

APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT OF PLAN
UNDER SECTION 12A OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

APPLICATION NO. Y/H19/1

<u>Applicant</u>	New Season Global Limited represented by Masterplan Limited
<u>Site</u>	The Maryknoll House, 44 Stanley Village Road, Stanley, Hong Kong (Rural Building Lot (RBL) 333 RP)
<u>Site Area</u>	About 7,645.5m ²
<u>Lease</u>	RBL 333 RP is subject to : (i) RBL333 - with a term of 75 years from 9.11.1931 and an option of renewal for one further 75 years - restricted to 'not more than ten houses' and 'houses of European Type only' - 'design, disposition and height' clause - no restrictions on user, gross floor area (GFA), site coverage (SC), building height (BH) nor landscaping (ii) Assignment with RBL 333 s.A dated 17.10.1975 - RBL 333 RP with the right to erect 3 houses - a right-of-way to be reserved for the owner and occupier of RBL 333 RP leading from the main road crossing RBL 333 s.A
<u>Plan</u>	Approved Stanley Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H19/12
<u>Zoning</u>	"Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC")
<u>Proposed Amendments</u>	(i) To rezone the application site (the Site) to "Residential (Group C) 2" ("R(C)2"); or (ii) To rezone the Site to "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Residential Development with Historic Building Preserved" ("OU(RDHBP)")

1. The Proposal

- 1.1 The applicant, owner of the Site, proposes to rezone the Site for a preservation-cum-development project for residential use and preservation of the Grade 1 historic building, i.e. the Maryknoll House building. According to the Notes of the OZP, 'House' and 'Flat' uses are column 2 uses within "G/IC" zone which require planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). However, according to Town Planning Board Guidelines

for Application for Development/Redevelopment within “G/IC” Zone for Uses other than GIC Uses under s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 16), a rezoning application is required if the proposed development is for predominantly non-GIC use.

- 1.2 The applicant has put forward 2 rezoning options: (i) Option A (preferred by the applicant) to rezone the Site to “R(C)2”, and (ii) Option B to rezone the Site to “OU(RDHBP)”. Both options have the similar development parameters, i.e. a BH of 3 storeys in addition to 1 storey of carport, GFA of 2,794.92m² in addition to the existing GFA of the Maryknoll House building and SC of 30%. Under Option A, ‘House’ and ‘Flat’ uses are column 1 uses within the proposed “R(C)2” zone. The Site is divided into two sub-areas, namely sub-area A for the Maryknoll House building and the slope on the eastern side, and sub-area B for the remaining portion of the Site, subject to a maximum BH of 75mPD (top-roof level) and 64mPD (excluding stairhood and landscape features) respectively together with 3 storeys in addition to 1 storey of carport (**Drawing Z-1**). Under Option B, ‘House’ and ‘Flat’ uses are column 2 uses which require planning permission from the Board within the “OU(RDHBP)” zone. Any addition, alteration and/or modification to the Maryknoll House building, except those minor alteration and/or modification works which are ancillary and directly related to the always permitted uses, requires planning permission from the Board. Development within the proposed “OU(RDHBP)” zone is proposed to be restricted to a maximum BH of 75mPD and 3 storeys in addition to 1 storey of carport (**Drawing Z-2**). The proposed amendments to the Notes of the OZP submitted by the applicant are shown at Appendix 7 of the supplementary planning statement (SPS) at **Appendix Ia**.
- 1.3 The applicant has also submitted a Conceptual Development Proposal (the Conceptual Proposal) to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed land uses and development parameters. The Conceptual Proposal comprises adaptive reuse of the Maryknoll House with a new 3-storey extension on the eastern side, a new basement carpark underneath the atrium garden and two new 3-storey houses over 1 storey of basement carpark at the southern platform (**Drawings Z-4 to Z-11**). A portion of the façade at the atrium, southern and eastern sides of the building will be demolished for the proposed ‘triple volume entrance’ and a new wing on the eastern side (**Drawings Z-13 and Z-14**). The existing garden and the slope at the southern side will be formed¹ for the development of the 2 additional residential blocks with the roof-top at 63.2mPD to avoid obstruction of Maryknoll House main building façade (**Drawing Z-10**). The Site is accessible via an existing access road from Stanley Village Road through the Stanley Knoll, which is a non-exclusive right-of-way under the assignment between owners of RBL 333 s.A and RBL 333 RP (**Plan Z-2**). The major development parameters of the Conceptual Proposal, in comparison with the existing development on site, are summarised as follows:

¹ According to the Conceptual Proposal, the proposed formation level of the lower platform is 51.7mPD.

	Existing Development ⁽¹⁾ (a)	The Conceptual Proposal ⁽⁷⁾ (b)	Differences (b) – (a) (%)
Site Area	About 7645.5m ²		-
Total GFA	3,210.952m ² ⁽²⁾	5,734.18m ²	+2523.228m ²
- The Maryknoll House Building	2,939.262m ²	2,939.26m ²	No change
- Existing Ancillary Building	271.690m ²	- (to be demolished)	- 271.690m ²
- Additional GFA	-	2,794.92m ²	+2,794.92m ²
PR	0.42	0.75	+0.33 (+79%)
SC	15.08%	30%	+14.92% (+99%)
BH	3 storeys (75mPD) ⁽³⁾	3 storeys ⁽⁴⁾ above 1 storey of carport (63.2 and 75mPD) ⁽⁵⁾	+ an additional storey of carport
No. of Block	1	3	+2
No. of Unit	N/A	8	N/A
Carparking Spaces	- ⁽⁶⁾	18	N/A
Motorcycle Parking Spaces	-	1	
Loading/Unloading Bay	-	1	

Notes:

- (1) Development parameters based on a set of building plan for alteration and addition works to the existing buildings approved by Building Authority (BA) on 12.9.2018 (the approved building plans).
- (2) According to the approved building plans, GFA of the existing development comprises 2,939.262m² for the Maryknoll House building with ancillary buildings of 271.690m² for a 2-storey dormitory, covered carport, porch and water pump.
- (3) According to the approved building plans, the existing flat roof of the Maryknoll House building is 75mPD, with the featured gables of 77.11mPD at its highest point.
- (4) According to the Conceptual Proposal, the proposed floor-to-floor height of the 3-storey extension on the eastern side ranges from 3.6m to 3.8m, the proposed floor-to-floor height of the new 4-storey houses at the southern platform is 3.5m to 4.5m.
- (5) Main roof level, not including the roof-top structures and existing gables above the Maryknoll House building.
- (6) There is no car parking grids at the existing covered carport.
- (7) According to the applicant, the Conceptual Proposal is prepared to illustrate the proposed amendment of the OZP and not submitted for approval.

- 1.4 The applicant proposes to implement a series of heritage conservation mitigation measures including preservation of the chapel and library at 1/F, the chapel undercroft at G/F and 2 staircases (**Plans Z-9 to Z-11**). The chapel and its undercroft will be designated as common area for ancillary clubhouse with exhibition displays of the history and heritage merits of the Maryknoll House to be erected. The library and a staircase will also be preserved to form part of the private mansion at the western side. The applicant also proposes to provide semi-annual guided tours open for the public and erection of exhibition display of the history and heritage merits of the Maryknoll House at the view point near Murray House. The proposed development will affect 144 out of 217 existing trees recorded at the Site; i.e. 117 trees in fair to poor conditions to be felled and 27 trees transplanted. The applicant proposes to plant 132 compensatory trees at a compensation ratio of approx. 1:1.12. A Preliminary Heritage Assessment (Pre-HA), Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), Landscape Proposal and Tree Assessment (LPTA), Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), Drainage and Sewerage Impact Assessment (DSIA), Preliminary Environmental Assessment (Pre-EA) and Geotechnical Planning Review Report (GPRR) are submitted to support the Conceptual Proposal (Appendices 4 to 6 of the SPS at **Appendix Ia**, and further informations (FIs) at **Appendices Ic, Id, Ig and Ih** refer).
- 1.5 In support of the application, the applicant has submitted the following documents:
- | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| (a) | Application form and letter received on 11.7.2018 | (Appendix I) |
| (b) | SPS | (Appendix Ia) |
| (c) | Supplementary information dated 18.7.2018 | (Appendix Ib) |
| (d) | FIs dated 14.9.2018 and 20.9.2018
<i>(accepted and not exempted from publication and
recounting requirement)</i> | (Appendix Ic) |
| (e) | FI dated 3.10.2018 (received 4.10.2018)
<i>(accepted and not exempted from publication and
recounting requirement)</i> | (Appendix Id) |
| (f) | FI dated 5.10.2018
<i>(accepted and exempted from publication and
recounting requirement)</i> | (Appendix Ie) |
| (g) | FI dated 19.10.2018
<i>(accepted and exempted from publication and
recounting requirement)</i> | (Appendix If) |
| (h) | FI dated 30.10.2018
<i>(accepted and exempted from publication and
recounting requirement)</i> | (Appendix Ig) |
| (i) | FIs dated 9.11.2018 and 13.11.2018
<i>(accepted and exempted from publication and
recounting requirement)</i> | (Appendix Ih) |
| (j) | FI dated 21.11.2018
<i>(accepted and exempted from publication and
recounting requirement)</i> | (Appendix Ii) |
| (k) | FI dated 12.12.2018
<i>(accepted and exempted from publication and
recounting requirement)</i> | (Appendix Ij) |

2. Justifications from the Applicant

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application are detailed in the SPS at **Appendix Ia** and FIs at **Appendices Ib** to **Ih**, and **Ij**. They are summarized as follows:

The Owner's Intention

- (a) the Maryknoll House is a Grade 1 building which should be preserved if possible; however, there is no statutory requirement for it to be preserved. The current owners of RBL 333 RP (the Owner) could demolish the building, but have investigated a practical and economic way to retain it. Given that the Government's heritage conservation policy provides economic incentives to 'protect, preserve and revitalize' privately owned buildings, the Owner's objective is to achieve the value as permitted under the lease through a high-value residential development;
- (b) the Owner purchased the Site for redevelopment for residential purposes as permitted by the lease and has no desire for 'G/IC' use at the Site;

Options for Development of the Site

- (c) the applicant has explored other alternative options for development, including demolition for redevelopment, non-in-situ land exchange and site expansion to include adjacent slopes. The applicant considers that the current option would retain the heritage building and provide the GFA originally permitted under the lease without the need for land exchange, lease modification or the payment of a land premium;

Proposal for Preservation and Adaptive Re-use of the Maryknoll House

- (d) the Maryknoll House has always been used as a residential building with ancillary facilities to serve the religious need of the previous owners. Conservation of the building into apartments would be an appropriate form of use and would be compatible with both the neighbouring residential development and the addition of new high quality residential development adjacent to the existing building;
- (e) the degree of 'economic incentive' that needs to be offered to justify the retention of the Site is the provision of a total PR of 0.75 for the new development together with the existing GFA of the Maryknoll House building. A SC of not more than 30% is required to achieve the design;
- (f) the applicant has conducted a Pre-HA and prepare the Conceptual Proposal which sensitively permits new development in conjunction with the conservation and revitalization of the Maryknoll House. The main heritage components identified in the Pre-HA have been respected, and the new development has been located in the least sensitive locations. The proposed 'triple volume entrance' which involves demolition of part of the façade is to enhance the space of the building in terms of lighting, ventilation, scenic views, circulation and social inclusion (**Drawings Z-13 and Z-14**). The Conceptual Proposal also offers public benefit by improving the views of the Maryknoll House from the waterfront, where the Owner proposes to erect an exhibition display for history and heritage merits of the Maryknoll House at a viewpoint near the Murray House, subject to consent from relevant government departments (**Drawing Z-24**). The Owner is also prepared to implement a system of semi-annual guided tours acceptable to the

future residents, allowing pre-registered members of the public legal access into the Site as the Owner's guests. Presently inaccessible by the public, the guided tours will provide a close-up experience of the ambience of the Maryknoll House and its heritage aspects, as well as access to certain common areas including part of the current chapel where the Owner also proposed to set up exhibition displays of the history and heritage merits of the Maryknoll House. Meanwhile, a Pre-HA, TIA, LPTA, VIA, DSIA, Pre-EA and GPRR are submitted to demonstrate no adverse impacts on the Conceptual Proposal;

Proposed Zoning Amendments

Zoning Option A – “R(C)2”

- (g) this zoning would best reflect the property rights of the applicant under the lease and is compatible with the zoning of the surrounding area. This option with BH restrictions would create the protection required for Maryknoll House while ensuring that any new standalone buildings are built below the platform level of the existing house, therefore would not create any visual impact for the views of the Maryknoll House from a long distance;

Zoning Option B – “OU(RDHBP)”

- (h) this zoning is related specifically to the preservation of Maryknoll House and the implementation of the new development within the Site. There are a limited number of uses which are included in Column 1 and permitted as of right under the existing “G/IC” zone. The applicant considers it is appropriate to permit these uses as of right under the new zone which are currently permitted under the “G/IC” zone;
- (i) an application for planning permission is required under s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) for any alteration to the Maryknoll House, or for the construction of flat(s) or house(s);
- (j) the applicant's preference is for Option A with the whole site rezoned to “R(C)2”. Option B is an alternative which also meets these intentions but is considered unnecessarily slow in terms of achieving development in a timely manner. Part of the economic incentive to be achieved is related to timely implementation;
- (k) the applicant noted CHO and AMO's comments on Options A and B. In response, the applicant acknowledges that Option B is subject to a s.16 application for alteration to the Maryknoll House building which would provide adequate control via the planning application process;

Responses to Public Comments

- (l) in response to the public comments received during the public inspection period, the applicant engaged a team of international experts in the field of conservation and adaptive reuse heritage architecture. The proposed design seeks to find the most appropriate way to balance a sensitive architectural project that carefully articulates the old with the new while preserving and enhancing the overall beauty, appeal and value of the Site for new users and the public alike. There are also media coverages that appreciate the heritage conservation merit of the proposal;

3. **Compliance with the “Owner’s Consent/Notification” Requirements**

The applicant is the sole “current land owner”. Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members’ inspection.

4. **Background**

- 4.1 The subject “G/IC” zone was shown on the OZP since the first draft Stanley OZP No. S/H19/1 gazetted on 27.5.1988. It is designated for ‘Institutional and Community’ use in the Stanley Outline Development Plan No. LH 19/21C adopted on 8.8.1962.
- 4.2 The Maryknoll House was built in 1935 and served as the headquarters of the Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers for their Chinese missionary work. The Site is governed by the Conditions of Sale No. 3114 for RBL 333, in which there is no restrictions on user, GFA, SC nor BH. In 1974, the Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers sold part of RBL 333 for private residential development which is subsequently registered as RBL 333 s.A. Both parties entered an assignment that RBL 333 RP would not erect more than 3 houses and RBL 333 s.A could erect the remaining 7 houses. It is also agreed that a right-of-way to be reserved for the user of RBL 333 RP leading from the main road crossing RBL 333 s.A. Subsequently, the owner of Lot RBL 333 s.A applied for lease modification and removed the house number restriction under the original lease, which is now known as the Stanley Knoll.
- 4.3 The Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) confirmed the Grade 1 status of the Maryknoll House building at its meeting held on 8.12.2016 for its architectural merit and authenticity (**Appendix III**). By definition, historic buildings accorded with Grade 1 status are buildings of outstanding merit, which every effort should be made to preserve if possible. The grading system is administrative in nature and will not affect the ownership, usage, management and development rights of the buildings that have been graded. It aims at providing an objective basis for determining the heritage value of historic buildings at the time of assessment which takes into account the six criteria, namely historic interest, architectural merit, group value, social value and local interest, authenticity and rarity.
- 4.4 As per the prevailing heritage conservation policy promulgated since 2007, the Government recognises the need for economic incentives in order to encourage and facilitate private owners to preserve historic buildings in their ownership. In implementing this policy, Commissioner for Heritage's Office (CHO) and Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) of the Development Bureau aim to strike a proper balance between preservation of historic buildings and respect for private property rights.
- 4.5 CHO and AMO have been exploring preservation-cum-development proposals for the Maryknoll House with the Owner since November 2016. The Owner originally preferred the redevelopment of the Site into a low-density development which involves demolition of the whole or large parts of the Maryknoll House building. After much persuasion following numerous rounds of discussion, the Owner agreed to preserve the entire Maryknoll

House building and to adopt a preservation-cum-development proposal in June 2018.

5. Previous Application

There is no previous rezoning request or application for OZP amendment for the Site.

6. Similar Application

There is no similar application for OZP amendment involving rezoning “G/IC” site for preservation-cum-development on the Stanley OZP.

7. The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans Z-1 to Z-2, aerial photo on Plan Z-3 and photos on Plans Z-4 to Z-8)

7.1 The Site is:

- (a) situated on a hilltop platform overlooking developments in the Stanley area. It is visually prominent from public viewpoints such as Stanley Ma Hang Park, Stanley Promenade and St. Stephen’s Beach;
- (b) comprised a 3-storey Grade 1 historic building which is currently vacant, i.e. the Maryknoll House building, with existing ancillary buildings for a 2-storey dormitory, covered carport, porch and water pump, and the adjoining open area;
- (c) to the south and east are natural hillslopes which are densely vegetated; and
- (d) accessible via an existing access road from Stanley Village Road through the Stanley Knoll leading to the Site.

7.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:

- (a) to the immediate north and east is a low-rise residential cluster, i.e. Stanley Knoll, Carmel Hill and Gordon Terrace, which is restricted for a maximum BH of 3 storeys in addition to 1 storey of carport, maximum PR of 0.75 and maximum SC of 25% under the “R(C)” zone. To the further east is the Stanley Main Beach;
- (b) to the southwest across Carmel Road is a bus terminus and the Stanley Plaza. The Ma Hang Estate, as well as Stanley Ma Hang Park, is situated to the further southwest restricted for a maximum BH of 12 storeys under the “R(A)3” zone; and
- (c) to the further southeast is the Stanley Market, Stanley Promenade and Stanley Bay which are popular tourist spots. Stanley Old Town is situated to the further southeast restricted for a maximum BH of 6 storeys under the “R(A)2” zone.

8. Planning Intention

- 8.1 The planning intention of the “G/IC” zone is primarily for the provision of GIC facilities to serve the needs of local residents and/or a wider district, region or the territory. It is also intended to provide land for uses directly related to or in support of the work of the Government, organization providing social services to meet community needs, and other institutional establishments.
- 8.2 According to the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP, the specific planning objectives of the Stanley area are:
- (a) to reinforce the existing attraction of Stanley as a residential, recreational and shopping area;
 - (b) to conserve the natural landscape, the existing character, historical buildings and temples in Stanley;
 - (c) to improve the living environment by providing public housing which had facilitated the squatter clearance in Ma Hang Valley (i.e. the existing Ma Hang Estate);
 - (d) to improve pedestrian and vehicular circulation; and
 - (e) to enhance the recreational potential of beaches and other unique sites.
- 8.3 It is the planning intention to keep the development in Stanley in a low-rise form in order to preserve the existing character.

9. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

- 9.1 The following government departments have been consulted and their views on the application and the public comments received are summarized as follows:

Land Administration

- 9.1.1 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West & South, Lands Department (DLO/HKW&S, LandsD):
- (a) from the Land Registry’s record, the RBL 333 has been carved out into RBL 333 s.A and RBL 333 RP by the Agreement of Sale and Purchase (ASP) dated 9.10.1974 and the subsequent Assignment (ASS) dated 17.10.1975, in which the number of houses entitlement under the Lease has been apportioned, subject to the parties on their own being able to obtain consent from the Government to increase the number of houses on the respective properties. However, the above apportionment on houses number is only a private agreement between the vendor and the purchaser of the above ASP/ASS. When the owner of RBL 333 RP submits any development proposal,

he has to demonstrate and put forward his arguments on the house number entitlement of RBL 333 RP under the lease for DLO's consideration along with the proposal;

- (b) under the lease, there is no provision relates to the technical concerns raised by the relevant departments, i.e. heritage conservation, water supply, noise, waste management and sewerage impact assessments;
- (c) details of the proposed development in the planning application has not been checked at this stage, and there is no implication that such development proposal is acceptable under the Lease even if the planning application is approved by the Board. Details of the proposed development will be checked under the Lease when the lot owner submitted building plans for consideration via centralized processing system; and
- (d) in view of the uncertainty of the necessity of lease modification, it is advised to enforce the planning conditions through TPO if the proposal is approved by the Board.

Heritage Conservation

9.1.2 Joint comments from the Commissioner for Heritage and Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments), AMO:

Rezoning Options

- (a) the Government recognises the need for economic incentives in order to encourage and facilitate private owners to preserve historic buildings in their ownership. As an incentive, it is considered justifiable to support the proposed development in exchange for the preservation of the Maryknoll House in-situ;
- (b) according to the proposed Option B, while retaining some 'G/IC' uses in the Column 1 uses, the applicant proposes residential uses (e.g. 'Flat' and 'Houses') to be listed in the Column 2 uses which require planning permission from the Board. This option highlights the heritage value and provides procedure/mechanism to manage and monitor future development/use which may affect the Maryknoll House. On the understanding that the Owner's intention is to redevelop the Maryknoll House for residential use, he render in-principle support to the proposed Option B to rezone the Site from "G/IC" to "OU(RDHBP)". In fact, when discussing the preservation-cum-development proposal with the Owner, he has indicated that he would only support the rezoning application under Option B. In other words, Option A is not supported;

Comments on the Proposed Conservation Treatment

- (c) according to the Conceptual Proposal, it is noted that the Maryknoll House will be preserved in-situ and revitalised for residential use. In general, the structural and architectural integrity of the Maryknoll House will remain intact. A new three-storey apartment wing will be constructed and attached to the east side of the Maryknoll House. This new apartment wing will have the same height of the Maryknoll House. Two new separate houses will be built at the southern sloping areas of the Maryknoll House. Their top level will not exceed the ground level of the Maryknoll House (excluding stairhoods/ landscape pavilion). It is also noticed that the applicant has proposed development controls on BH restrictions (i.e. 75 mPD and 3 domestic storeys over 1 storey of carport), maximum GFA of 5,734.18 m² (based on a PR of 0.75 for the whole lot, with reference to the relevant parameters of plots of land nearby), and SC of no more than 30% within the Site. In this regard, it is considered that the grand view of the Maryknoll House will not be affected;
- (d) among the proposed works associated with the Maryknoll House, the design of the proposed 'triple volume entrance' involves the removal of a section of the Maryknoll House from G/F to 2/F to make way for its new main entrance with a new lift shaft, in order to meet contemporary standards for the provision of barrier free access for the future users/visitors of greater scale with diverse needs. While the construction of this new main entrance will lead to a certain change to the visual and structural integrity of the façade as well as the architectural authenticity of the Maryknoll House, the distinctive green glazed tiled roofs would remain intact. The proposed new main entrance has the merit of enhancing the connectivity of the Maryknoll House for its transition from a cloistered monastic house to a modern residential mansion. In this way, the proposed new main entrance would serve as the circulation node connecting the new and the old, the interior and the exterior, the building and the people. He considers the current proposal has struck a proper balance between preservation of elements with heritage value and adaptive reuse of the building;
- (e) he welcomes the preservation of the two grand staircases and the chapel wing of the historic building. While the interior of the Maryknoll House has been renovated, altered and added with new construction over the years to meet the contemporary requirements, the pair of staircases and the chapel are basically intact and considered the most significant architectural features which ought to be preserved. The pair of staircases denotes the connectivity and circulation within the Maryknoll House; the chapel with its columns, vaulted ceiling and stained glass

exemplifies the eclectic style mixing East and West and reminds its previous evangelical use for congregation;

- (f) since the design of the proposed residential development is still conceptual at this stage, the owner would need to substantiate that the Maryknoll House would not be subjected to adverse visual impacts arising from the proposed residential development when the detailed design is available (i.e. during s.16 planning application submission under the rezoning Option B);
- (g) the Maryknoll House has never been open to the public since it was built in 1935. The Owner of the Maryknoll House now proposes to arrange half-yearly guided tours acceptable to future residents, allowing the public to visit the common facilities of the Maryknoll House, including part of the original chapel. The Owner also proposes to erect an exhibition display showing the historic merits of the Maryknoll House at a viewpoint near the Murray House for public appreciation. These two proposals could revitalise the social connectivity between the historic building and the community;
- (h) having said that, in anticipation of the proposed extensive renovation, addition and/or alteration works to be conducted at the Maryknoll House, a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) should be devised and implemented by the applicant for proper management of the Maryknoll House in transition to its new use. The CMP should at least cover the following aspects and be submitted to the satisfaction of AMO prior to the commencement of any proposed works to the Maryknoll House:
 - (i) identification of the Character Defining Elements of both exterior and interior of the Maryknoll House and their current conditions;
 - (ii) outline of the conservation approach of the development project;
 - (iii) documentation of the Maryknoll House with photographic recording, cartographic recording and 3D scanning prior to the commencement of any works;
 - (iv) documentation of the proposed works to the Maryknoll House;
 - (v) evaluation of the impacts of the proposed renovation and alteration works on the Maryknoll House;
 - (vi) provision of protective measures for the Maryknoll House throughout the project period; and
 - (vii) recommendations of mitigation measures for the Maryknoll House to manage changes arising from the proposed redevelopment;

Preservation-cum-development Options

- (i) in formulating the appropriate economic incentives, factors to be taken into account generally include the heritage value of the historic building concerned, the development potential and value of the site where the building is located, the space provided by the Site from the planning perspective, the wish of the owner, the land and financial implications on the Government, as well as the anticipated public reaction. In general, options which involve realising development potential within the site would first be examined for preservation of historic buildings to make up for the loss of development rights of the private owners. Then, options which involve transferring development rights to another site under the ownership of the same owner would be explored. It is not until those options which are found infeasible/undesirable that non-in-situ land exchange proposals would be considered;
- (j) Taking into account the above, 4 options for preservation of Maryknoll House were proposed in the applicant's submission, namely i). base case without preservation of the Maryknoll House, ii). non-in-situ land exchange; iii). expanded site to include gardens; and iv). development within existing site boundary, it is indicated in the applicant's submission that the last Option (i.e. development within the existing site boundary) is the preferred option. Other options such as non-in-situ land exchange are therefore not considered further;

Consultation with AAB

- (k) Since the proposed redevelopment scheme for the Maryknoll House is privately funded and is not a capital works project, it is not necessary for the owner to consult AAB on its conservation plan under the existing mechanism. Notwithstanding, at the invitation of the AAB Chairman at the meeting held on 6.9.2018, AAB members were briefed on the background and details of the preservation-cum-development proposal for the Maryknoll House. Specially, AAB members noted that under the present redevelopment proposal, the most important components of the Maryknoll House, i.e. the exterior walls and façade, as well as the chapel, would largely be preserved, and the proposal involves a rezoning application which is subject to the Board's approval;

Public Comments

- (l) CHO and AMO welcome the information shared by public and the applicant which enriches the understanding of the historical and cultural background of the inception of the Maryknoll House and, above all, the appreciation of this Grade 1 historic building, its unique as-built conditions as well as its rich

heritage values;

- (m) in general, we welcome preservation-cum-development proposals which are commensurate with the heritage value of Maryknoll House. While the applicant's proposal will lead to a certain change to the façade of the Maryknoll House, the structural and architectural integrity of the Maryknoll House will generally remain intact. The grand view of the Maryknoll House will not be affected. In anticipation of the proposed extensive renovation, addition and/or alteration works to be conducted at the Maryknoll House, the applicant should devise and implement a CMP to properly manage the changes of uses and conservation of the Maryknoll House; and
- (n) it is understood that the redevelopment scheme is still in its conceptual stage. Further information, such as as-built drawings featuring the existing layout of the Maryknoll House, plans illustrating the extents of alterations/ changes and the treatment to the Character Defining Elements at the interior/ exterior of the Maryknoll House, will be provided in the detailed design stage, to facilitate further understanding and comments in future departmental circulations/ referrals of relevant applications.

Urban Design and Visual

9.1.3 Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD):

- (a) the proposal is to rezone the subject "G/IC" site to "R(C)2" (Option A) or "OU(RDHBP)" (Option B) to facilitate development of two 4-storey houses, as well as adaptive re-use of the Maryknoll House, a Grade 1 historic building, with erection of an extension wing for five apartments and a mansion, and demolition of part of the Maryknoll House for creation of a main entrance/lobby;
- (b) the applicant's proposal with an overall intention to preserve the subject historic building generally tallies with the urban design considerations for heritage preservation as stated in section 6.2(6) of the Urban Design Guidelines to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). The overall scale of the new extension wing and the two houses in terms of BH and building mass are considered to have respected the heritage feature, and is not incompatible with the landscape setting. Nevertheless, demolishing part of the House for creation of a main entrance would change the building externally and may affect the overall heritage value of the Maryknoll House given the symmetrical architectural style. AMO's comment is relevant in this regard;
- (c) the proposed PR restriction of 0.75 is generally in line with the

prevailing PR restriction of the nearby “R(C)” zones. As for the proposed BH restriction (3 storeys over 1 storey of carport and maximum BH of 75mPD for Area A and 64mPD for Area B), the restriction in number of storeys is generally in line with the prevailing BH restriction for “R(C)” zone while the proposed BH of 75mPD and 64mPD are not incompatible with the House and surrounding developments. In this regard, a stepped height profile is considered more appropriate for this site from urban design and visual perspectives; and

Visual Impact Assessment

- (d) with considerations to the provisions of the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41, the applicant has submitted a VIA in support of the proposal. It is noted that there are discrepancies between the layout and photomontages as the Maryknoll House should largely be shielded from view by the two new houses of 63.2mPD when viewed VPs at a lower level (VPs 3 and 4), and partially obstructed when viewed from VPs 10 and 11, rather than the current view presented on the photomontages with the Maryknoll House exposing to view. It is considered that the claim in the visual assessment that the proposal would open up views to the heritage building for public appreciation and enhancing the landscape value of the building may be overstated.

9.1.4 Comments of the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department (CA/CMD2, ArchSD):

- (a) no comment from architectural and visual impact point of view; and
- (b) based on the information provided, the proposed scheme is considered effectively blend in with the old building and surrounding natural context harmoniously in terms of character and scale.

Tree Preservation and Landscape

9.1.5 Comments of CTP/UD&L, PlanD:

- (a) no objection to the rezoning application from the landscape planning perspective; and
- (b) according to the response from the applicant, it is noted that all the comments on landscape design will be addressed in the detailed design for the proposed development especially if it is subject to planning application under the proposed “OU(RDHBP)” zone.

9.1.6 Comments of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS):

no specific comment since there is no tree or Old & Valuable Tree under the purview of HKW Tree Team of Leisure and Cultural Services Department will be affected.

9.1.7 Comments of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC):

- (a) no major comment on this application; and
- (b) it is noted that 144 nos. of trees in fair to poor conditions are proposed to be felled/transplanted by the proposed development in “G/IC” zone. From tree preservation point of view, the impact to the existing trees should be minimized as far as practicable. It is also noted that the trees to be affected by the proposed development are mainly common species and compensatory planting will be provided.

Traffic

9.1.8 Comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T):

- (a) no comment on the application; and
- (b) updates on the TIA is required at a later stage should the layout of the proposed scheme be altered.

Environment

9.1.9 Comments of the Director of Environment Protection (DEP):

- (a) there is no insurmountable environmental problem as a result of the proposed development is anticipated. As such, he has no objection to the proposed development from environmental planning perspective;
- (b) notwithstanding the above, on the contrary of the conclusion in the noise impact assessment (**Appendix Ic**) submitted by the applicant, based on preliminary assessment, the proposed development of the indicative scheme would be subject to adverse road traffic noise impact exceeding the relevant noise standards in HKPSG (i.e. >70dB(A)) without proper measures in place. Besides, while the proposed development would involve soil excavation works at the existing slopes for construction of platform, the FI is silent on C&D materials management issue; and
- (c) since the proposed development would be always permitted under “R(C)” zone and no separate planning permission is required, the above mentioned road traffic noise and waste management issues should be duly addressed in this planning application stage if the applicant opts for Option A (i.e. “R(C)”). Nonetheless, in the event the applicant opts for Option B,

the road traffic noise and waste management issues could be addressed in the separate s.16 planning application in the later stage.

Drainage and Sewerage

9.1.10 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department (CE/HKI, DSD):

- (a) no comment on the DSIA from the drainage point of view; and
- (b) for development controlled under the Buildings Ordinance (BO), drainage connection plans and details should be incorporated into drainage plans, and submitted together with the supporting hydraulic calculations to the Building Authority (BA) for approval.

Building Aspect

9.1.11 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong East and Heritage Unit, Buildings Department (CBS/HKE&H, BD):

- (a) no objection to the application;
- (b) the applicant is required to demonstrate the means of access from Stanley Village Road has been duly provided to the subject lot and that the width of the access road all along from Stanley Village Road to the subject lot is not less than 4.5m wide, with reference to Regulations 5 and 18A of the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R). In the meanwhile, he reserves his comments on the proposed development parameters under Regulations 19, 20 and 21 of B(P)R;
- (c) the subject lot may be considered a Class A site if the lot owner has an unfettered right of way to pass or re-pass the abovementioned access road which is not less than 4.5m wide all along with reference to Regulation 18A(3)(a)(iv) of B(P)R;
- (d) it is prudent for PlanD to consider if the PR/SC/GFA are reasonably claimed by the applicant, in particular whether the proposed car ramp is excessively long and that the carpark located at a specially low level is convincing. According to the BO, the permissible PR and SC for a Class A site with BH not exceeding 15m is 3.3 and 66.6% (for domestic buildings)/ 5 and 100% (for non-domestic buildings), which are much greater than the development intensity for "R(C)" zone on the OZP. Furthermore, according to PNAP APP-2, above-ground car parks with no adverse environmental impact (such as PR<1) may be disregarded from GFA calculation;
- (e) the 'triple volume entrance' and the voids above it under the existing roof are accountable for GFA calculation under the

BO unless they are exempted;

- (f) according to B(P)R 24, every room used or intended to be used for the purpose for habitation in any building shall have a height of not less than 2.5m measured from floor to ceiling, provided that there shall be not less than 2.3m measured from the floor to the underside of any beam. However, an excessively high headroom or excessive storey height may arouse GFA concern under the BO, unless they are exempted; and
- (g) detailed comments on compliance with the BO would be given upon formal building plans submission. Subject to your acceptance of the design and position of the carpark, the AP may provide justifications for PR/SC exemption in plan submission stage for consideration by BA.

Fire Safety

9.1.12 Comments of the Director of Fire Services (D of FS):

- (a) no in-principle objection to the application subject to fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of D of FS. EVA arrangement shall comply with Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 administered by BD; and
- (b) detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans.

Geotechnical Aspect

9.1.13 Comments of the Head of the Geotechnical Engineering Office (H(GEO), CEDD):

- (a) no adverse geotechnical comment on the FI and the GPRR submitted by the applicant; and
- (b) the submission of a revised GPRR in support of the planning application is required if the layout of the proposed scheme is altered.

Public Utilities

9.1.14 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD):

- (a) no objection to the application based on the Conceptual Proposal of 8 no. of residential units/houses at the Site; and
- (b) if the future development is going to deviate from the Conceptual Proposal, the applicant is required to provide

further details for WSD's assessment.

9.1.15 Comments of the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services:

- (a) no particular comment on the application from electricity supply safety aspect; and
- (b) in the interests of public safety and ensuring the continuity of electricity supply, the parties concerned with planning designing, organizing and supervising any activity near the underground cable or overhead line under the mentioned application should approach the electricity supplier (i.e. HKE) for the requisition of cable plans (and overhead line alignment drawings, where applicable) to find out whether there is any underground cable and/or overhead line within and/or in the vicinity of the Site. They should also be reminded to observe the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation and the "Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines" established under the Regulation when carrying out works in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines.

District Officer's Comments

9.1.16 Comments of the District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department (DO(S), HAD):

- (a) no comment on the application; and
- (b) did not receive any comment from the public during the public inspection period.

9.2 The following government bureau/departments have no comments on the application:

- (a) Secretary for Education;
- (b) Chief Highways Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department;
- (c) Commissioner of Police;
- (d) Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene;
- (e) Director of Health; and
- (f) Director of Social Welfare.

10. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period

10.1 On 20.7.2018, the application was published for public inspection. During the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, which ended on 10.8.2018, 252 public comments were received. On 28.9.2018 and 19.10.2018, FIs were published for public inspection. During the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection periods ended on 19.10.2018 and 9.11.2018, 5 and 9 public comments were received respectively (**Appendix II**).

10.2 Out of the total 266 public comments received, 16 of them supported the

application, 220 of them objected to the application and 30 provided general comments. Objecting comments are from Southern District East Area Committees, Save Hong Kong Heritages and Central Concern Group, the Conservancy Association, Heritage Footprints, Hong Kong South Concern Group, Super Bloom Development Limited, Million Profit Asia Group Limited and Amy and Hugo Profit International Holdings Limited as well as members of the general public. The views of the public comments are summarized as follows:

Supporting Views (16)

- (a) the proposed development retains local culture and building characteristics. It gives a sharp contrast to the historic building which is a trend to bring new life to heritage building. The developer's intention to preserve the historic building is appreciated;
- (b) support to rezone the Site to "OU(RDHBP)" in which the redevelopment scheme will be subject to the Board's approval and public consideration. The proposed "OU(RDHBP)" zone must include a planning intention to preserve the public views and the main façades of the Maryknoll House, and exclude further relaxation on PR and BH restrictions. The SC should be restricted to 25% to tally with the surrounding "R(C)" sites, with a provision of minor relaxation based on individual design merits;
- (c) the proposal can benefit the community by allowing the public to visit the Maryknoll House;
- (d) the proposed development utilizes land resources and helps relieving housing shortage in Hong Kong. It could further enhance the property price of the area;

Objecting Views (220)/General Comments (30)

Proposed Land Uses

- (e) there are inadequate G/IC facilities in the Stanley area. The Maryknoll House was used for religious institution and had never been occupied for residential use. The Site should be retained for 'G/IC' uses, for instance, reserve for Christian groups for retreats, a museum to exhibit religious development in Hong Kong, a place for homeless people, a school or a market;
- (f) the proposal is merely a development for private luxury houses, instead of the claimed intention for heritage conservation. The approval of the rezoning application will set an undesirable precedent on changing the use of "G/IC" sites. Land ownership is not a relevant consideration on the suitability of land uses other than 'G/IC' uses at "G/IC" sites;
- (g) it is suggested to develop public housing on the Site to cater the prevailing demand of public housing in Hong Kong. Some suggested to adaptive reuse the Maryknoll House into a private luxury heritage hotel as a tourism attraction;

- (h) there has been increasing public concern and scrutiny of the rezoning and land sale of previous “G/IC” sites by church groups to property developer;

Heritage Conservation

- (i) the Government should review the historical status of the Maryknoll House before considering the rezoning application;
- (j) the Government should pursue non-in-situ land exchange for the Maryknoll House making reference with the King Yin Lei and to include the Site under the Development Bureau’s Revitalizing Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme. CHO and AMO should step up their duties to ensure the buildings is both preserved and used for appropriate purpose;
- (k) the AAB should declare the Maryknoll House as temporary Declared Monument, and liaise with the community and the Owner on the preservation proposal to utilize local resources for cultural tourism;

The Conceptual Proposal

- (l) the proposed development fails to take into account the architectural, historical and social values of the Maryknoll House. It should be preserved as a whole without any damage or alteration. A Heritage Assessment should be conducted;
- (m) the Maryknoll House is a Chinese-style syncretism architecture with symmetrical design. The proposed alteration on the exterior will affect the integrity, authenticity and symmetrical design of the building. The applicant should also consider to preserve significant internal spaces and fabrics;
- (n) to preserve the exterior façade at the eastern side of Maryknoll House, it is suggested to further relax BH of House 2 to accommodate the proposed GFA of the extension block. Also, it is suggested to relax the overall SC restriction to allow design flexibility for an extension wing at the eastern side to be entirely separated from Maryknoll House;

Proposed Conservation Measures

- (o) the Maryknoll House should be open for public visit;
- (p) the proposed number of public tours is not sufficient. There is a great chance that the Maryknoll House will ultimately be converted to a private clubhouse. It is also worried that the guided tour would generate nuisance to the surrounding residents and receive complaints, which may hinder the implementation of the proposed conservation plan;
- (q) erection of exhibition display at the Murry House cannot compensate the damages to the Maryknoll House;

Technical Concerns

- (r) there are concerns on whether the existing road network has any spare capacity for construction vehicles and additional trip generated by the

proposed development, in particular, Stanley Village Road and Cape Road. Road widening works or other traffic mitigation measures should be considered to meet future traffic demand in Stanley;

- (s) there is structural safety concern arisen from the construction of basement carpark at the atrium and alteration to the main building. It is doubted that whether the proposed development could fulfil the current buildings requirements; and
- (t) the proposed development may induce noise nuisance and air pollution to the surrounding residential neighbourhood. The original greenery and the environment will be ruined.

11. Planning Considerations and Assessment

11.1 The Site is occupied by an existing 3-storey building, i.e. the Maryknoll House building, which is a Grade 1 historic building built in 1935. The application is to rezone the Site from “G/IC” to either “R(C)2” (Option A) or “OU(RDHBP)” (Option B) to facilitate a preservation-cum-development residential project. The proposed development involves adaptive reuse of the Maryknoll House with a new apartment wing and 2 separated houses to its south. According to the Conceptual Proposal submitted by the applicant, most of the exterior façade of the Maryknoll House building will be retained, whilst a portion of the façade at the atrium, southern and eastern sides of the building will be demolished for the proposed ‘triple volume entrance’ and a new wing on the eastern side. A stepped BHs of 75mPD for the new wing and 63.2mPD for the 2 new houses on a separated platform are adopted to preserve the grand view of the main façade of the Maryknoll House building. The two grand staircases, the chapel wing and library of the Maryknoll House will also be repaired and retained. The applicant has also submitted various technical assessments including Pre-HA, TIA, LPTA, VIA, DSIA, Pre-EA and GPRR to demonstrate that the Conceptual Proposal is technically feasible.

Heritage Conservation

- 11.2 According to the heritage conservation policy, the Government recognizes the need for economic incentives in order to encourage and facilitate private owners to preserve historic buildings under their ownership. Since November 2016, CHO has been exploring various development options with the Owner to conserve the Maryknoll House building. Taken into consideration of the proposed use and development parameters, CHO considers it is justifiable to support the proposed development in exchange for the preservation of the Grade 1 historic building in-situ as an economic incentive, and policy support is given on the proposed project.
- 11.3 While the construction of ‘triple volume entrance’ will lead to a certain change to the visual and structural integrity of the façade as well as the architectural authenticity of the Maryknoll House, AMO considers that the distinctive green glazed tiled roofs would remain intact. The proposed new main entrance has the merit of enhancing the connectivity of the Maryknoll House for its transition from a cloistered monastic house to a modern residential mansion.

In this way, the proposed new main entrance would serve as the circulation node connecting the new and the old, the interior and the exterior, the building and the people. Hence, it has struck a proper balance between preservation of elements with heritage value and adaptive re-use of the building, and that the grand view of the Maryknoll House will not be affected. CA/CMD2 of ArchSD also considers the proposed development effectively blend in with the old building and surrounding natural context harmoniously in terms of character and scale.

- 11.4 The applicant proposes to conduct semi-annual guided tours open for the public and erection of exhibition display on the history and heritage merits of the Maryknoll House at the public view point near Murray House, subject to consents obtained by relevant departments. AMO considers these measures could revitalize the social connectivity between the historic building and the community. In this regard, the applicant should submit and implement a CMP prior the commencement of the development to properly manage the change of uses and conservation of the Maryknoll House.

Land Use Compatibility and Development Intensity

- 11.5 The proposed residential development will have a PR of 0.75, BH of 3 domestic storeys in addition to 1 storey of carport and a SC of 30%. It is considered not incompatible with the surrounding residential neighbourhood, which is predominantly low-rise residential developments under “R(C)” zone with PR restriction of 0.75, SC of 25% and BH of 3 domestic storeys in addition to 1 storey of carport. It is also in line with the overall planning intention to keep the developments in Stanley in a low-rise setting in order to preserve the existing character. CTP/UD&L of PlanD also considers that the proposed PR and BH is generally in line with the prevailing PR and BH restrictions of the nearby “R(C)” zone.
- 11.6 Taking into account paragraphs 11.2 to 11.5 above, the proposed development intensity of PR of 0.75 and BH of 3 domestic storeys is regarded as an appropriate balance of the relevant planning considerations and conservation of the private-owned historic building.

Provision of G/IC Facilities

- 11.7 The “G/IC” zoning of the Site is to reflect the use of ‘Religious Institution’ for the headquarters of the Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers. However, the ownership of Maryknoll House has changed since 2016 and the current Owner has no intention to continue the ‘G/IC’ use at the Site. Concerned departments, upon consultation, have also not raised any request to retain the Site for ‘G/IC’ use nor to resume the Site for G/IC development. Besides, there is sufficient G/IC provision in the Stanley area and the Southern District in accordance with the HKPSG (**Appendix IV**). Whilst the “G/IC” zone at the Site no longer reflects the changed planning circumstances and current character of the Site, the proposed rezoning to facilitate the preservation-cum-development project would not jeopardize the provision of G/IC facilities in the Stanley area.

Other Technical Considerations

11.8 While relevant government departments including DEP, C for T, CTP/UD&L of PlanD, CE/C of WSD and H(GEO) of CEDD have no objection to or no adverse comment on the application, there are technical concerns such as road traffic noise, waste management, traffic, landscape, water supplies and geotechnical aspects that would need to be further addressed at the implementation stage.

Planning Mechanism and Development Control

11.9 The applicant has put forward 2 options of zoning amendments to implement the proposed development.

Option A -

11.10 Option A proposes to rezone the Site to “R(C)2” zone, which is the preferred option of the applicant, allows the Owner to redevelop the Site without the need for planning permission from the Board. There is no provision under the applicant’s proposal to ensure the preservation of the Maryknoll House building, which is a Grade 1 historic building. According to DLO/HKW&S, there is also no provision under the lease for the submission and implementation of a CMP as required by AMO, as well as further submissions to address any relevant technical concerns as mentioned in paragraph 11.8 above. CHO does not support Option A. It is considered that the proposed “R(C)2” zoning would not provide adequate enforceable mechanism to ensure the in-situ preservation of the Maryknoll House building and to monitor the implementation of the proposed preservation-cum-development project. Hence, Option A is considered not acceptable.

Option B -

11.11 Option B has set out the planning intention of the “OU(RDHBP)” for ‘preservation of the Maryknoll House building for residential development’. Except some proposed ‘G/IC’ uses under column 1 uses which are always permitted, planning permission from the Board is required for ‘Flat’ and ‘House’ uses, as well as any addition, alteration and/or modification to the Maryknoll House. The Board can therefore further examine the revised layout of the proposed preservation-cum-development project through the planning application system and impose suitable approval condition(s) to require the applicant to submit and implement a CMP and relevant technical assessments as mentioned in paragraphs 11.4 and 11.8 above respectively. CHO has rendered in-principle policy support to Option B.

Public Comments

11.12 There are 16 supportive and 220 opposing public comments together with 30 providing comments. As for the adverse public comments, the applicant’s responses at **Appendices Ic** and **Ii**, departmental comments in paragraph 9.1 above, and the planning assessment in paragraphs 11.2 to 11.11 above are relevant.

12. Planning Department's Views

- 12.1 Based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 and having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 10 above, PlanD has no objection to Option B under the application with respect to the proposed rezoning of the Maryknoll House to a specific "OU" zoning to preserve the Grade 1 Historic Building. Option A is not supported for the following reasons:
- (a) the proposed "R(C)2" zoning does not provide sufficient planning control to achieve the planning intention for preservation of the Maryknoll House building and for monitoring the implementation of the proposed preservation-cum-development project; and
 - (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate how the technical concerns on the proposed residential development could be addressed at the implementation stage.
- 12.2 Should the Committee decide to agree or partially agree to the subject application, the relevant proposed amendments to the approved Stanley OZP No. S/H19/12 would be submitted to the Committee for agreement prior to gazetting under section 5 of the Ordinance.
- 12.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide not to agree to the proposed amendments, the following reasons are suggested for Members' reference:
- (a) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not undermine the heritage value of the existing historical building within the Site.
 - (b) the development intensity of the proposed development is considered excessive having regard to the setting of the Site with the presence of an existing historic building.

13. Decision Sought

- 13.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to agree, partially agree, or not to agree to the application.
- 13.2 Should the Committee decide not to agree or partially agree to the application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for the decision should be given to the applicant.

Attachments

- Appendix I** - Application form and letter received on 11.7.2018
- Appendix Ia** - SPS
- Appendix Ib** - Supplementary information dated 18.7.2018
- Appendix Ic** - FIs dated 14.9.2018 and 20.9.2018
- Appendix Id** - FI dated 3.10.2018

Appendix Ie	- FI dated 5.10.2018
Appendix If	- FI dated 19.10.2018
Appendix Ig	- FI dated 30.10.2018
Appendix Ih	- FIs dated 9.11.2018 and 13.11.2018
Appendix Ii	- FI dated 21.11.2018
Appendix Ij	- FI dated 12.12.2018
Appendix II	- Public comments received
Appendix III	- Historic Building Appraisal for the Maryknoll House prepared by AMO
Appendix IV	- G/IC provision in the Stanley area and the Southern District
Drawing Z-1	- Proposed amendment for “R(C)2” zone under Option A
Drawing Z-2	- Proposed amendment for “OU(RDHBP)” zone under Option B
Drawings Z-3 to Z-9	- Layout Plans for the Conceptual Proposal
Drawings Z-10 and Z-11	- Section Plans for the Conceptual Proposal
Drawing Z-12	- Landscape Plan for the Conceptual Proposal
Drawings Z-13 and Z-14	- Photomontages for the Conceptual Proposal
Drawings Z-15 to Z-20	- Drawings extracted from VIA submitted by the applicant
Drawings Z-21 to Z-23	- Heritage Items Conserved Plan submitted by the applicant
Drawing Z-24	- Location Plan for the Proposed Exhibition Display near Murray House
Plan Z-1	- Location plan
Plan Z-2	- Site plan
Plan Z-3	- Aerial photo
Plans Z-4 to Z-11	- Site photos

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
JANUARY 2019**