

**Minutes of 1115th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 17.6.2016**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairman

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Miss Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)
Mr C.W. Tse

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)
Transport and Housing Bureau
Miss Winnie M.W. Wong

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Director of Planning
Mr K.K. Ling

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr T.Y. Ip

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Director of Lands
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board (Atg.)
Ms Lily Yam

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Karen F.Y. Wong

Agenda Item 1

[Open meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1113th Meeting held on 3.6.2016

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1113th meeting held on 3.6.2016 were confirmed without amendments.

[Mr Franklin F.L. Yu and Mr C.W. Tse arrived to join the meeting under Agenda Item 2.]

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Confidential Item] [Closed Meeting]

2. This item was recorded under confidential cover.

[Ms Janice W.M. Lai arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Central District Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H4/15

(TPB Paper No.10125)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

3. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the Draft Central District Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) were mainly related to the rezoning of the Murray Road Multi-storey Car Park (MRMCP) site and the Queensway Plaza (QP) site for commercial use. The Transport Department (TD) appointed MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) to conduct a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) for the proposed development at MRMCP. The Planning Department (PlanD) appointed Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (ARUP) to undertake the Planning and Design Study on the Redevelopment of Queensway Plaza, Admiralty –

Feasibility Study (QP Study). The QP was operated by the Wheelock Properties (HK) Limited (Wheelock). Pacific Place Holdings Ltd (R4) was a subsidiary of Swire Properties Limited (Swire). MasterPlan Ltd was the consultant of a representer (R3). The following Members had declared interests on the item for having business dealings or affiliation with Wheelock, MVA, ARUP, MasterPlan, Swire or representers or having office in Admiralty :

- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with Wheelock, MVA, ARUP and MasterPlan
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with Wheelock, MVA and ARUP, and past business dealings with Swire
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - involving in a legal case with Wheelock and his firm having current business dealings with ARUP and the representer (R9), past business dealings with representer (R10), having acted in matters involving the names of representer (R4) and representatives of representer (R3)
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having current business dealings with Wheelock and Swire
- Mr Franklin F.L. Yu - having past business dealings with ARUP and being a member of Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design (R68)
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with MVA, Wheelock and Swire
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with ARUP
- Professor S.C. Wong - being an engineering consultant of ARUP and the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil Engineering of the University of Hong Kong where ARUP had sponsored some
(*Vice-chairman*)

activities of the Department before

- Dr C.H. Hau - being the vice-chairman of The Conservancy Association which received donation from Wheelock before
- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - her firm was tenant of the properties of Swire
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with ARUP, Wheelock and the representer (R9), past business dealings with representer (R10), and having acted in matters involving the names of representer (R4) and representatives of representer (R3); and his office locating in a building in the vicinity of the QP
- Mr H.F. Leung - his office locating in a building in the vicinity of the QP
- Mr K.K. Ling - being honorary advisor of Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design (R68)
(*Director of Planning*)

[Mr H.F. Leung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

4. Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being not able to attend the meeting. The meeting agreed that the interest of Mr Alex T.H. Lai was direct and he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. Noting that Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the cases with Wheelock/representers/QP Study, the meeting agreed that the interests of Mr Franklin F.L. Yu, the Vice-chairman, Dr C.H. Hau, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr H.F. Leung and Mr K.K. Ling were indirect and they should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The Chairman said that sufficient notice had been given to all the representers and commenters inviting them to the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the meeting, the rest had either indicated not to attend the hearing or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing in their absence.

6. The following government representatives, representers, commenters and representatives of representers/commenters were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department, (PlanD) and its Consultant

Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK)

Mr J.J. Austin - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK)

Ms Carmen Chu - Director, ARUP

Transport Department (TD) and its Consultant

Ms Maggie K. K. Mak - Senior Engineer/Central & Western

Mr Edmund Kwok - Associate Director, MVA

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R3 - Mile Sheen Limited

Mr Ian Brownlee] Representer's representatives

(MasterPlan)]

Mr Chapman Lam]

Mr W.H. Lam]

Mr C.K. Lau]

Ms Anna Wong]

Ms Margaret Wong]

Mr Eric Yu]

Mr Raymond Pang]

R4 - Pacific Place Holdings Limited

Mr Lau Chung Bo, - Representer's representative (attend only)
Boregard

R5 - Central & Western Concern Group

Mr John Batten - Representer's representative

R9 / C14 - Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer/Commenter

R6 – Thee Alliance for a Beautiful Hong Kong Ltd.

R10 – Melanie Moore

R11 – Evelyn Moore

R12 – Genevieve Moore

Ms Claudia Yuen - Representers' representative

R65 – Designing Hong Kong Limited

C1- Paul Zimmerman

Mr Paul Zimmerman - Representer's representative and commenter

R68 - Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design

Mr Ivan Ho] Representer's representatives

Mr Tam Po Yiu]

C7 - Franz Donhauser

Mr Wilson Wong - Commenter's representative (Attend only)

C9 - Law Ngar Ning Katty

C11 - Evelyn Moore

C12 - Genevieve Moore

C13 - Melanie Moore

Ms Law Ngar Ning, - Commenter and commenters' representative
Katty

7. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He then invited government representatives to brief Members on the background of the representations.

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr J.J. Austin, STP/HK, made the following main points as detailed in the Paper :

Background

- (a) on 11.12.2015, the draft Central District OZP No. S/H4/15 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of 72 representations and 14 comments on the representations (comments) were received;
- (b) on 6.5.2016, the Town Planning Board (the Board) agreed to consider the representations (R1 to R72) and comments (C1 to C14) collectively in one group;

Public Consultation

- (c) during the publication period of the draft OZP, the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) was consulted on 21.1.2016. The C&WDC expressed concerns on insufficient public car parking spaces in the future commercial development at the MRMCP site; the negative air ventilation and heat island effect; adverse visual impact on the ridgeline and to residents in the Mid-levels; the reduced breathing space; and adverse traffic impact arising from the zoning amendments;

[Miss Sandy H.Y. Wong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

The Representations

Supportive Representations (R1 to R4)

- (d) R1 and R2 supported all Amendment Items whereas R3 and R4 supported the proposed redevelopment of the eastern portion of the QP site (Amendment Item B1). R1 to R4 had also submitted general proposals. The proposals of R1 to R4 and the government's responses as detailed in paragraphs 4.2 and 6.3 of the Paper respectively were summarised as follows:

Land Use Mix (MRMCP and QP Sites)

- (i) a mixed use development to create a focal point should be provided and a minimum gross floor area (GFA) for retail use should be stipulated in the Notes of the "Commercial (4)" ("C(4)") zone or in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP;
- (ii) the response to the above proposal was:
- the amendment items were in line with the 2014 Policy Address for increasing land supply for commercial and business uses in the central business district (CBD). Adequate flexibility had already been provided in the OZP for the mix of use (i.e. office, retail and eating place) for the future development;

Linkage to the Surrounding (MRMCP and QP Sites)

- (iii) more linkages to the surrounding should be provided and an elevated walkway between the Central Government Offices (CGO) and the High Court should be designated;
- (iv) the response to the above proposal was:
- the redevelopment of MRMCP and QP would not affect the existing linkages. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) considered the existing linkages sufficient. The Government

was examining the feasibility of providing a new footbridge to connect the QP site with the Tamar footbridge;

Control Mechanism (QP redevelopment)

- (v) the controls and requirements should be clearly stated in the Notes and/or ES of the OZP, or incorporated into the lease;
- (vi) a planning brief for the QP site should be prepared and presented to the Board at the same meeting when the representations and comments were considered so as to allow public input;
- (vii) the responses to the above proposals were:
 - the main development parameters including the maximum building height, maximum site coverage and the required provision of public open space (POS) were already stipulated in the Notes of the OZP;
 - a Planning and Design Brief (PDB) was being prepared to guide the design and development of the site. The PDB would be attached to the land sale document. The PDB would be submitted to the Board for consideration, taking into account suitable points raised by the representers and the views of the Board;

Pedestrian Connections (QP Site)

- (viii) the existing pedestrian connections to Central and the adjacent buildings should be maintained throughout the construction period and upon completion of the development. The main links to the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) station and ground level should be retained or reprovisioned;
- (ix) it should be clarified whether the proposed pedestrian bridge connecting to the Tamar footbridge was to be built by the developer or by the Government;

- (x) the construction of basements under MTR facilities should be allowed;
- (xi) the responses to the above proposals were:
- the future developers would be required to maintain pedestrian connectivity with the surrounding developments through the existing walkways during both the construction period and upon completion of the development, and to provide a direct and barrier-free connection between the MTR concourse and the basement of the future development and with all existing footbridges and MTR exits;
 - the Government was exploring the technical feasibility of the footbridge to connect the site with Tamar footbridge, and yet to decide on the implementation;
 - the future development was required to avoid encroaching onto the existing MTR facilities within the site; but the development could be built above, adjacent to and under the MTR facilities;

Internal Transport Facilities (QP Site)

- (xii) the provision of car parking spaces and loading/unloading bays should not be required to follow the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) due to the good transport network available;
- (xiii) the response to the above proposal was:
- C for T considered it necessary to provide adequate car parking spaces and loading/unloading bays for the redevelopment of QP based on HKPSG;

Covered Open Space (QP Site)

- (xiv) as there would be difficulties in providing 1,400m² of open space at

the ground level, a proportion of not more than 25% being covered open space should be allowed;

(xv) the response to the above proposal was:

- a more important consideration was on the function and overall integration of the covered portion with the remaining POS and the building development. The PDB would set out clearly the principles that need to be considered in the design of the POS;

Site Coverage Calculation (QP redevelopment)

(xvi) the footbridges should be exempted from site coverage calculation;

(xvii) the response to the above proposal was:

- QP Study had demonstrated a workable scheme with site coverage not exceeding the 65% limit with all footbridge connections included for site coverage calculations. There was flexibility under the existing mechanism to apply for a minor relaxation of the planning control;

Other Design Requirements (QP Site)

(xviii) an atrium with a minimum area of 400m² and a minimum height of 8m should be stipulated in the ES of the OZP while flexibility for its location should be allowed. Flexibility should be allowed in the design of vehicular ramps in the basement of the site and in deciding the location of the refuse collection point on G/F. It was necessary to clarify whether the existing tree cluster needed to be maintained;

(xix) the response to the above proposal was:

- while specifying a minimum site requirement for the atrium could be considered, a 8m high headroom for the atrium might be too restrictive for innovative building design. The PDB for the QP site would set out the design principles and the

basic parameters for safeguarding the designated Tree Protection Zone and in-situ preservation of the Old and Valuable Tree (OVT) and mature trees within the zone, etc. The layout of the internal vehicular ramp, the exact location of the Refuse Collection Point (RCP), or the design and configuration of other design features would be subject to detailed design of the future development;

Traffic Arrangements (QP Site)

- (xx) modifications to the vehicular traffic arrangements on G/F should be made. The southern section of Tamar Street was proposed to be turned into a one-way northbound carriageway. The bus lane at the centre of the site was proposed to be relocated to the eastbound carriageway of Drake Street;
- (xxi) temporary traffic arrangements should be considered such as relocating the taxi stands to an area near Lippo Centre; the temporary closure of MTR Exit C2; and the rerouting of bus access to United Centre;
- (xxii) the responses to the above proposals were:
 - the representer's proposal of relocating the bus lane to the eastbound carriageway of Drake Street would impose serious conflicting movement with the taxis leaving the taxi stand, and result in the loss of a bus stop and bus stacking bays as well as other problems including the deletion of the existing loading/unloading bays, possible obstruction to taxi stand activities, and practicality of manoeuvring long bus and sharp turning from Drake Street to Admiralty (East) Public Transport Interchange (PTI);
 - the future developer would be required under the lease to conduct a TIA for construction traffic to the satisfaction of C for T;

Adverse Representations (R5 to R70)

- (e) R5, R6, R9 to R12, R14 to R59 and R62 to R64 opposed to Amendment Item A while R5, R6, R10 to R13 and R15 to R64 opposed to Amendment Items B1, B2 and B3. Their grounds and proposals and the government's responses as detailed in paragraphs 4.3 and 6.3 of the Paper respectively were summarised as follows:

MRMCP (Amendment A)

Traffic Impact

- (i) the redevelopment including the provision of new parking facilities would aggravate pedestrian and vehicular traffic;
- (ii) the redevelopment would draw cars to the area south of Connaught Road and aggravate the traffic congestion. A 'Park-n-Walk' strategy should be adopted;
- (iii) the responses to the above grounds were:
- the TIA conducted for the MRMCP site concluded that the future proposed development would not cause any adverse traffic impact to the surrounding road network;
 - the existing extended public transport network had adequate flexibility for the public to choose whether to park and walk or to take public transport;

Car Parking Space Provision

- (iv) there were different views on the level of car parking provision at MRMCP upon its redevelopment. Some considered that a reduction in car parking space provision upon redevelopment would cause on-street illegal parking and inconvenience to the public, while some commented that the provision was excessive;
- (v) early closure of the MRMCP would aggravate the shortage of car parking spaces in Central for 4-5 years;

- (vi) the responses to the above grounds were:
- although 388 public car parking spaces were currently provided at MRMCP, the TIA conducted for the MRMCP site indicated that the provision of 102 public car parking spaces was appropriate to meet the parking demand. Additional 150 private car parking spaces would be provided to serve the commercial development at the site;
 - the TIA estimated that there would be an interim shortage of public parking spaces for private cars and motor cycles within the reasonable walking catchment area of the MRMCP site during construction period. Due to the stringent physical constraints, there was no suitable location to provide temporary public car parking spaces. However, the public could still use the public parking spaces for private cars and/or motor cycles in the vicinity of MRMCP (300m to 500m);

Electronic Road Pricing (ERP) Scheme

- (vii) the provision of public car parking spaces was excessive and not in line with the ERP Scheme;
- (viii) the existing car park, locating at the periphery of CBD, should be retained for the implementation of the ERP Scheme;
- (ix) the responses to the above grounds were:
- while some members of the public or stakeholders expressed that more parking spaces should be provided at the periphery, others considered that parking spaces should be reduced to suit the ERP scheme. The Government would explore the need of the measures complementary to the ERP scheme taking into account relevant public views;
 - the proposed commercial development at the MRMCP site would not pre-empt the implementation of the ERP scheme;

Pedestrian Connection

- (x) explanation should be provided on why only one elevated public walkway would be re-provisioned instead of the current two walkways;
- (xi) the response to the above ground was:
 - MRMCP was currently connected on four sides to the existing footbridge system. The future development would be required to retain connecting points on the four sides of the development to the footbridge system;

Air Pollution

- (xii) traffic congestion would worsen air pollution which would bring negative impacts to Hong Kong's economy;
- (xiii) the response to the above ground was:
 - the TIA for MRMCP suggested that there was no adverse traffic impact and that the proposal would not cause any traffic congestion. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) considered that it was unlikely to have adverse environmental impact from the induced traffic flow;

Air Ventilation Impact

- (xiv) the redevelopment would cause a wall effect and worsen the canyon effect. The 'Scheme under Study' in the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) was not 190mPD in height and the result of the AVA could not reflect the real situation of the local wind environment after redevelopment;
- (xv) the response to the above ground was:
 - the AVA identified a good design direction and concluded that the building height of the development was of secondary importance in terms of air ventilation performance. A development with smaller footprint and more setback from site boundary would perform better;

Visual Impact

(xvi) there was a technical error in the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) in that it could not be demonstrated that an assessment area equal to approximately 3 times the overall building height of the subject development had been adopted, as required by the VIA assessment guidelines;

(xvii) the response to the above ground was:

- the visual appraisal was undertaken in accordance with the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Submission of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board (TPB PG-No.41). The assessment area equalling to three times the height of the building was usually adopted as initial reference in approximating the extent of the assessment area, the boundary of assessment would be refined taking into account the view from areas with direct sightlines to the site;

Loss of Community Facilities

(xviii) the loss of community facilities was not compensated for;

(xix) the response to the above ground was:

- relevant management/maintenance departments had been consulted and it was confirmed that only a public car park would need to be reprovisioned. Government departments had no other specific facility requirement for the site;

Supply of Grade-A Offices

(xx) no information on the supply and demand of Grade-A office was provided;

(xxi) the response to the above ground was:

- according to the 2015 Policy Address, the demand of economic activities for office, retailing, hotel, trading and

logistics space was huge. In the 'Hong Kong Property Review 2016' published by the Rating and Valuation Department, the vacancy rate of Grade-A offices in Central decreased from 6.5% in 2005 to 5.4% in 2015, which was lower than the overall vacancy rate. The average rents of Grade-A offices in Central increased drastically from \$410/m² in 2005 to \$1030/m² in 2015;

QP (Amendment B1 to B3)

Traffic Impact

- (xxii) the increase in pedestrian and vehicular traffic arising from the new office development would worsen traffic congestion and pollution;
- (xxiii) the redevelopment of the site for commercial use would worsen the issue of picking-up and dropping-off passengers along Queensway;
- (xxiv) the responses to the above grounds were:
- the TIA confirmed that, with a suitable mitigation measure in place (i.e. the prohibition of loading and unloading activities within the site during peak hours viz. 7am to 10am and 4pm to 7pm), the proposed development would not cause significant adverse traffic impact to the surrounding road network;
 - adequate loading and unloading and car parking spaces would be provided within the QP site in accordance with HKPSG;

Road Layout

- (xxv) the existing lay-by and road design should be retained and Amendment Item B3 was unnecessary. The junction between Tamar Street and Drake Street would be a point of great conflict.

The existing PTI and related facilities should be improved;

(xxvi) the response to the above ground was:

- Amendment Item B3 was to reflect the existing bus lay-by and the road design would not be changed. The design of the road junction and the ingress/egress of the QP site would comply with the Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM). C for T would ensure that the PTI would be designed in accordance with the latest design standard;

Pedestrian Connection

(xxvii) there might be constraints in providing a pedestrian footbridge around Admiralty Centre to connect with Tamar;

(xxviii) the increase in office floorspace would attract more commuters and aggravate the already over-crowded situation at Admiralty MTR Station. The analysis in the TIA about the pedestrian flows on vertical access points at AM and PM peak hours were at comfort levels of D and E was not acceptable;

(xxix) the responses to the above grounds were:

- a study would be undertaken to investigate the feasibility of the proposed footbridge to connect the site with Tamar footbridge;
- the TIA concluded that the performance of all MTR entrances and footbridges in and around the site would be operating at an adequate level except the proposed vertical access point near MTR Exit C1. The future developer was required to provide a direct underground barrier-free pedestrian connection between the MTR station concourse and the basement floor of the proposed development. It would help improve the pedestrian traffic at the proposed vertical access near MTR Exit C1;

Loss of Public Open Space and Community Facilities

(xxx) the proposal would result in the loss of at-grade open space and greenery was of poor planning. The proposed reprovisioning of part of the POS was in the form of a covered open space and was not supported. The proposed at-grade POS and indoor atrium space would only serve as a pedestrian walkway or a spot for advertising/promotion activities rather than a quality public space. The proposed landscape podium might not be user-friendly as gardens at upper levels were inaccessible and unpopular;

(xxxii) the response to the above ground was:

- the existing Admiralty Garden had a site area of 1,700m². To compensate for the loss of that open space, the future developer was required to provide POS (including the above-grade POS) with the proposed development and surrounding pedestrian connections in accordance with the design principles and guidelines as set out in the PDB;

Tree Felling and Greening

(xxxiii) there were no details on the no. of trees to be felled and the compensatory planting to be provided for the proposed development;

(xxxiiii) the proposed greening coverage of 30% was inadequate. A greener CBD should be promoted and roadside planting should be encouraged;

(xxxv) the responses to the above grounds were:

- a tree survey was conducted under the QP Study. The study recommended retaining 11 trees including the OVT, transplanting 7 trees and felling 25 trees. A tree protection zone was designated to protect the OVT and its adjoining mature trees;
- the requirement of minimum 30% coverage for greening

with the POS was in line with the 'Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines'. The future developer was also required to maximise greening opportunities within the proposed development and design;

Visual and Urban Design

- (xxxv) the redevelopment proposal for QP was excessive, arbitrary and incompatible with the surrounding existing buildings. The proposal would make the environment at Admiralty more congested;
- (xxxvi) a view corridor along Tim Wa Avenue passing through the podium of Far East Finance Building and the western portion of the QP site should be adopted for the VIA;
- (xxxvii) the responses to the above grounds were:
- the proposed development was not incompatible with the surrounding developments in terms of scale and height. The maximum site coverage and set back could allow opportunities to enhance visual openness and amenity at street level;
 - the alternative view corridor along Tim Wa Avenue suggested by the representer would not be affected by the QP redevelopment;

Air Ventilation

- (xxxviii) the proposed tower block up to 200mPD would cause adverse impact on air ventilation;
- (xxxix) the response to the above ground was:
- according to the AVA, the redevelopment proposal would not bring about adverse air ventilation impacts;

Others

- (xl) explanations should be provided for not incorporating the provision of car parking spaces in the Notes of “C” zone, and not submitting the planning brief and Master Layout Plan (MLP) at the current stage to the Board for consideration;
- (xli) no information was provided to address the water and air nuisance generated by the new refuse collection point (RCP). The ‘Refuse Collection Point’ to be specified as Column 1 use should be justified. ‘Commercial Bathhouse/Massage Establishment’ should not be included in the Notes of the “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Elevated Walkway cum Retail Use ” zone;
- (xlii) the proposed redevelopment scheme should be subject to public engagement;
- (xliii) the problem of inadequate eating places and long queues during lunch hour in Admiralty would be exacerbated;
- (xliv) the restriction of non-domestic GFA and the requirement of the pedestrian connection should be stipulated in the “OU(Elevated Walkway cum Retail Use)” zone;
- (xlv) the splayed façade would likely cause adverse glare impact on motorists and pedestrians;
- (xlvi) the responses to the above grounds were:
 - the provision of private car parking spaces should be in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG and to the satisfaction of C for T. A PDB to guide the future development of the site would be prepared taking into account the views of the Members on the representations. The Board would be consulted accordingly;
 - the design, planning, construction and operation of the RCP should follow the environmental planning principles in

Chapter 9 of HKPSG and subject to related environmental pollution control ordinances. Any possible development impacts e.g. the water and air nuisances could be addressed in the context of the proposed development subject to approval by relevant authorities. ‘Commercial Bathhouse/Massage Establishment’ uses were not incompatible with other commercial uses, and was a column 1 use within “C” zone;

- a number of consultations with C&WDC were carried out before and after the submission of the proposed zoning amendments to MPC. The exhibition of the draft OZP for public comments and submission of representations for the consideration by the Board was also a form of public consultation;
- ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’ were Column 1 uses that were always permitted within “C(3)” and “C(4)” zones. That allowed maximum flexibility for the future developer to decide on the mix of uses (i.e. office, retail and eating places) for the future development;
- given that the building bulk of the walkway was largely controlled via the building height restriction, it was considered not necessary to impose any GFA restriction;
- the future developer was required to adopt a low reflective façade treatment to minimize reflection of sunlight to minimize the glare impact to meet the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines;

Adverse Representatives’ Proposals

(xlvii) the western part of the existing QP should be rezoned from an area shown as ‘Road’ and “Commercial” to “OU(Elevated Walkway cum Information & History Display Spaces &

Information Boards)”;

(xlviii) the existing building height of QP and its walkway should be specified as the maximum building height of the site;

(xlix) QP should be developed into a low-rise entertainment node built around an open courtyard and a community meeting place with a direct connection to Tamar Park;

(l) the responses to the above proposals were:

- the planning intention of the “OU(Elevated Walkway cum Retail Uses)” zone was to reflect the existing shopping arcade use. The provision of history display spaces and information boards was always permitted and could be fully integrated with the commercial use;
- a maximum building height of 21mPD was specified for the western portion of the existing QP to reflect the existing height of the building;
- QP was considered suitable for redevelopment in view of the demand for commercial floorspace. The development potential was optimised. The PDB would set out the important planning and design principles to guide its redevelopment into a focal point with good connectivity with its surroundings;

Representations Providing Views (R71 & R72)

(f) two representations providing views on all the amendment items which were similar to those raised in the supporting/adverse representations and the responses above were relevant;

Comments on Representations

- (g) 14 comments on representations were received with 7 supporting the Amendment Item B1, 3 objecting to all the Amendment Items and 4 providing various views on the Amendment Items. The grounds of comments were similar to those raised in the representations, and the responses to the representations above were relevant ;

PlanD's Views

- (h) PlanD's views on the representations as summarised in paragraph 8 of the Paper were:
- (i) the supportive views of R1 to R4 and the comments provided by R71 and R72 were noted; and
 - (ii) R5 to R70 were not supported, and the Plan should not be amended to meet the representations.

9. The Chairman then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their submissions.

R3- Mile Sheen Limited

10. Noting that R3's representatives had requested for 30 minutes to speak as they had 4 speakers and a lot of information to present, the Chairman said that reasonable flexibility could be given to them for more speaking time but reminded them that their presentation should be related to the OZP amendments, concise and not repetitive.

11. Mr Ian Brownlee said that their submission was attached to Annex 3 of the Paper which included an executive summary, architectural drawings, TIA and retail study. In addition, his team had recently prepared a Queensway Plaza Redevelopment Stakeholder Engagement Report which would be tabled at the meeting. He did not understand why his team was only allowed 30 minutes to speak while the government representatives had presented for almost 50 minutes.

12. The meeting noted that the government representative's presentation was intended to brief Members on the background, the subject matters of all the representations and comments received and the Government's responses to facilitate Members' ensuing discussion, while the presentations of individual representers/commenters would be focused on their own case.

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee made the following main points:

- (a) they supported the "C(4)" zoning at the QP site, but raised concerns on the needs for enhancement of pedestrian connectivity, better traffic arrangement to avoid deterioration of the traffic condition and better provision of food and beverage (F&B) and retail facilities in the area which were required to support a high quality office node; and
- (b) they did not propose any amendments to the Plan and Notes of OZP, but recommended to add certain requirements/specifications in the ES and the forthcoming PDB or lease to ensure that a balance approach was taken to achieve a development of quality design.

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr W.H. Lam made the following main points:

- (a) based on the scheme submitted by PlanD to the Board when considering the proposed amendments to the OZP, they noted that a long list of Government, institution or community (GIC) facilities would be accommodated in the proposed QP redevelopment which was subject to a site coverage restriction of 65%. On the street level, there would be a taxi stand and its queuing space, bus terminus/stops with its routes running across the site, MTR Exits C1 and C2 and its pedestrian tunnel, a RCP (594m²), a POS (1,400m²) and a vehicular ramp to the basement car park of the commercial development. After deducting the area of those facilities, only 550 m² (8.8% of site area) would be available which was grossly inadequate to provide elevator cores, fire escape stairs, smoke vents and lift lobbies to support the commercial development with such a

large scale of 93,000m² GFA. The retention of MTR exits and its pedestrian tunnel also had safety concerns when construction works were carried out above and below them;

- (b) it was proposed to (i) relocate the bus lane to Drake Street; and (ii) allow future developer to liaise with MTRC to reprovision the MTR Exit C1 and its pedestrian tunnel to the eastern boundary of the site with no interruption to the MTR operation. As a result, the development area on G/F could be increased to 1,000m² (16% of site area) to facilitate the design for Grade A offices at that very prime site;
- (c) the calculation of the site coverage should exclude one-storey footbridges to in line with the latest Sustainable Building Design Guidelines of the Buildings Department. The atrium at level 2 should have an event place of 400m² with 8m headroom clearance to form a focal point; and

[Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (d) if the proposed redevelopment followed HKPSG, the basement car park would have 6 levels. Given the high rock head level at the site, the 6-level car park would need a long construction time which would prolong the disturbance in the area and delay the supply of new Grade A offices. As the site was located right next to the MTR station, the Board was requested to minimize the car parking space provision and the scale of the basement.

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Chapman Lam made the following main points:

Car Parking Space Provision

- (a) Table 11 of Chapter 8 of HKPSG stated that the Authority would need to have flexibility, within and beyond the standard ranges, to meet special circumstances by considering factors such as proximity to and quality of pedestrian access linking railway stations and other major public transport interchanges, availability of public transport services and public car parks, road capacity in the district, feasibility of providing safe entry/exit points,

area and shape of the site, parking demand and supply condition in the vicinity;

- (b) the site was located in one of the largest railway hubs in Hong Kong served by four railway lines (i.e. South Island Line (SIL), Tsuen Wan Line, Shatin to Central Link (SCL) and North Island Line), well-established bus and minibus networks and tramway service. The public car parks in the vicinity such as Harcourt Garden, Pacific Place and United Centre and Queensway Government Offices were not fully utilized. Given some representations had raised concerns over the traffic condition in Admiralty, the reduction of public car parking spaces at the QP site could reduce the reliance of private cars and promote the use of public transport. In gist, given the site constraints and the fact that it could fulfill the criteria set out in HKPSG stated above, flexibility should be allowed for car parking provision;

Alternative PTI Layout and Traffic Arrangement

- (c) Admiralty was a transport hub and its transport function took priority. The Government's proposed PTI layout and traffic arrangement were conceived from a study conducted by TD which focused on the operation of the PTI without giving consideration to the proposed QP redevelopment;
- (d) their alternative PTI layout might not be better, but it could illustrate that the PTI layout under QP Study had a number of issues. For example, the southbound traffic along Tamar Street would encounter four traffic conflicting junctions within short distance, and there would be public safety concern due to the bus routes running across the centre of the site;
- (e) the Government's comments on R3's proposed PTI layout that it would reduce the number of bus bays and cause traffic conflict between the taxi queue and bus turning into Admiralty (East) PTI. In response, he considered that the bus bays displaced could be accommodated elsewhere given there was an opportunity for restructuring the bus routes upon the opening the SIL in end 2016. Their proposed widening of Drake Street

and simplification of junction arrangement along Tamar Street could compensate the conflicting point between taxi queue and bus traffic; and

- (f) the swept path analysis confirmed that it was feasible for bus to turn into the Admiralty (East) PTI and the arrangement could also be further modified if their proposal was accepted. In gist, their proposed PTI layout and traffic arrangement was a balance between various requirements and priorities. He requested the Board to accept that the PTI layout and traffic arrangement proposed under QP Study needed to be refined taking into account the architectural, buildings and other factors, and to allow flexibility in the lease for the refinement of the PTI layout and traffic arrangement.

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr C.K Lau made the following main points:

- (a) a stakeholder engagement exercise for QP redevelopment was conducted to collect the stakeholders' views on the needs of retail and F&B for the whole Admiralty area. The QP site was at a central location of the study area and ideal for retail/F&B use while other sites with known development plans were at the fringe of Admiralty. Currently, 21.2% of the total commercial floorspace in Admiralty was used for retail. The worker population would be increased from 54,600 to 71,600 while the amount of future retail floorspace was not yet known;
- (b) the retail provision in Admiralty was found to be the lowest among other common commercial areas in Hong Kong including Yau Tsim Mong, Wan Chai, Kwun Tong, Central and Western, Kowloon Bay Action Area. The workers in Admiralty would need to wait an average of 15 to 30 minutes at the F&B outlets in Admiralty during lunch hour, usually only one hour, on weekdays and the number of seats to people ratio was 1:6.3; and
- (c) existing retail provision in Admiralty was at a deficit as compared with other areas surveyed. It was proposed to adopt the existing retail provision ratio of 21.2% and provide 20,000m² retail GFA in the proposed

development with the total GFA of 93,300m² at the QP site with such an ideal central location.

17. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee said that in summary, R3 had the following main proposals:

- (a) to provide flexibility in the PDB and lease to allow the future developer to relocate the bus bay and realign the MTR facilities within the site with the agreement of the Mass Transit Railway Corporation (MTRC) and Transport Department; and
- (b) to specify in the ES of the OZP that (i) the provision of internal transport facilities in accordance with HKPSG was not necessary; (ii) the provision of a minimum retail floorspace of 20,000 m²; and (iii) other features including design requirements for the atrium, exemption of elevated footbridge system from site coverage calculation, and maximum proportion of covered open space.

R5 - Central & Western Concern Group

18. Mr John Batten made the following main points :

- (a) while PlanD had referred to the Policy Address in 2014 that new commercial sites would be provided in various commercial areas in Hong Kong to meet the demand, Members should note that the Policy Address over several years had assured the public that a better living environment and life would be provided;
- (b) the interface issue between the pedestrian flow and vehicular traffic was a problem Admiralty facing. Pedestrian crossing the roads had conflicted with the vehicular traffic. A number of bus routes had to make several tight turns for entering into the existing PTIs while some bus routes had drop-off/pick-up points at Queensway instead of going into the PTIs. PlanD assumed that the public transport provision in Admiralty would not be changed. However, with the opening of SIL, it was bound to be some changes in the patronage of bus routes to the southern district of Hong

Kong Island. Great flexibility should be allowed in planning the use of the area at street level in Admiralty. Even though the AVA for the QP Study concluded that there would be no air ventilation problem in the area, the existing G/F environment of Admiralty was appalling with vehicular emission;

- (c) despite that the OZP only provided a broadbrush control on development, it was the opportunity that the public could exert influence over the development. The development proposals as presented in the Paper could not be considered as a good planning. The minutes of C&WDC meeting as included the Paper indicated that C&WDC was not satisfied with many aspects of the proposed developments;
- (d) C&W Concern Group opposed to the QP and MRMCP redevelopment proposals as they would have wall effect in the area, increase the development intensity of the already over-crowded area and aggravate the shortage problem of parking spaces and public transportation;
- (e) noting that the proposed amendments would eventually be approved, he hoped that the Board could make decisions that would help improve the environment of the over-crowded area. The POS in Hong Kong was full of dangers to the public as there was no greenery and adequate seating and shades. If covered, such as under podium, the POS was usually an appalling place in the hot summer and cold winter. The design of the 1,400m² POS at-grade at the QP site should be carefully looked at;
- (f) it was important to be clear on the types of POS to be provided in the QP site. The Paper stated that future developer needed to follow 'Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines' in designing and managing the POS. That would not be sufficient assurance given that the POS in some developments, such as, the one at Lee Tung Street where the POS provided at podium was not visible and easily accessible to the public; and
- (g) C&W Concern Group requested for rezoning the western part of the existing Queensway Plaza from an area shown as 'Road' and "C" to

“OU(Elevated Walkway cum Information & History Display Spaces & Information Boards)”. The intention of such rezoning was to recapture the history of Admiralty area which was once used for the colonial military’s facilities and immigration reception centre for immigrants from the Mainland. Even if the OZP would not allow provision for such detailed design, it was suggested to incorporate in the lease the requirements for providing features to recapture the history of Admiralty.

R6 - The Alliance for a Beautiful Hong Kong Ltd. (The Alliance)

R10 - Melanie Moore

R11 - Evelyn Moore

R12 - Genevieve Moore

19. Ms Claudia Yuen made the following main points :

- (a) the Alliance objected to the OZP amendments. Admiralty was a very congested area with the problems of serious air pollution, heavy pedestrian flow, congested vehicular traffic and insufficient eating places. It was already saturated without spare capacity for more office development. Over the years, the Government had made efforts to decentralize the office development from CBD in Central/Admiralty to other areas such as Kowloon Bay, Kwun Tong, Tsim Sha Tsui, for the sustainable growth of Hong Kong. The current amendments to increase the office floorspace in CBD of Central was against the Government’s office decentralization policy;
- (b) in response to the congestion issue of the public transport, in particular the MTR Admiralty station, raised by the representers/commenters, the Government had suggested to add a pedestrian corridor from MTR platform to the concourse. However, the crux of the congestion issue was that there were too many office workers in Admiralty. During the peak hours, passengers in MTR Admiralty Station platform needed to wait for 5 trains for boarding, which could not be resolved by providing more exits;

- (c) the Alliance opposed to the reduction of POS at the QP site upon redevelopment. The existing QP had POS at its rooftop and the at-grade Admiralty Garden. Despite that a POS and an atrium would be provided in the proposed QP redevelopment, they would likely be used as pedestrian corridors and places for holding promotion activities, rather than resting and relaxing gardens for the public. The POS at the terraced podium would likely be managed by private developer. Based on the track records, such POS had varied management qualities and was not open to the public 24 hours;
- (d) the public had expressed various demands, such as increasing POS provision and not to replacing the existing POS with one of inferior quality. The Government simply responded that the relevant bureaux/departments had been consulted and confirmed that only public car parking spaces at the MRMCP site was needed. Public consultation was meaningless if the Government did not revise their proposals to take into account public views collected;
- (e) the low-rise development at the existing QP site allowed the penetration of sea breeze into the inland area, and replacing it with the proposed high-rise development would have profound effect on the air ventilation in the congested Admiralty. The Alliance objected to the loss of the only breathing space in the area;
- (f) while 7 existing trees at the QP site would be transplanted and 27 trees would be felled, there was only a small amount of greening (30%) would be provided in the proposed QP redevelopment with substantial portion to be provided under covered area. The greening provision was insufficient to meet the needs of the congested Admiralty area and the proposed development. The Alliance requested to retain the trees or minimize the number of trees to be replanted and felled within the future development; and
- (g) in all, the Alliance objected to Amendment Items A, B1, B2 and B3 and hoped that the Board would consider their grounds of representation.

R9 - Mary Mulvihill

20. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) as observed in many other cases, PlanD usually made use of various technical assessments to demonstrate no insurmountable problems arising from the proposed developments, and the Board rubberstamped the proposals without critically reviewing the assessments and considering the proposals from the community's perspective. The Board was reminded that they had a duty to assess whether the proposal was a good plan to improve the environment and what it would give to the community. Pages 10, 11, 14, 15 and 18 of the Paper revealed that the proposed developments had adverse visual and air ventilation impacts on the area;
- (b) an Audit Report prepared by the Commissioner for Audit had already revealed the abusive use of POS in private developments. It could also be seen from the case of K11 development in Tsim Sha Tsui where the developer had turned a POS of about 1,000 m² into a pedestrian corridor with a few seats at one end and a few plants. For Lee Tung Street development, most of the POS outside the future MTR exits would likely be taken up as pedestrian corridors. It appeared that such abusive use would be repeated in the current case;
- (c) she objected to the Government's response that community facilities were not required in Admiralty because it was a business area. People spent most of their days in work place and community facilities and POS should be provided to cater for the needs of workers within the area, for example, to sit down and relax during lunch hours and to gather with friends in early evening. There were also not enough facilities in Admiralty to cater for the domestic helpers gathering together in weekends and the large crowds of public come for the events/protests nearby. If there were enough dining facilities in the area, office workers would not need to buy takeaway food and throw away many plastic bags and lunch boxes which had generated negative impact on environment;

- (d) the existing Admiralty Garden had lots of greening and trees and its area would be reduced by half for the construction of office tower above. The air ventilation at the future Admiralty Garden would be blocked. The AVA should assess not only the air ventilation of the district but also at the future Admiralty Garden;
- (e) the TIA conducted for the OZP amendment was usually meaningless. In the redevelopment case for the Middle Road Car Park, a DC member, a member of Democratic Alliance for the Better and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB) and she attended the hearing to object the zoning amendment. The Board asked only a few questions and the zoning amendment was eventually approved. That car park was subsequently closed down resulting in chaotic traffic in Tsim Sha Tsui while the local residents suffered from constant noise pollution which was worse than air pollution;
- (f) it was common that the Government would propose mitigation measures along with the zoning amendments and she was concerned on how the Government would ensure that the mitigation measures would be implemented. MTRC was supposed to put guards on the streets to prevent double parking in relation to a pedestrian subway leading to K11 development but had not done so. She currently exchanged 20 emails with Transport and Housing Bureau but the problem still could not be resolved and might last for many years. A good plan should not rely on mitigation measures to achieve the results;
- (g) according to the materials submitted by the Administration to the Legislative Council, the disposition of the building at the Tamar development was aligned to allow a major breezeway to bring winds from the harbour to the inner area. The Tamar development had incorporated a number of measures including the POS, green carpet, visual permeability features and open-door design to maintain the air ventilation in the surrounding area. Its building height restriction of 160mPD could safeguard the 20% building free zone below the ridgeline. All those measures would be wasted with the proposed wall-like tower at the QP site. There was also no illustration of the air flow path under the AVA

assessment and the layout of the proposed redevelopments in the Paper;
and

- (h) HKPSG set out Qualitative Guidelines on Air Ventilation which included, among others, (i) the provision of breezeways along major prevailing wind directions and air paths intersecting the breezeways; (ii) the creation of breezeways in forms of major open ways through the high-density/high-rise urban form; (iii) special considerations to the appropriate scale, height and disposition of building blocks along the waterfront to avoid blockage of sea/land breezes and prevailing winds; (iv) avoidance of congestion of tall buildings that blocked the winds; (v) maximization of planting in open space; and (vi) the provision of wide gaps between building blocks. She requested Members to assess whether the proposed developments were in compliance with those design criteria.

R65 - Designing Hong Kong Limited (DHK)

C1 - Paul Zimmerman

21. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Paul Zimmerman made the following main points :

- (a) he opposed to Amendment Item A, i.e. rezoning of the MRMCP site from “G/IC” and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “C(3)” and recommended to defer the sale of the site, reduce the number of parking spaces in the proposed development and implement a ‘Park-n-Walk’ strategy for Central;

Defer the Sale of the MRMCR Site

- (b) the MRMCP site was located to the south of Connaught Road and fell within the area where TD had raised serious concern on its traffic congestion. The early closure of MRMCP would contradict the strategy to reduce traffic congestion in Central. As compared with Kowloon and New Territories, Hong Kong Island had very low average car journey speeds of 21.4km/hour in 2013 during morning peak hours on weekdays, while the section of Chater Road from Pedder Street to Murray Road (i.e. around the MRMCP site) had even lower speeds of 10.2km/hour;

- (c) when presenting the proposal to C&WDC, PlanD admitted that there would be an interim shortfall of parking spaces during peak hours in the area, and said that motorists might use nearby car parks. However, the alternative car parks suggested by PlanD were unrealistic. For example, Star Ferry Car Park was always full at 11 am and during lunch hours, motorists needed to drive through the congested roads to reach Cheung Kong Centre Car Park which would aggravate the traffic congestion problem, and Harcourt Garden Car Park was far away. Based on his experience in using MRMCP, most of the cars parking there were chauffeur driven and those cars would then drive around or wait at roadside which would aggravate the traffic congestion issue. It was recommended to redevelop the car park of City Hall into a tower car park before closing the MRMCP;

'Park-n-Walk' Strategy

- (d) the City Hall Car Park was located to the north of Connaught Road, i.e. at the periphery of the CBD, and the vehicles parking there would not need to drive into the inner area of Central. 'Park-n-Walk' behavior pattern was already developed in Sheung Wan where motorists parked their cars in Rumsey Street Car Park and walked to the inner area of Sheung Wan through the footbridge system;
- (e) such 'Park-n-Walk' Strategy should be adopted for Central in which car parks were located at the periphery of CBD to the north of the major Connaught Road corridor, with quick access to the road corridor to reduce traffic in the inner area to the south of Connaught Road. To facilitate the implementation of 'Park-n-Walk' strategy, the pedestrian linkages between the waterfront and the area south of Connaught Road corridor should be enhanced; and

Reduce the Number of Parking Spaces in MRMCP Redevelopment

- (f) with the redevelopment of City Hall multi-storey Car Park into tower Car Park and the enhancement of the pedestrian connections to the inner

area, the number of car parking spaces to be provided in the MRMCP site should be reduced to support the 'Park-n-Walk' policy.

[Mr Franklin F.L. Yu left the meeting at this point.]

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of 5 minutes.]

R68 - Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design (HKIUD)

22. Mr Ivan Ho made the following main points:

- (a) HKIUD raised concerns on the Amendment Items B1, B2 and B3. The QP site was an important site located at the centre of Admiralty. The QP redevelopment provided the opportunity to improve the urban space and quality of the area. The public and professional bodies should be widely engaged in designing the QP redevelopment in addition to the public consultation conducted under the Town Planning Ordinance;
- (b) the Government's responses to HKIUD's views were disappointing as they had deferred the resolution of the issues at a later stage. For example, the greening ratio was formulated without considering its implementability. The building industry was facing difficulties in meeting the greening ratio and had to compromise the quality of the building design for it. The QP redevelopment should be regarded as an opportunity to set a good example to illustrate that town planning and building design could be responsive to the climatic change issue;

23. Mr P.Y. Tam made the following main points:

- (a) the bulk of the proposed QP redevelopment was excessive, arbitrary and unharmonious with the surrounding developments. PlanD considered that the proposed QP redevelopment was not incompatible as its building bulk was similar to those of the surrounding buildings. However, planning should be people-oriented. Whether the proposed QP redevelopment was in harmony with the surroundings should be assessed by its internal and external spatial relationship with people;

- (b) the VIA was not comprehensive as the viewpoint to the façade facing Admiralty Centre was not included. PlanD responded that they had followed the Government technical circular in conducting the VIA. However, the sensitive receivers of the visual impact should be the pedestrians in the nearby roads as the proposed QP redevelopment would block air ventilation and penetration of sunlight at the street level but viewpoints to the proposed development from nearby roads were not assessed;
- (c) as illustrated by R3, the vehicular ingress/egress point of the proposed QP redevelopment was obviously not feasible and such technical assessment should be conducted by the Government rather than a representer. The vertical connections of the proposed development were not clear and PlanD's response was that the future developer was required to work out the details. That meant that the practicality and implementability of the ingress/egress points and vertical connections could not be ascertained. The main planning merit of the proposed QP redevelopment was its possible connection to Tamar footbridge but the feasibility of such connection had yet to be carried out which meant that the provision could not be guaranteed. HKIUD was also concerned with the public accessibility of the POS at podium as raised by other representers/commenters, which could not be a user friendly or people-oriented design; and
- (d) if the Government needed to meet the target as set out in the Policy Address for providing a certain amount of commercial floor space, it could be achieved by other means such as lowering the development intensity at the QP site and identifying other suitable sites to share the development intensity or replace the QP site totally, rather than placing a development with excessive scale at the unsuitable QP site.

24. In conclusion, Mr Ivan Ho said that HKIDU recognized the need for office development, but requested Members to consider that the QP site was at a very prime location in Admiralty, the redevelopment offered opportunity for more greening, enhancing pedestrian

connectivity and provision of supporting facilities in the area. The Board should not make hasty decision to construct office tower of typical design just to meet the land supply schedule.

C9 - Law Ngar Ning, Katty

C11 - Evelyn Moore

C12 - Genevieve Moore

C13 - Melanie Moore

25. Ms Law Ngar Ning, Katty, made the following main points :

- (a) while representers/commenters attended the hearing had the wish to discuss with the Board the way to achieve a good town plan that could provide a good working and living environment, the intention of the Government appeared to be not the same. Admiralty was already saturated and had reached its development capacity. Replacing the existing low-rise developments at the MRMCP and QP sites with the proposed high-rise developments would fill up the only breathing spaces in Admiralty. The high-rise buildings on both sides of Queensway would result in wall effect and canyon effect in the area. She doubted whether it was a good planning and whether the proposed QP redevelopment which was very bulky would not have any adverse impacts on the surroundings;
- (b) she did not agree with R5's representative that the proposed development had to be built irrespective of the views of representers/commenters. The Board could exercise their right to reject the OZP. There was a need to improve the environment of Admiralty and the Government should enhance the provision of greening/POS and rationalize the traffic, but not add more office towers to increase the development intensity;
- (c) the proposed QP redevelopment would not bring along any benefits to Admiralty, but adverse impacts such as more office workers patronizing the already congested MTR. The CBD could be decentralized to other areas such as East Kowloon so that the existing development intensity of Admiralty could be retained;

- (d) in response to the request for reducing car parking space provision in the MRMCP site, the Government said that it was not certain whether such provision should be more or less under the ERP scheme. That revealed the lack of a clear overall strategy on how the cars would be parked in Central. The MRMCP currently had 388 public car parking spaces but only 102 would be provided in the future development. The shortfall could not be met by the car parks at City Hall and Star Ferry as they would also be demolished in due course, and the number of car parking spaces to be reprovisioned was not known. Moreover, if the ERP scheme was implemented, there should be more car parks in the periphery area to facilitate the motorists to walk into the CBD; and
- (e) as a whole, the redevelopment proposals were immature without clear planning and implementation details. The approval of the zoning amendments would be a disaster to Admiralty and Members were requested to reject the Plan.

C14 - Mary Mulvihill

26. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) the time allowed for the representers/commenters to study the Paper was getting shorter recently. In other previous cases, she received the papers 7 days before the hearing, but for the current case, only 5 days before. She wondered when Members received the Paper and whether Members had sufficient time to go through the representations and comments and study the issues;
- (b) she agreed with R65's representative that the traffic around Cheung Kong Centre Car Park was very congested and the Government should not put more traffic in the area;
- (c) the Government gazetted the new road scheme for the MRMCP site before the Board had approved the amendments to the OZP. Such approach would put the integrity of the Board at stake as it would imply that the Board was a rubber stamp and the proposal would be approved in any case.

It might be argued that the road gazetting was a statutory procedure independent of the Town Planning Ordinance, but that in fact had ignored the due process and the integrity of the system. It would also be a waste of resources if the OZP amendments were not approved, which could be a case to be brought to the attention of Commissioner for Audit. Members were requested to ensure that they had approved the OZP amendments before the Government initiated other statutory/administrative procedures; and

- (d) Members were requested to assess the impact of the proposed developments on the district as a whole rather than the proposed office towers per se at the QP and MRMCP sites.

27. As the presentation from the government's representative, and the representers/commenters/their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the question-and-answer (Q&A) session. The Chairman explained that the Q&A session was for Members to better understand the amendments to the OZP and the concerns of the representations/comments. Members would raise questions and the Chairman would invite the representers/commenters/their representatives and/or the government's representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board, or for cross-examination between parties, although it was understandable that they might not necessarily agree with the responses of others.

Alternative PTI Layout and Its Traffic Arrangement at the QP Site

28. The Vice-chairman said that the G/F of the proposed development would not be desirable for activity node due to the presence of a reprovisioned RCP, and the R3's proposed PTI layout at the QP site would have (i) mixed bus traffic and private car/taxi traffic, (ii) sharp bends for buses turning from R3's proposed bus lane to Admiralty (East) PTI, and (iii) loss of bus bays. He asked R3's representatives about the purpose of enlarging the G/F floorspace of the proposed development and the design merits of the alternative PTI layout and its traffic arrangement. In response, Mr Ian Brownlee, R3's representative, said that their proposed PTI layout was not necessarily the final design. Their submission was intended to illustrate that

there would be other PTI layout option that would achieve a better overall plan for the G/F use of the site, and flexibility should be allowed in the PDB for such option.

29. Mr Chapman Lam, R3's representative, said that despite the reduction of road area as compared with the one under QP Study, R3's alternative PTI layout had the merit of simplifying the traffic arrangement along Tamar Street. Under the traffic arrangement of the QP Study, the southbound traffic of Tamar Street entering from Harcourt Road to the car park of the proposed development would encounter four conflicting traffic movements within a short section of Tamar Street while R3's alternative traffic arrangement could space out and minimize the conflicting traffic points. Regarding the sharp bends for buses turning from R3's proposed relocated bus lane to Admiralty (East) PTI, the swept path analysis had confirmed that the bus movement was technically feasible, but further improvement could be explored in the detailed design stage.

30. Ms Margaret Wong, R3's representative, supplemented that the G/F of the QP site was not intended to be an activity node. Their preliminary design revealed that the PTI layout of the QP Study would allow only 8% of the site area on G/F to support the proposed commercial development above, which was insufficient to accommodate the lift lobby, machine plant room, and air intake/exhaust even for a typical office development, let alone Grade A office development with such a large scale of 93,000m² GFA and 5-level basement. The additional G/F floorspace gained by the alternative PTI layout could allow more design flexibility. The relocation of bus lane from the centre of the site to the northern boundary abutting the proposed widened Drake Street could remove the traffic conflict between buses and pedestrians and thus enhance pedestrian safety.

31. The Vice-chairman and a Member asked whether there was flexibility to accommodate R3's proposed alternative PTI layout and its traffic arrangement, if found to be more desirable, and the feasibility of widening Drake Street. In response, Ms Carmen Chu, PlanD's consultant, said that the PTI layout of the QP study had taken on board the recommendations of the TD's Admiralty Traffic Study completed in 2012 for a wider area of the whole Admiralty, not only the QP site. The study consultant had discussed with TD on the feasibility of the alternative PTI layout and its traffic arrangement, and TD had raised major concerns on the proposal. R3 claimed that one of the issues of the PTI layout and traffic arrangement of the QP Study was vehicles entering from Queensway via Tamar Street needed to make a tight U-turn to reach the car park of the proposed development. In fact,

under the QP Study, adequate maneuvering space had been allowed in the design for small vehicles to enter from Queensway to the site whereas large vehicles would enter from Harcourt Road taking a smooth path to reach the car park of the proposed development without the need of making a U-turn. The proposed bus lane under the QP Study would divert bus traffic away from the busy section of Drake Street in front of Admiralty Centre and allow segregation between bus traffic and private car/taxi traffic, while R3's proposed relocation of bus lane would have mixed traffic at that busy section of Drake Street. In view of the existing structures of MTR Exit C2, the feasibility of R3's proposed widening of Drake Street was yet to be ascertained. There was concern that R3's alternative PTI layout and traffic arrangement would defeat the intention of segregating traffic of different vehicle types to reduce their conflict under the Admiralty Traffic Study.

32. Mr Ian Brownlee said that R3's proposed alternative PTI layout was formulated from the perspectives of practicality and usability, rather than urban design concept, and reiterated that flexibility should be incorporated into the PDB and lease for PTI layout option other than that recommended under the QP Study. Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang, DPO/HK, said that the notional scheme recommended under the QP study had already made minor adjustments to the road layout, and as a result, unlike R3's claim, more than 8% G/F area would be available for supporting the commercial development above. While the PTI layout and its traffic arrangement in the notional development scheme were considered appropriate and had struck a balance among various needs, the OZP and PDB could allow flexibility for variations.

Traffic Impact

33. In response to a Member's enquiry on the future traffic condition in Admiralty, Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that upon completion of a number of major transport infrastructure projects in the area, a substantial portion of the existing traffic, which was not destined for Central/Admiralty, would be removed. Ms Carmen Chu supplemented that the proposed development at the MRMCP site was anticipated for completion in 2021 to match with those of a number of road/railway projects which included the Central and Wanchai By-pass (2017/18), MTR South Island Line (East) (end 2016), Shatin to Central Link (SCL) northern line (2019), and SCL southern line (2021). It was anticipated that the proposed QP redevelopment would be occupied a few years after the completion of the MRMCP site.

With such implementation programmes for the two sites, their TIAs concluded that there would not be any adverse impact on the road and public transport networks in Admiralty.

Car Parking Space Provision

34. The Vice-chairman asked (i) how the provision of the car parking spaces in the proposed QP redevelopment was derived; and (ii) what the long-term and interim impacts of reducing the number of public car parking spaces from 388 to 250 at the MRMCP site would be. In response, Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that having considered that the QP site was well served by a number of railway lines and bus/minibus routes, the lower limit of the provision range stipulated under HKPSG was adopted in determining the car parking space requirement. For the MRMCP site, a TIA was conducted to determine the provision of public car parking spaces. The TIA examined the parking demand against parking supply within a reasonable walking catchment area (i.e. 300m). Factors such as the current parking utilization of adjacent public car park, new developments/redevelopments in the study area which were known at the time of conducting the TIA and the estimated traffic growth, etc. were considered. The TIA estimated that there would be a shortfall of 102 public car parking spaces in the area by 2024. The proposed provision of minimum 250 car parking spaces in the MRMCP site should be sufficient to meet its own demand in accordance with HKPSG and the shortfall of public car parking spaces in the area.

35. In response to a Member's question about the utilization rate of the Harcourt Garden Car Park, Ms Maggie K.K. Mak, TD, said that there were 600 public car parking spaces in the car park and according to the TIA for the MRMCP site, the utilization rate of that car park during the peak hours was 74% which would be sufficient to partially absorb the interim demand during the construction period of the proposed development at the MRMCP site.

36. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Paul Zimmerman, R65's representative, said that MRMCP had catered for the demand in the area to its west, rather than its east. Harcourt Garden Car Park, locating to the east of MRMCP, was not a feasible alternative as most of the current users of MRMCP would need to walk some 400m more up and down the walkway system which should not be considered as within a reasonable walking distance. Roadside parking problem would be aggravated if no alternative public car park

was provided in the construction period of the MRMCP site. He requested the Government to defer the sale of the MRMCP site until a public car park was provided in the vicinity.

Air Ventilation

37. In response to two Members' enquiries on the air ventilation performance of the QP site, Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that an AVA study for the QP site was conducted in accordance with the Government's Technical Circular No.1/06 on Air Ventilation Assessment. Two schemes had been tested under the AVA study and were found to have similar air ventilation performances with the existing condition. The AVA study also revealed that the existing wind environment in the area was dominated by the high-rise buildings in the vicinity of the QP site. Based on the AVA findings, the current scheme with a site coverage restriction of 65%, setbacks from adjoining roads, chamfered podium design and other air ventilation enhancement design were formulated. Further AVA study on the current scheme was conducted and concluded that with those design measures, the air ventilation impact at the pedestrian level would be minimized.

Public Open Space at the QP Site

38. Noting that the POS in the proposed QP redevelopment would be under private management, the Vice-chairman asked how the Government could ensure the POS in the proposed QP development would be easily accessible for public enjoyment. In response, Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that the future developer was required to observe the 'Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines' promulgated by the Development Bureau and to endeavor to provide quality POS of high visibility and usability. Such design and management guidelines and principles would also be incorporated into the PDB for the site.

Tree Preservation at the QP Site

39. Noting that the tree survey conducted for the QP study had recommended to retaining 11, transplanting 7 and falling 27 trees, a Member asked apart from individual trees, whether the value of trees in cluster was assessed; and where the trees affected would be replanted and trees felled would be compensated. In response, Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that the preservation value of the trees in cluster was recognized and would be set out in the PDB for the QP site. The developer would be required to submit tree preservation proposal and to identify suitable areas within the proposed development for tree transplant and compensatory

tree planting. As the suitability of the tree planting spots in the proposed development could only be assessed when the building design put forth by the developer was available, further details on the tree preservation and landscaping proposals could not be provided at the current stage.

Site Search and Office Decentralization

40. A Member asked (i) the criteria for identifying the two sites for commercial use and whether the carrying capacity of the area for more commercial developments was reviewed; (ii) what the overall development strategy for Central was; (iii) how the proposed developments would bring benefits to the area; and (iv) whether decentralization of the office development had been explored. In response, Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that the strong demand for office land in Hong Kong had been confirmed in various studies at the strategic level. On decentralization of office development, the Government had made efforts to develop office use in Kwun Tong and other new commercial nodes. However, for the Central district, the rapid increase in rental price together with the low vacancy rate indicated that there was still a strong demand for office space in the CBD. The two sites were identified, among others, with the potential for providing office development, and a series of technical assessments had been conducted which concluded that the proposed office developments would not have adverse impacts on the surrounding area including the capacity of transport network in the area.

41. Regarding the carrying capacity of the area in terms of sufficiency of community facilities, Ginger K.Y. Kiang continued to say that the current provision of GIC facilities within the area covered by the OZP could meet the HKPSG requirements. As Central was basically a commercial area with a small residential community, the demand for GIC facilities to cater for the residential community was relatively small. In addition, the relevant bureaux/departments had been consulted on the need for any community facilities at the sites and if required and appropriate, those facilities had already been incorporated in the proposals. One of the improvements to be brought by the proposed QP redevelopment was the enhancement of the walking environment and connectivity of the Admiralty area. As the existing QP was a converging point for people, the future design of the QP development would give weight to the importance of vertical connection at various levels and connections to the surrounding developments. On G/F, there would be a POS with a design integrated with the tree clusters for public enjoyment. The atrium at the elevated level would be

designed to be a gathering place for people converging from different directions and transport networks. Escalators would be provided to facilitate the public to commute to various levels, in particular to the POS at podium. The environment of the walkways would be enhanced by encouraging the provision of greening. The feasibility of an elevated walkway to Tamar would be studied to further enhance the connectivity.

42. In response to a Member's concern on the carrying capacity of the road network, Mr Paul Zimmerman said that paragraphs 1 and 10(a) of the Public Engagement Document on ERP Pilot Scheme stated that road traffic was deteriorating in Hong Kong and severe traffic condition occurred almost daily in Central and its adjacent area.

Others

43. In response to two Members' enquiry on why the tree survey and AVA study were not attached to the Paper, Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that the tree preservation proposal, in particular the arrangement for the OVT, and the AVA study findings had been submitted to the Board when the proposed amendments to the OZP was considered by the Board in November 2015. As the purpose of the Paper was to consider the representations and comments, detailed findings of the various impact assessments already considered by the Board were not attached to the Paper again.

44. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairman said that the Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in the absence of the representers, commenters, their representatives and government's representatives and would inform them of its decision in due course. The Chairman thanked them for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation

45. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr K.K. Ling, Director of Planning, briefly explained the relevant OZP amendment procedures and planning framework, including the following main points:

- (a) before commencing the OZP amendment procedures, Members were briefed on the proposal under the QP Study. In November 2015, findings of the various technical assessments, in particular, AVA, VIA

and TIA for the MRMCP and the QP sites were submitted to the Board when the Board considered the proposed amendments to the OZP;

- (b) the OZP only provided a broadbrush control over development. For complicated site of strategic importance where more detailed control was warranted like the QP site, PDB would be prepared based on the planning and design concept formulated under the study. The PDB would set out the objectives rather than very prescriptive control such that the developer would have sufficient flexibility to achieve the optimal design. The District Council and local stakeholders had been consulted on the draft PDB under the QP Study. The PDB was intended to be attached to the lease for development control. The PDB would incorporate views of Members, representers and commenters where appropriate and would be submitted to the Board for consideration;
- (c) any new road layout would need to be gazetted under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance which would be a venue for the public to raise concerns on the detailed traffic arrangement of the road layout;
- (d) at the strategic planning level, 'Hong Kong 2030: Planning Vision and Strategy' (Hong Kong 2030) had already set out a planning framework for the future development of Hong Kong including the office development strategy. While recognizing the need for office decentralization, Hong Kong 2030 also recommended increasing the land supply in Central especially for Grade A offices; and
- (e) regarding the development strategy for Central, it would continue to function as the core of the CBD in Hong Kong. With the completion of major transport infrastructure projects, there was potential for the Central to accommodate more commercial development at suitable sites. Some sites in Central, such as the Central Market and Murray Building, were proposed to be retained after assessing their site characteristics and surrounding context. A balance between development and preservation had been struck in planning the development of Central.

46. A Member said that Admiralty was suitable for office development. Despite that the MTR Admiralty Station was currently very crowded during the peak hours, there should not be any insurmountable problem for accommodating more office developments with the incoming improvement of the transport infrastructures. The zoning amendments were supported. Two Members concurred with the Members' views.

47. A Member said that as new office sites were required to meet the demand for office development in Hong Kong, the main criterion in assessing the suitability of the new sites was whether the proposed development would have adverse impacts on the area, rather than whether they were located in CBD or not. The MRMCP and the QP sites were suitable for office development based on the findings of the various technical assessments.

48. Three Members said that it was a suitable timing to amend the OZP to facilitate the commercial developments as the anticipated occupation years of the two office developments were after completion of the major transport infrastructure projects in the area. While the Government had developed other office nodes such as Quarry Bay and Kowloon East over the years, there was still strong demand for office floorspace in CBD as revealed by the high rental price in Central. Given that MRMCP was currently not fully utilized, the reduction in public car parking spaces might not be an issue. They supported the zoning amendments.

49. In response to a Member's request, the Chairman said that, for Members' easy reference, consideration could be given to attaching illustrations of the proposed development scheme, where relevant, and findings of technical assessments to future hearing paper, even though those documents might have already been submitted to the Board during consideration of the proposed amendments.

50. In response to the same Member's enquiry that how the public would find out whether their views had been incorporated into the PDB, the Secretary said that the future TPB paper for the consideration of the PDB and the minutes of the TPB meeting would be made available in the TPB's website.

51. A Member said that whilst the zoning amendments were not opposed to, there was concern that the tree clusters of the existing Admiralty Garden at the QP site could not be retained given that the area of the future POS would be reduced by half. Mr K.K. Ling said

that the existing Admiralty Garden was not popular due to its undesirable setting and poor lighting, the design intention of the future POS was to integrate it with the OVT to provide a more open and welcoming setting to the public. Another Member said that the existing Admiralty Garden was located next to the RCP with very low partition wall which was not conducive to public enjoyment, and suggested that the PDB should consider the provision of a higher partition wall and buffer distance between the RCP and the future POS. A Member also said that it was worth considering a representer's proposal of incorporating some elements within the future development to recapture the history of Admiralty. The meeting agreed that Members' views could be incorporated into the PDB where appropriate to guide the future planning and design of the QP redevelopment and to allow flexibility for alternative design.

52. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether the future developer would need to revert to the Board or relevant departments if his proposal was different from the notional scheme under QP Study, Mr K.K. Ling said that the future developer needed to submit a layout plan, which should be prepared with reference to the PDB, under lease for the scrutiny of relevant government departments. As long as the development would comply with the restrictions of the OZP, approval from the Board was not required.

53. The Secretary said that the Stakeholder Engagement Report submitted by R3's representatives to the Board at the current meeting should be treated as not having been made in accordance to the Ordinance as it was received after the publication periods of the OZP amendments and the representations. Nevertheless, it was noted that the content of the Report was generally covered in R3's presentation. The meeting agreed.

54. After deliberation, the Board decided to note the supportive views of R1 to R4 and the comments provided by R71 and R72, and agreed to advise them as follows:

“ *Murray Road Multi-storey Car Park (Amendment Item A) and Queensway Plaza (Amendment Items B1 and B2)*

- (a) adequate flexibility has already been provided under the “Commercial (3)” (“C(3)”) and “Commercial (4)” (“C(4)”) zones for the future developer to decide on the mix of use in the future development as ‘Office’, ‘Shop and Services’, ‘Market’ and ‘Eating Place’ were always

permitted while 'Flat' and 'Residential Institution' use may be permitted with or without condition on application to the Town Planning Board. Stipulating a minimum retail gross floor area (GFA) for the "C(4)" zones would reduce the flexibility currently provided and considered as unnecessary;

Murray Road Multi-storey Car Park (Amendment Item A)

- (b) the existing linkages from Murray Road Multi-storey Car Park (MRMCP) to the Murray Road/Chater Road junction and to the tram stop or Queensway were sufficient. The proposed development of MRMCP would not affect the existing linkages;

Queensway Plaza (Amendment Items B1 and B2)

- (c) the Air Ventilation Assessment for the Queensway Plaza (QP) site has confirmed that, with the provision of building setbacks, a reduced podium footprint and a chamfered podium design, the wind stagnation area would be minimized and the proposed development would not cause significant adverse air ventilation impact to the surrounding area;
- (d) the main development parameters of the QP redevelopment including maximum building height, maximum site coverage and required public open space provision are already stipulated on the Outline Zoning Plan. Besides, a Planning and Design Brief will be prepared to guide design and development of the site;
- (e) the future developer would be required to maintain pedestrian connectivity with the surrounding developments both during the construction period and upon completion of the development. A Traffic Impact Assessment on the temporary vehicular traffic arrangements and temporary pedestrian connection arrangements will also need to be conducted;
- (f) the future development is required to avoid encroaching onto the existing facilities of Mass Transit Railway (MTR). Nevertheless the future development was allowed to build above, adjacent and under the MTR

facilities and required to provide direct and barrier-free connections to the MTR concourse and exits;

- (g) the proposal to relocate the bus lane to the eastbound carriageway of Drake Street would impose serious conflicting movement with taxis leaving the taxi stand and result in loss of a bus stop and bus stacking bays which would adversely affect bus operations;
- (h) it was considered necessary to provide adequate car parking spaces and loading/unloading bays based on the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines to ensure that the future development would have sufficient internal transport facilities to match manifest operational requirements;
- (i) the Planning and Design Brief would only set out the design principles and the basic design parameters including inter alia the provision of special design features such as an atrium as a focal point at the intersection of pedestrian routes, the reprovisioning of the refuse collection point, the in-situ preservation of the Old and Valuable Tree. Flexibility would be provided to cater for innovative design;

55. The Board also decided not to uphold R5 to R70 and that the Plan should not be amended to meet the representations on the following grounds:

“ *Murray Road Multi-storey Car Park (Amendment Item A)*

- (a) the traffic impact assessment (TIA) conducted for the proposed development for Murray Road Multi-storey Car Park (MRMCP) demonstrated that the proposal would not cause adverse traffic impact to the surrounding areas. The TIA also revealed that all identified critical junctions would perform satisfactorily in the design years;
- (b) the proposed provision of 102 public car parking spaces and 69 public motorcycle parking spaces, as recommended by the TIA, is appropriate to meet the projected parking demand in the area;
- (c) the requirement of the future development at the MRMCP site to maintain the same level of linkage with the adjoining footbridge network

would provide adequate linkage to the commercial development in the area;

- (d) no adverse environmental impact as a result of traffic congestion in the area is anticipated;
- (e) the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) concludes that the building height of the development is of secondary importance in terms of air ventilation performance and that a development with a smaller footprint and more setback from site boundary would perform better from the air ventilation standpoint. A maximum site coverage of 65% for the site is stipulated for this site. No adverse air ventilation impact is anticipated;
- (f) there is no significant visual impact. The visual appraisal is undertaken in accordance with the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Submission of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board (“TPB PG-No.41”), and had taken into account the impacts as viewed from areas with direct sightlines to the site as required in the guidelines;
- (g) there is a shortage in supply of offices in the Central Business District (CBD). There is a need to increase the commercial land supply through measures such as converting non-location bound Government, institution or community sites in the CBD into commercial use;

Queensway Plaza (Amendment Items B1 and B2)

- (h) TIA had been undertaken. It had confirmed that, with suitable mitigation measure in place (i.e. the prohibition of loading and unloading activities within the site during peak hours viz. 7am to 10am and 4pm to 7pm), the proposed development would not have significant adverse traffic impact;
- (i) Amendment Item B3 is to reflect the existing bus lay-by between the QP and Queensway from “Open Space” to an area shown as ‘Road’. The existing bus lay-by would be retained and the road design would not be

changed;

- (j) the future developer would be required to maintain pedestrian connectivity with the surrounding developments both during the construction period and upon completion of the development. A TIA on the temporary vehicular traffic arrangements and temporary pedestrian connection arrangements will also need to be conducted;
- (k) there is no need to specify the parking requirements on the Outline Zoning Plan as the provision of private car parking spaces should be in accordance with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport;
- (l) according to the AVA, it is anticipated that the QP redevelopment would not have significant adverse air ventilation impact;
- (m) to compensate for the loss of the existing Admiralty Garden of 1,700m², the future developer is required to provide public open space of not less than 2,100m² including at-grade open space of 1,400m². It is necessary to incorporate this re-provisioning requirement in the Notes of the Outline Zoning Plan;
- (n) adequate information has been provided on tree felling and greening based on a tree survey conducted;
- (o) it is necessary to re-provision the existing refuse collection point within the site. As it would be comprehensively designed and constructed with the QP redevelopment, no adverse impact is anticipated and hence 'Government Refuse Collection Point' is specified as Column 1 use within "Commercial (4)" zone; and
- (p) according to the Visual Impact Assessment, there is no significant visual impact imposed by the proposed development. The future development is subject to maximum site coverage of 65% and setback from Drake Street, United Centre and Tamar Street to allow opportunities to enhance visual openness and amenity at street level. ”

[Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung, Ms Janice Lai and Mr H.F. Leung left the meeting at this point. Mr Philip S.L. Kan arrived and Mr Alex T.H. Lai returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferment of Review of Application No. A/TP/598

Proposed Religious Institution and Columbarium (Redevelopment) in “Green Belt” Zone, Lots 6 R.P., 54 R.P. (Part), 56, 440 S.A R.P., 441 R.P., 443 S.A, 443 R.P. (Part) and 445 in D.D. 24 and adjoining Government Land, Ma Wo, Tai Po

(TPB Paper No. 10129)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

56. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Mr Michael Wong
(Chairman) | - co-owning with spouse a townhouse at Lo Fai Road, Tai Po |
| Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung | - his company owning a flat at On Chee Road, Tai Po |
| Mr H.W. Cheung | - owning a flat at Tai Po Market, Heung Sze Wui Street |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - his firm having past business dealings with the applicant’s representative |

57. As the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the review application, the meeting agreed that the Chairman and the above Members could stay in the meeting. Members noted that Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung had already left the meeting.

58. The Secretary said that on 6.6.2016, the applicant wrote to the Secretary of the Board and requested the Board to defer making a decision on the review application for one month to allow more time to carry out the necessary assessments and to provide updated relevant

information in response to departmental comments on land issues, traffic scheme, visual impact and tree preservation to support the review application.

59. Since 2008, the same applicant had submitted seven s.16 applications and two s.12A applications at the application site (the Site). For the seven s.16 applications, four of them were rejected by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC)/the Board on review and three were withdrawn by the applicant before the RNTPC had considered the applications. For the two s.12A applications, one of them was rejected by the RNTPC and one was withdrawn by the applicant. As compared to the current application, those applications were similar in nature but with different scale of development. The applicant had also submitted a number of further information (FI) and deferment requests for those applications to resolve the technical issues mainly on traffic, environmental and landscape impacts and to address the concerns of government departments and public comments.

60. There were suspected unauthorized structures identified within the Site. A demolition order was served by the Buildings Department on the podium deck within the Site which had been demolished. A warning letter against the columbarium structure was also issued by the Lands Department (LandsD) to the applicant on 3.2.2012.

61. At the s.16 application stage, the applicant had requested to defer consideration of the application once, but the RNTPC decided on 19.2.2016 not to agree to the applicant's deferral request since the request for deferment did not meet the criteria as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 33) in that the applicant had sufficient opportunities to address the concerns on the application which were similar to the previous applications and the deferment would affect the interests of other relevant parties (i.e. 1,962 opposing public comments) and the progress of the lease enforcement actions to be taken by LandsD at the Site.

62. Although it was the first request for deferment under the current review application, it should be noted that since 2008, the same applicant had submitted seven s.16 applications and two s.12A applications. Under the circumstances, there was no strong justification for deferment. The request for deferment did not meet the criteria as set out in TPB PG-No. 33 for the same consideration as those of the s.16 application. Given the public concern, the review application should be considered by the Board as early as possible.

63. After deliberation, the Board decided not to defer a decision on the review application. The Board then proceed to the consideration of the subject review application under Agenda Item 5.

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/TP/598

Proposed Religious Institution and Columbarium (Redevelopment) in “Green Belt” Zone, Lots 6 R.P., 54 R.P. (Part), 56, 440 S.A R.P., 441 R.P., 443 S.A, 443 R.P. (Part) and 445 in D.D. 24 and adjoining Government Land, Ma Wo, Tai Po

(TPB Paper No. 10127)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

64. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|--|--|
| Mr Michael Wong
(<i>Chairman</i>) | - co-owning with spouse a townhouse at Lo Fai Road, Tai Po |
| Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung | - his company owning a flat at On Chee Road, Tai Po |
| Mr H.W. Cheung | - owning a flat at Tai Po Market, Heung Sze Wui Street |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - his firm having past business dealings with the applicant’s representative |

65. Members agreed that the Chairman and the above Members’ interests were indirect as their properties were far away from the application site, and they could stay in the meeting. Members noted that Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung had already left the meeting.

66. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant were invited to the meeting :

Mr C.K. Soh - District Planning Officer/Shu Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN), PlanD

Mr Lau Yau Kuen] Applicant's representatives

Mr Chan Kin Ming]

Toco Planning Consultants Ltd

Mr Ted Chan]

Ms Jacqueline Lily Ho]

Mr Daniel James C.H. Wei]

67. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited DPO/STN to brief Members on the review application.

68. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr C.K. Soh, DPO/STN, presented the review application and covered the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) on 21.12.2015, the applicant sought planning permission for the redevelopment of an existing compound, namely Chung Woo Ching Sai (CWCS) at the application site (the Site) for religious institution and columbarium uses. The Site fell within an area zoned "Green Belt" ("GB") on the approved Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TP/26;
- (b) on 19.2.2016, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to reject the application and the reasons were:
 - (i) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the "GB" zone which was to define the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There was a general presumption against development within the zone. There was no strong planning justification in the submission to justify a departure from this planning intention;

- (ii) the proposed columbarium use was considered not compatible with the existing residential developments in the surrounding areas;
 - (iii) the application did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for 'Application for Development within "GB" zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance' in that the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would have no adverse traffic, sewerage and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and
 - (iv) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the "GB" zone, encouraging 'destroy first, and build later' activities and extensive vegetation clearance. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in adverse traffic impact on the surrounding area and a general degradation of the natural environment and landscape quality in the area;
- (c) on 23.3.2016, the applicant applied, under section 17(1) of the Ordinance, for a review of the RNTPC's decision to reject the application with the following justifications in support of the review application:
- (i) CWCS was a charitable religious institution which had been in existence at the Site for more than 70 years. The proposed redevelopment would facilitate upgrading of the buildings and facilities and improvement of the site condition;
 - (ii) the proposed redevelopment was low-rise and low-density in nature with extensive landscaping, which was in line with the planning intention of "GB" zone;
 - (iii) in considering the land use history of Ma Wo area, the unique site character of the columbarium and the appropriate mitigation measures adopted, the columbarium was not incompatible with the residential developments in the surrounding areas;

- (iv) similar approved columbarium developments had shown that the proposed traffic arrangement was implementable and enforceable by approval conditions, lease conditions and relevant ordinances to resolve potential traffic impacts;
 - (v) the redevelopment proposal had avoided extensive clearance of vegetation by preserving and transplanting most of the existing trees within the Site. Extensive tree planting had been proposed to enhance greening effect; and
 - (vi) in view of the unique site background, the intention for redevelopment and the full commitment to improve the site condition, approval of the application was unlikely to set an undesirable precedent of condoning unauthorized building works and encouraging extensive vegetation clearance;
- (d) the site was formed on a slope, currently occupied by some domestic and religious related buildings and temporary structures of 1 to 3 storeys high and a 2-storey home for the retired staff. A columbarium building and a terraced open air columbarium were suspected unauthorized structures according to LandsD. A podium deck covered by a Demolition Order served under the Buildings Ordinance in 2006 had been demolished;
- (e) previous application - the Site or part of it was the subject of four previous s.16 planning applications submitted by the same applicant for the same religious institution use/religious institution and columbarium uses, which were all rejected by the Board on review or the Committee between 2008 and 2014 on the grounds generally similar to those of the subject application at the s.16 stage. The Site was also the subject of a previous s.12A application for zoning amendment submitted by the same applicant to facilitate redevelopment of the existing CWCS religious compound. The application was rejected by the Board on 10.7.2009 mainly on the grounds that the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not generate adverse environmental, traffic, visual and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas, and that the proposed development would be subject to adverse environmental impacts generated by Tolo Highway.

From 2011 to 2015, the Site was also involved in four withdrawn s.12A or s.16 planning applications (No. Y/TP/17, A/TP/480, A/TP/542 and A/TP/590) for proposed religious institution/columbarium uses;

- (f) similar application – there was no similar application in the area;
- (g) public comments - a total of 1,976 public comments were received, all objecting to the application on the grounds generally similar to the rejection reasons of the subject application at the s.16 stage, and in addition, that CWCS had repeatedly submitted applications which was a waste of Government's time and manpower;
- (h) PlanD's views - PlanD did not support the review application based on the planning considerations and assessments set out in paragraph 7 of the Paper which were summarized below :
 - (i) compared with the proposal in the s.16 stage, apart from reducing the site coverage from 12.3% to 9.52% which was mainly due to discounting coverage of the open-air columbarium and increasing the landscape area from 3,657m² to 3,988m², the major development parameters of the proposed development including site area, plot ratio, gross floor area (GFA), building heights and number of niches (3,044), memorial photo-plates (6,000) and compensatory planting of heavy standard trees (249) remained unchanged;
 - (ii) on traffic impact, the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) considered the public transport impact assessment still not satisfactory in that the occupancy survey for green mini-bus was not conducted during Ching Ming Festival and the taxi mode had not been reviewed. Besides, whether the proposed new access arrangement could be effectively implemented and whether it was feasible to incorporate different parking and loading/unloading provision on normal day and festival day in the land lease were doubtful. District Lands Officer/Tai Po, LandsD advised that there was no guarantee that additional land would be granted for such road improvement purposes or conditions relating to operational matters would be incorporated in the lease. C for T did not support the application unless the above traffic issues could be resolved.

- (iii) notwithstanding the applicant had proposed to enlarge the landscape area, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, PlanD considered that the applicant had not provided any revised plan or section to substantiate his commitment to address the landscape issues and his concerns including the feasibility of tree treatment and tree assessment had not yet been met. The submitted tree assessment and tree photos prepared in 2013 were outdated and not acceptable. In that regard, he maintained his reservations on the application from the landscape planning perspective; and
- (iv) as the justifications provided in support of the review application were similar to those at the s.16 stage and there was no major change in planning circumstances in the surrounding area since the rejection of the application, the planning considerations and assessment at the s.16 application stage were still valid. There was also no strong reason to warrant a departure from the RNTPC's previous decision.

69. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the review application. With the aid of visualizer, Mr Lau Yau Kuen made the following main points:

- (a) he was an executive of the Board of CWCS. CWCS had existed at the Site for 70-80 years and had undertaken works to improve the infrastructures of the area over the years. CWCS was a charitable organization with staff and volunteers to help carry out its work, and also supported the charity work of other organizations;
- (b) CWCS was a law-abiding organization and had stopped selling out niches since 2012, and removed the unauthorized developments within the Site. Whilst CWCS had focused on spiritual devotions of individuals, the public often mistook it as a religious cult; and
- (c) CWCS had kept applying for the proposed use over the years with a view to improving the environment and landscape of the area, rather than acting in opposition to the local residents. He requested the Board to recognize their determination in improving the area which would also benefit the local community.

70. The Chairman said that the Board would consider the application irrespective of the religion involved and invited the applicant's representatives to continue their presentation.

71. With the aid of visualizer, Mr Ted Chan made the following main points:

- (a) PlanD's assessment of the subject application had missed the point that CWCS had been occupying at the Site for some 70 years and was in existence before the publication of the first OZP for the area in 1980s. CWCS was not familiar with the planning system and missed the opportunities to raise objection to the "GB" zoning of the Site when the first OZP was published;
- (b) given CWCS including its columbarium was an existing use and the current proposal was to carry out improvement works to the existing facilities, it should not be subject to stringent criteria and requirements for traffic impact and environmental assessments. Over the years, circumstances had changed, for example, trees might be felled due to typhoons and diseases. Although CWCS had felled trees on their private land, it was a common practice for private land owners over the years;
- (c) there was public view that the applications for the proposed columbarium use had deliberately dragged on for a long time. However, it should be noted that improvement to the proposal was made in each round of applications, for example, by increasing the number of trees and car parking spaces within the proposed development and adding a new road link, while the number of niches was kept at 3,000. The relevant bureaux/departments had imposed their new requirements in each round of comments on the application which were difficult for the applicant to meet; and
- (d) regarding the four rejection reasons, he had the following responses:
 - (i) the proposed development, in terms of its use, greening provision, development intensity and building height, was in line with the planning intention of the "GB" zone;

- (ii) CWCS was in existence with the nearby residential developments for years and there should not be any land use compatibility issue. Moreover, CWCS with 3,000 niches had existed long before the residential developments came into the area, and its columbarium was surrounded by tree and plants and far away from the residential developments. Noise screen should not be regarded as a visual concern;
- (iii) the current application was in compliance with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for “Application for Development within “GB” zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance” in terms of its plot ratio, site coverage, building height and use. As regards TD’s concern on the feasibility of the land exchange to facilitate the road improvement works, it should be regarded as an implementation issue, rather than a planning consideration. A condition could be imposed in the planning permission to require the provision of the road link; and
- (iv) as CWCS was an existing use and with its proposed scale and landscaping plan, the proposed use would not set an undesirable precedent case.

72. As the presentation from PlanD’s representative and the applicant’s representatives had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

73. Having noted that government land was involved in the proposal, the Chairman asked about the progress of the land exchange with LandsD. In response, Mr Ted Chan said that the applicant was liaising with LandsD regarding the authorized development at the Site and had not yet commenced the land exchange process.

74. A Member asked whether the history of the Site had been taken into account when determining whether the current columbarium use at the Site was permitted or not. In response, Mr C.K. Soh, DPO/STN, said that planning permission was not required if the applicant could demonstrate that the applied use was in existence before the publication of the first statutory plan covering the Site. If the use under application was not an existing use, the application should be processed in accordance with the provision of the OZP.

75. The Vice-chairman asked which buildings and the quantity of niches were in existence within the Site before the publication of the first OZP for the area in 1982. Mr Ted Chan said that there were buildings within the Site as indicated on a survey plan in 1980 which was also shown on the visualizer. Mr Lau Yau Kuen said that about 1,000 niches were built and occupied then and some others were sold out but not occupied yet. There were sale receipts of the niches which had been submitted to FEHD to prove that the niches were in existence in 1980s.

76. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Mr C.K. Soh, with reference to Plan R-3b of the Paper shown on the PowerPoint, said that as illustrated from a series of aerial photos of the Site from 1980 to 2012, the building structure accommodating the niches and other building structures came into existence after the publication of first OZP covering the Site.

77. A Member asked why the number of building structures within the Site had been increasing over the years from 1980 to 2012. In response, Mr Ted Chan said that since he had been engaged in the planning applications for the proposed development, he was not aware of any new buildings constructed in addition to the existing development at the Site.

78. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairman informed the applicant's representatives that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked DPO/STN and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation

79. The Chairman invited Members to consider the review application taking into account the written and oral submissions of the applicant's representatives. A Member said that despite that the applicant's representatives had emphasized that CWCS was an existing development, the proposed use under application should be regarded as a new proposal as planning permission would not be required if there was evidence to prove that the use was an existing use. The use under application should hence be assessed based on the prevailing criteria for assessing development in the "GB" zone. The review application was not supported as it did not meet the assessment criteria.

80. The meeting noted that there was no change in the planning circumstances since the previous consideration of the subject application by the RNTPC. Members agreed to maintain the RNTPC's decision to reject the application.

81. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review and the following reasons were:

- “ (a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone which is to define the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission to justify a departure from this planning intention;
- (b) the proposed columbarium use is considered not compatible with the existing residential developments in the surrounding areas;
- (c) the application does not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for “Application for Development within “GB” zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance” in that the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would have no adverse traffic and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (d) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the “GB” zone, encouraging ‘destroy first, and build later’ activities and extensive vegetation clearance. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in adverse traffic impact on the surrounding area and a general degradation of the natural environment and landscape quality in the area. ”

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H7/18A to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB Paper No. 10128)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

82. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in the consideration of the representations and comments in respect of the Draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP)No. S/H7/18A:

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| Mr Michael W.L. Wong
(<i>Chairman</i>) | - | his close relative being the Chief Executive Officer of Po Leung Kok (PLK) (R1) |
| Professor S.C. Wong
(<i>Vice-chairman</i>) | - | being the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil Engineering of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) where Sun Hung Kai Properties Ltd. (SHKP) had sponsored some activities of the department before. Being an employee of HKU and the HKU Space and PLK Community College (the Community College) was adjoining the PLK site |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - | his spouse owning a flat at Caroline Hill Road |
| Mr K.K. Cheung |] | Mr K.K. Cheung co-owned with spouse a |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai |] | flat at The Leighton Hill. Mr Alex T.H. |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan
(<i>Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs
Department</i>) |] | Lai's parents and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan's close relative owned flats at The Leighton Hill. The Leighton Hill Management Services Office (R88) submitted a representation on behalf of the residents of The Leighton Hill |

- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealing with Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHKP), being the mother company of The Leighton Hill Management Services Office (R88). Owning a flat at Kwai Shing Lane, Happy Valley, and being the Chairman of Happy Valley Residents' Association
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu] having current business dealings with SHKP
Ms Janice W.M. Lai]
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho]
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having current business dealings with SHKP and PLK (R1)
- Mr Franklin F.L. Yu - having past business dealings with SHKP and PLK (R1) and his spouse was an employee of SHKP
- Ms Christina M. Lee - being the Secretary-General of the Hong Kong Metropolitan Sports Events Association which obtained sponsorship from SHKP before
- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok - his parents owning a property at Blue Pool Road; and being an employee of HKU and the Community College was adjoining the PLK site and a Director of a primary school of PLK (R1)
- Mr H.F. Leung] being employees of HKU and the
Dr C.H. Hau] Community College was adjoining the PLK site

Ms Winnie W.M. Ng - being a Director of the Kowloon Motor Bus Co. Ltd. (KMB) and SHKP was one of the shareholders of KMB

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn - self-occupying a flat at Broadwood Road
(*Director of Lands*)

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - self-occupying a flat in Tai Hang

83. As the item was procedural in nature, the meeting agreed that above Members could stay in the meeting. Members noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Franklin F.L. Yu and Mr H.F. Leung had already left the meeting, while Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Ms Christina M. Lee, Dr Wilton W.T. Fok, Ms Winnie W.M. Ng and Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

84. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 30.10.2015, the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/18, incorporating amendments mainly to revise the building height restrictions for two “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) sites covering the Man Lam Christian Church at Village Road and part of the PLK at Leighton Road, was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).

85. During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 94 representations were received. On 22.1.2016, the representations were published for three weeks for public comments. A total of three comments were received. After giving consideration to the representations and comments under section 6B(1) of the Ordinance on 15.4.2016, the Board decided not to uphold the representations and that no amendment should be made to the draft OZP to meet the representations. Since the representation consideration process had been completed, the draft OZP was ready for submission to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval.

86. After deliberation, the Board agreed:
- (a) that the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/18A and its Notes at Annexes I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C for approval;
 - (b) to endorse the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/18A at Annex III of the Paper as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for the various land-use zonings on the draft OZP and issued under the name of the Board; and
 - (c) that the updated ES was suitable for submission to the CE in C together with the draft OZP.

Agenda Item 7

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

87. There being no business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:40pm.