

**Minutes of 1230<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 11.9.2020**

**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

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

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr C.H. Tse

Mr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mr Y.S. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong)

Transport Department

Mr M.K. Cheung

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

Director of Lands

Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Miss Annie H.Y. Wong

### **Opening Remarks**

[Open Meeting]

1. The Chairperson said that the meeting would be conducted with video conferencing arrangement.

### **Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

#### Confirmation of Minutes of the 1229<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 28.8.2020

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The draft minutes of the 1229<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 28.8.2020 would be sent to Members after the meeting.

[Post-meeting Note: The draft minutes were sent to Members on 18.9.2020. No proposed amendments were received from Members by the deadline on 21.9.2020. The minutes were confirmed on 21.9.2020 without amendments.]

### **Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

#### Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

3. The Secretary reported that there were no matters arising.

**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Further Representations No. F1 and F2 on Proposed Amendments to the Draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H7/20 Arising from the Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (TPB Paper No. 10675)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

4. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) involved a proposed District Court and a proposed commercial development at the Caroline Hill Road (CHR) site in Wong Nai Chung. AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants for the proposed development. 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) which had submitted representation (R6) and was the affiliated company of Beststride Limited that had submitted further representation (F1), Ronald Lu & Partners (HK) Limited (RLP) (representative of R6), Townland Consultants Ltd (Townland) (representative of R33) and/or Ms Mary Mulvihill who had submitted representation and comment (R34/C105):

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn<br>(Chairperson)    | - | co-owning with spouse a flat and a car parking space at Broadwood Road in Happy Valley; |
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang<br>(Vice-chairperson) | - | a close relative submitted a representation;  |
| Dr Venus Y.H. Lun                           | - | her firm having current business dealings with Hysan;                                   |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho                           | - | having current business dealings with   |

AECOM and RLP, and having past business dealings with Hysan and Townland;

- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with RLP, 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 past business dealings with AECOM;
- Mr Franklin Yu ]
  
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with Hysan and RLP;
  
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with RLP, past business dealings with AECOM and Townland, and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time, and his parents co-owning a flat at The Leighton Hill in Causeway Bay;
  
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - Lee Hysan Foundation had 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;
  
- Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong ] Lee Hysan Foundation had sponsored some of
- Mr. L.T. Kwok ] their projects before; and
  
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being an ex-Executive Director and former

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, and co-owning with spouse a flat on Ventris Road in Happy Valley.

5. Members noted that as Dr Venus Y.H. Lun's interest was direct, she should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As the interests of Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang (Vice-chairperson), Ms Lilian S.K. Law, Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong, Messrs Ricky W.Y. Yu and L.T. Kwok were indirect, Messrs Stephen L.H. Liu, Thomas O.S. Ho, Franklin Yu, K.K. Cheung, Alex T.H. Lai and Dr C.H. Hau had no involvement in the submissions of further representers/representers/commenters, and the properties owned by Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn (Chairperson), Mr K.K. Cheung, Ms Lilian S.K. Law and Mr Alex T.H. Lai's parents had no direct view of the CHR Site, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting. Members noted that Dr C.H. Hau had not yet joined the meeting.

[Dr Venus Y.H. Lun left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

6. The Chairperson said that notification had been given to the further representers, 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 further representers, representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the further representations in their absence.

7. The following representatives of Planning Department (PlanD), further representer, representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

*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)

*Further Representer, Representatives, Commenters and their Representatives*

F1 – Beststride Limited

R6 – Hysan Development Projects Company Limited

R633 – Fan Lai

Mr Ian Brownlee ]  
Ms Jacqueline Yu ] Further Representer's and Representatives'  
Ms Winnie Wong ] Representatives  
Mr Anthony Cheung ]

R8 – Chan Sze Hung

Mr Chan Sze Hung - Representer

R12 – Tse Wai Chun, Paul (謝偉俊)

Hon Tse Wai Chun, Paul - Representer

R13/C1 – Clarisse Yeung (楊雪盈)

R344 – Lai Kam Cheung

Ms Clarisse Yeung - Representer, Commenter and  
Representer's Representative

R34/C105 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

R377 – Yau Man Shan Cathy

Ms Yau Man Shan Cathy - Representer

R459 – Wong Kieu Cleo

Ms Law Wai Shan - Representer's Representative

R465 – Yu Prima



Mr Mak King Sing - Representer's Representative

R473 – Tang Kin Tat (鄧建達)

Ms Koo Kwok Wai, Sabina - Representer's Representative

R618 – Hung Kwok Yiu Duncan

Mr Hung Kwok Yiu Duncan - Representer

8. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representative would be invited to brief Members on the background of the further representations. The further representers, representers, commenters and their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions in turn. She reminded the attendees that their oral submissions should be confined to the proposed amendments to the OZP which were the subject of the further hearing. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each further representer, representer, commenter or their representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submission. There was a timer device to alert the further representers, 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 further representers, representers, commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to PlanD's representatives, further representers, representers, commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, PlanD's representatives, further representers, representers, commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting, and the Board would deliberate on the further representations in their absence and inform the further representers, representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

9. The Chairperson then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the further representations.

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint Presentation, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the further representations, including the background of the amendments, the grounds/views/proposals of the further representers, planning assessments

and PlanD's responses to the further representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10675 (the Paper).

[Dr C.H. Hau, Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

11. The Chairperson then invited the further representers, representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their views and whether they supported or objected to the proposed amendments.

F1 – Beststride Limited

R6 – Hysan Development Projects Company Limited

R633 – Fan Lai

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

- (a) the proposed amendments were generally supported and some refinements were suggested below;
- (b) he noted that the proposed amendments to paragraph 8.1.3 of the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft OZP were to guide the future development of the CHR site including protection of trees, provision of a buffer from the neighbouring area and stipulation of requirements for the design and location of the open space. He suggested that the ES should be further amended by including a requirement to ensure that the landscaping and open space within the "Government, Institution or Community (2)" ("G/IC(2)") zone would be integrated and compatible with the landscaping of the "Commercial (2)" ("C(2)") zone;
- (c) the landscape proposals for the "C(2)" zone would be submitted together with the layout plan for the Board's approval on application under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). As such, the requirement for the future developer to make a landscape submission under lease as stated in the

ES was considered not necessary and should be removed;

- (d) the requirement for optimising the public area by covering the road bisecting the CHR site with a landscaped deck should be added to the ES;
  - (e) submission of a traffic impact assessment (TIA) together with the layout plan on application under section 16 of the Ordinance, which should be included in the Notes of the “C(2)” zone. In that connection, the requirement for the future developer to undertake an updated traffic review (TR) under lease as stated in the ES should be removed; and
  - (f) noting the Social Welfare Department (SWD)’s intention to incorporate a 60-place Day Care Centre for the Elderly (DCCE) in the “C(2)” zone, the Net Operating Floor Area (NOFA) of 358m<sup>2</sup> should therefore be included in the ES as a requirement, not an option, for the future developer. In view of the aging population, the provision of a DCCE with 80 places instead of 60 places was considered more appropriate.
13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jacqueline Yu made the following main points:
- (a) according to the ES of the “C(2)” zone, the stone retaining walls along the northern and eastern peripheries of the site should be preserved. However, only the wall on the eastern side was a Grade 3 historic building. The northeast corner of the site fronting Leighton Road could be open up for providing a direct pedestrian access between the site and the future public transport interchange (PTI), which could shorten the walking distance by about 200m;
  - (b) the proposed road in the “C(2)” zone would divide the CHR site into two portions. The two portions could be integrated by covering the road with a landscaped deck to create an urban park. Separate entrances to the District Court would be provided on G/F and 1/F for security and management control including a pedestrian entrance for office users and the public provided at the

landscaped deck on 1/F with gate control which would only be opened during office hours and a separate entrance on G/F for vehicles and security purpose;

- (c) if a 2.5m high solid fence wall was proposed to be built at the perimeter of the “G/IC(2)” zone, the District Court would become an isolated island separated from the urban park. The greenery of the CHR site would also be reduced by 35%;
- (d) the existing District Court and Family Court in Wan Chai were highly accessible to the public with a front entrance connected with Gloucester Road Garden and a security access for vehicles at the back to the basement of Wan Chai Tower; and
- (e) there were many overseas courthouses with communal garden and outdoor landscape for the enjoyment of both the local community and the officers while the security of the courthouses could still be maintained. Similar design could be adopted in the CHR site.

#### R8 – Chan Sze Hung

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

- (a) he objected to the commercial use at the CHR site. The site should be retained for government, institution and community (GIC) uses such as law courts, government offices and open space;
- (b) open space should be located at-grade and easily accessible to the public. Some existing public open spaces, which were managed by developers with limited access, were considered not desirable;
- (c) the integration of the two portions of the CHR site proposed by the representatives of F1 was considered unnecessary as the District Court should be separated from the commercial development for security reason; and

- (d) the traffic to Leighton Road and Broadwood Road via Hoi Ping Road was congested due to double parking at Hoi Ping Road and tailback of vehicles queuing to enter the car park of Lee Garden Three. With the proposed underground parking and green minibus facility at the CHR site, similar traffic issues would be anticipated and should be addressed when the layout plan was submitted by the future developer.

15. The Chairperson pointed out that the subject hearing should focus on the further representations in respect of the proposed amendments to the draft OZP while the issues and concerns raised in the representations and comments, including the proposed uses of the site and those traffic-related matters, had already been deliberated by the Board in the previous hearing on the representations and comments (representation hearing).

R12 – Tse Wai Chun, Paul (謝偉俊)

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

- (a) he was making the oral submission in his capacity as a member of Wan Chai District Council (WCDC) (the Broadwood constituency);
- (b) there were concerns on the development intensity of the site and traffic impact on the area. While he noted that the TR report submitted in support of the rezoning had already been considered by the Board, he urged the Board to explore if there was any scope to further impose requirements or restrictions on the proposed development to address the public concerns such as the number of parking spaces; and
- (c) the designation of a non-building area (NBA) with a width of 40m to provide a breathing space for the residential developments at CHR(West) and the provision of visual corridors towards the Old and Valuable Trees (OVTs) should also be considered, which would be elaborated by another representer (R618) at the meeting.

R13/C1 – Clarisse Yeung (楊雪盈)

R344 – Lai Kam Cheung

17. Ms Clarisse Yeung made the following main points:

- (a) she objected to commercial use at the CHR site and considered that the proposed amendments to the ES of the draft OZP could not fully address her concerns;
- (b) there had been an increase in vacancy rate of commercial buildings and the situation would get worse due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The recent vacancy rates in Wan Chai and Causeway Bay were about 7.37% and 8.26% respectively. The redevelopment projects by the Swire Properties and Hopewell Holdings Limited would produce an addition of 200,000m<sup>2</sup> commercial gross floor area (GFA) in Wan Chai, which would sufficiently meet the demand in the area. The commercial development at the CHR site would be an excess supply;
- (c) similar to the CHR site, the ex-Mong Kok Market site was rezoned to “C(3)” in 2012 for commercial development with a community health centre with a GFA of not less than 4,500m<sup>2</sup>. The site was included in the 2019-20 Land Sale Programme but was then removed in February 2020 probably due to a decrease in demand for commercial GFA in the area. Similarly, the commercial use at the CHR site should also be reviewed;
- (d) WCDC objected to the proposed provision of an underground public transport facility for minibus at the CHR site. The views of WCDC should be respected; and
- (e) while there were residents supporting the proposed amendments to the Notes of the “C(2)” zone requiring the submission of a layout plan for consideration by the Board, they requested that a new TIA should be conducted and a minimum floor area of the proposed GIC facilities should be specified. Also, a social impact assessment should be conducted for the future development.

R34/C105 – Mary Mulvihill

18. With the aid of a visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:
- (a) the South China Morning Post on the day before reported the findings of the Hong Kong Population Projections 2020-2069 released by the Census and Statistics Department (C&SD). The population would grow from 7.51 million in 2019 to a peak of 8.11 million in 2041 and then drop to 7.35 million by 2069. With post-war baby boomers entering old age, the number of elderly persons aged 65 and over was projected to nearly double in the coming 20 years. The number of elderly would increase from 1.32 million or 18.4% of the population in 2019 to 2.52 million or 33.3% of the population in 2039. The elders would account for 38.4% of the population in 2069. The elderly population would remain at more than 2.5 million for at least 30 years. With the increasing aging population but decreasing demand for commercial space, the CHR site should not be rezoned from “G/IC” to “C”;
  - (b) she supported the recommendations made by the representative of F1 related to GIC facilities and open space. She also asked for a reduction of the development scale of the District Court;
  - (c) the proposed 60-place DCCE was insufficient to meet the demand. Besides, the high mortality rate of the elderly in the COVID-19 pandemic was resulted from the poor conditions of the Residential Care Homes for the Elderly (RCHE). There was an urgent need for improvement; and
  - (d) the proposed District Court should not necessarily be moved to a mega building at the CHR site. The Family Court could be moved to the North Kowloon Magistracy which was now a vacant historic building in Kowloon. The Conservancy Association shared the same views and strongly supported the said proposal.

R465 – Yu Prima

19. Mr Mak King Sing made the following main points:
- (a) he was making the oral submission in his capacity as a member of WCDC. WCDC and residents of Wan Chai objected to commercial development at the CHR site;
  - (b) the amended ES could not address the traffic concerns raised by the residents including the traffic impact generated from the 10,000m<sup>2</sup> retail GFA of the proposed commercial development. It was pointed out in the representation hearing that weekend traffic was normally higher than that of weekdays. The peak hour should fall within a weekend morning but not a weekday morning as stated in the TR report;
  - (c) the updated TR to be submitted under lease would not undergo public consultation. The arrangement was not transparent;
  - (d) the proposed commercial development at the CHR site deviated from the policy of decentralisation of commercial use as advocated by the Government. The imminent need of commercial GFA was not well justified given the increasing vacancy rate in the core business districts. A comprehensive study on the demand for commercial GFA and parking spaces should be conducted;
  - (e) in view of the long-standing traffic issue in Wan Chai, a TIA covering the whole district should be carried out; and
  - (f) minibuses provided feeder services and the stops should be located adjacent to the MTR Stations. The relocation of minibus stops/terminus to the CHR site was not supported.

R459 – Wong Kieu Cleo

20. Ms Law Wai Shan made the following main points:
- (a) she was making the oral submission in her capacity as a member of WCDC;



- (b) there was limited public open space in the congested Wan Chai District but Hysan insisted on developing the commercial building with an urban park. The actual area of open space provided for the public under the proposal was questionable; and
- (c) the open space provision standards proposed in the Hong Kong 2030+ should be adopted. Users of those public open spaces managed by developers always encountered bad experience due to the poor management, e.g. Lee Tung Avenue. According to the ‘Public Space Pyramid’ advocated by the Hong Kong Public Space Initiative, an ideal public space should possess four main qualities, namely accessibility, environment and facilities, public utilisation and sociability. In addition to specifying the minimum area of open space required in the “C(2)” zone, i.e. 6,000m<sup>2</sup>, the open space at the CHR site should be genuinely open and easily accessible for the enjoyment of the general public.

R473 – Tang Kin Tat (鄧建達)

21. Ms Koo Kwok Wai, Sabina made the following main points:

- (a) her oral submission was made in the capacity of a member of WCDC;
- (b) the number of elderly population aged over 65 would increase from 17% in 2016 to 31% in 2036. According the projection of C&SD, there would be one elderly for every five people in Wan Chai in 2028. In January 2019, SWD briefed members of WCDC on the deficiency of places of RCHE. The CHR site should therefore be used for elderly facilities in response to the imminent demand;
- (c) according to the amended ES, the future developer of the commercial development at the CHR site was encouraged to provide more elderly facilities and performing arts and cultural facilities. However, the community requested that such provision should be mandatory but not voluntary; and

- (d) post-war baby boomers entering old age could offer many business opportunities. For forward planning, the concept of ‘green-silver cohabitation or inclusion’ should be explored and incorporated in the development of the CHR site instead of developing the site into a commercial building.

R618 – Hung Kwok Yin Duncan

22. With the aid of a visualiser, Mr Hung Kwok Yin Duncan made the following main points:

- (a) he was an architect and the chairman of an owners’ corporation of a residential development in the Broadwood area, Wan Chai;
- (b) among the objection grounds that had been elaborated in the representation hearing, he emphasised that the TR report in support of the OZP amendments which had many deficiencies but accepted by the Board might be subject to legal challenge; and
- (c) he had three demands and urged the Board to make further amendments to the draft OZP. The demands included (i) the inclusion of a NBA with a width of 40m between the District Court and residential blocks across CHR(West) for the improvement of air ventilation and sun light penetration; (ii) the provision of a visual corridor for the OVTs from the street level without compromising the development intensity; and (iii) imposing a restriction on the maximum number of car parking spaces and loading/unloading bays to be provided within the proposed commercial development.

23. As the presentations of PlanD’s representatives, the further representers, representers, commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairperson would invite the further representers, representers, commenters, their representatives and/or PlanD’s representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be

taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

*GIC Facilities*

24. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed amendments made to the ES could address the concern on the provision of DCCE;
- (b) the difference between DCCE and RCHE, and the considerations of accommodating such facilities at the CHR site;
- (c) whether SWD had required the provision of a 80-place DCCE in the “C(2)” zone, and the implications of specifying the provision of a DCCE in the ES;
- (d) whether the minimum GFA requirement of GIC facilities to be provided at the CHR commercial development was stipulated in the proposed amendments;
- (e) whether the future developer of the commercial development in the “C(2)” zone would have any obligation to provide the GIC facilities specified in the ES;
- (f) whether there would be incentives for the future developer to provide more quality GIC facilities at the CHR site; and
- (g) having noted that the public had concern on the provision of GIC facilities, how the public could get involved in the process between the OZP approval and the implementation of the commercial development.

25. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) subsequent to the representation hearing in respect of the draft OZP, the Board’s intention of providing more GIC facilities in the “C(2)” zone had been

reflected in the proposed amendments to the ES. Given SWD's latest indication to incorporate a 60-place DCCE in the proposed commercial development at the CHR site, should the Board consider it appropriate to include the NOFA of the DCCE in the ES in addition to the two GIC facilities already specified as a factual update, the ES could be further amended;

- (b) a DCCE referred to a centre-based community care services providing day time care, rehabilitation exercises and social activities to the elderly persons. Different from RCHE, there were no residential care and facilities in DCCE. Same as Child Care Centre, under the relevant regulations, the locational requirement of not being situated at a height more than 24m above the street level was applicable to DCCE and RCHE. In that regard, there would be design constraints on the commercial development if a RCHE was requested to be provided at the site in addition to a DCCE. Furthermore, a DCCE without residential facilities was considered more compatible with the commercial use. While the said locational requirement was not applicable to the District Health Centre, locating the facilities in the lower level of the building was preferred from the users' perspective;
- (c) SWD only indicated to incorporate a 60-place of DCCE in the "C(2)" site. Specifying a provision higher than that being contemplated by SWD might be problematic;
- (d) in the Notes of the "C(2)" zone of the draft OZP, no minimum GFA requirement of GIC facilities was stipulated but the maximum GFA restriction of 100,000m<sup>2</sup> for the whole development was imposed. The floor area of the GIC facilities as required by the Government was counted towards the maximum GFA restriction. To provide certainty to the future developer, the NOFA of District Health Centre and Child Care Centre was stated in the ES and would be incorporated in the land sale conditions;
- (e) since the provision of GIC facilities specified in the ES of the "C(2)" zone would be incorporated in the land sale conditions, the future developer of the commercial development at the CHR site should comply with the requirements

on the provision of the GIC facilities. In addition, under the proposed amendments to the Notes of the “C(2)” zone, the future developer was required to submit a layout plan, which should include details of the GIC facilities, to the Board for approval;

- (f) the Board’s intention of requiring provision of more GIC facilities taking into account the current deficit in Wan Chai District and mentioning the compatibility of performing arts and cultural facilities for the “C(2)” site had been spelt out in the amended ES. The future developer would take all relevant information, including the Board’s intention as set out in the ES, into consideration in bidding for the site and in preparing the submission of the layout plan for the Board’s approval; and
- (g) the layout plan including the details of the GIC facilities to be provided would be submitted under section 16 of the Ordinance and would undergo the statutory consultation process. The public could provide comments on the layout plan including the proposed GIC facilities during the public inspection period of the planning application.

26. Regarding the question on the incentives for the future developer to provide more GIC facilities, the Chairperson supplemented that to facilitate the bidders to determine the bidding prices, the land sale conditions had to be specific and precise. The requirements set out in the ES of the “C(2)” zone including the required provision of the specified GIC facilities would be translated into the land sale conditions. The successful bidder should provide the GIC facilities requested under the lease accordingly. If the future developer intended to provide additional GIC facilities on top of the requirements under lease, such proposal would also be included in the layout plan to be submitted under section 16 of the Ordinance to the Board for approval.

27. In response to another Member’s question on whether land premium should be paid by the developer if application for minor relaxation of GFA restriction was approved under section 16 of the Ordinance, the Chairperson said that lease modification would in general not be allowed within five years upon the sale of the land. However, if the sale conditions were drafted to include a clause allowing the future developer to apply to the Board for minor

relaxation of GFA restriction in order to provide additional G/IC facilities, it was expected that the bidders would determine the bidding prices taking into account the inclusion of such a clause.

*Landscaping, Open Space and Layout*

28. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) how the quality of the public open space in the “C(2)” zone to be managed by the developer could be improved and ensured;
- (b) how the views on the street level towards the OVTs could be secured;
- (c) the mechanism to control the landscape and urban design of the commercial development at the CHR site and the implications of the design on the adjacent “G/IC(2)” site;
- (d) given the proposed amendments to the ES, whether the enhancement in integration of the “C(2)” and “G/IC(2)” sites could be achieved; and
- (e) making reference to the District Court in Wan Chai, whether the commercial development could be integrated with the District Court at the CHR site if the security issue could be addressed.

29. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) some criteria for a quality open space, including the general locational requirement, integration with the facilities within the site and be user friendly, were set out in the ES of the “C(2)” zone. The future developer should demonstrate the openness, accessibility, connectivity and other design merits of the open space in the layout plan submission on application under section 16 of the Ordinance to the Board for approval. Besides, the developer was required to submit a Landscape Master Plan under lease. The details of management arrangement, such as the opening hours of the public open space, could be

monitored and enforced under lease, as appropriate;

- (b) according to the air ventilation assessment conducted in the rezoning stage, clear building gaps of not less than 25m and 20m in width in a northwest-southeast direction involving the two OVTs should be provided to facilitate air ventilation. The building gaps, which were specified in the ES, could also serve as visual corridors to preserve the views towards the OVTs. The proposed new access road in the CHR site would also allow appreciation of the OVT at the “G/IC(2)” site from CHR(W);
- (c) to address Members’ concerns on the design and layout of the “C(2)” site raised at the representation hearing, the submission of a layout plan for the Board’s approval had been incorporated into the Notes of the “C(2)” zone. The future developer was required to submit a layout plan including the landscape and urban design proposals, among others, within the “C(2)” site under section 16 of the Ordinance. While the zonings and boundaries of the “C(2)” and “G/IC(2)” sites on the OZP were confirmed by the Board in the deliberation of the representations and comments, the future developer would still have the flexibility to enhance the integration of the commercial development and the surroundings through the landscape and urban design proposals. The Board could scrutinise the design and layout through the planning application mechanism;
- (d) the security and operational requirements of the District Court should be recognised. The District Court would not be physically integrated with the commercial development, but the integration of the two sites could be achieved through various measures, e.g. building design and landscape treatments; and
- (e) the District Court in Wan Chai was built in the 1980s. Since the security requirements for the law courts had changed, the design standards of the District Court in Wan Chai might no longer be applicable.

30. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the meaning of ‘Public Space Pyramid’, Ms Law Wai Shan, R459’s representative, explained that it was composed of four main qualities

of an ideal public space. Firstly, the basic requirement of a public space was ‘accessibility’, which meant that the public space should be as open as possible and easily accessible. Secondly, ‘environment and facilities’ should be made available for public enjoyment for which the physical design and hygiene mattered. Thirdly, a public space should achieve ‘public utilisation’ by turning a space into a place to connect people with the surroundings. Fourthly, it was about the requirement for high level of ‘sociability’ in that a public space should facilitate social interactions among people and eliminate obstructions which discouraged interactions. She further said that similar to wet markets, the physical setting of public spaces should encourage the realisation of social life and interactions among people. Hence, to create an ideal public space, it was important to engage the public in the planning, design and management of the space.

31. In response to a Member’s question on whether the landscaped deck proposed by F1 would affect the OVT in the “C(2)” site, Ms Jacqueline Yu, F1’s representative, said that the proposal was technically feasible and would not affect the OVT. The OVT would not be covered by the landscaped deck and sufficient protection measures for the OVT would be provided.

32. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the incorporation of the design principles of quality open space suggested by the representers/commenters into the commercial development, Mr Ian Brownlee, F1’s representative, clarified that Hysan was giving views on the CHR site as a member of the community in the area. The proposal presented by them was to illustrate that the road between the commercial development and the District Court could become an incidental element instead of a dominant one in the design by decking over. Moreover, to achieve a better integration of the “C(2)” and “G/IC(2)” sites, the design of the open space should not only be well integrated with the facilities within the “C(2)” site. Hence, it was suggested that further amendments should be made to the ES of the “G/IC(2)” zone by including the requirement that the landscaping and open space within the “G/IC(2)” zone should be integrated and compatible with the landscaping of the “C(2)” zone, which could help optimise the public benefits, no matter who the future developer of the “C(2)” site would be.

*Traffic*



33. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the key findings of the TR;
  - (b) the arrangement of the updated TR under lease;
  - (c) how the number of car parking spaces of the commercial development would be determined;
  - (d) whether the proposed public transport facility for minibus in the “C(2)” site would serve as a terminus or en-route stops; and
  - (e) assessment of the pedestrian arrangement proposed by F1.
34. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, made the following main points:
- (a) the TR which aimed at assessing the traffic impacts of the proposed development at the CHR site on the surrounding areas was conducted prior to the zoning amendments to the OZP. With proposed mitigation measures and road improvement works, which had been presented to the Board in the representation hearing, the TR report concluded that there would not be unacceptable traffic impacts arising from the CHR development. However, given the limited traffic capacity nearby the CHR site was subject to a maximum GFA of 100,000m<sup>2</sup> as stipulated in the “C(2)” zone. The development intensity was already lower than that permissible under the Building (Planning) Regulations for a commercial building on Hong Kong Island;
  - (b) the updated TR requirement to be imposed under lease was applicable to the “C(2)” zone only. The updated TR was not to review the development intensity of the site but to facilitate making refinements, if necessary, to the traffic scheme including the provision of transport facilities of the proposed development;

- (c) as stipulated in the Notes of the “C(2)” zone, a public vehicle park of not less than 125 parking spaces as requested by the Transport Department (TD) taking account of the traffic condition and parking provision in the area was required. The developer should also provide ancillary parking spaces for the commercial development in accordance with the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and subject to TD’s agreement;
- (d) the provision of the public transport facility for minibus at the CHR site was to facilitate the relocation of minibus stops at Lan Fong Road, should the Government decide to pursue such a relocation in future. Subject to the consultation by TD with the stakeholders including WCDC, either en-route stops or a terminus for minibus could be arranged there; and
- (e) the stone retaining walls situated at the eastern boundary of the CHR site were confirmed as a Grade 3 historic building by the Antiquities Advisory Board. Taking into account the traffic improvement scheme, the OVT at the northern boundary and the intention to preserve the stone retaining walls as far as possible, the requirement for preserving the northern and eastern portions of the walls was incorporated in the ES of the draft OZP while the northwestern portion would be affected due to the road improvement works. Regarding the proposal of F1 to open up the northeastern corner of the site for pedestrian arrangement, it was necessary to consider its impacts on that portion of the walls as a Grade 3 historic building and the OVT on top of the stonewall as well as the topography of the site which was sloping upward from west to east. Subject to the design and layout of the commercial development, the justifications for such pedestrian arrangement should be given when the layout plan was submitted to the Board for approval.

#### *District Court*

35. In response to a Member’s question on whether the District Court could be moved to the historic buildings in other areas as suggested by R34/C105, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the CHR site was the most suitable one to meet the operational requirements of the Judiciary for the provision of the District Court, Family Court and Lands Tribunal. In view

of the long-term needs and current accommodation requirements of the Judiciary, the historic buildings referred to by the representer might not be suitable for such purpose.

*Others*

36. In response to a Member's question on the NBA suggested by R618, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that in the deliberation of the representations and comments, the Board had adopted a balanced approach to address the public's concern on building separation on the one hand and to allow design flexibility for the district court development on the other, and agreed that a building gap of not less than 30m should be provided between the District Court and residential blocks across CHR(West). Such requirement had been incorporated into the amended ES of the "G/IC(2)" zone.

37. In response to a Member's question on whether the public would be further consulted prior to the implementation of the proposed development, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that for the future development of the District Court, WCDC would be consulted. For the commercial development, a layout plan should be submitted by the future developer for the Board's approval under section 16 of the Ordinance and there would be a statutory public consultation process.

38. In response to a Member's question on the implementation programme of a commercial development, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that in general, the development should be completed in about five years after the land sale. For the CHR site, with the need to construct a road within the site, it might take about five to six years to complete the development.

39. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures had been completed. The Board would deliberate on the further representations in closed meeting and would inform the further representers, representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives, further representers, representers, commenters and their representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

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

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting during the break.]

### Deliberation Session

#### *GIC Facilities*

40. Members noted from the further hearing that SWD had the intention to incorporate a 60-place DCCE in the “C(2)” site. Similar to the specification of the requirement for providing a District Health Centre and a Child Care Centre in the ES, the Chairperson suggested and Members agreed that opportunity could be taken to reflect this factual update in the ES, by specifying the requirement for providing a 60-place DCCE in the “C(2)” site with the corresponding NOFA. Besides, Members generally acknowledged the public’s aspiration for the provision of more GIC facilities in the area and considered that the future developer should be encouraged to provide additional GIC facilities within the site. While noting that the intention had already been reflected in the ES, Members agreed that the relevant wording in paragraph 8.1.3 of the ES could be suitably refined to convey the intention in clearer terms.

41. A Member was concerned whether there would be incentives for the future developer to provide more quality GIC facilities, for instance by adopting tender arrangements which took into account factors other than the price bids. In response, the Chairperson said that while the two-envelope tender arrangement could provide incentives for the bidders to incorporate more design merits in the development proposals, such as to achieve the vision for a world class harbourfront with quality public open space at Site 3 of the New Central Harbourfront, such kind of tender arrangement would involve a much complicated and lengthy procedure and would be applied only in very special circumstances.

#### *Traffic*

42. A Member asked the rationale for imposing the requirement for an updated TR and not a new TIA under the lease. Upon the Chairperson’s invitation, the Secretary explained that with the mitigation measures and road improvement works proposed under the TR report in support of the OZP amendments, the development intensity of the “C(2)” zone was confirmed to be technically feasible without generating adverse traffic impact in the area.

The Chairperson remarked that the TR report in support of the OZP amendments had been accepted by TD and the traffic issues had been thoroughly deliberated by the Board in its meeting on 19.6.2020. Given the possibility of adopting alternative traffic measures in the detailed design stage by the future developer, to adopt a prudent approach, the Board had already agreed to include the requirement for the future developers to conduct an updated TR under lease, taking into account any changes in circumstances during the interval between the approval of the draft OZP and the implementation of the commercial development. On the other hand, should there be minor relaxation of development intensity of the “C(2)” zone proposed by the future developer, an application would need to be submitted under section 16 of the Ordinance for the Board’s approval, and a new TIA would likely be required to demonstrate no substantial adverse traffic impact would be brought about by the proposed increase in GFA, together with planning justifications and other relevant assessments in the planning application.

43. Noting the traffic concerns reiterated by the further representers, representers and commenters, Members generally acknowledged that the TR report had been accepted by TD and considered that there was no ground for a departure from the Board’s decision on the draft OZP. After all, the traffic issue was also outside the scope of the proposed amendments which were the focus of the current round of hearing and deliberation.

#### *Open Space*

44. A Member was of the view that the proposed podium design connecting the District Court and the commercial development at the CHR site as proposed by F1 was not appropriate due to security reason.

45. Noting the public aspirations and the design principles of a quality open space such as walkability and accessibility as suggested by a representer’s representative, a Member considered it worthwhile to enhance the ES to provide more guidance for the provision of a better designed public open space at the CHR site. While sharing the good intention of providing a quality open space, another Member pointed out that unless there were concrete requirements to be specified under the ES, flexibility should be allowed for innovative design to be proposed by the future developer. Some Members concurred that design flexibility should be given. A Member expressed that it was impossible to stipulate every single

criterion in the ES to guide the design of the open space, which would be subject to the detailed design and there would be a requirement for submission of the Landscape Master Plan under lease. It should also be noted that a layout plan of the proposed commercial development including the landscape proposal was required to be submitted to the Board for approval. Through processing planning applications, the Board could scrutinise the design of open space and revision to the ES was thus not necessary.

46. In response to the Chairperson's question on whether relevant guidelines could be included in the ES for the design of open space, Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, D of Plan, said that there was an on-going study on Urban Design Guidelines Revamp. The study aimed to revamp Chapter 11 of HKPSG to advocate adoption of better urban design measures and provide examples of good practices for developers, consultants and other stakeholders in the formulation of development schemes. The guidelines were not meant to be prescriptive, mandatory requirements but advocacy for good urban design practices. The draft revised guidelines were currently under consultation with relevant professionals in the development sector. It was anticipated that the revised guidelines would be promulgated by end of 2020 or early 2021. Given that it had already been an established practice for professionals to follow the prevailing guidelines or practice notes in formulating development proposals, the inclusion of such guidelines in the ES for the design of the open space was considered not necessary.

47. A few Members considered that for the CHR site, a quality open space was attributed to user friendliness, easy accessibility, visibility of OVTs and sociability. The same Member, who suggested enhancing the ES to provide guidance for designing a better public open space, considered that reference could be made in the ES referring to Chapter 11 of HKPSG, which provided guidance on better urban design to enhance the built environment.

48. Noting that the ES did not form part of the proposed amendments to the draft OZP but could be further modified upon deliberation, the Chairperson concluded that the relevant part in paragraph 8.1.3 of the ES could be suitably refined to reflect more clearly Members' views on the design requirements of the open space particularly covering the aspects of easy accessibility and public enjoyment of the built environment and the special features of the site.

49. Members generally considered that the other grounds and proposals of the further representations had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper and the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

50. After further deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of Further Representation No. F1 (part). The Board decided not to uphold the remaining part of Further Representation No. F1 and Further Representation No. F2 and considered that the draft Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should be amended by the proposed amendments for the following reasons:

- “(a) the development mix of the Further Representation (FR) site will be subject to the detailed design of the future developer as long as the proposed uses comply with the provision of the “Commercial (2)” (“C(2)”) zone. The future developer will be required to submit a layout plan under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance), which will be processed in accordance with the provision of the Ordinance including publication for public inspection (**F2**). There is already provision for application for minor relaxation of the gross floor area restriction to cater for additional government, institution and community (GIC) facilities to be proposed in the FR site (**F1 and F2**);
- (b) under the Notes of the “C(2)” zone, the future developer will have to submit information of elevated walkways and roads to be constructed within the FR site in the layout plan submission to illustrate the connectivity within the site. Whether the new access road will be covered by a landscaped deck is subject to the detailed design by the future developer. It is not appropriate to set out such design requirement in the Explanatory Statement (**F1**); and
- (c) the Transport Review (TR) in support of the OZP amendments has been accepted by the Transport Department. The purpose of layout plan submission is to allow the Board to scrutinise the design and layout of the FR site with the provision of GIC facilities and public open space, instead of reconfirming the feasibility of the development in traffic terms. Hence, requiring the submission of TR under the Notes of the “C(2)” zone is not

supported (F1)”.

51. The Board also agreed that opportunity could be taken to amend the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/20 to provide a factual update regarding the provision of GIC facilities and for clarity, as follows:

paragraph 8.1.3 of the ES of the OZP

“For the “C(2)” site ..... A District Health Centre with a Net Operating Floor Area (NOFA) of about 1,000m<sup>2</sup>, ~~and a~~ Child Care Centre with a NOFA of about 531m<sup>2</sup> ~~and a Day Care Centre for the Elderly with a NOFA of about 358m<sup>2</sup>~~ shall be provided. ~~There is scope to include~~ *The project proponent of the site is encouraged to provide* more GIC facilities taking into account the current deficit in Wan Chai District ~~and for the benefit of the local community such as Day Care Centre for the Elderly~~. Performing arts and cultural facilities are also compatible uses in the “C(2)” site..... The design of the open space should ..... and be user friendly *and easily accessible. It should be designed as a quality place for the public to interact and enjoy the built environment and its special features, including the OVTs and stone retaining walls.*”

52. Members also agreed that the draft OZP (amended by the proposed amendments), together with their respective Notes and updated ES, were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C).

53. The Board also noted that, in accordance with section 6H of the Ordinance, the OZP should thereafter be read as including the amendments. The amendments should be made available for public inspection until CE in C had made a decision in respect of the draft OZP in question under section 9 of the Ordinance.

[Mr K.K. Cheung left the meeting during the deliberation.]

[Messrs Franklin Yu, Y.S. Wong, Thomas O.S. Ho and Wilson Y.W. Fung left the meeting at this point.]



**Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/H6/89

Proposed 'Office', 'Eating Place' and 'Shop and Services' Uses in "Commercial (1)" Zone and area shown as 'Road', 281 Gloucester Road, Causeway Bay, Hong Kong

(TPB Paper No. 10676)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

54. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for having business dealings with Jardines Group Companies (Jardines), Hongkong Land Limited (HKL) and/or Mandarin Oriental which were affiliated companies of Excelsior Hotel (BVI) Limited (Excelsior) (i.e. the applicant), and/or the applicant's consultants, Ronald Lu & Partners (HK) Limited (RLP), MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) and/or Meinhardt (Hong Kong) Limited (Meinhardt):

- |                     |   |   |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho   | - | having current business dealings with RLP, HKL and MVA;   |
| Mr K.K. Cheung      | - | his firm having current business dealings with RLP, Jardines, HKL, Mandarin Oriental, Meinhardt and MVA;        |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu | - | having past business dealings with RLP;   |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai    | - | his former firm having current business dealings with RLP, Jardines, HKL, Mandarin Oriental, Meinhardt and MVA; |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung | - | being an ex-employee of Jardines; and   |
| Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong  | - | being an ex-employee of Maxim's Group Companies, an associated company of Jardines.                             |

55. Members noted that Messrs K.K. Cheung, Alex T.H. Lai, Thomas O.S. Ho and Wilson Y.W. Fung had left the meeting. Members also noted that Mr Stephen L.H. Liu and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had no involvement in the application, and agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

56. The following government representatives and the applicant's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

*Planning Department (PlanD)*

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

Mr T.W. Ng - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK)

*Transport Department (TD)*

Mr Alex K.K. Au - Senior Engineer/Wan Chai (SE/Wan Chai)

*Excelsior* ]

Mr William John Latter ]

Mr Kieren John Barry ]

*Masterplan Limited* ] Applicant's Representatives

Mr Ian Brownlee ]

*MVA* ]

Mr Chapman Lam ]

57. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. She then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the review application.

58. With the aid of a PowerPoint Presentation, Mr T.W. Ng, STP/HK, PlanD briefed Members on the background of the review application including the consideration of the application by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board, departmental and public

comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10676 (the Paper).

[Dr Venus Y.H. Lun returned to join the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

59. The Chairperson then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the review application.

60. With the aid of a PowerPoint Presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee, the applicant's representative made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant was willing to accept the approval conditions as recommended by PlanD in the Paper;
- (b) as shown on the approved general building plan (GBP) for a commercial development at the site, the development falling entirely within the "Commercial (1)" ("C(1)") zone did not occupy the whole lot owned by the applicant. The subject application was to extend the basement of the proposed development to the edge of the lot falling in an area shown as 'Road' and provide some drop-off area on G/F;
- (c) four loading and unloading bays on the basement level would be converted to car parking spaces resulting in the provision of an addition of 24 car parking spaces adopting a puzzle stacking system; and
- (d) the pick-up/drop-off area on G/F would be widened to address the comments of TD. Landscaping and pedestrian footpath would also be provided.

61. As the presentation of PlanD's representative and the applicant's representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

62. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) as far as the area shown as 'Road' was concerned, what the differences

between the approved GBP and the current proposal under application were;

- (b) as compared with the approved GBP, whether the development intensity would be increased under the subject application;
- (c) noting MPC's rejection reason was solely on traffic ground, with the traffic measures currently proposed by the applicant, whether the proposed development was considered acceptable in traffic terms;
- (d) whether the proposed traffic measures would bring genuine improvement, and the key measure amongst all;
- (e) noting that providing more car parking spaces in an extra basement level (4<sup>th</sup> basement) was proposed as a possible option of mitigation measures in the section 16 application stage, given the traffic measures proposed in the review application, whether the provision of a 4<sup>th</sup> basement level was considered not necessary;
- (f) details of the puzzle stacking system and its application to the proposed development; and
- (g) the measures to make up for the reduction in loading and unloading bays for light goods vehicles due to the conversion to the puzzle parking system.

63. In response, with the aid of the PowerPoint slides, Mr Ian Brownlee, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed development under the approved GBP fell entirely within the "C(1)" zone while under the subject application, the basement of the proposed development would be extended to the area shown as 'Road'; and
- (b) the plot ratio (PR) of the proposed development remained unchanged as compared with the approved GBP and the floor area in the basement for car park use was excluded from gross floor area (GFA) calculation.

64. In response, with the aid of the visualiser, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD said that according to the applicant's submission, the site area under the proposed scheme was 4,272m<sup>2</sup> while that under the approved GBP was 4,236m<sup>2</sup>, which accounted for an increase of 36m<sup>2</sup> due to the detailed setting out of site boundary. There was a corresponding increase in the GFA of 535m<sup>2</sup> while the PR of 15 remained unchanged.

65. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Chapman Lam, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) there were two traffic improvement measures to address the concern of queuing back of vehicles to Gloucester Road. Firstly, more parking spaces would be provided; and secondly, the G/F drop-off area was rationalised and widened to provide more spaces for holding seven to eight vehicles simultaneously (excluding the passageway for the car park). Besides, there were various measures in the traffic management plan including time management of loading strategy, car parking booking system, provision of smart ticket gates such that vehicles would not need to stop before passing through the gates with the aid of technology, centralised water filter to eliminate water delivery to the office users and sharing the parking vacancy information in the Government's smartphone app in addition to the signs outside the car park. Furthermore, the applicant agreed to assist the Government in developing a district wide car park vacancy signage system. After the completion of the development, the applicant agreed to conduct monitoring survey of the drop-off area up to two years. These measures demonstrated a great improvement from those proposed in the section 16 application stage; and
- (b) the puzzle double stacking parking system was similar to double-deck parking. Different from the traditional double-deck parking, the puzzle parking system was a robotic system for higher efficiency. The system was proposed given the sufficient headroom for double-deck arrangement.

66. In response, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr Alex K.K. Au, SE/Wan Chai, TD made the following main points:

- (a) in the section 16 stage, the applicant failed to provide sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in adverse traffic impact on the surrounding areas. It should be noted that the proposed development was situated at a strategic location adjacent to key transport infrastructures including the Cross Harbour Tunnel. One of the prime traffic concerns was the possible knock-on effect imposed on the roads in the surrounding by the traffic associated with the proposed development. In the review application, the applicant proposed a range of traffic improvement measures to address the issues. Firstly, the entry gate of the car park would be located at 2<sup>nd</sup> basement level of the building allowing 16 upstream queuing spaces to minimise queuing back to the public road on G/F. Secondly, the pick-up/drop-off area on G/F would be enhanced and widened to three lanes which comprised two lanes for the holding of seven to eight vehicles for pick-up/drop-off, and one by-pass lane for diverting vehicles to leave the building when the car park was full. Thirdly, the number of parking spaces would be increased from 119 to 143 spaces (+24 spaces) with adoption of a puzzle parking system. Amongst all, the key measure was the widening of the pick-up/drop-off area on G/F, when coupled with the management measures proposed, would serve to improve the efficiency of vehicles entering to/exiting from the development and minimise queuing back to the public road;
- (b) despite the fact that more parking spaces could be provided via the construction of extra basement levels, the viability of constructing extra basement levels would be subject to various constraints. The applicant's submissions made in the review application illustrated further the site constraints which contributed to the infeasibility of providing extra basement levels. To mitigate the issue, the applicant proposed a range of enhancements, including provision of enhanced layout, hardware facilities and management measures to optimise the internal traffic arrangement, taking into account the site constraints;
- (c) under the puzzle parking system, after the vehicle was parked at a vacant space on the floor level, it would be transported automatically by a mechanical device to a proper vacant space for parking. It was a more efficient system than the

traditional double-deck parking system and it would save the time for the drivers to park their cars; and

- (d) due to the constraint of the building layout including the presence of columns in between parking spaces, the proposed puzzle parking system would be applied in clusters of area on 1<sup>st</sup> basement floor of the proposed development, by converting areas originally designed for four loading and unloading bays for light goods vehicles. To make up the reduction in the number of loading and unloading bays, the applicant had proposed measures to minimise the need of goods vehicle's loading/unloading activities under a traffic management plan including a pre-booking system to arrange the loading and unloading activities in a more organised manner and outside the peak hours; and providing a centralised water filter system to eliminate the logistics of loading/unloading bottled water for the office users and hence reduce the trip generation of trucks.

67. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application in the absence of the applicant's representatives and inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the government representatives and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

68. Members noted that the application was rejected by MPC solely on traffic ground. In the review application, the applicant had demonstrated efforts to work out a range of traffic improvement measures to address the traffic issues, especially the widening of the pick-up/drop off area on G/F to ease the queuing problem and the increase in the number of parking spaces within the proposed development, which were considered acceptable by TD. In addition, the detailed design and implementation of the proposed traffic management measures could be monitored through the approval conditions. Members generally considered that the review application could be supported.

69. After deliberation, the Board decided to approve the application on review, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 11.9.2024 and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless prior to the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the design and provision of internal transport facilities including car parking spaces, loading/unloading bays and pick-up/drop-off area to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and implementation of a Traffic Management Plan to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of a Feasibility Study Report (FSR) on the use of Advanced Guided Vehicle Parking System (AGVPS) and the implementation of the AGVPS recommended in the FSR, if any, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of a sewerage impact assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (e) the implementation of local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the SIA in planning condition (d) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB”.

70. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Annex J of the Paper.

### **Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business



71. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:30 p.m.