at Kwai Shing to the west;
- (f) in general, the imposition of height bands were commensurate with the planning intention of various land use zones and taking into consideration the BHs of the majority of the existing buildings/committed developments. Developments near the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Kwai Fong and Kwai Hing stations were assigned with higher height bands to reinforce the nodal developments around the stations;
- (g) the medium-rise and dispersive nature of the existing buildings at the container terminals and the openness of the “G/IC” and “OU” sites along

the waterfront area should be maintained for visual and air ventilation purposes;

Proposed BH Restrictions

- (h) considering the topography, local character, land uses and existing BH, the Area can be divided into six sub-areas. The proposed BH restrictions for these sub-areas as detailed in paragraph 4.8 and shown on Plans 8B, 8B-1 to 8B-5 were summarized below :

Central Sub-area (Plan 8B-1)

- (i) capitalised on the accessibility brought about by the two MTR stations at Kwai Fong and Kwai Hing, a twin-nodal development could be established around the two stations to accommodate high-rise commercial buildings up to 170mPD (i.e. Metroplaza) and 150mPD (i.e. Kowloon Commerce Centre) respectively;
- (ii) a BHR of 90mPD was proposed for the two “Commercial” (“C”) sites near the two MTR stations. BHRs of 90mPD, 100mPD, 110mPD and 120mPD were proposed for the high-rise residential developments adjacent to the two MTR stations, taking into account the existing BHs and development intensity permitted under the OZP;
- (iii) the business/industrial area on Tai Lin Pai Road under the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) and “I” zones was proposed to be subject to stepped-up height bands of 105mPD, 120mPD and 135mPD, while the business/industrial area on Wo Tong Tsui Street under the “OU(B)” zone was subject to BHRs of 105mPD and 130mPD;
- (iv) a BHR of 90mPD was proposed for the “Residential (Group E)1” zone of the ex-Kwai Chung Police Married Quarters site at Kwai Yi Road which was intended for public rental housing development;

Eastern Sub-area (Plan 8B-2)

- (v) this sub-area was situated at an ascending terrain overlooking the Central Sub-area. The proposed height bands in this sub-area were to respond to the upwardly sloping foothill. A BHR of 120mPD was proposed for the private residential developments in the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone along Castle Peak Road and the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone on Cheung Wing Road;
- (vi) a BHR of 130mPD was proposed for the industrial/business development under the “OU(B)” zone and a BHR of 190mPD was proposed for The Apex under the “C(2)” zone ;
- (vii) rings of progressively increasing height bands of 150mPD to 220mPD corresponding to the contours were proposed for the residential developments on steeper topography to the east of Wo Yi Hop Road;

Kwai Shing Sub-area (Plan 8B-3)

- (viii) this sub-area was mainly occupied by residential developments encircling a small knoll. There were four large-scale high-rise public rental housing estates, namely Kwai Shing West Estate, Kwai Shing East Estate, Tai Wo Hau Estate and Kwai Chung Estate. The proposed BHRs of 100mPD to 190mPD for this sub-area aimed to replicate the hilly terrain with incrementally increasing height bands running uphill;

Ha Kwai Shing Sub-area (Plan 8B-4)

- (ix) this sub-area was dominated by an exposed headland topped by Highland Park. There were medium-/high-rise public rental housing and Home Ownership Scheme estates located around the foothill. The BH profile for this sub-area aimed to respect the hilly

terrain with the highest height band of 260mPD for Highland Park, surrounded by gradually descending height bands stepping downhill;

- (x) a review on the “CDA” zoning of the site at Kau Wa Keng had been undertaken. The site was subject to development constraints in environmental and air ventilation aspects and the “CDA” zoning would be maintained to ensure that future development would be carried out in a comprehensive manner and to incorporate appropriate mitigation measures. A BHR of 120mPD was proposed for the subject “CDA” zone, taking into account the maximum PR of 5 permitted under the OZP and the BH profile;

Waterfront Sub-area (Plan 8B-5)

- (xi) this sub-area was located at the entrance of prevailing summer wind with a visually prominent waterfront and a hilly terrain near Tsuen Wan Chinese Permanent Cemetery. BHRs of 90mPD, 105mPD, 120mPD and 140mPD were proposed for the “I” sites along Tsuen Wan Road;

Golden Hill Foothill Sub-area (Plan8B)

- (xii) this sub-area was a visually sensitive area on high elevation which was characterised by an outcrop with a few medium-/high-rise residential developments scattered in the “R(B)” zone;
- (xiii) Wonderland Villas was a private residential development which fell partly within the “R(B)2” zone and partly within the “C(1)” zone. The “R(B)2” portion featured 22 medium- to high-rise residential blocks, 18 of which standing shoulder-to-shoulder in a curvilinear shape (with existing BHs of 264.1 to 339.2mPD/15 to 36 storeys) and the remaining 4 in a row on the northeastern edge (with existing BHs of 295.7 to 313.5mPD/17 to 23 storeys). It was proposed to impose stepped BHRs of 260mPD, 275mPD, 290mPD and 275mPD for the “R(B)2” portion. It was also proposed that any new

development or redevelopment under the “R(B)2” zone would require the submission of a planning application to the Board with the support of a layout plan and visual impact assessment to ensure that the BH, massing, disposition and layout of the future development would be acceptable in visual and planning terms. Redevelopment to the existing BHs under “R(B)2” zone was not allowed. Variation of building height to create visual interest was also encouraged. The “C(1)” portion was a commercial complex and a BHR of 225mPD was proposed to reflect its existing BH; and

- (xiv) for Wah Yuen Chuen and Regency Park which were situated at the hillside, BHRs of 215mPD/245mPD for the respective “R(B)4” zone and a BHR of 265mPD for the respective “R(B)3” zone were imposed to reflect their existing BHs;

Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA)

- (i) an AVA by expert evaluation had been undertaken to provide a qualitative assessment of the wind environment within the Area. The following locations, as shown in Plan 7A of the Paper, were identified as areas of major air ventilation concern :

“OU(B)” and “I” zones along Kwai Chung Road and Castle Peak Road

- (i) the buildings in this business/industrial area were densely developed and air flow in the east-west direction was limited. In particular, the two building clusters between Kwai Chung Road and Tai Lin Pai Road, with only a few narrow public passages between buildings, was generally impermeable for wind penetration;

“OU(B)” zone bounded by Castle Peak Road and Wo Yi Hop Road

- (ii) a large building cluster and the lacking of straight roads in the area was unfavourable for air flow and making wind from the northeast, east and southeast difficult to penetrate;

Public Rental Housing Estates along Kwai Shing Circuit

- (iii) the layout and disposition of Kwai Shing East Estate, Kwai Shing West Estate, Kwai Luen Estate and the planned public rental housing estate at Kwai Shing Circuit would obstruct the penetration of southeasterly wind; and

Kau Wa Keng

- (iv) the existing scattered 2 to 3-storey houses at the western fringe of Kau Wa Keng would not restrict southerly wind from entering the inland valley. However, there might be wind blockage if the western fringe was redeveloped into high-rise buildings in future under the current “CDA” zone;

NBAs and Building Gaps

- (j) NBAs and building gaps were proposed on the OZP to improve the air ventilation. The details were contained in paragraph 4.4 and shown on Plans 7B to 7E of the Paper and were summarized below :

NBAs at Wo Yi Hop Road Industrial Area (Plan 7B)

- (i) a 9m-wide NBA between Chun Pin Street and Castle Peak Road was proposed to facilitate east-west air flow at pedestrian level;
- (ii) a 4m-wide NBA from the lot boundary abutting Lam Tin Street and a 3.5m-wide NBA from the lot boundary abutting Ta Chuen Ping Street and Chun Pin Street were imposed to cater for the long-term road widening proposal and to enhance the air permeability of the business/industrial area of Wo Yi Hop Road;

NBAs and Building Gaps at Tai Lin Pai Road Industrial Area (Plan 7C)

- (iii) a 15m-wide NBA was proposed at a public footpath and at the western portion of Manhattan Centre to link up the north-south air path along Kwai Wing Road and Kwai Cheong Road;

- (iv) a NBA was proposed between Wo Yi Hop Road and Wah Sing Street to ensure penetration of the northeasterly wind to the business/industrial area of Tai Lin Pai Road;
- (v) to break up the existing building clusters of the business/industrial areas in the “OU(B)” and “I” zones of Tai Lin Pai Road, four 15m-wide NBAs were proposed between Kwai Chung Road and Tai Lin Pai Road, between Kwai Chung Road and Kwai Cheong Road and between Kwai Chung Road and Kwai Ting Road;
- (vi) a 15m-wide building gap above 25mPD within the “OU(B)” zone between Castle Peak Road and Tai Lin Pai Road was proposed to facilitate the northeasterly wind reaching Tai Lin Pai Road;
- (vii) a 15m-wide building gap above 18mPD between Wing Yip Street and Tai Lin Pai Road was proposed to extend the air path from Wing Yip Street to Kwai On Road;

NBAs and Building Gaps at Tsuen Wan Road Industrial Area (Plans 7D & 7E)

- (viii) a 15m-wide NBA aligned with Kwai Lok Street was proposed at an elongated industrial land sandwiched between Tsuen Wan Road and Kwai Hei Street;
- (ix) a 50m-wide building gap above 24mPD was proposed between Tsuen Wan Road and Kwai Fuk Road to maintain the current sea breeze from the southwest to the inland;
- (x) a building gap of varying widths (ranging from 35m to 217m) above 24mPD was proposed within the “R(A)” zone to the immediate north of Lai King Estate to preserve the air path channelling southeasterly wind to Tsuen Wan Road; and

Proposed Further AVA

- (xi) a requirement for submission of an AVA was added to the Notes for the “CDA” zone of Kau Wa Keng. Moreover, the requirements for AVAs for public rental housing estates, including Kwai Shing West Estate, Kwai Shing East Estate, Tai Wo Hau Estate, Kwai Chung Estate, Kwai Hing Estate/Kwai Chun Court, Shek Yam East Estate and Shek Lei Estate, were stipulated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) for long-term implementation upon redevelopment;

“G/IC” Sites

- (k) there were a total of 145 “G/IC” sites in the Area, of which 130 sites had been developed to their designated uses. The proposed BHRs are mainly to reflect the existing BHs. For school sites, a BHR of 8 storeys was generally imposed to meet the requirement for standard school development. Moreover, for government land which was currently vacant or occupied by temporary uses, or reservoirs, a BHR of 1 storey was proposed to allow flexibility for ancillary structures;
- (l) BHRs of 85mPD and 125mPD were proposed for the Princess Margaret Hospital and BHRs of 85mPD and 110mPD were proposed for the Kwai Chung Hospital to reflect the predominant existing BHs of the two hospitals;

“OU” Sites

- (m) there were 11 “OU” zones on the OZP covering business uses, container terminals, container-related uses, cargo handling area, cemetery, funeral parlours and crematorium, sewage treatment works, sewage screening plant, slaughter house, electricity substation and petrol filling station. The BHRs for the “OU(B)” zones with high-rise building were described under various sub-areas above. Other “OU” sites mainly comprised low- to medium-rise buildings. Their BH profiles were proposed to be retained by setting the maximum BH at their current levels;

- (n) the container terminals (CTs) were located at a prominent location which was the gateway of breezeway and adjacent to the visual corridor of Rambler Channel. The BHRs for major buildings within the CTs, including terminals buildings/logistics centres, were proposed in terms of mPD ranging from 25mPD to 110mPD to reflect their existing BHs. A BHR of 2 storeys was proposed on the open yards and the small-scale buildings within the CTs, taking into account the predominant BHs of 1 to 2 storeys of these buildings and to allow flexibility for ancillary structures in the open yards. Such BHR did not apply to container stacks and crane structures;

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

“O” Sites

- (o) there were 24 “O” sites, of which 21 sites involved only government land and 18 sites had been developed into public open spaces. The remaining three “O” sites, which were covered by vegetation, were reserved for future open space development. There were three “O” sites which comprised both government land and private land and the “O” zoning of these sites was proposed to be retained;
- (p) a total of 17 existing public open spaces, all under the management of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department, were proposed to be rezoned from various zones to “O” to reflect their current use and planning intention;

Rezoning Proposals

- (q) a total of 16 sites which were currently occupied by GIC facilities were proposed to be rezoned from various zones to “G/IC”, “G/IC(1)” or “G/IC(2)” zones to reflect the as-built condition and the planning intention. Facilities located within industrial areas (currently zoned “I” and “OU(B)”) were proposed to be rezoned to a more restrictive “G/IC(1)” zone due to potential environmental interface problems with the nearby industrial uses;

- (r) a total of 10 existing school sites of 2 to 8 storeys high were proposed to be rezoned from “R(A)” to “G/IC” and a BHR of 8 storeys were stipulated for these schools sites;
- (s) the existing MTR Emergency Access Points were proposed to be rezoned from “R(A)” and “I” to “OU(Railway Related Facilities)” and the existing MTR Ventilation Building was proposed to be rezoned from “R(A)” to “OU(Ventilation Building)”;
- (t) other rezoning proposals mainly included the rezoning of three existing vegetated slopes to “GB”, the rezoning of four existing electricity substations to “G/IC” or “G/IC(1)” zones and minor zoning boundary adjustments to reflect the existing land allocation boundary and road alignment;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (u) the proposed amendments to the Notes were shown in Attachment II of the Paper and mainly included :
 - (i) the incorporation of BHRs, NBA and building gap requirements and incorporation of minor relaxation clause for plot ratio restriction, BHR, NBA and building gap requirements;
 - (ii) the incorporation of a clause to require the submission of an AVA for the “CDA” zone;
 - (iii) the incorporation of a new set of Notes for the “G/IC(1)” sub-zone;
 - (iv) the incorporation of a new set of Notes for the “OU(Railway Related Facilities)” and “OU(Ventilation Building)” zone; and
 - (v) the updating/revision of the Notes to be consistent with the provisions recently incorporated in various OZPs and in accordance

with the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plan;

Proposed Amendments to the ES of the OZP

- (v) opportunity was taken to revise the ES as detailed in Attachment III of the Paper to take account of the proposed amendments, to include a set of criteria for consideration of planning applications for minor relaxation of BHRs and to update the information for various land use zones to reflect the latest planning circumstances; and

Departmental and Public Consultation

- (w) 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 Kwai Tsing District Council would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition period of the draft Kwai Chung OZP.

3. The Chairman noted that the proposed amendments mainly involved the stipulation of BHRs on various development zones and the majority of the BHRs had taken into consideration BHs of the existing buildings/committed developments. He asked whether there were any specific zones, within which redevelopment to the existing BH was not allowed or the BHR was proposed based on some other considerations. In response, Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan, DPO/TWK, said that they involved the “R(B)2” zone of Wonderland Villas and the “OU(Container Terminal)” zone of the Kwai Chung Container Terminal. The Chairman suggested and Members agreed that discussion could be focused on these two zones.

4. Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan briefed Members that a stepped BHRs of 260mPD, 275mPD, 290mPD and 275mPD were proposed for the “R(B)2” zone of Wonderland Villas and redevelopment to its existing BHs was not allowed, taking into consideration the visual impact of the development. Moreover, any new development or redevelopment of the site would require the submission of a planning application with the support of a layout plan and

a visual impact assessment to the Board for consideration.

5. The Chairman said that Wonderland Villas was located on the hilltop and the area was very windy. He asked about the purpose of the proposed building gaps as shown in the powerpoint and how the resulting wind impact could be mitigated. In response, Mr. Calvin K.F. Chiu, the AVA Consultant, said that there were some mitigation measures like tree plantings to reduce the wind impact at the pedestrian level.

[Mr. Felix W. Fong left the meeting at this point.]

6. A Member opined that from the architectural point of view, the existing building design of Wonderland Villas in a curvilinear shape along the ridgeline had its own merits and was granted an award by the Hong Kong Institute of Architects. This Member doubted whether the proposed stepped BHRs of 260mPD, 275mPD, 290mPD and 275mPD for the subject "R(B)2" zone, with no provision for redevelopment to the existing BHs, could achieve a better building design upon redevelopment as compared with the current one. This Member considered that the existing building design should be retained and the existing BHs of Wonderland Villas should be taken as the BHRs.

7. In response to a Member's enquiry on the historical background of Wonderland Villas, Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan said that according to his understanding, the Government granted the site for private residential development either under Letter A or Letter B and Wonderland Villas was built in 1980s. Under the lease, there was a condition which required the submission of a Master Layout Plan for the development. At that time, there was less public concern on the 'wall effect' of the development. However, there were also public views expressing that Wonderland Villas was the 'archetype' of walled buildings. The proposed stepped BHRs for Wonderland Villas were mainly intended to contain its visual impact.

8. The Chairman said that it might not be appropriate to stipulate BHRs which were more stringent than the existing BHs and at the same time not to allow redevelopment to the existing BHs. A Member opined that Wonderland Villas was located on the hilltop and it would not block the view or air ventilation of other developments. Moreover, the visual

impact of the development was subjective and subject to debate. Another Member shared similar views and suggested taking the existing BHs of Wonderland Villas as the BHRs for the subject “R(B)2” zone.

9. The Secretary said that the existing built form of Wonderland Villas would not be able to meet the Sustainable Building Design (SBD) Guidelines. Hence, upon redevelopment, re-design of the buildings was necessary. In this regard, the Urban Design Section of the Planning Department (PlanD) had undertaken a thorough investigation on the appropriate BHs for Wonderland Villas and drawn up a layout plan for the subject “R(B)2” zone. Stepped BHRs were proposed for this zone. The stipulation of a BHR at the highest level of the existing BH was not appropriate as the developers would likely redevelop the entire site to the highest level and resulted in a monotonous built form. The selection of several existing BHs as BHRs would not be able to reflect its current design with varying BHs. Consideration had also been given to rezone the site into “CDA” but redevelopment of the site would unlikely take place in short or medium term. The proposed BHRs of 260mPD, 275mPD, 290mPD and 275mPD could be able to accommodate the total gross floor area permissible under the OZP and comply with the SBD Guidelines. To address Members’ concern to take the existing BHs as the BHRs, the Notes for the subject “R(B)2” zone could be amended to allow redevelopment to its existing BHs. The Chairman added that the ES should also be revised to better illustrate the site characteristics of Wonderland Villas.

10. Another Member asked whether there was any mechanism to ensure that future development or redevelopment would respect the unique building design of Wonderland Villas. In response, the Secretary said that the applicant or developer would be required to submit a planning application with the support of a layout plan and a visual impact assessment upon redevelopment to the Board for consideration. Such requirement was stipulated in the Notes for the “R(B)2” zone.

11. After discussion, the Committee agreed with PlanD’s recommended BHRs for Wonderland Villas but the Notes for the “R(B)2” zone should be amended to allow redevelopment of Wonderland Villas to its existing BHs. The ES should also be amended accordingly. Besides, the relevant part of the ES should also be revised to better illustrate

the site characteristics of Wonderland Villas.

[Post-meeting Note: The ES was revised to better illustrate the design of the building development and site characteristics of Wonderland Villas.]

12. Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan then briefed Members on the proposed BHRs for the “OU(Container Terminal)” zone. Mr. Chan said that the BHRs for major buildings within the CTs were proposed in terms of mPD ranging from 25mPD to 110mPD to generally reflect their existing BHs. A BHR of 2 storeys was proposed on the open yards and the small-scale buildings within the CTs, taking into account the predominant BHs of 1 to 2 storeys of these buildings and to allow flexibility for ancillary structures in the open storage yards. A minor relaxation of the BHRs might be considered on application to the Board. There was no PR restriction for this zone but under the lease, any development within the CTs would require the submission of a layout plan for approval of the Director of Lands.

13. A Member said that according to the Outline of the 12th Five-Year Plan for National Economic and Social Development of the People’s Republic of China, Hong Kong played a significant role as a high-value goods inventory management and regional distribution centre. It was anticipated that there would be an increasing demand for land from the logistics industry. The proposed BHRs which mainly reflected the existing BHs of the CTs might impose constraints on the future development of the logistic industry. In response, Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan said that flexibility for redevelopment of the CTs was allowed. As stated in paragraph 8.10.2 of the ES in Attachment III of the paper, minor relaxation of BHRs might be considered by the Board on application under section 16 of the Ordinance. Developers or concerned parties who wished to redevelop the CTs could submit a comprehensive redevelopment scheme to the Board for consideration through the section 12A application procedure.

14. The Chairman said that the logistics industry had changed over years and greater flexibility should be given to cater for the changing requirements. The proposed BHR of 2 storeys for the open yards and the small-scale buildings, which only reflected the existing situation, might be too restrictive. Noting that a section 12A application and the subsequent plan making process would involve lengthy procedure, it would be more appropriate to allow

a higher BHR and if the operators would require an even higher BH to meet the fast-changing requirements of the logistic industry, they could submit a section 16 application for minor relaxation of BHR.

15. A Member said that the BHRs for the “OU(Container Terminal)” zone should not be too loose to avoid piecemeal redevelopment within the CTs. Another Member opined that it was difficult to predict the changing requirements of the logistics industry, the stipulation of BHRs by making reference to the existing predominant BHs was acceptable but sufficient flexibility should be allowed to cater for the changing requirements. A Member shared similar views that the turnover rate of the business within the CTs could be very fast. An application for minor relaxation of BHR might not allow sufficient flexibility.

16. A Member said that according to his understanding, modern logistics facilities were used in the logistics industry to enhance the operational efficiency and special-design warehouse would better suit their operational needs. The stipulation of BHR in terms of number of storeys would be able to allow a greater degree of flexibility.

17. Another Member said that the logistics industry in Hong Kong would also be affected by the policy in the Mainland. The operators of the logistics industry would need to respond quickly to changes, taking into consideration the development of the CTs in the Guangdong Province, like the Yantian Port.

18. A Member held a different view that the logistics industry was capital intensive and the operators should be able to respond quickly to market changes and they could liaise with the Government on their land requirements. Another Member shared the same view and added that application for minor relaxation of BHR had already allowed enough flexibility to cater for the changing requirements and it was necessary to justify why a relaxation clause for BHR was adopted for the “OU(Container Terminal)” zone. This Member also pointed out that for the future development of the CTs, it required a more comprehensive and long-term planning. It might not be appropriate to allow too much flexibility in the BHRs at this stage.

[Professional C.M. Hui left the meeting at this point.]

19. In response to a Member's enquiry on the precedent of adopting relaxation instead of minor relaxation clause, the Secretary said that the stipulation of relaxation clause in specific zones on the OZP was aimed to achieve some specific objectives. A relaxation clause for PR restriction for the Kowloon Station site had been stipulated on the OZP. Regarding the BHR, a relaxation clause was included in the "C" zone of the Tsim Sha Tsui OZP which was regarded as a high-rise node and the application for relaxation of BHR would need to meet a set of criteria. It was also applied in free-standing arts and cultural facilities under the "O" and "OU(Arts, Cultural, Entertainment and Commercial Uses)" zones on the West Kowloon Cultural District OZP as well as the "CDA(1)" zone for the West Kowloon Terminus of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link on the South West Kowloon OZP in order to allow greater design flexibility.

20. The Secretary continued to point out that the CTs were located at a prominent location of breezeway and adjacent to the visual corridor of Rambler Channel. It was more appropriate to have a comprehensive planning of the CTs in formulating the BHR if the existing BHs were not adopted. Nevertheless, the submission of a section 12A or a section 16 application for relaxation of BHR could still achieve the purpose for development control and the proposals would need to be published for public information. Although the former involved a more lengthy procedure, the applicant could present the proposal in front of the Board, whereas the applicant of the latter was not allowed to do so.

21. As Members had different views on whether application for relaxation of BHR for the "OU(Container Terminal)" zone should be submitted under section 16 or section 12A of the Town Planning Ordinance, the Chairman requested a show of hands. Five Members were in support of using the section 16 application procedure, one Member was in support of using the section 12A application procedure and two Members did not indicate their views.

22. After discussion, Members generally considered that the site for the CTs was unique and it was important to enhance the future development of the logistics industry in Hong Kong. The Committee agreed with PlanD's recommended BHRs for the "OU(Container Terminal)" zone. However, instead of stipulating a minor relaxation clause for the BHR, a relaxation clause for the BHR should be stipulated to provide flexibility to

cater for the fast-changing requirements of the logistics industry. The ES should also be revised to reflect the above amendments.

[Post-meeting Note: The ES was revised to reflect that a relaxation clause for the BHR was adopted for the “OU(Container Terminal)” zone and the application may need to be supported with technical assessments.]

23. Subject to the incorporation of the amendments as mentioned in paragraphs 11 and 22 above, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree that the proposed amendments to the approved Kwai Chung OZP No. S/KC/25 and the draft Kwai Chung OZP No. S/KC/25A at Attachment I of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/KC/26 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance;
- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment III of the Paper as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the TPB for the various land use zonings on the OZP; and
- (c) agreed that the revised ES was suitable for exhibition together with the draft OZP and its Notes under the name of the Board.

[The Vice-chairman thanked Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan, DPO/TWK, Ms. M.L. Leung, STP/SD, Ms. Fannie F.L. Hung, STP/KT, Ms. Ivy C.W. Wong, TP/SD and Mr. Calvin K.F. Chiu, AVA Consultant, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]