

**Minutes of 1221<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 8.5.2020**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr. Roger C.K. Chan

Mr. C.H. Tse

Mr. Conrad T.C. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong  
Transport Department  
Mr Alex K.K. Au

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department  
Mr Gavin C.T. Tse

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Elvis W.K. Au

Deputy Director (General), Lands Department  
Ms Karen P.Y. Chan

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr. Y.S. Wong

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms April K.Y. Kun

Senior Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Ms Carmen S.Y. Chan (a.m.)

Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu (p.m.)

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

**Confirmation of Minutes of the 1220<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 17.4.2020**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1220<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 17.4.2020 were sent to Members before the meeting. Subject to any proposed amendments by Members on or before 11.5.2020, the minutes would be confirmed.

[Post-meeting Note: The minutes were confirmed on 11.5.2020 without amendments.]

**Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

**Matters Arising**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) **Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plan**

2. The Secretary reported that on 28.4.2020, the Chief Executive in Council approved the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (renumbered as No. S/K13/30) under section 9 of the Town Planning Ordinance. The approval of the draft OZP was notified in the Gazette on 8.5.2020.

(ii) **Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plan**

3. The Secretary reported that on 28.4.2020, the Chief Executive in Council referred the approved Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TP/28 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The reference back of the said OZP was notified in the Gazette on 8.5.2020.

(iii) **Online Inspection of Representations in respect of Draft Statutory Plans**

4. The Secretary reported that according to section 6(4) and section 6(A) of the

Town Planning Ordinance, the Town Planning Board (the Board) should arrange all representations made in respect of draft statutory plans for public inspection, and within the first 3 weeks during which any representation was available for public inspection, any person could make comment to the Board in respect of the representation. To fulfill the requirement, a full set of the written representations was currently made available at the two Planning Enquiry Counters (PECs) of the Planning Department for public viewing.

5. To improve the quality of public service, it was suggested to upload the full set of written representations on the Board's website upon the date of publication of the representations to provide an alternative means for the general public to view the representations online in addition to visiting the PECs physically. The comments on representations and further representations, if any, would also be uploaded to the Board's website.

6. The above arrangement would take effect upon the next round of publication of written representations for the Hoi Ha, Pak Lap and So Lo Pun Outline Zoning Plans.

7. Members noted the above arrangement.

### **Hong Kong District**

#### **Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H7/20

(TPB Paper No. 10623)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

8. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments involved sites in Wong Nai Chung and AECOM Asia Company Ltd. (AECOM) was the consultant of the proposed amendments. The following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in Wong Nai Chung area; and/or having affiliation/business dealings with AECOM, Hysan Development Company Limited (Hysan) (R6), Ronald Lu &

Partners (Ronald Lu) (representatives of R6), Townland Consultants Ltd (representative of R33) and/or Ms Mary Mulvihill (R34/C105):

- Ms Bernadette Linn (Chairperson) - co-owning with spouse a flat and car parking space at Broadwood Road in Happy Valley
  
- Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang (Vice-chairperson) - a close relative submitted a representation
  
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with Hysan and Ronald Lu
  
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with Ronald Lu, past business dealings with AECOM and Townland, and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time, and co-owning with spouse a flat at The Leighton Hill in Causeway Bay
  
- Dr C.H. Hau - having current business dealings with AECOM
  
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with AECOM, Ronald Lu, and having past business dealings with Townland and Hysan
  
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with Ronald Lu, past business dealings with AECOM and Townland, and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time, and parents co-owning a flat at The Leighton Hill in Causeway Bay
  
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with AECOM

- Mr. L.T. Kwok ] Lee Hysan Foundation had sponsored some of  
Prof Jonathan W.C. Wong ] their projects before
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - co-owning with spouse a flat on Ventris Road  
in Happy Valley and being an ex-Executive  
Director and committee member of The Boys'  
& Girls' Clubs Association of Hong Kong and  
Lee Hysan Foundation had sponsored some of  
the activities of the association before
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - having Lee Hysan Foundation sponsored  
some of his projects and being the Director  
and Chief Executive Officer of Light Be  
(Social Realty) Company Limited which had  
received donation from the Foundation before
- Dr Venus Y.H. Lun - having current business dealings with Hysan

9. Dr Venus Y.H. Lun had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Lincoln L.H. Huang (the Vice-chairperson), L.T. Kwok and Ricky W.Y. Yu, Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong and Ms Lilian S.K. Law were indirect, Messrs Alex T.H. Lai, Stephen L.H. Liu, K.K. Cheung, Thomas O.S. Ho and Franklin Yu and Dr C.H. Hau had no involvement in matters related to the representation site at Caroline Hill Road (CHR), and the properties owned by Ms Bernadette Linn (Chairperson), Mr K.K. Cheung, Ms Lilian S.K. Law, and Mr Alex T.H. Lai's parents did not have direct view of the CHR Site, they could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

10. The Chairperson said that notification had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and

comments in their absence.

11. The following government representatives were invited to the meeting:

**Government Representatives**

*Planning Department (PlanD)*

Mr Louis K.H. Kau - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong  
(DPO/HK)

Mr Anthony K.O. Luk - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong  
(STP/HK)

*Transport Department (TD)*

Ms Fiona H.Y. Fong - Engineer/Wan Chai 1

*Highways Department (HyD)*

Mr C.K. Wan - District Engineer/General(2)(B)

*AECOM*

Ms Charis Wong - Senior Engineer/Traffic & Transport  
Planning

12. The following representers, commenters and their representatives of the first session were invited to the meeting at this point.

**Representers, Commenters and their Representatives**

R3 - Lau Chun Kit

Lau Chun Kit - Representer

R4 - Lai Wing Sze

R5 - Chan Lai Fan

R6 - Hysan Development Projects Company Limited

R633 - Lai Yun Fan

*Hysan Development Projects Company Ltd* - Representers' representatives



Ms Winnie Wong ]  
*Ronald Lu & Partners –*  
Mr Anthony Cheung ]  
Ms Jacqueline Yu ]  
*Masterplan Limited –*  
Mr Ian Brownlee ]  
Ms Kira Brownlee ]

R8 – Chan Sze Hung

Mr Chan Sze Hung - Representer

R12 - 謝偉俊

R610 - 陳敏灝

R611 - 蔡家輝

Hon Tse Wai Chun, Paul Representer & representers’  
representative

R13/C1 -楊雪盈 Clarisse Yeung

R344 - Lai Kam Cheung

R367/C6 - Fung Ho San

R421/C18 Holland, Trevor Alan

R468/C21 - Li Chun Yin

C3 - 灣仔起步 Kickstart Wan Chai

C7 - Chung Siu Ming

*楊雪盈區議員辦事處 –*  
Ms Yeung Suet Ying Clarisse - Representer and commenter &  
representers and/or  
commenters’ representative

Mr Cheung Charlton ] Representers’ representatives  
Mr Mak King Sing ]  
Ms Chan Yuk Lam ]  
Ms Law Wai Shan ]  
Ms Koo Kwok Wai ]

R14 - 香港希雲街十三號至十五號 A 業主立案法團 The Incorporated Owners  
of 13-15A, Haven Street, Hong Kong

R377 – Yau Man Shan, Cathy

Mr Lung Wing Kei - Representer's representative

R17 - Caroline Hill Planning Concern Group

R472 - Cheung Sin Ying

C2 – 楊子雋 Arthur Yeung

Yeung Tze Chun Arthur(楊子雋) - Commenter & representers'  
representative

13. The Chairperson extended a welcome. She said that in light of the novel coronavirus infection and the special work arrangement for government departments, the meeting originally scheduled for 3.2.2020 for consideration of representations and comments in respect of the draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H7/20 was re-scheduled at the current meeting. The representers, commenters and their representatives had been informed that the hearing would be split into three sessions. She then briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representative would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments. The representers, commenters, and their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer, commenter or his or her representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submissions. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after all attending representers, commenters or their representatives of each session had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or the representers, commenters and their representatives. After the Q&A session of each session, representers, commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting, while the government's representatives would be invited to leave the meeting upon completion of all the Q&A sessions. The Town Planning Board (the Board) would deliberate on the representations and comments after the completion of all the Q&A sessions and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

14. The Chairperson remarked that the conceptual scheme prepared by the government (government scheme) was only one of the possible schemes to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed development. A number of conceptual schemes had also been proposed by the representers/commenters. In considering the representations and comments, due consideration should be given to the suitability of the proposed zoning and the development restrictions as stipulated on the draft OZP for the CHR Site, rather than focusing on the details of those conceptual schemes which were only indicative by nature. In this regard, the Chairperson invited the representers/commenters to be specific with their suggestions as to whether, and if yes how, the OZP would have to be amended to facilitate their proposed scheme, if they were going to present an indicative scheme different from that proposed by the Government.

15. The Chairperson then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations and comments.

16. Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, STP/HK3, with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the amendments, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10623 (the Paper).

17. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives of the first session to elaborate on their representations/comments.

### R3 – Lau Chun Kit

18. Mr Lau Chun Kit made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Tin Hau and attended primary school at CHR area. He agreed with the proposed amendments to the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP as various factors had been considered including the impacts on the surrounding environment, building separation, building gaps as well as plot ratio (PR);
- (b) the proposed commercial development at the CHR Site was a logical expansion from Causeway Bay where office space in that district was

already saturated;

- (c) traffic concerns had been addressed as a minibus terminus would be provided within the CHR Site, road improvement works at Leighton Road and CHR were proposed, and an underground pedestrian walkway to cater for pedestrian flow was planned;
- (d) due to a number of site constraints including the Old Valuable Trees (OVTs), stone walls and drainage pipe, the government scheme, with proposed PR less than the maximum permissible level under the Building (Planning) Regulation (B(P)R) was considered acceptable;
- (e) public space and recreational and cultural facilities in the district, including Happy Valley Park, Victoria Park and South China Athletics Association, were adequately provided. The Hong Kong Central Library was within a 15- minute walk from the CHR Site and a number of welfare associations were located within the same district. The proposed District Health Centre (DHC) and Child Care Centre (CCC) within the CHR Site were considered not necessary; and
- (f) whether the commercial development within the site would be for Grade A office or hotel use should be determined by the future developer based on the prevailing market situation, while the retail Gross Floor Area (GFA) should be restricted in view of the already overcrowded condition in Causeway Bay arising from the concentration of shopping facilities in the district.

R4 - Lai Wing Sze

R5 - Chan Lai Fan

R6 - Hysan Development Projects Company Limited

R633 - Lai Yun Fan

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee and Ms Jacqueline Yu made the following main points:

- (a) Hysan supported the rezoning as it was a step forward to develop the vacant site. However, they objected to the details of the government scheme as the scheme was lack of vision and could not address the local's concerns. By revising the government scheme, Hysan's proposal would address the community's common concerns on inadequate government, institution and community (GIC) facilities, fragmented open space, dominating and incompatible approach in accommodating the court buildings, traffic congestion, and adequacy of measures for retaining OVTs. They also suggested the imposition of a requirement on the submission of Master Layout Plan (MLP) for the Board's approval so as to facilitate appropriate planning control over the development mix, scale, design and layout of the future development at the CHR Site;
  
- (b) the development parameters in the scheme submitted in Hysan's written representation (proposed scheme) generally followed the development restrictions as stipulated on the draft OZP, while a balanced scheme was further prepared in accordance with the need of the community and to address the concerns raised by some representers/commenters;
  
- (c) the layout of the proposed scheme and the balanced scheme was similar except the development intensity. The basic concept of the balanced scheme was to shift all towers towards the western portion of the site so as to create an amphitheatre at the east. A landscape deck was proposed to connect the towers which would form an urban park as a whole. By shifting the towers to the west, a larger setback could be created to increase the distance from the residential area of Haven Street. It could also minimize the visual impact induced by the proposed development. The landscaped deck could be a platform for active activities and the lower deck area could be used for community facilities such as community hall, DHC, CCC and elderly center. Besides, an art library would be provided as one of the cultural facility. The balanced scheme provided an integrated open space of up to 10,000m<sup>2</sup> as compared to the 6,000m<sup>2</sup> fragmented open space under the government scheme. The wind corridors along the north-south and east-west could still be

maintained and widened from 25m to 60/70m;

- (d) the balanced scheme had also reduced the commercial GFA to 75,000m<sup>2</sup> so that the two commercial towers in the proposed scheme would be one. The reduced building bulk could further enhance the visual and air ventilation performances. The green area would be increased due to the reduction of building footprint. The two OVTs were retained as an anchor point to the site. The stone wall at the east and north would also be maintained and integrated with the landscape design;
- (e) two independent ingress/egress would be provided for the district court under the balanced scheme. One was located at the southwest corner of the site on the ground level facing CHR(West) and the other one was located on the first floor of the landscaped deck. The court could still achieve independent security control despite connecting to the landscaped deck. The scheme also proposed to slightly reduce the site area of the district court so that the DHC could be situated next to it with a larger open space for public enjoyment. A 'smart interchange' was also introduced, where the minibus stop was located, at the north-east of the site. Passengers could stay in the waiting lounge with air-conditioning at the minibus terminus while the traffic information would be updated on the notice board by smart system. A possible connection to the MTR station would also be made available at the north-east corner of the site;
- (f) with reduced commercial GFA and parking spaces under the balanced scheme, the traffic load could be alleviated. The scheme would provide better air ventilation, reduced visual impact on the neighbourhood especially those resided at Haven Street, increase the green coverage and add a local art library as a district anchor. The new urban park could become a new connection and recreational destination for the community. The smart interchange would become a new benchmark for other local interchange in Hong Kong and the art library could feature local art programmes and become a platform and incubator for artists. The new community hall could facilitate social integration and foster a creative community. The balanced scheme was a win-win scenario to fulfil the

needs of both the government and the community;

- (g) in response to PlanD's comment on the lack of technical assessments to support the alternative schemes proposed by representers, it was considered that if the Traffic Review (TR) report prepared by the government was acceptable, the traffic impact of the balanced scheme with reduced GFA and hence traffic load should also be considered acceptable. The Expert Evaluation conducted for the balanced scheme showed that with strategic provision of voids near the towers, two breezeways would facilitate the annual and summer wind. No significant adverse ventilation impact was expected under both annual and summer wind conditions. As such, the balanced scheme was technically feasible;
- (h) the OZP amendment splitting the CHR Site into two zones, i.e. "Government, Institution or Community(2)" ("G/IC(2)") and "Commercial (2)" ("C(2)"), would restrict the design of future development at the site. The access road across the site and the building gaps between the two commercial towers as shown on the government scheme were constraints from design perspective. In addition, the area designated for the district court development was too large. The design of the court should integrate with the park. The reliance on the lease conditions to govern the future development layout would preclude the Board and the public from expressing their views on the design of the development in the next stage. The requirement under lease was not an adequate means to achieve an optimal design. The suggested integrated design could be achieved through submission of MLP for the Board's consideration in the next stage;
- (i) two rezoning options were recommended for the Board's consideration. The first option was to rezone the whole site to "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") which required submission of MLP to allow further inputs from the public and the Board. The second option was to change the zoning boundary of "C(2)" and "G/IC(2)" zones by reducing the size of the "G/IC(2)" zone for district court. The developer

of “C(2)” zone should be required to submit a MLP. Reference could be made to the Sai Yee Street site in Mong Kok, where the requirement of submission of MLP was stipulated in the Notes for the “C(4)” zone of the Mong Kok OZP after the hearing of representations and comments by the Board; and

- (j) the government should provide adequate elderly facilities to meet the demand as elderly facilities were always in deficit. The Board should listen to the public especially the views from the Wan Chai District Council (WCDC).

#### R8 – Chan Sze Hung

20. Mr Chan Sze Hung made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident at Broadwood Road for more than 30 years;
- (b) only six supporting representations were received among the 600+ representations which was only 1% of the total. The government should not proceed with the OZP amendments as the majority of the representers had opposing views;
- (c) traffic was a major problem in the area. As there were schools near the CHR Site, heavy traffic congestion occurred during the morning hour, lunch hour and school dismissal at around 4pm. Roadside loading/unloading activities could also be found in the afternoon around 3pm. It was expected that the situation would become worse with the proposed commercial development at the CHR Site. Moreover, a lot of learner drivers usually occupied Eastern Hospital Road which had seriously affected traffic flow in the area;
- (d) the proposed 600 car parking spaces at the site would attract more vehicles into the area. Similar to the Times Square development, more traffic was induced when car parking spaces were provided, which led to serious traffic congestion along Russell Street. The conclusion of the



TR report that no unacceptable traffic impact would be caused to the nearby road network due to the proposed development at the CHR Site was questionable. CHR/Link Road/Broadwood Road were narrow streets, there would be serious traffic congestion once the commercial development was implemented at the CHR Site;

- (e) it was not appropriate to propose a minibus terminus within the CHR Site as currently most of the passengers taking minibus from Lan Fong Road/MTR station to Greenway Terrace or Jade Terrace which were close to the CHR Site. If the minibus terminus was relocated to the CHR Site which was half way to their destination, strong objection from the locals was expected; and
- (f) in view of the current economic situation, the vacancy rate for commercial buildings in Central was high, and there was no need for new commercial development in Causeway Bay.

R12 - 謝偉俊

R610 - 陳敏灝

R611 - 蔡家輝

21. Hon Tse Wai Chun, Paul made the following main points:

- (a) this oral submission was made in the capacity of a member of WCDC (Broadwood District) and a member of the Legislative Council;
- (b) while he supported certain scale of commercial development, WCDC had passed motions several times on 8.5.2018, 8.1.2019 and 4.7.2019 to oppose the government scheme for the redevelopment of the CHR Site. Recently, a motion was passed on 15.4.2020 requesting the government to delete the CHR Site for commercial use from the land sale programme (LSP). Almost all WCDC members opposed the proposed redevelopment at the CHR Site;
- (c) according to government data released recently, the gross domestic

product (GDP) had suffered its worst decline, shrinking by 8.9% in the first quarter of 2020. According to the figure in March 2020, the vacancy rate for private office was about 7.06% while the rental fee of Class A office buildings had dropped by 30% to the lowest point as compared to that in 2018. Due to the changing economic environment, the development intensity of the CHR Site for commercial development should be suitably adjusted;

- (d) while residents nearby treasured the tranquil CHR Site in the urban area, they understood that vacant land would need to be made use of for development. A balanced approach should be adopted for planning the future use of the CHR Site;

#### *Traffic*

- (e) the role of the Hong Kong Stadium would change for holding district events rather than international events upon the commissioning of Kai Tak Sports Park. As such, though the scale of events might be smaller, there would be an increase in the frequency of usage of the Hong Kong Stadium by schools and other local community groups, and the traffic flow pattern would change accordingly. Coupled with the traffic generated by the commercial development at the CHR Site, the traffic situation in the area would become worse. The area would no longer be suitable for learner drivers and for taking road tests;
- (f) the TR report prepared by the government was outdated and the data collected from a day's survey could not reflect the real situation. The accuracy of the traffic survey based on a weekday only was questionable, having noted that the weekend traffic was normally higher than that of weekdays, and the TR report had not taken into account the traffic condition when public event was held in the Hong Kong Stadium; and
- (g) in order to avoid unnecessary judicial review in future, the Board was requested to consider carefully whether the TR report with missing information was acceptable.

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

R13/C1 - 楊雪盈 Clarisse Yeung

R344 - Lai Kam Cheung

R367/C6 - Fung Ho San

R421/C18 Holland, Trevor Alan

R468/C21 - Li Chun Yin

C3 - 灣仔起步 Kickstart Wan Chai

C7 - Chung Siu Ming

22. With the aid of Powerpoint presentation, Ms Yeung Suet Ying Clarisse, Ms Koo Kwok Wai, Mr Cheung Charlton, Mr Mak King Sing, Ms Chan Yuk Lam and Ms Law Wai Shan made the following main points:

- (a) they introduced themselves. Ms Yeung Suet Ying Clarisse was the Chairman of WCDC. Ms Koo Kwok Wai was a member of WCDC and the Chairman of the Community Building and Housing Affairs Committee. Mr Mak King Shing was the Vice-Chairman of WCDC and the Chairman of the Development, Planning & Transport Committee. Ms Chan Yuk Lam was a member of WCDC (Tin Hau) and the Chairman of the District Works & Facilities Management Committee. Ms Law Wai Shan was a member of WCDC (Oi Kwan), the Chairman of Funding & General Affairs Committee and Vice Chairman of Cultural & Leisure Services Committee;
- (b) due to the traffic congestion issue the CHR Site remained vacant. In several WCDC meetings in the past, PlanD was requested to provide detailed information on the proposed development at the CHR Site but no information was received. When the demolition proposal was first submitted to WCDC in 2016, there was a lack of information on the future use for WCDC members to consider the proposal. The proposed development at the CHR Site was never supported by WCDC. No public consultation had been conducted by the government departments. PlanD should consult the neighbourhood and resolve the local's concerns particularly on the traffic aspect prior to submitting the proposal for the

Board's consideration;

*Site history*

- (c) way back in 1930, the government had considered selling the CHR Site but finally the proposal was dropped. The Hong Kong Daily Press mentioned that the area was considered as 'lungs' and play field that should be permanently preserved. Carving out the CHR Site for development would spoil the amenities of the Sookunpoo Valley which was used as a play field. The south and south-eastern side of the CHR Site was either occupied by GIC use or open space, including South China Stadium, Hong Kong Stadium, Tung Wah Eastern Hospital and St. Paul's Hospital. Rezoning the site for commercial use would deviate from the intention of retaining the open area by the predecessors;

*GIC facilities (community hall)*

- (d) WCDC had requested that a performance venue for local art performance groups be provided in the CHR Site. However, PlanD responded that a new multi-purpose Moreton Terrace Activities Centre would be provided and hence such a facility would not be required in the CHR Site. Unfortunately, the proposed size of the activities centre at Moreton Terrace was not suitable for performance use. Although some performance venues could be provided by the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts and Arts Centre, those venues were not managed by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department and they were mainly for performances by overseas rather than local art groups. Under the government scheme, only about 3,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA had been reserved for DHC and CCC in the CHR Site and whether the facilities provided could cater for local needs was questionable. There should be better communication between the government departments and the WCDC in order to better serve the community. Opportunity was taken to convey a message from a resident of Lei Ha Court that the CHR Site should be used as a green space for the nearby residents;

*GIC facilities (for elderly)*

- (e) there was a need for subsidized residential care services (RCS). The number of RCS places had shown a modest increase of about 1,500 beds in 2011-2015 while the number of elderly applicants on the central waiting list for subsidized RCS places had grown by more than 5,000 over the same period. The aging population would further aggravate the problem of acute RCS deficit, particularly on the Hong Kong Island. The site would be more suitable for providing subsidized residential facilities for the elderly as it was located close to Tung Wah Eastern Hospital and Ruttonjee Hospital with medical services provided and was surrounded by greenery environment for the elderly to enjoy;
  
- (f) the government should plan ahead to provide community facilities for elderly people as the aged population was increasing and it was expected that more than 33.7% of the population would be of age over 65 in 2060. There would be about 26% of residents in the Wan Chai district with age over 65 in 2028. It was suggested that the CHR Site could accommodate a comprehensive DHC including a learning kitchen, an exercise area, an area for provision of emotional therapy services and an examination center. The GFA for a comprehensive DHC should be much more than 2,000m<sup>2</sup> as planned by the government. Besides, subsidised elderly home, supporting center for care takers of the elderly, and community hall for art and cultural performances should also be provided in the CHR Site;
  
- (g) a social enterprise that could provide job opportunities for the elderly could also be provided within the CHR Site. The site should be developed for all ages to use. The site should cater for a community circle for residents to participate and gather around, and for care takers to share their experiences in the community. The site should not be developed into a commercial space for hotel and office development;

*District court*

- (h) Causeway Bay was considered as a shopping district and relocating the district court to the fringe of Causeway Bay was not suitable from the land use point of view. Regarding the 2017 Policy Address for relocation of the court facilities in Wan Chai North, the intention was to relocate those government offices out of the core commercial district to diversify the job opportunities in other districts. Locating the district court complex in the CHR Site defeated such an intention. Once the district court complex was built, it would generate additional traffic to the already congested area. As the complex was located next to the commercial development, security issue was another concern. In fact, the court building in Wan Chai North was only built in 1986 with building age of about 34 years and there was no urgency to relocate it. Demolition of the building in Wan Chai North would also generate huge construction wastes and induce adverse environmental impact;

*Commercial development*

- (i) according to the research from Gartner, Inc., setting up physical office for running a business in the future might not be necessary. The government should consider whether the traditional way to plan for a commercial district was still appropriate in this century. The proposed commercial development within the site should integrate with other elements that would meet the community needs and innovative and creative design should be adopted;

*Traffic issue*

- (j) the TR report only provided traffic data up to the junction outside St. Paul's Hospital without any data at Moreton Terrace, hence the data presented in the TR report could not reflect the real situation. For the pedestrian flow, the assessment indicated that the pedestrian flow with capacity along Hoi Ping Road but it was not a common route for

pedestrians walking from the MTR station to the CHR Site. Their experience was that even without the proposed development, the footpath near the junction of Leighton Road and CHR(East) was currently fully occupied by pedestrians all the time. The effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measure of the addition of 3 seconds for the green time of pedestrians crossing at that junction was questionable. Besides, the TR report, which only took account of traffic flow at several nearby junctions, was not comprehensive and information shown was unclear and misleading. The scenario with sports events at the Hong Kong Stadium and school buses picking up students at around 4pm in the nearby area were missing. The TR report should be reviewed. Classified traffic volume count survey, vehicular queue/ stacking length survey, journey time survey, pedestrian flow survey and kerbside loading/unloading activity survey should be included;

- (k) the outcome of the TR report prepared by the government for the CHR Site was totally different from the observations of the daily traffic conditions made by the public. According to the Traffic Study for Causeway Bay West prepared by TD in August 2014, any intensification or redevelopment of the nearby commercial sites in Causeway Bay West such as the Time Squares, Hysan Place, Lee Theatre and other hotel developments, would worsen the traffic in the area including Leighton Road. As the CHR Site was close to Leighton Road, it was expected that the proposed commercial development would cause traffic congestion. The report also mentioned that Causeway Bay was a densely built-up area with immense traffic demand, and it was subject to constraints to make changes to the existing infrastructure to enhance the traffic situation significantly. Notwithstanding the road improvement scheme formulated for the CHR Site, the conclusion of the TR report that no unacceptable traffic impact would be generated on the nearby road network with the proposed development at the CHR Site was totally flawed;
- (l) it was not worth to sacrifice the only piece of vacant land in the area for commercial development. The proposed commercial development

would induce significant traffic impact on the surrounding area. In fact, the current traffic in the area was already overflowing with no additional road capacity to accommodate any additional traffic generated by the proposed development;

- (m) although the government had indicated that relocation of the minibus stop at Lan Fong Street to the CHR Site was yet to be confirmed, most of the passengers opposed the relocation proposal as the minibus mainly provided transportation services from Causeway Bay MTR station to their residences in Tai Hang, Lai Tak Tsuen and Happy Valley, etc. If the station was relocated to the CHR Site, passengers would need to take a long walk from the heart of Causeway Bay for a ride and the function of the minibus would be lost. The additional traffic generated by locating the minibus stop in the CHR Site was not reflected in the TR report;
- (n) the TR report also mentioned the provision of an underground walkway to improve the connectivity for pedestrians from the heart of Causeway Bay to the CHR Site. In 2011, public consultation on a feasibility study on a pedestrian subway system in Causeway Bay was conducted but no conclusion was available so far. A study on pilot scheme for underground space development in selected strategic urban areas including Causeway Bay, Happy Valley, Admiralty/Wan Chai and Tsim Sha Tsui West was also conducted in 2015 but no implementation time table was announced. These demonstrated that the provision of underground pedestrian walkway might not be feasible in Causeway Bay;

*Open space*

- (o) according to the data released by Civic Exchange, the average open space per person in Hong Kong was about 3.1m<sup>2</sup> in 2009 which had been dropped to 2m<sup>2</sup> per person in 2019. The accountable recreational open space per person of 2.7m<sup>2</sup> was comparatively lower than other Asian cities such as Tokyo, Seoul and Singapore. Although some public open spaces were provided in the district were within private developments,



they were not well-designed to facilitate public use. An ideal public open space should be easily accessible for all users with adequate facilities to encourage social interaction in the area. Whether the scattered open space as shown in the government scheme could provide a vibrant and attractive open space to serve as a social gathering place for the public was doubted. Due to the lack of open space and GIC facilities, the valuable CHR Site should be reserved for GIC use;

- (p) referring to the balanced scheme presented by Hysan, the commercial GFA could be reduced by 25%. It demonstrated that the government scheme was an aggressive development and even private developer would like to scale down the development intensity. The existing traffic condition was already congested and would become worse if the proposed development was approved. The provision of GIC facilities within the site should cater for local needs and meet their aspiration. The urban park in Berlin which was transformed from the former Tempelhof Airport provided a massive open air space for the public to enjoy freely and it was a good example to model on; and
- (q) notwithstanding Hysan's claim that the locals' concern would be addressed by their balanced scheme, Hysan's proposal should not be accepted as it would still result in a commercial development at the CHR Site.

[Messers Stephen L.H. Liu and Franklin Yu and Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung left the meeting during the presentation.]

R14 - 香港希雲街十三號至十五號A業主立案法團 The Incorporated Owners of  
13-15A, Haven Street, Hong Kong

R377 – Yau Man Shan, Cathy

23. The Chairperson said that the representative of R14 and R377 who attended the meeting had indicated that no oral representation would be made.

R17 - Caroline Hill Planning Concern Group

R472 - Cheung Sin Ying

C2 – 楊子雋Arthur Yeung

24. With the aid of Powerpoint presentation, Mr Yeung Tze Chun Arthur made the following main points:

- (a) he was the convenor of the Caroline Hill Planning Concern Group. As PlanD had not conducted proper public consultation for the proposed development at the CHR Site, the Concern Group, comprising nearby residents along Haven Street, CHR, Broadwood Road and Link Road was set up in early 2019 to follow up the subject matter. The Concern Group objected to the proposed development at the CHR Site;

*Traffic*

- (b) no full TR report but only a summary was submitted to WCDC for consideration at its meetings on 8.5.2018, 8.1.2019 and 4.7.2019. The information contained in the TR report was outdated, biased and the data collected for the traffic survey was inadequate. Only the data from 8am to 10am and 5pm to 7pm (a total of 4 hours) on one typical weekday in 2017 were collected. Beside, there was no discussion on how the traffic pattern/ traffic flow would be affected when the Central-Wan Chai Bypass was in place. The credibility of the TR report was questionable;
- (c) the CHR Site was surrounded by GIC facilities, including schools and hospitals. The traffic generated from these facilities might not fall within the rush hours of commercial development. Serious traffic congestion was found in a typical weekday afternoon on Leighton Road and Link Road as well as in a weekend morning on Link Road and CHR(West) due to vehicles getting in and out from the South China Athletics Association;
- (d) the government only stated that road improvement works would take

place at the junction of CHR(West)/Link Road (J6). As only survey data taken on one day was available, the traffic count conducted was not accurate as traffic along Link Road northbound turning right to Tung Wah Hospital was not busy during weekday. However, that section would be extremely busy during weekend as it was the direction to the South China Athletics Association and the Hong Kong Stadium. The design of J6 could not address the existing traffic congestion problem and it would even induce serious weaving issue at the proposed junction. The Board should not agree to the proposed amendments and government departments should conduct another TR based on accurate and comprehensive data and propose a more suitable GFA for the development at the CHR Site;

*District court*

- (e) comparing against the existing 11-storey (i.e. 88mPD) high West Kowloon Law Courts Building (WKLCB) with similar development intensity, the proposed building height (BH) of 135mPD for the district court development at the CHR Site was considered not appropriate. The Board should consider whether the BH of 135mPD for the district court was justifiable. The development intensity should be scaled down to reduce visual impact and to enhance air ventilation. Whilst the Paper stated that no other public facilities could co-locate with the district court, the existing district court in Wan Chai North was co-located with other government offices in the same building. The district court should co-locate with other GIC facilities such as cultural center to meet the local needs;

*Site layout*

- (f) the proposed four towers at the site under the government scheme would block the view and wind to and from Sunning Road and the junction of Percival Street and Leighton Road. The shadow analysis showed that the proposed development would block the sunlight penetrating to nearby residential developments including Silverwood, Caroline Heights, etc and

might affect the health of the residents;

- (g) while the government scheme was indicative only, the Board should base on the government scheme to impose non-building area (NBA) along the southwestern boundary of the site so as to provide adequate setback from the existing residential buildings. Also, the proposed open space located at the eastern corner of the site was not easy to access. Government departments should clearly define the types of open space to be provided, namely public green, plaza, courtyard or pocket space for better design and management;
- (h) other environmental impacts such as bird strikers, heat island effect, urban canyon effect and skyscraper reflections should also be addressed in the planning stage rather than relying on other control mechanism such as BEAM plus or Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) upon the detailed design stage which would be too late; and

*Public consultation*

- (i) the planning process was not fair because it did not give consideration to the comments and motions raised by WCDC. No public engagement was initiated when the plan was formulated. The two public consultation meetings mentioned by PlanD were organized by WCDC members instead. The Board should not agree to the proposed OZP amendments and PlanD should proactively engage stakeholders from the community before formulating the planning proposal. Besides, a more comprehensive TR should be conducted with further reduction of the development intensity. More information should be provided on the site layout and the function of open spaces.

25. As the presentation from the government representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives of the first session had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session for the first session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairperson would invite the government representatives, representers, commenters and their 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. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

26. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

*Site history*

- (a) whether the use of the site had changed having noted that a representer had pointed out that the site was proposed to be retained for open space use in 1930;

*Control mechanism*

- (b) whether there was any mechanism to ensure that the development, including the development parameters and mitigation measures as shown on the conceptual layout plan, could be achieved in the future development;

*Public consultation*

- (c) if the amendments to the draft OZP were confirmed, whether the public could still provide comments or inputs for the planned developments in the “C(2)” and “G/IC(2)” zones;
- (d) whether the site could be rezoned to “CDA” so that the public could be involved in the planning process by providing comments on the future MLP, whether the inclusion of the court development was a constraint for not rezoning the whole CHR Site to “CDA” and whether the government had taken initiatives to conduct public consultation on the planned development of the CHR Site;

*Development intensity and building height*

- (e) how the location of the district court was determined and how the

development parameters of the “C(2)” zone were devised;

- (f) whether restricting the GFA of 100,000m<sup>2</sup> for the development at the “C(2)” zone was due to the limited traffic capacity of the local area and whether it was a common practice to specify a maximum GFA for a particular site on the OZP;
- (g) whether the developable area of 8,953m<sup>2</sup> for the “C(2)” zone as mentioned in the footnote of the major development parameters table in the presentation had excluded the required open space of 6,000m<sup>2</sup>;
- (h) whether the government would consider to reduce the commercial GFA in the “C(2)” zone as requested by the representers;
- (i) whether a GFA of 70,000m<sup>2</sup> was required for the district court, family court and Lands Tribunal;
- (j) with reference to the WKLCB, whether the proposed BH of 135mPD for the district court development was appropriate given the GFA required was only about 70,000m<sup>2</sup>;

*Traffic aspect*

- (k) how to assess the traffic data in the TR report, whether there was any traffic data collected on an hourly basis, whether data collected in weekday was sufficient to assess the traffic generated by the CHR Site;
- (l) whether the traffic data collected in one weekday was considered sufficient for traffic assessment;
- (m) whether the traffic survey conducted in 2017 was still suitable for assessing the proposed development. Also, whether the traffic data would need to be updated as the Central-Wan Chai By-pass was now in operation;
- (n) whether the TR had addressed the traffic generated by the proposed development and whether the traffic capacity had reached saturation point

upon full development of the CHR Site;

- (o) how the assumed retail GFA in the CHR Site would affect the TR result;
- (p) whether the full TR report had been submitted to WCDC for consideration;
- (q) the purpose or rationale for locating the minibus stop within the CHR Site;

*Community facilities*

- (r) whether the proposed development in the “C(2)” zone could accommodate additional GIC facilities if those facilities were required in the future;
- (s) whether the provision of residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) at the CHR Site had been explored and whether some of the commercial GFA could be allocated for the provision of elderly facilities; and

*Open Space*

- (t) whether more open space could be provided notwithstanding that the OZP had stipulated a minimum 6,000m<sup>2</sup> of public open space and whether the management of the open space would be assigned to the future developer.

27. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, Ms Fiona H.Y. Fong, Mr C.K. Wan and Ms Charis Wong made the following main points with the aid of PowerPoint slides and visualizer:

*Site history*

- (a) the site was no longer reserved for open space years ago. Before demolition works took place at the site, it was occupied by the ex-Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) Headquarters, a workshop for car repairing, the ex-Civil Aid Service Headquarters, the ex-Post Office Recreation Club and the PCCW Recreation Club. The site had long been occupied by GIC and recreational uses rather than preserved as a green lung;

*Control mechanism*

- (b) the indicative layout was prepared to facilitate the preparation of technical assessments to support the amendments to the OZP. The essential elements had been incorporated into the Notes of the OZP. For the “C(2)” zone, a maximum BH of 135mPD, maximum GFA of 100,000m<sup>2</sup> which should include the GFA of GIC facilities as required by the government, and the provision of open space of not less than 6,000m<sup>2</sup>; a public transport facility for minibuses; and a public vehicle park of not less than 125 parking spaces had been stipulated in the Notes while the Explanatory Statement of the OZP also specified that quantitative Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) would be conducted at the detailed design stage to identify the exact alignment of the building gap and/or other enhancement measures, the retail GFA of the commercial development would be restricted to 10,000m<sup>2</sup>, and a DHC with a net operational floor area (NOFA) of about 1,000m<sup>2</sup> and a CCC with a NOFA of about 531m<sup>2</sup> should be provided. The requirements for the submission of quantitative AVA, preservation of OVTs, protection of the stone retaining walls and trees thereon, submission of Landscape Plan and compliance with the SBDG would also be incorporated in the land sale conditions. The future developer was also advised to make reference to the ‘Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines’ promulgated by the Development Bureau to design and manage the public open space to be provided within the CHR Site;

*Public consultation*

- (c) the proposed development at the CHR Site and the proposed amendments to the OZP were presented three times to WCDC in 2018 and 2019. If the amendments to the draft OZP were confirmed, the relevant government departments would proceed to the detailed design of the district court development, and WCDC would be further consulted in that regard. As for the commercial development, if the future developer followed the development parameters as stipulated on the OZP, no further public



consultation under the planning regime for the development on the “C(2)” zone was required. If the future developer sought for minor relaxation of BH or GFA restrictions, submission of planning application to the Board would be required and the public could make comments on the proposal during the planning application process;

- (d) regarding public consultation, PlanD would conduct public consultations for major planning studies. For district planning matters, normally the District Council would be consulted for the purpose of collecting public views. Besides, the Town Planning Ordinance had stipulated the statutory public consultation procedure in the plan making process. The public could make representations/comments to the Board in respect of OZP amendments and attend hearing meeting to make oral submission. The two residents’ forums were organized by WCDC members and the representatives of concerned government departments had attended to explain the land use proposals and responded to residents’ concerns;

*Development intensity and building height*

- (e) as the district court was a government facility, it was appropriate to designate a “G/IC” zoning while the commercial development would be implemented by private developer and the “C(2)” zone had incorporated the relevant development parameters to guide and control the development. Despite the two different zonings, an integrated design could be achieved as demonstrated in the indicative scheme with suitable decking design. For the site at Sai Yee Street in Mong Kok, the site context was different from the CHR Site. The Sai Yee Street site was located close to the East Rail Station which had heavy pedestrian flow to and from other parts of Mong Kok through the site with more requirements for provision of the GIC facilities than that proposed in the CHR Site. Accessibility to these proposed GIC facilities and integrated open space design and connectivity with the surrounding areas in the Sai Yee Street site were also concerns to Members. Hence, the Board finally decided to require the submission of MLP for the Sai Yee Street site to ensure that the concerns would be properly addressed. As for the CHR Site, the design should be less complicated in terms of pedestrian connectivity and the 6,000m<sup>2</sup> public open

space were all within the “C(2)” zone at the CHR Site. Furthermore, the submission of Landscape Plan to demonstrate the integration of the open space with the development would be incorporated in the land sale condition;

- (f) a GFA of 70,000m<sup>2</sup>, a site area of 10,620m<sup>2</sup>, and three independent accesses including one for emergency access for the court development were requested by the project proponent. Also, as mentioned in PlanD’s presentation, a stone retaining wall at the eastern periphery of the site and the tree growing thereon would have to be preserved. Taking into account all the requirements and site constraints, locating the district court at the south western side of the CHR Site with a new east-west access road connecting CHR(East) and CHR(West) to serve both the district court and the commercial development was a option that could satisfy the requirements. A maximum BH of 135mPD for commercial development at the “C(2)” zone was in line with the BH restriction of “Commercial” zone in Causeway Bay across Leighton Road. Given the traffic constraint, the PR for the “C(2)” zone was lower than the maximum permissible development intensity of high-rise commercial buildings under the B(P)R (i.e. a PR of 15). With the requirement for provision of an open space of not less than 6,000m<sup>2</sup> within the “C(2)” zone, keeping the maximum BH of 135mPD could allow design flexibility for the commercial development. Limiting the GFA to 100,000m<sup>2</sup> for the commercial development at the site was due to the limited traffic capacity nearby. It was not an unusual practice to impose GFA restriction for a particular site on OZP after taking into account its site constraints, infrastructure capacity and other planning considerations;
- (g) the proposed road improvement works, the indicative access road and the public open space to the south of the access road were excluded from the “C(2)” zone for calculation of the developable area;
- (h) according to the “Review of Land Requirement for Grade A Offices, Business and Industrial Uses” conducted under the Hong Kong 2030+ Study, there was a long- term shortage of Grade A office of 1.06 million m<sup>2</sup> GFA in Hong Kong. The vacancy rate of Grade A office in Wan Chai/ Causeway

Bay (4.5% in end-2018) had always been relatively low as compared with the territorial total (8.7% in end-2018). Hence, there was a demand for commercial floor space in Hong Kong. According to the technical assessments, a maximum GFA of 100,000m<sup>2</sup> at the “C(2)” zone would not generate significant adverse impacts on its surroundings in terms of the visual, air ventilation and traffic aspects. Besides, after consultation with WCDC, the requirement for provision of a DHC and a CCC to meet the needs of the community was included in the calculation of GFA of 100,000m<sup>2</sup>;

- (i) the district court development would consist of the district court, family court and Lands Tribunal. The GFA for the district court development was estimated with reference to the existing NOFA for the district court, family court and Lands Tribunal with future expansion of about 1.5 times of the existing facilities. After converting the required NOFA to GFA, the required GFA of 70,000m<sup>2</sup> for the court development was considered a fair and reasonable estimation;
- (j) according to the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)’s preliminary design for the district court development, a stepped BH development would be adopted within the site and only one of the court building would reach the maximum BH of 135mPD. The building disposition and the BH of the buildings were yet to be finalized. Regarding the floor-to-floor height of the court development, reference was made to the WKLCB of 5.5m to 6.5m. Although the actual BH for the court building was yet to be finalized by the project proponent, the BH restriction of 135mPD was considered acceptable in visual term;

*Traffic aspect /Traffic Review Report*

- (k) when conducting the TR for the proposed development, reference had been made to the data obtained from the Annual Traffic Census for the year 2015 to 2018. It was observed that the traffic flow during the peak hour in a weekday morning was heavier than the traffic flow in a weekend morning while the traffic flow during a weekday afternoon and the traffic flow during

weekend were comparable.;

- (l) the CHR Site was planned for commercial and district court development, the nature of which was for office use. The traffic generated by the development would be concentrated in normal office working days, i.e. Mondays to Fridays rather than in weekend. Besides, it was observed that the traffic flow pattern on weekday was quite regular with little variation. The above factors contributed to the choice of a normal weekday to conduct the traffic survey to form a base case. That was the established and acceptable practice to conduct TR in Hong Kong;
- (m) traffic data collected in 2017 was set as a base case to project the traffic flow near the CHR Site up to 2031. Notwithstanding that the traffic count near the CHR Site had slightly dropped in the last two years, as a conservative approach, an annual traffic growth rate of 0.1% was applied to the traffic flow for modelling purpose. As the Central-Wan Chai Bypass was located far from the site, the traffic impact associated with the Bypass was insignificant;
- (n) in conducting TR, a trip generation rate according to the types and scale of the proposed development would be applied to estimate the concern of traffic generated by the proposed development. The generated trips would be assigned to the surrounding road network to assess their implications on the capacity of nearby road junctions. The TR demonstrated that together with the proposed road improvement works, the reserve capacities (in terms of percentage) for all the nearby signalized junctions remained positive implying that the junction would operate with spare capacity upon implementation of the proposed development and was considered acceptable. For the priority junctions, the design flow/capacity ratio were less than 0.85, which was also considered acceptable;
- (o) as reflected in the TR report, retail use would generate comparatively more traffic than other commercial uses like office and hotel. To minimize the traffic impact of the future commercial development, the retail GFA was restricted to 10,000m<sup>2</sup>. The traffic assessment was conducted based on the

assumption of a maximum retail GFA of 10,000m<sup>2</sup>;

- (p) the preliminary findings of the TR was presented to WCDC in the meeting on 8.1.2019. The adopted data of trip generation and performances of key road junctions extracted from the TR report, were submitted to WCDC for members' reference. The whole TR report, together with other technical assessments attached to the MPC Paper No. 1/19 on proposed amendments to the approved Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/19, was available on the Board's website and at the Planning Enquiry Counter of PlanD for public inspection. WCDC members were informed at its meeting on 24.7.2019;
- (q) at present, there were minibus terminus for a number of minibus routes along Lan Fong Road and Lee Garden Road and there was limited space for future expansion. While public transport facility for minibuses could be provided within the CHR Site, TD had yet to decide how these associated minibus routes would be adjusted, and whether to relocate the existing minibus terminus to the CHR Site or provide en-route stops to accommodate the transport needs of the public. Consultation with the stakeholders including the locals would be conducted should there be any options or proposals formulated for the adjustment of minibus routes;

*Community facilities*

- (r) according to the Notes of the OZP, 'Social Welfare Facility' and 'Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture' were Column 1 uses which were always permitted in the "C(2)" zone. The NOFA for the DHC and the CCC as stated in the Explanatory Statement was not prescriptive requirements on scale of GIC provision in the Notes of the "C(2)" zone;
- (s) regarding the provision of GIC facilities in the Wan Chai district, there was no shortfall of major GIC facilities except day care centres for the elderly and residential care home for the elderly (RCHE), the population-based standards of which were reinstated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines in end-2018. The provision of RCHE was generally determined by a host of factors including age profile of the population, availability and geographic distribution of such facility in the district. As

the CHR Site would mainly be used for commercial and district court purposes, it was considered that priority should be given to the provision of DHC and CCC. Nevertheless, the Social Welfare Department had indicated that multi-pronged approaches would be adopted to increase the supply of elderly care facilities in Wan Chai district; and

*Open Space*

- (t) according to the Notes of the OZP for the “C(2)” zone, not less than 6,000m<sup>2</sup> public open space should be provided. There was no restriction for the future developer to provide public open space above the stipulated minimum requirement. To address the concern raised by the representers/commenters for achieving a quality design and proper management of public open space in private development, a set of Design and Management Guidelines was promulgated by the Development Bureau to provide a framework for better design based on the principles of connectivity, appropriateness and quality, with due emphasis on public comfort and greenery. The commercial development at the CHR Site would be a private project. Thus, the Development Bureau’s design and management guidelines were applicable.

28. Some Members raised the following questions to Representer R6:

- (a) the rationale for suggesting an art library in the CHR Site;
- (b) the reasons why submission of MLP for the Board’s approval was required for the balanced scheme to be achieved;
- (c) clarification on the development parameters of the proposed scheme and the balanced scheme, and whether the GFA and site area for the district court in the balanced scheme were proposed to be reduced in R6’s oral presentation differing from this submitted written representation of maintaining the GFA and site area of the “G/IC(2)” zone;
- (d) the basis for the proposed reduction of the commercial GFA in the balanced

scheme from 100,000m<sup>2</sup> to 75,000m<sup>2</sup>;

- (e) whether the proposed scheme was prepared based on the current restrictions as stipulated on the OZP; and
- (f) whether there were any proposed facilities and activities on the ground level of the proposed scheme and the balanced scheme as it appeared that the entire site was covered by landscaped deck.

29. In response, Mr Ian Brownlee and Ms Jacqueline Yu (representatives of R6) made the following main points with the aid of Powerpoint slides:

- (a) the provision of an art library, which was cultural in nature, could cater to the community needs. Together with the provision of community hall, DHC and CCC, the proposed GIC facilities could address the request from WCDC and the community;
- (b) the requirement for submission of a MLP to the Board could ensure that the various concerns would be addressed in the layout design under the Board's scrutiny. Another merit was that the public could have a chance to provide comments on the MLP during the planning application process;
- (c) under the proposed scheme, the BH and GFA for the district court was 135mPD and 70,000m<sup>2</sup> respectively, which were the same as the government scheme. For the balanced scheme, while retaining the BH for the commercial development at 135mPD, the reduction of commercial GFA by 25,000m<sup>2</sup> could allow the two towers be combined to one. The GFA for the district court remained the same as proposed by the government, but the site area was reduced by 1,000-2,000m<sup>2</sup> resulting in a more spacious landscaped deck;
- (d) generally, the typical floor plate for a Grade A office building was about 2,000m<sup>2</sup>. Given the maximum BH of 135mPD, the total GFA for a single office building under the balanced scheme would be about 75,000m<sup>2</sup> which was comparable to other Grade A office building. The

reduction of GFA within the “C(2)” site could enhance the surrounding environment with better air ventilation and visual experience to the nearby residents, and the traffic trip could be reduced by 80-120 passenger car units (PCU) per hour during peak hours;

- (e) the open space as shown in the government scheme was fragmented and the building gaps proposed would divide the site into four sections. Although it was necessary to provide building gaps to facilitate air flow, imposing a designated location of the building gap would pose constraint for quality design. The balanced scheme was to illustrate the potential of the site to create a decent urban park for the community; and
- (f) referring to the section plan of the balanced scheme, minibus stop and GIC facilities including community hall, DHC, CCC and district elderly center could be provided below the landscaped deck.

30. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to Representer R13:

- (a) the current situation of provision of community hall and elderly facilities in Wan Chai district;
- (b) the GFA required for the community hall for performing arts and elderly facilities in the CHR Site; and
- (c) whether all WCDC members objected to any kind of commercial development at the CHR Site. If all those GIC facilities requested could be provided within the site, whether they would still oppose the proposed commercial development at the site; and whether WCDC members had objection to the district court development at the CHR Site.

31. In response, Ms Yeung Suet Ying Clarisse (R13), made the following main points:

- (a) in 2013, WCDC noted that there was no community hall for performance



activities in Wan Chai district and proposed to build a community hall at Moreton Terrace using the \$100 million funding under the Signature Project Scheme. However, the proposed size/function of the community hall in Moreton Terrace turned out not as expected. Although some venues, such as Fong Chung Social Service Center or Leighton Hill Community Hall, were provided in Wan Chai, they were of small scale and not suitable for performing arts. That was the main reason why the local requested a community hall in the CHR Site, similar to the concert hall in the Hong Kong City Hall or the theatre in Sai Wan Ho Civic Centre in terms of their function and scale. In fact, a performance theatre was needed rather than a community hall;

- (b) a performance venue for 200-300 audiences, day care center for the elderly and RCHE were expected to be provided within the CHR Site to meet the needs in the Wan Chai district; and
- (c) according to WCDC's latest motion, WCDC objected to the proposed land sale of commercial development at the CHR Site. Majority of the WCDC members considered the rezoning amendments unacceptable if the traffic issue was not addressed. As far as she understood, they opposed commercial development at the CHR Site. There was no discussion on district court development in the motion as the development was also a GIC use. However, residents nearby the site raised concern on the proposed BH of the district court development.

32. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the first session had been completed. The Board would deliberate the representations/comments in closed meeting in a separate session after all the hearing sessions were completed and would inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers, commenters and their representatives of the first session for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

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

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng left the meeting at this point.]

33. The following representers, commenters and their representatives of the second session were invited to the meeting at this point:

**Representers, Commenters and their representatives**

R19/C102 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Tai Hang Terrace

R20/C101 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Park Garden, Tai Hang Drive

R21/C100 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Wing On Towers

R22/C103 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Butler Towers

R24/C95 - Jardine's Lookout Concern Group

R26/C85 - Hui Ming Chun Cindy

R27 - Caroline Garden OC Committees

R28/C104 - Residents of Jardine's Lookout

R29/C96 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Linden Height

R30/C97 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Flora Garden

R520/C87 - Behrens Chee Sau Chun Bella

R529 - Leung Wai Po Rosanna

R530 - Yim Lok Yan Natalie

R531 - Trevor Yim Che Ming

R532 / C86 - Yim Hong

R533 - 陳惠美

R535 - 彭銘楷

R592 - Ng Tsz Chun Shunichi

R593 - Pang Lo Mei

R600 - 許宗熾

R602 - Alice Yung Woon Cheung

C94 - Caroline Hill Planning Concern Group

C98 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Cavendish Heights (Block 8)

C99 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Cavendish Heights (Blocks 1-7)

Ms Hui Ming Chun Cindy	1	Representers/and Commenters and
Mr Tsang Wai Lun William	1	Representers' and Commenters'
Mr Yim Hong	1	representatives
Ms Pang Lo Mei	1	

R31 - The Incorporated owners of Beverly Hill

Mr Robert Yeung - Representer's representative

R33 - Best Epoch Holdings Limited

*Townland Consultants Ltd*

Ms Cindy Anne Lee Tsang 1 Representer's representatives

Mr Lau Chi King Vincent 1

Mr Ho Shek Tim 1

R34/C105 - Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

R35 – Doctoral Exchange

Mr Cheung Neo Ton Francis - Representer's Representative

R47 - Cheng Yin Tai

Mr Cheng Yin Tai - Representer

34. The Chairperson extended a welcome to the representers, commenters and their representatives. She then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives of the second session to give their oral submissions.

R19/C102 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Tai Hang Terrace

R20/C101 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Park Garden, Tai Hang Drive

R21/C100 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Wing On Towers

R22/C103 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Butler Towers

R24/ C95 - Jardine's Lookout Concern Group

R26/C85 - Hui Ming Chun Cindy

R27 - Caroline Garden OC Committees

R28/C104 - Residents of Jardine's Lookout

R29/C96 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Linden Height

R30/C97 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Flora Garden

R520/C87 - Behrens Chee Sau Chun Bella

R529 - Leung Wai Po Rosanna

R530 - Yim Lok Yan Natalie

R531 - Trevor Yim Che Ming

R532/C86 - Yim Hong

R533 - 陳惠美

R535 - 彭銘楷

R592 - Ng Tsz Chun Shunichi

R593 - Pang Lo Mei

R600 - 許宗熾

R602 - Alice Yung Woon Cheung

C94 - Caroline Hill Planning Concern Group

C98 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Cavendish Heights (Block 8)

C99 - The Owners Corporation Committee of Cavendish Heights (Blocks 1-7)

35. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Hui Ming Chun Cindy made the following main points:

*Development Parameters*

- (a) the BH restriction of 135mPD for the commercial development at the site was considered acceptable. However, the BH restriction of 135mPD for the district court buildings was excessive;
- (b) 'canyon effect' and 'urban heat-island effect' created by tall buildings at the site would adversely affect the micro-climate and air ventilation in the vicinity;
- (c) the proposed district court buildings with height up to 135mPD were in close proximity to the residential buildings along CHR(West) and Link Road and severe issue of over-shadowing was anticipated. Many of the residential buildings at CHR(West) had their living rooms and bedrooms facing the CHR Site and therefore were susceptible to deterioration in living conditions;
- (d) based on a shadow analysis at the summer solstice, which had the longest period of daylight in a year, many of the residential buildings in the vicinity would be in the shadows of the district court buildings for 8 to 10

hours. It was considered that the building gap of only 20m between the residential buildings at CHR(West) and the proposed district court building at the southern portion of the site was not sufficient;

- (e) similarly, the visual impact of the district court buildings on the surrounding area was unacceptable. However, only photomontages from viewpoints such as the Peak and Happy Valley Racecourse were provided by PlanD to downplay the impact. The concern of the community on visual intrusiveness was brushed aside by PlanD in their response simply by quoting the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41 that 'private views from residential or commercial towers were not considered as it was not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations in the highly developed context of Hong Kong';
- (f) the WKLCB at Shum Shui Po had a BH of only about 80mPD. The proposed district court buildings should primarily be functional buildings and there was no need to adopt a BH restriction of 135mPD, which was excessive and incompatible with the surrounding areas, solely for the sake of design flexibility. No convincing justifications had been put forward by PlanD in that regard so far;
- (g) PlanD had been reluctant to consider alternative design options for the site. The current indicative scheme with four massive towers and minimal setback and building gap was not meeting the aspirations of the local community. A stepped BH descending from the northeast to the south should be adopted. Additional study should be conducted to explore alternative design options;

#### *Traffic and Access*

- (h) 600 car parking spaces would be provided within the site and the access road would unlikely be able to cope with the traffic generated by the development;

- (i) at present, traffic congestion in the vicinity of the site was common even on typical weekdays. During weekend, the long queue of vehicles waiting to enter the car park of Lee Garden 3 often caused congestion at Hoi Ping Road, Sunning Road and Hysan Avenue. The additional traffic brought by the development would further deteriorate the situation in the area. Times Square could serve as an example and the traffic issues around it remained unresolved for years;
- (j) in the proposal put forward by PlanD, a 20m-wide access road would bisect the site. The access road would be utilised by both the commercial towers and the district court buildings. There were grave concern regarding the ownership and management responsibility of the access road and whether it would complicate the operation of the district court buildings;
- (k) insufficient consideration had been given to enhance pedestrian connections to the site;

#### *Open Space*

- (l) the open space at an elevated platform of about 15mPD near the eastern site access meant that elevator/underground crossing would need to be provided to access that open space. Such arrangement was undesirable from accessibility point of view. That open space would also become an isolated or 'left-over' space in the development. On the whole, the open spaces in the development were fragmented and inconvenient for the public to enjoy;
- (m) the OVT located near the centre of the site would be enclosed by the district court buildings and likely be fenced off from the public due to security considerations of the district court buildings. The construction works for the district court buildings would likely affect the health of the OVT;

*Alternative Proposal - Scheme B1 and C1*

- (n) the alternative schemes B1 and C1 presented at this morning were win-win options for all stakeholders as they could address the concerns of the community without affecting the amount of GFA that could be provided at the site;
- (o) the district court buildings were proposed to move to the northern part of the site abutting CHR(East). It was possible to keep the BH of the district court buildings at 71m or below while accommodating the 70,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA as required by the Judiciary. The requirements for a 5.5m floor-to-floor height for the court room and a floor plate of not less than 5,300m<sup>2</sup> could also be met;
- (p) it was proposed to reduce the number of commercial towers from two to one in order to provide more open space for public enjoyment. A tower with a 2,500m<sup>2</sup> footprint would accommodate the 100,000m<sup>2</sup> commercial GFA without breaching the current BH restriction of 135mPD;
- (q) vehicular access to the district court buildings should be provided at CHR(East) via a consolidated entry point for better security and convenience. CHR(East) could serve as an emergency vehicular access (EVA) for the site and there was no need to provide a separate EVA within the site;
- (r) the alternative schemes would unlikely affect the masonry walls along the boundary of the site. The distance between the buildings and the masonry walls was about 10m in the alternative schemes as compared to 5m in PlanD's proposal;
- (s) it was proposed to divert the traffic entering the commercial towers to the basement level via the ingress at CHR(West). Different vehicles would be diverted to suitable zones and a separate access would be provided for vehicles queuing for hourly parking. Due to the large size of the site,

proper loading/unloading bays and traffic interchange could be accommodated at the basement, thereby reducing the number of vehicles on the ground level and free up space for development of additional public open space;

- (t) a 40m-wide non-building area (NBA) should be provided along the south-western boundary of the site to minimise the impact of the proposed development on the residential buildings along CHR(West). The NBA could form part of the open space at the site. With the introduction of this NBA, air ventilation and sunlight penetration for the area could also be greatly enhanced. Given the size of the site, it would not pose unreasonable constraint on the future development nor affect the achievable development intensity. Simply adopting the SBDG or meeting the basic requirements under the B(P)R was not sufficient to ensure that the impact of tall buildings could be suitably mitigated;
- (u) the economy of Hong Kong had been declining since 2019 due to various factors including the COVID-19. The GDP had dropped by 8.9% in the first quarter of 2020 and the demand for retail and commercial floor space had plummeted. Scheme C1, while largely similar to scheme B1, called for a reduction of the retail floor space by 10,000m<sup>2</sup> and rezoning part of the site (about 7,000m<sup>2</sup>) to “Open Space”. The open space should be managed by the government in order to avoid many of the issues associated with the management of public open space in private developments that had been widely reported by the media in recent years;
- (v) the government should consider withdrawing the site from the 2020 LSP as the likelihood of unsuccessful tendering was high;

*Comments on Representations/Proposals submitted by other Representers*

Submission by R6

- (w) objected to R6’s representation. Development restrictions were necessary to ensure that the future development would not cause excessive



traffic, environmental and visual impacts. The existing character of the site, including OVTs and masonry walls, should be respected in the design;

- (x) the community was already suffering from the traffic issue brought by the shopping malls in the Lee Garden area. The scheme by R6 was basically to turn the site into an extension of Lee Garden. However, the local community did not want to have another 'focal point' at the site;
- (y) the unrestricted access to the district court buildings in R6's proposal was not acceptable from a security point of view;

Submissions by R11 and R35

- (z) there was no clear delineation of the district court buildings from the other developments at the site in the proposals. The massive building blocks proposed were visually intrusive and would adversely affect the micro-climate of the area;
- (aa) the vehicular access proposed near CHR and Link Road was not acceptable as it would aggravate the traffic conditions at those busy junctions; and
- (bb) the proposed amphitheatre might become a source of noise and nuisance to the nearby residents. As a result, the activities that could be permitted at the amphitheatre would be limited.

36. At the end of her presentation, Ms Hui Ming Chun Cindy submitted a set of 63 standard letters from nearby residents objecting to the inclusion of the CHR Site in the 2020 LSP.

R31 - The Incorporated owners of Beverly Hill

37. Mr Robert Yeung made the following main points:

- (a) the site should be withdrawn from the 2020 LSP. Given the prevailing

economic situation, the site would unlikely be disposed of at a good price. Reduced revenue from land sale for the government meant the public would suffer while the land developer could maximise their profit;

- (b) the TR was conducted in 2017 and its validity was questionable as the traffic situations might have been changed since the data was collected. If the baseline data from 2017 was outdated or inaccurate, the conclusion of the TR would also be flawed;
- (c) the traffic in the vicinity of the site was already very congested. For example, it had taken him 25 minutes to travel by taxi from Beverly Hill to the CHR Site today and that distance was only about a 8-minute walk;
- (d) there were doubts on whether the OVT in the centre of the site could be properly preserved in PlanD's indicative scheme; and
- (e) majority of the WCDC members did not support the development at the site. The government should duly consider the views of the community.

### R33 – Best Epoch Holdings Limited

38. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lau Chi King Vincent made the following main points:

- (a) the core business area in Causeway Bay was situated mostly to the north of Leighton Road. The CHR Site was outside this core area and acted as a breathing space between the core business area and the surrounding residential areas in Leighton Hill and Caroline Hill area;
- (b) the development parameters stipulated on the draft OZP were not appropriate. High-density commercial development at the site was not desirable from land use compatibility, urban design, environmental and infrastructural capacity perspectives. The proposed development would cause interface issue with the surrounding environment and there would be societal loss, as well as a permanent change in the character of the area;

- (c) the site was previously occupied by low-rise structures not exceeding 3 storeys. Any high-density development, regardless of the use, was not suitable for the site. Future development at the site should strive to preserve the site as a 'green lung' for the area. The tall buildings at the site would significantly affect air ventilation as well as visual openness in the vicinity. No consideration of air ventilation impact on the area around CHR was made;
- (d) severe adverse traffic impact on the surrounding area was anticipated. The data adopted in the TR was questionable as it had not taken into account the additional traffic from major events such as horse-racing and Hong Kong Sevens World Rugby Event. Also, the traffic data was collected in 2017 and might have become outdated. Furthermore, the feasibility of the underground pedestrian connection to Causeway Bay MTR station was highly uncertain;
- (e) setback along both sides of the site abutting CHR should be provided to facilitate visual, air ventilation and pedestrian permeability and such requirements should be incorporated into the OZP;
- (f) there were OVTs at the site and the proposed building gaps could not sustain healthy growth of those trees. The OVT in the middle of the site would most likely be affected by the planned access road;
- (g) it was estimated that there would be a shortfall of 2.7ha of local open space in Wan Chai area. Despite an open space of 6,000m<sup>2</sup> was proposed in the development, there was still a deficit of 2.1ha;
- (h) the proposed development failed to address the community's need for GIC facility. PlanD should have, but had not, taken into consideration whether the proposed development would adversely affect future provision of GIC facility in the district and whether the site was required for GIC use in the long run;

- (i) there was strong objection from the local community. Majority of the WCDC members objected to the proposed development and the WCDC passed a motion objecting to the government's plan for commercial use at the site. While there was a need to utilise scarce land resource, development at the site must be compatible with the surrounding area on land use, urban design, landscape, environmental and infrastructural aspects and, at the same time, meet public aspiration; and
- (j) PlanD should consider to conduct a further study on the feasibility of expanding the core business area of Causeway Bay into Caroline Hill. Alternative land use options should also be provided for consideration.

39. Mr Ho Shek Tim supplemented that the restrictions on BH and development intensity should be revised with reference to the original buildings at the site. High-density development at the site would cause traffic congestion and affect residents living in the surrounding area.

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

R34/C105 – Mary Mulvihill

40. With the aid of the visualizer, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) there was a shortfall of 296 day care centre places and 686 beds for RCHE in the district. The government should strive to meet the various needs of the community and should not rely on developers to provide community facilities, in particular elderly facilities, in private developments. Developers would focus primarily on profit-making, rather than providing quality community facilities to serve the public;
- (b) there was no strong justification for the Lands Tribunal, currently located at the Former Kowloon Magistracy, Yau Ma Tei, to be relocated to the proposed district court development at the site. The North Kowloon Magistracy would also be vacated after SCAD closing its campus in June 2020. During the current economic climate, public resources should be

used in a prudent manner. Similarly, the Family Court should be accommodated in a more convenient location rather than the site;

- (c) according to a report issued in March 2011, the Audit Commission considered that the Judiciary was negligent in providing documentation and justification for key decisions, and the Judiciary could seek specialist assistance to provide accurate planning and costing data for making an informed decision in the option analysis stage of an accommodation project. There was no strong reasons to justify a district court building with height up to 135mPD;
- (d) areas with high concentration of commercial developments, for example Tsim Sha Tsui, tended to have insufficient residents to support local shops. During economic downturn, those local shops would suffer due to a drastic drop in visitors to the area;
- (e) with the current trend for people to work from home, the demand for commercial floorspace would likely be very different in future;
- (f) public open spaces and recreational facilities being provided in newly completed private developments, such as the Victoria Harbour and Harbour Glory in North Point, were unsatisfactory;
- (g) lease conditions offered no effective means for monitoring private development. The Board or the WCDC would have no opportunity to scrutinise the future design of buildings at the site; and
- (h) consideration could be given to moving the district court buildings to near Leighton Road and provide GIC facility such as RCHE near CHR. The RCHE could serve as a quarantine centre if such need arose in the future.

[Dr Lawrence K.C. Li left the meeting at this point.]

#### R35 – Doctoral Exchange

41. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Cheung Neo Ton Francis made the following main points:

- (a) development of district court buildings at the site was supported but the floor space for commercial development should be reduced. The current design with a total of four massive towers at the site was not desirable as it would result in fragmented open spaces scattering around the site;
- (b) the proposal by R35 with a mega-building at the eastern portion of the site in place of two district court buildings would increase the available area of open space from 6,000m<sup>2</sup> to 12,000m<sup>2</sup>. The larger open space would benefit the local community. Some of the commercial floor spaces could also be developed at the basement level, so that the floor spaces on above-ground levels could be used for other purposes;
- (c) a number of revisions to the distribution of GFA were proposed. It was suggested to reduce the total GFA at the site from 170,000m<sup>2</sup> to 130,000m<sup>2</sup>. The floor space for office use should be reduced from about 42,700m<sup>2</sup> to 32,000m<sup>2</sup> while the retail floor space could increase from 10,000m<sup>2</sup> to 20,000m<sup>2</sup>. Floor space for GIC use could also be increased from about 3,700m<sup>2</sup> to 8,000m<sup>2</sup>. Based on the preliminary traffic impact assessment conducted by the representer, the above revised floor space allocation would not result in adverse traffic impact;
- (d) with the main building block situated at the eastern portion of the site, the remaining area of the site could be 'freed up' and the overall openness and air ventilation at the site could be enhanced;
- (e) a slip road at the eastern side of the site and a minibus station at the eastern boundary were proposed. Pedestrian access points should be provided on three sides of the site to facilitate traffic flow; and
- (f) underground developments were often costly due to the complex construction works involved. The government could consider to carry out site formation works/enabling works before handing over the site to the developer, in order to provide a financial incentive to encourage the developer to adopt a design that would best suit the government's requirement.

42. As the presentations from representers/commenters and their representatives of this session had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and would invite the representers/commenters, their representatives and/or the government 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. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

43. The Chairperson and some Members raised questions on the following aspects to the government's representatives:

*Traffic*

- (a) whether there was requirement for the proposed access road within the site to be open-air or whether decking over the access road was permissible;
- (b) what the management/maintenance arrangement was for the future access road within the site;
- (c) whether counting of vehicles for the TR on only one specific day was an acceptable practice;
- (d) whether the parking spaces at the site would be made available for hourly parking by the public, and whether the impact of queuing of vehicles on nearby roads for hourly parking on weekends/holidays had been taken into account in the TR;
- (e) whether the TR had taken into account the slow traffic of learner drivers in the area;
- (f) whether the traffic capacity of the nearby road network was the critical factor for the proposed development at the site;
- (g) whether there were merits of R35's proposal with a slip road provided at the eastern boundary to replace the east-west access road under the

government scheme;

*Indicative Scheme by PlanD*

- (h) whether the design/deposition of the future district court buildings would follow the indicative scheme provided by the government, and whether the public could scrutinise the final design of the district court buildings;
- (i) referring to the government scheme that a 25m-wide building gap had been provided within the site between the two commercial towers, whether the building gap of 20m between the district court buildings near CHR(West) and the residential development opposite them were sufficient, and whether the building gap could be widened;
- (j) whether there was a standard for minimum floor height for the district court buildings, and whether the Judiciary had finalised the court facilities to be provided at the site;
- (k) besides DHC and CCC, whether additional GIC facilities could be provided at the site;
- (l) in response to the concerns of Members, a revised conceptual layout with disposition of the district court buildings set back further from CHR(West) had been provided by PlanD during the further consideration of proposed amendments to the approved Wong Nai Chung OZP (as detailed in Plan FC-3 of MPC Paper No. 5/19). Noting R26's request for a NBA of 40m, what the distance was between the south-western edge of the district court building and the residential buildings at CRH(West) in the revised conceptual layout; and
- (m) whether there was scope to swap the location of the open space at the north-eastern corner of the site and the district court buildings.

44. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, Mr C.K. Wan, Ms Fiona H.Y. Fong and Ms Charis Wong made the following responses:



*Traffic*

- (a) the access road shown in the government scheme was indicative in nature. The future developer could consider different arrangements for the access road, including decking over it;
- (b) upon completion, the access road within the site would be handed back to the government and become a public road to be managed by TD and maintained by HyD. The concern on the management arrangement of the access road affecting the operation of the district court building was unfounded;
- (c) the traffic flow pattern on weekdays in the surrounding area was regular with little variation only. As such, despite only one day of traffic survey data was used, the likelihood for the TR result being not representative was low;
- (d) the development would include 125 public car parking spaces. Besides, the ancillary car parking spaces for the retail floor space would normally be made available for hourly-parking by visiting customers, while the ancillary parking spaces for the office floor spaces would normally not be made available for public use. Regarding the concern on tailback, sufficient queuing space would need to be incorporated into the development following the design requirements. The actual arrangement would be formulated at the detailed design stage;
- (e) the survey conducted for the TR had taken into account all road users, including learner drivers;
- (f) the traffic capacity of the road junctions in the vicinity was a major consideration for the development project. Based on the TR, the remaining capacity of the nearby road network with improvement works at certain junctions could support the proposed GFA of 170,000m<sup>2</sup> for the proposed development at the CHR Site;

- (g) regarding R35's proposal, it could not cater for a roundabout to be provided at CHR(West) as in the government scheme which would be fundamental for handling the traffic flow. Furthermore, the access road proposed by R35 would adversely affect the masonry walls at the north-eastern corner of the site;

*Indicative Scheme by PlanD*

- (h) the disposition of district court buildings shown in the indicative scheme had taken into account information provided by the ArchSD and the preliminary design requirements for district court buildings. However, it was mainly provided to demonstrate the feasibility of pursuing the intended development under the development parameters prescribed on the OZP. The actual design for the buildings within the site had yet to be finalized. WCDC would be consulted on the final design of the district court buildings before the development project was submitted to the Legislative Council for funding approval;
- (i) the 25m-wide building gap at the site between the commercial towers were mainly provided to illustrate enhanced local air ventilation. The current width of CHR(West) was about 8.2m. Based on the advice of ArchSD, the future district court building near CHR(West) could maintain at least a 20m distance from the nearby residential buildings. Increasing the building gap in a substantial manner might pose constraint on design flexibility of the district court buildings;
- (j) in the indicative scheme, reference had been made to the floor-to-floor height of the WKLCB which was a recently-completed law court building. However, the scheme was indicative in nature and did not represent the final floor-to-floor height requirement for the district court buildings at the CHR Site, which could only be finalised in a later stage. Currently, it was anticipated that the District Court, Family Court and Lands Tribunal would be accommodated at the site but it was up to the Judiciary to decide on the combination of different courts to be provided at the site;

- (k) according to the Notes of the draft OZP, provision of 'social welfare facility' was always permitted at the site. Therefore, there was sufficient flexibility for providing other/additional GIC facilities, such as elderly and youth facilities, at the site if they were required by the Government;
- (l) the distance between the south-western edge of the district court building and the residential buildings at CRH (West) as shown in the revised conceptual layout in Plan FC-3 of MPC Paper No. 5/19 was about 35m; and
- (m) regarding the possibility to rearrange the open space at the north-eastern corner and the district court buildings, such change would make it difficult to provide an emergency exit for the district court buildings which was required for its operation. Furthermore, referring to the indicative scheme, the district court buildings would sit on a platform at about 13 to 15 mPD and the level of CHR(East) at the eastern site access was about 5.7mPD. The level difference might provide an opportunity for a footbridge/deck linking up the open spaces near the district court buildings and that in the commercial development.

45. Some Members raised the following questions to Representer R26:

- (a) the major assumptions in respect of the schedule of accommodation and development parameters adopted in the proposed alternative scheme;
- (b) regarding alternative scheme B1 proposed by the representer, whether adopting a stepped BH for the district court buildings was acceptable;
- (c) what the justifications were for 'pushing' the district court buildings towards the north-eastern part of the site and away from the residential buildings on CHR(West), noting that there were also a number of residential buildings along CHR(East);
- (d) elaboration on the information shown in the shadow analysis diagram and whether it was related to the solar path;

- (e) whether GIC facilities had been included in the representer's proposal;
- (f) what the height of the district court buildings was in scheme B1 in terms of mPD; and
- (g) in both schemes B1 and C1, only one access point was proposed for the district court buildings. Nothing the district court buildings might occasionally attract a large number of public, whether the access arrangement was sufficient.

46. Ms Hui Ming Chun Cindy (R26/C85) made the following responses:

- (a) PlanD had not provided sufficient justification for the proposed BH restriction at 135mPD at the site. Based on the limited information available, she had made assumptions in the alternative schemes, including a floor plate with an area of 5,300m<sup>2</sup> for the district court buildings. In deriving the alternative schemes, reference had been made to the WKLCB;
- (b) a stepped BH profile for the district court buildings with the lower building near CHR(West) and a wider building gap away from the residential buildings at CHR(West) and Link Road was considered acceptable. PlanD should have duly considered the over-shadowing effect of the tall district court buildings on the residential buildings;
- (c) the residential buildings on CHR(West) were situated in a "Residential (Group B)" zone whereas the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Mixed Use" ("OU(MU)") zone and "G/IC" zone along CHR(East) mainly consisted of church, convent, school, hospital and residential buildings with commercial uses on the ground floor. As such, it was more suitable to adopt a stepped BH profile for the district court buildings with the lower building close to CHR(West). The district court buildings in schemes B1 and C1 would be set back 10m from the site boundary so that the total distance between the district court buildings and the buildings at CHR(East) and Haven Street would be about 17.7m;

- (d) the plan regarding overshadowing was a shadow analysis, which illustrated the number of hours that a particular point was in shadow of the district court buildings in a day, rather than a diagram for the sun's path;
- (e) part of the 100,000m<sup>2</sup> commercial floor space could be allocated for the provision of GIC facilities. There was scope to accommodate facilities such as RCHE on the lower floors of the commercial towers;
- (f) the two district court buildings in alternative scheme B1 were about 61 to 71m in height and the site level varied from about 5mPD at CHR(East) to about 15mPD at CHR(West). The resultant BH should be equivalent to about 76mPD. Those two buildings each with 16 storeys (including basement(s)) could provide a total GFA of 70,000m<sup>2</sup> and meet the floor space requirement from the Judiciary; and
- (g) the access point for district court buildings as shown in alternative schemes B1 and C1 was similar to the design adopted at the WKLCB. Two vehicular entrances could be provided on CHR(East) and should fulfil the operational need of the district court.

47. Mr Yim Hong (R532/C86) supplemented that the findings of the TR prepared by the government were not convincing. Furthermore, the traffic condition in the Causeway Bay area was unlikely to be improved in the future as people would continue to visit the area for shops, offices, schools etc.

48. Some Members raised the following questions to Representer (R35):

- (a) noting that one of the important requirements for the district court buildings was a clear delineation from the other buildings/uses, whether the integrated design with a mega-building at the site as proposed by the representer would hinder the operation of the district court, in particular from security perspective;
- (b) whether the proposal would affect the income that could be generated by the commercial development;

- (c) whether a design with the mega-building at the north-eastern part separated from the commercial buildings at the western side was feasible; and
- (d) whether the presenter could further elaborate on the merits of his proposal.

49. Mr Cheung Neo Ton Francis (representative of R35) made the following responses:

- (a) one of the critical considerations for the design of the district court buildings was security. There were plenty overseas examples of court buildings co-locating with public spaces. Proper separation of the different uses within the building was feasible. There was no strong reason to assume that the proposed integration of buildings for various uses at the site would affect the operation of the district court;
- (b) significant savings in both cost and time could be achieved if the basement for the buildings were designed and constructed in an integrated manner. Innovative ideas should be considered for the development at the site;
- (c) from an architectural design point of view, it was considered that the option with buildings for various uses being integrated would provide the best connectivity for the users and better utilisation of the site. However, if required, it was feasible to separate the district court buildings from the commercial buildings in his proposal;
- (d) it was suggested that the office floor space should be reduced by about 25-40% and some of the retail floor space should be relocated to the basement level. With such revisions, the area available for public open space could be greatly increased. To enhance connectivity, underground linkages to other shopping centres in the area could be considered. CHR(West) could be widened and a slip road could also be provided along the eastern boundary of the site to access the site. A minibus stop outside the site near Leighton Road could also be provided.

50. Regarding the provision of social welfare facilities in commercial developments, Members noted that facilities such as RCHE had specific requirements on where they could be accommodated. Due to safety consideration, RCHE could not be accommodated on high floors of a commercial building. Also, using part of the commercial GFA for social welfare facilities might have impact on the overall viability of the commercial development.

51. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the second session had been completed. The Board would deliberate the representations/comments in closed meeting in a separate session after all the hearing sessions were completed and would inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers and commenters and their representatives for attending the hearing. They left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Philip S.L. Kan, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Ms Lilian S.K. Law left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

52. The following representers, commenters and their representatives of the third session were invited to the meeting at this point:

**Representers, Commenter and their representative**

R598 - Kwok Chiu

R599 - Fiona Hung

R615 - Hung Man Ping

R618 - Hung Kwok Yiu Duncan

R619 - Hung Kwok Hei Lyndon

R620 - Hung Kwok Kit Gordon

R625 - Tai Fai Kee

Mr Hung Ho Ching - Representers' representative

R606 / C54 – Leung Wai On

Mr Leung Wai On - Representer and Commenter

53. The Chairperson extended a welcome to the representers, commenters and their representatives. She then invited the representers and commenter and their representative of the third session to give their oral submissions.

R598 - Kwok Chiu

R599 - Fiona Hung

R615 - Hung Man Ping

R618 - Hung Kwok Yiu Duncan

R619 - Hung Kwok Hei Lyndon

R620 - Hung Kwok Kit Gordon

R625 - Tai Fai Kee

54. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Hung Ho Ching made the following main points:

- (a) the government had included the site into the 2020 LSP before the statutory planning procedures were completed and there was doubt whether the government had respected the established consultation mechanism;
- (b) it appeared that the proposed roundabout at CHR(West) by the government would not be functional as its radius was too small for manoeuvring of long vehicles;
- (c) the underground pedestrian link to the MTR station was only at conceptual stage with no programme for implementation;
- (d) CHR(East) and the nearby Cotton Path were narrow and had insufficient capacity to handle the additional traffic brought by the high-density development at the site. In that regard, the overall PR of the site should be reduced by at least 30% to reduce its traffic impact;
- (e) the TR conducted by the government was incomplete in that the baseline traffic data was not collected on a busy day, and there was no pedestrian routing analysis nor traffic analysis for Leighton Road and Broadwood Road;



- (f) according to the TR, the estimated reserved capacity for nearby junctions would drop to below 15% upon completion of the development. Regarding pedestrian movement, the level of service for the pedestrian crossing and footpath near the China Congregational Church (CC Church) would only reach 'LOS D';
- (g) the taller buildings within the site should be developed closer to the existing business cluster near Leighton Road, away from the residential buildings along CHR(West);
- (h) the government should not rely on the future developer to provide public parking facilities at the site as the primary objective of the developer would be maximising profit;

*Proposal (by R594 to R599)*

- (i) the BH restriction of 135mPD for the district court buildings was excessive and should be reduced to 80mPD to 100mPD. Alternatively, a BH restriction in the form of maximum number of storeys could be adopted for the court buildings. In contrast, the BH restriction for the commercial development could be relaxed to 150mPD to accommodate a taller tower, so as to free up additional space on the ground level for various public purposes;
- (j) the OVT in the centre of the site should form the focal point in the future development. The OVT should remain accessible by the public and not enclosed by buildings; and
- (k) traffic should be diverted to the basement level of the development and the ground level should be free of vehicles in order to enhance pedestrian accessibility. Loading/unloading facilities and public transport interchange should be provided at the basement. The number of ingress/egress points should be increased from two to three with direct access to Leighton Road, Link Road and Cotton Path. CHR and Cotton Path should also be widened to increase their capacity.

R606 / C54 – Leung Wai On

55. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Leung Wai On made the following main points:

- (a) the site was previously used for recreational purpose. There was a lack of sports ground and recreational facilities in the area. The site should be retained as a recreational area for public enjoyment;
- (b) on many occasions recreational facilities such as the football fields and basketball courts in Victoria Park would be occupied for various events/activities, such as Hong Kong Brands and Products Expo, Lunar New Year Fair, SCB Hong Kong Marathon, Hong Kong Flower Show, Mid-Autumn Festival celebration and rallies. Based on his estimation, those recreational facilities were only available for use by the public on 59% of the days annually;
- (c) while recreation clubs such as the Disciplined Services Sports & Recreation Club, Indian Recreation Club, South China Athletic Association, Craigengower Cricket Club and Hong Kong Football Club were located in the area, those clubs were only accessible by their members but not the general public;
- (d) there were other sites along Leighton Road and Lee Garden Road that were being redeveloped into commercial/residential buildings. Allowing high-density commercial development at the site would worsen the traffic problems in the area and cause an over-supply of commercial floor space. Instead, part of the site should be used for widening of Leighton Road to ease traffic congestion in the area; and
- (e) tall buildings at the site would reduce air ventilation and cause pollutants to be trapped in the area. The BH restriction of the site should be revised to tally with the existing low-rise buildings. Any relaxation in BH restriction should be substantiated by detailed AVA using computational fluid dynamics simulation or wind tunnel.

56. As the presentations from representers/commenter and their representative of this session had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and would invite the representers/commenter, their representatives and/or the government 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. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

57. The Chairperson, the Vice-chairperson and some Members raised questions on the following aspects to the government's representatives:

*Traffic*

- (a) whether traffic issue at the junction of Leighton Road and CHR(West) was caused by the traffic coming down from Link Road or the slow bus/minibus traffic on Leighton Road near Sunning Road and Pennington Street;
- (b) what the measures proposed by the government were to mitigate the potential traffic impact;
- (c) whether improvement to pedestrian linkages had been considered;
- (d) whether there was a minimum standard of reserved junction capacity that was acceptable to TD;
- (e) elaboration on the figures used to represent the reserved junction capacity;
- (f) noting that there was proposal to relocate the minibus stops at Lan Fong Road to the CHR Site, whether such relocation would affect the result of the TR;

*Indicative Scheme by PlanD*

- (g) what was the justifications for development of the district court buildings at the site;

- (h) whether the BH restriction of 135mPD for the district court buildings was necessary and whether there were specific requirements in terms of the size of the district court buildings;
- (i) whether an underground access road could be accommodated under the current restrictions stipulated in the OZP;

*Alternative Scheme from the Representers*

- (j) whether there was any major issue with the alternative schemes B1 and C1 proposed by Representer R26 earlier;
- (k) whether the alternative proposals recommended by the representers were generally acceptable;
- (l) whether greening of the roundabout and provision of an ingress/egress point on Leighton Road as proposed by R594 to R599 was technically feasible;

*Others*

- (m) whether the recreational facilities at the site as mentioned by a representer and commenter (R606/C54) were open to public;
- (n) what the planning intention was for the “OU(MU)” zone along CHR(East);
- (o) whether there were restrictions on the OZP regarding over-shadowing by tall buildings;
- (p) whether the development would affect the historic building in Po Leung Kuk; and
- (q) whether the OVT at the centre of the site could be transplanted to increase design flexibility for buildings.

58. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, Mr C.K. Wan, Ms Fiona H.Y. Fong and Ms Charis Wong made the following responses:

*Traffic*

- (a) based on HyD's observation, traffic congestion at the junction of Leighton Road and CHR(West) was mainly caused by vehicles waiting to turn right onto Leighton Road, as currently there was only a single right-turn lane;
- (b) a TR had been conducted and a number of improvement measures had been identified, including (i) to modify the junction design to add a shared right-turn lane at the northbound of Leighton Road/ CHR(West)/ Hoi Ping Road junction to shorten the queue at CHR(West) for turning right onto Leighton Road; (ii) to set aside part of the site for road improvement works by providing an additional lane on Leighton Road (west bound) for left turn onto CHR(West); (iii) to provide a right-turning lane on CHR(East) to avoid blockage caused by ingress vehicles on the eastern ingress point; and (iv) to modify the existing priority junction at CHR(West)/ Link Road into a roundabout-like circulation to facilitate traffic movement from different directions. A swept-path analysis for long vehicles up to 12m in length had been conducted to confirm the feasibility of the proposed roundabout;
- (c) Level-of-Service (LOS) of pedestrian facilities including footpaths and crossings had been studied in the TR and improvement works for pedestrian crossing facilities would also be carried out at crossings around the site. Subway connection from the site to the MTR station would also be allowed for. On the other hand, the government had recently adopted a policy to encourage developers to further enhance pedestrian connectivity through premium reduction for lease modifications required for provision of pedestrian links if certain criteria could be met. There was scope for the future developer to provide a footbridge linking up to other developments in the vicinity;

- (d) generally speaking, for new development areas under planning, it was more desirable to achieve reserve capacity of about 15% in order to accommodate future growth. However, it might not be always practical for the existing main urban areas to achieve the same reserve capacity. There was no set standard on a minimum figure of reserve capacity and such figure was not the sole indicator of whether the traffic situation for a junction was acceptable. For the current case, the TR showed that the signalised junctions around the site would still have spare capacity after taking into account the traffic generated by the proposed development;
- (e) the figures on junction capacity in the TR were presented in two ways. For a signalised junction, the figure would be presented in terms of a percentage. A positive percentage meant that there was reserved capacity. For a priority junction, the figure would be presented in an absolute figure. A figure of 1 meant that the junction was operating at its designed capacity and normally a figure lower than 0.85 would be considered as acceptable;
- (f) while the minibus stops at Lan Fong Road could be relocated to the site if required, the relocation proposal was still preliminary in nature. Whether the proposal would eventually proceed ahead would not affect the findings of the TR in any substantial manner;

*Indicative Scheme by PlanD*

- (g) the District Court currently located at the Wan Chai Tower would be relocated to the site. There were specific site requirements for court buildings and the choice of suitable sites in urban area was very limited. Having considered different options, the Judiciary considered the current site the most suitable;
- (h) the BH restriction of 135mPD stipulated for the CHR Site had taken into account the BH restrictions for different land use zones in the vicinity. The site for development of the district court buildings should be at least 10,000m<sup>2</sup> in area and the total GFA required for the district court buildings was 70,000m<sup>2</sup>. It was anticipated that only one of the court

building would need to be developed up to 135mPD. Input from ArchSD had been sought and based on the current indicative scheme with building footprints of the two blocks of 1,700m<sup>2</sup> and 2,300m<sup>2</sup> and an assumed floor-to-floor height of about 5.5m to 6m, the height of the taller and lower court buildings would be about 132mPD and 108mPD respectively;

- (i) the OZP had not restricted the alignment of the access road within the site. There was scope for the future developer to deck-over an at-grade access road or provide an underground access road within the site. However, as the road would have to be handed back to the government upon completion, the design and construction of the road would need to meet the applicable standards. A clear delineation of the boundary of the district court development would also be required;

*Alternative Scheme from the Representatives*

- (j) it was uncertain whether the access arrangement and site configuration proposed for the district court development in schemes B1 and C1 would be acceptable to the Judiciary. It should also be noted that the two alternative schemes had moved the district court buildings to the eastern side of the site, and as a result, the distance between the district court buildings and the residential buildings at CHR(East) would be reduced to about 18m;
- (k) greening of the roundabout as proposed by R594 to 599 was technically feasible. Regarding the proposed ingress/egress point on Leighton Road, it should be avoided as far as possible as Leighton Road was a district distributor with considerable amount of traffic and the traffic impact on Leighton Road should be minimised;
- (l) some proposals involved one large district court building instead of two smaller buildings, or an integrated design of the district court building with other commercial uses without a clear delineation. It was uncertain at the current stage whether those alternative schemes were

acceptable to the Judiciary. For proposals that involved swapping of the location of the district court and commercial developments, further amendments to adjust the boundaries of the “C(2)” and “G/IC(2)” zones on the OZP were required;

*Others*

- (m) part of the site was previously occupied by two recreational clubs, namely Ex-Post Office Recreation Club and PCCW Recreation Club. Those two recreation clubs served their respective employees and were not opened to the public. Both clubs had ceased operation in 2018. Besides Victoria Park, the residents in the area could also have easy access to Causeway Bay Sports Ground and Happy Valley Recreation Ground;
- (n) the planning intention of the “OU(MU) zone was primarily for mixed non-industrial land uses. Residential or other uses, or a combination of various types of compatible uses including commercial, residential, educational, cultural, recreational and entertainment uses were allowed. Physical segregation had to be provided between the non-residential and residential portions within a new/converted building to prevent non-residential uses from causing nuisance to the residents;
- (o) there was no minimum standard on sun-light penetration in the context of the OZP. However, there were minimum requirements under the B(P)R for prescribed windows which was related to air ventilation and natural lighting. Regarding the SBDG, it was desirable for buildings to set back at least 7.5m from the mid-line of the abutting access road so that with setback of buildings on both sides of the road, a wind corridor of 15m in width could be preserved;
- (p) the Po Leung Kuk Building was located some distance from the boundary of the site and no heritage impact assessment had been conducted. Based on the AVA conducted, no adverse impact on the vicinity, including the Po Leung Kuk, was anticipated; and



- (q) the OVT at the site should be preserved in its existing location as far as practicable and transplanting the tree was not recommended. In fact, the OVT had not constrained the design of the district court buildings.

59. Some Members raised the following questions to the representative of Representers R598, R599, R615, R618, R619, R620 and R625:

- (a) whether the OVTs on the masonry walls near CHR(East) would be affected in the representers' proposal; and
- (b) being residents of the area, what the representers' view was on the traffic problems.

60. Mr Hung Ho Ching made the following responses:

- (a) it was not practical to preserve the OVTs on the masonry walls as they would likely be affected by the site formation works. Emphasis should be placed on the preservation of the large OVT at the centre of the site; and
- (b) the junction of CHR(West) and Leighton Road was one of the bottleneck in the area while the junction outside the CC Church, which involved traffic from multiple directions, was the fundamental cause for severe traffic issue in the area. The causes for traffic congestion in the area had not been adequately addressed by TD and he had serious doubts on the effectiveness of the traffic improvement measures. Regarding the feasibility of the proposed roundabout on CHR(West), he was not sure whether a swept-path analysis for long vehicles had been conducted in the TR.

61. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures had been completed. The Board would deliberate the representations/comment in closed meeting in a separate session and would inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representer, commenter, the representers' representative and the government's representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Conrad T.C. Wong left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

62. As the meeting had run for more than twelve hours and it was late in the evening, the Board agreed to hold the deliberation session at another meeting.

**Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferment of Review of Application No. A/H6/87 (3rd Deferment)

Proposed 'Flat' use (access road for residential development and pedestrian link) in "Green Belt", "Residential (Group A) 1" and "Residential (Group B)" Zones and an area shown as 'Road', 4-4C Tai Hang Road (Part) and Adjoining government Land, Tai Hang Road, Hong Kong

(TPB Paper No. 10646)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

63. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tai Hang Road, Causeway Bay and Kenneth To and Associate was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in Causeway Bay area; and/or having business dealings with KTA:

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

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li - co-owning with spouse a flat at Tai Hang Road

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had current business dealings with KTA

64. Members noted that Dr Lawrence K.C. Li had already left the meeting. As the property of Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had no direct view of the application site and the interest of Mr Daniel K.S. Lau was indirect, Members agreed that they should be allowed to stay at the meeting.

65. The Secretary reported that in view of the latest position related to the novel coronavirus infection, some meetings of the Board had been rescheduled. The hearing of representations and comments on the draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan, being one of the backlog cases originally scheduled for 3.2.2020, was rescheduled for this

meeting and it was anticipated that there would not be sufficient time for the Board to consider the review application. The Planning Department (PlanD) had requested the Board to adjourn the review to a later date.

66. Members noted that according to 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), the Board might, under special circumstances and/or on reasonable grounds as the Board thought fit, adjourn the meeting for consideration of the submissions and reschedule the relevant meeting to another date.

67. After deliberation, the Board decided to adjourn the meeting for consideration of the review application to a later date as requested by PlanD. The application would be submitted to the Board for consideration once the rescheduled meeting was fixed by the Secretariat of the Board.

### **Procedural Matters**

#### **Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting]

Application to the Chief Executive under Section 8(2) of the Town Planning Ordinance for Extension of Time Limit for Submission of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Kai Tak Road/Sa Po Road Development Scheme Plan No. S/K10/URA1/1 and the Draft Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K10/25 to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval

(TPB Paper No. 10647)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

68. The Secretary reported that the Development Scheme Plan (DSP) area was located in Ma Tau Kok (K10) and the following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in the Ma Tau Kok area; and/or having affiliation/business dealings with the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) (C1 for the DSP) or Ms Mary Mulvihill (R1 and C1 for the Draft Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K10/25 and R90 and C10 for the DSP):

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang  
(Vice-chairperson)

- being the Deputy Chairman of Appeal  
Board Panel of URA

- Mr Raymond K.W. Lee (as Director of Planning) - being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its Committee
  
- Mr Y.S. Wong - being a non-executive director of the URA Board
  
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being a non-executive director of the URA Board, a member of its Committees, and a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA
  
- Mr Philip S.L. Kan - being a former non-executive director of the URA Board and a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA
  
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung ] being directors of the Board of the Urban  
Ms Lilian S.K. Law ] Renewal Fund of URA
  
- being directors of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA
  
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with URA and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time
  
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with URA and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time
  
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with URA
  
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - his former company having past business dealings with URA

- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a former Director of Hong Kong Housing Society which was currently in discussion with URA on housing development issues
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund of URA, and Director and CEO of Light Be (Social Realty) Co. Ltd. which was a licensed user of a few URA's residential units in Sheung Wan
- Mr L.T. Kwok - the institution he was serving had received sponsorship from URA
- Mr Conrad T.S. Wong - his family member owing a flat at Sha Po Road, Kowloon City

69. Members noted that Mr Y.S. Wong had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members also noted that Miss Winnie W.M. Ng, Ms Lilian S.K. Law, Messrs Philip S.L. Kan, K.K. Cheung, Thomas O.S. Ho, Stephen L.H. Liu, Alex T.H. Lai and Conrad T.C. Wong had left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature and no discussion was required, Members agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

70. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10647 (the Paper). On 5.7.2019, the draft URA Kai Tak Road/Sa Po Road DSP No. S/K10/URA1/1 and the draft Ma Tau Kok OZP No. S/K10/25 were exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. During the exhibition periods, a total of 90 representations and 10 comments on the DSP were received, and 1 representation and 3 comments on the OZP were received. According to the statutory time limit, the draft URA Kai Tak Road/Sa Po Road DSP No. S/K10/URA1/1 and the draft Ma Tau Kok OZP No. S/K10/25 should be submitted to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval on or before 5.6.2020. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was first scheduled for 31.1.2020 and rescheduled for 17.4.2020. Due to the latest position related to the novel coronavirus infection, the hearing of the representations and comments had to be further rescheduled, tentatively to June 2020. There would be insufficient time for the whole plan-making

process including submission of the draft DSP and the draft OZP to the CE in C for approval to be completed within the 9-month statutory time limit (i.e. on or before 5.6.2020). It was necessary to seek CE's agreement for an extension of the statutory time limit for six months (i.e. to 5.12.2020) to allow sufficient time to complete the plan-making process.

71. After deliberation, the Board agreed that the CE's agreement should be sought under section 8(2) of the Ordinance to extend the time limit for submission of the draft DSP and draft OZP to the CE in C for a period of six months from 5.6.2020 to 5.12.2020.

### **Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting]

Application to the Chief Executive under Section 8(2) of the Town Planning Ordinance for Extension of Time Limit for Submission of the Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/33 to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval  
(TPB Paper No. 10648)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

72. The Secretary reported that the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) area was one of the subject sites for the proposed amendments to the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H3/33. The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliation/business dealings with URA or Ms Mary Mulvihill (R8 and C3), or owning properties, or providing services in the district:

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang<br>(Vice-chairperson)      | - | being the Deputy Chairman of Appeal Board Panel of URA                        |
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee<br>(as Director of Planning) | - | being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its Committee |
| Mr Y.S. Wong                                     | - | being a non-executive director of the URA Board                               |

- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being a non-executive director of the URA Board, a member of its Committees, and a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA
  
- Mr Philip S.L. Kan - being a former non-executive director of the URA Board and a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA
  
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung ] being directors of the Board of the Urban  
Ms Lilian S.K. Law ] Renewal Fund of URA
  
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with URA and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time
  
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with URA and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time
  
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with URA
  
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - his former company having past business dealings with URA and his company owning an office unit at Queen's Road Central
  
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a former Director of Hong Kong Housing Society which was currently in discussion with URA on housing development issues

- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund of URA, and Director and CEO of Light Be (Social Realty) Co. Ltd. which was a licensed user of a few URA's residential units in Sheung Wan
- Mr L.T. Kwok - his institution had received sponsorship from URA and provided Service Team services to URA in the district
- Mr Conrad T.S. Wong - being a director of companies owning 6 properties at Jervois Street, Western Street and Pok Fu Lam Road
- Dr Roger C.K. Chan - spouse owning a flat at Des Voeux Road West

73. Members noted that Mr Y.S. Wong had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members also noted that Ms Lilian S.K. Law, Messrs Philip S.L. Kan, K.K. Cheung, Thomas O.S. Ho, Stephen L.H. Liu, Alex T.H. Lai and Conrad T.C. Wong had left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature and no discussion was required, Members agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

74. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10648 (the Paper). On 9.8.2019, the draft OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 7 of the Ordinance. During the exhibition periods, a total of 57 representations and 25 comments were received. According to the statutory time limit, the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/33 should be submitted to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval on or before 9.7.2020. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was originally scheduled for May 2020. In view of the latest position related to the novel coronavirus infection and the need to clear the backlog cases to be considered by the Board, the hearing of the representations and comments had to be rescheduled until further notice. It was anticipated that there would be insufficient time for the whole plan-making process including submission of the draft OZP to the CE in C



for approval to be completed within the 9-month statutory time limit (i.e. on or before 9.7.2020). It was necessary to seek CE's agreement for an extension of the statutory time limit for six months (i.e. to 9.1.2021) to allow sufficient time to complete the plan-making process.

75. After deliberation, the Board agreed that the CE's agreement should be sought under section 8(2) of the Ordinance to extend the time limit for submission of the draft OZP for a period of six months from 9.7.2020 to 9.1.2021.

**Agenda Item 7**  
[Open Meeting]

**Any Other Business**

76. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 9:45 p.m.