

**TPB Paper No. 10530
For Consideration by the
Town Planning Board on 29.3.2019**

**REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/H3/436
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**PROPOSED OFFICE, SHOP AND SERVICES AND EATING PLACE
IN “RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)9” ZONE
AT 36 GAGE STREET, SHEUNG WAN, HONG KONG**

REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/H3/436
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

**Proposed Office, Shop and Services and Eating Place
in “Residential (Group A)9” Zone
at 36 Gage Street, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong
(Inland Lot (IL) 62 S.B ss.2)**

1. Background

- 1.1 On 2.3.2018, the applicant, Sheen Honour Limited represented by Llewelyn Davies Hong Kong Ltd., sought planning permission under s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) to develop a 21-storey (120mPD at main roof) office development with shop and services/eating place on G/F to 2/F at 36 Gage Street, Sheung Wan (the Site). At that time, the Site was zoned “Residential (Group A)9” (“R(A)9”) on the approved Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H3/31 and subject to a maximum building height of 120mPD. The zoning and development restrictions remain unchanged on the current OZP No. S/H3/32 (**Plan R-1**).
- 1.2 On 21.9.2018, the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board decided to reject the application for the following reasons:
- (a) the proposed office development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group A)9” (“R(A)9”) zone which is for high-density residential developments. The approval of the application would result in a reduction of housing supply;
 - (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the site is not conducive to residential development; and
 - (c) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the same “R(A)9” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would aggravate the shortfall in the supply of housing land.
- 1.3 The table below sets out the main development parameters and floor uses of the proposed development.

Site Area	88.1 m ² (about)
Non-domestic Plot Ratio (PR)	Not more than 15
Total non-domestic GFA	Not more than 1,321.5 m ²
- Office	- about 1,110 m ²
- Shop and Services/Eating Place	- about 211.5 m ²

No. of Blocks	1
Building Height (BH)	Not more than 120mPD at main roof
No. of Storeys	Not more than 21
Site Coverage (SC) below 15m	Not more than 85%
Building Setback	More than 1 m from the lot boundary
Parking Spaces and Loading/Unloading (L/UL) Facilities	Nil
Major Uses by floor:	
G/F to 2/F	Shop and Services/Eating Place
3/F	Mechanical Floor
4/F to 21/F	Office

1.4 For Members' reference, the following documents are attached:

- (a) MPC Paper No. A/H3/436A (Annex A)
- (b) Extract of minutes of the MPC meeting held on 21.9.2018 (Annex B)
- (c) Secretary of the Town Planning Board's letter dated 5.10.2018 (Annex C)

2. Application for Review

2.1 On 19.10.2018, the applicant applied, under s.17(1) of the Ordinance, for a review of the MPC's decision to reject the application (Annex D). In support of the review, the applicant submitted a letter dated 3.1.2019 including written representation and a notional residential development scheme (Annex E).

3. Justifications from the Applicant

3.1 In support of the review application, the applicant provided justifications in response to the Board's decision. They can be summarised as follows:

Optimising the Development Potential and Land Supply for different Land Uses

- (a) approval of the application will help increase of the office floor space supply and fully utilise the permissible development potential of the Site;
- (b) the applicant's proposal will address the demand for commercial floor spaces in the Central Business District for small and medium enterprises, and similar commercial developments are also found in the vicinity;
- (c) while the residential population of Central & Western District is decreasing from 2006 to 2016, the number of housing stock in the district was increasing in the same period;
- (d) the proposed development is technically acceptable as no adverse departmental comment has been received, and it meets all the main planning criteria set out in the Town Planning Board Guideline No. 5 for Application for Office

Development in Residential (Group A) Zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPG-PG No. 5);

The Site is not conducive to residential development

- (e) according to the applicant's notional residential scheme (**Drawings R10 to R-12**), only 9 duplex-floor flats of about 17m² can be provided when all the technical requirements on the permissible plot ratio and site coverage, means of escape, and separation distance between bathroom door and kitchen bench are to be met;
- (f) the small flat size as shown in the notional residential scheme has demonstrated the Site is not conducive to residential development. Approval of the application will only have negligible impact on the residential housing supply;

Precedent of similar applications

- (g) the current application share the same merits as similar applications No. A/H3/402 and A/H3/432 (same site) that were approved by the Board, including the proposed development is compatible with the mixed-use developments in the vicinity of SOHO area, it would not generate adverse traffic impact, it is well served by public transport, the proposed commercial use does not conflict with the lease conditions except for offensive trade clause, the site is under single ownership and the timely implementation of the developments is guaranteed, and the provision of building setback would improve the traffic and pedestrian environment;
- (h) additional merits of the proposed development include optimising the development potential of the Site by increasing the development intensity and providing impetus for revitalising deteriorating building and the local environment; and
- (i) the proposed office development is technically feasible and acceptable by all relevant departments.

4. The Section 16 Application

The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans R-2, R-3, and R-5 to R-8)

4.1 The characteristics of the Site and its surrounding area at the time of the consideration of the s.16 application by MPC are described in paragraph 8 of **Annex A**. There has been no material change of the characteristics since then.

Planning Intention

4.2 There has been no change of the planning intention of the "R(A)9" zone, which is mentioned in paragraph 9 of **Annex A**.

Town Planning Board Guidelines

- 4.3 Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Office Development in “R(A)” Zone (TPB PG-No. 5), which is relevant to the consideration of the s.16 application, is still valid. The relevant assessment criteria of the Guidelines are set out at paragraph 5 of **Annex A**.

Previous and Similar Applications

- 4.4 There is no previous application in respect of the Site. The similar applications at the time of the consideration of the s.16 application are mentioned in paragraph 7 of **Annex A**. Since then, there has been 1 additional similar s.17 review application (No. A/H3/438) which was rejected by the Board on 11.1.2019.

5. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

- 5.1 Comments on the s.16 application made by relevant government departments are stated in paragraph 10.1 of **Annex A**.
- 5.2 For the review application, the following government departments have been further consulted and their views together with their previous comments on the s.16 application are summarised below:

Land Administration

- 5.2.1 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South, Lands Department (DLO/HKW&S, LandsD):
- (a) the lease governing the lot is subject to restrictions including non-offensive trades clause. It is noted that ‘eating places’ are proposed within the proposed development. For any building or any part or parts thereof to be used for the purpose of ‘eating places’, an application for licence to remove several offensive trades from the non-offensive trades clause is required;
 - (b) the current proposal does not conflict with the lease conditions governing the Site save and except for the aforesaid non-offensive trade restriction, and so, if the application is approved by the Board, the applicant is not required to seek lease modification from LandsD to implement it except for the aforesaid offensive trade licence. Therefore, any planning conditions, if imposed by the Board, cannot be written into the lease through lease modification;
 - (c) there is no lease requirement imposed on the lot owner to provide a public passageway within the Site to connect Pak Tsz Lane and Gage Street. We therefore have no comment on the proposed re-provisioning of the existing passage within the Site; and
 - (d) it is noted that a Grade 1 Historic Building, i.e. Pak Tsz Lane, Sheung Wan Hong Kong (Serial No. N24), is situated within the Site.

Traffic Aspect

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

- (a) no comment on the nil provision of parking spaces for the proposed development in view of the site constraints and the justification provided by the applicant;
- (b) as residential development is already permitted at the Site, it is considered that the proposed office use will not generate significant adverse traffic impact; and
- (c) a pedestrian passageway together with a staircase connecting Pak Tsz Lane Park with a clear width not less than the existing provision should be maintained. This requirement should be specified as an approval condition.

Building Aspect

5.2.3 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department (CBS/HKW, BD):

- (a) detailed assessment on the proposal could only be made at formal submissions stage; and
- (b) given the limited information provided in the application document, BD reserves their comment on the following:
 - (i) determination of site areas, including the inclusion of existing right of way into the site area, for the purpose of PR and SC calculations under Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) 20 & 21;
 - (ii) building over the right of way, to which the Buildings Ordinance s.31(1) is applicable;
 - (iii) compliance with Practice Note for Authorised Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-151 and APP-152 in case of application(s) for the related GFA concessions and/or modification for SC under PNAP APP-132;
 - (iv) the major façade served by the Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA) being less than one-fourth of the total length of all the perimeter walls of the building, to which B(P)R 41(D) is application; and
 - (v) the Means of Escape/ Means of Access arrangement.

Sewerage Aspect

5.2.4 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department (CE/HK&I, DSD):

- (a) it is noted from Table 1 that the design flow for office is 80 litre/employee/day. In order to ensure that the sewerage system under planning will be sustainable, 280 litre/employee/day (i.e. the sum of the unit flow factor of employee and the unit flow of commercial activities under general – territorial average) shall be used unless otherwise justified. Please review; and
- (b) the SIA for the development needs to meet the full satisfaction of the Sewerage Infrastructure Group of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD), the planning authority of sewerage infrastructure. DSD's comments on the SIA are subject to views and agreement of EPD.

Environmental Aspect

5.2.5 Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP):

- (a) as office developments are normally provided with centralized air conditioning system, the applicant/Authorized Persons should be able to select a proper location for fresh-air intake at the detailed design stage to avoid exposing future occupants from unacceptable environmental nuisances/impact; and
- (b) should the Board approve this application, approval conditions requiring the applicant to submit a SIA to the satisfaction of DEP or of the Board; and to implement the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the SIA to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Board are recommended to be included in the planning permission.

Fire Safety Aspect

5.2.6 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;
- (b) detailed fire services requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans; and
- (c) as no details of EVA has been provided, comments could not be offered at the present stage. Nevertheless, the applicant is advised to observe the requirements of EVA as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Building 2011 which is administrated by BD.

Urban Design & Visual Aspect

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

it is noted that the proposed BH of 120mPD at main roof level is within the prevailing BH restriction on the OZP. The proposal also meets the setback requirement as stated in the Remarks of the “R(A)9” zone of the OZP.

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

- (a) no comment from visual impact point of view; and
- (b) it is noted that the proposed use, development massing and intensity may not be incompatible with the adjacent developments.

Architectural Aspect

5.2.9 Comments of CA/CMD2, ArchSD:

- (a) in order to have the same basis of comparison against the proposed office development, the applicant is advised to prepare the plans and section for the notional residential scheme with permitted SC based on Appendix A of PNAP APP-132 instead of based on First Schedule of CAP 123F B(P)R. The applicant is also advised to prepare summary tables showing the ratio of Usable Floor Area (UFA) vs Construction Floor Area (CFA) for each floor for both notional residential scheme and office development scheme to compare the UFA efficiency; and
- (b) as shown in the section of the notional residential scheme, it is noted that the area of E/M rooms and transformer room are much larger than mechanical floor area as indicated in the section of the office developments scheme. The applicant is advised to clarify this discrepancy.

Landscape Aspect

5.2.10 Comments of CTP/UD&L, PlanD:

- (a) the proposed development is considered not incompatible with the urban landscape character since medium to high-rise developments are common in the vicinity;
- (b) there is no existing significant landscape resources within the Site, and adverse landscape impact due to the proposed development is not anticipated;
- (c) there is no landscape/greening treatments for the proposed development. The applicant should explore and maximise the

provision of greening to improve the landscape and visual amenity in this application as far as practical; and

- (d) the applicant is recommended to improve the walking environment at street level and the passage connecting to No. 1-2 Pak Tsz Lane.

Heritage Aspect

5.2.11 Comments of the Commissioner for Heritage (CHO) and the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO), Development Bureau (DEVB)

- (a) no comment on the proposed development as the applicant has committed to do the following:
 - (i) re-provide a free right of way to Pak Tsz Lane taking into account the concerns of AMO;
 - (ii) preserve the setting of the entrance passage at No. 36 Gage Street (the Passageway) to Pak Tsz Lane;
 - (iii) fully respect the character of the Passageway, including but not limited to its width, height, location and alignment within the lot;
 - (iv) preserve as far as possible the flight of steps within the Passageway leading to Pak Tsz Lane;
 - (v) not to disturb the integrity of the flight of steps and related structures of Pak Tsz Lane outside the Site; and
 - (vi) to replace the existing plastic plaque with a new plaque with material and style of the English lettering and Chinese characters matching the early 20th century signage design;
- (b) for better preservation of Pak Tsz Lane, the building plans for the project should be submitted to AMO for comments;
- (c) prior to the commencement of any works, the applicant should be required to provide photographic and cartographic records of the existing Passageway to Pak Tsz Lane to AMO for record purpose; and
- (d) AMO should be allowed to conduct 3D scanning of the existing Passageway before commencement of any works.

Others

5.2.12 Comments of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH):

no objection to the application provided that the proposed development will not impede the operation of the Gage Street Refuse Collection Point at all times.

5.2.13 Comments of the Commissioner for Tourism (C for Tourism):

the Tourism Commission, in collaboration with LCSD and Central & Western District Council (C&WDC), is taking forward the revitalisation of Dr Sun Yat-sen Historical Trail project as a major initiative for developing cultural and heritage tourism. The revitalised Trail, featuring 16 newly created artworks along the historic spots of the Trail was launched on 26.4.2018 and will become a new tourism attraction to entice visitors looking for in-depth tourist experience in Hong Kong. Two of the new artworks of the revitalised Trail will be located in the Pak Tsz Lane Park which is adjacent to the Site. The applicant/developer should ensure that the construction works as well as the new building would not form any obstruction to visitors' access to the artworks and have any adverse impact on the environment adjacent to the artworks.

5.2.14 The following departments have no objection to/no comment on the application:

- (a) Project Manager (South), Civil Engineering and Development Department;
- (b) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department ;
- (c) Chief Highway Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department ;
- (d) Chief Engineer/Development (2), Water Supplies Department;
- (e) Senior Inspector of Road Management Office (Traffic Hong Kong Island), Hong Kong Police Force;
- (f) District Operations Officer (Central District), Hong Kong Police Force; and
- (g) District Officer (Central and Western), Home Affairs Department

6. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period

6.1 During the statutory publication period of the review application (ended on 23.11.2018) and the FI (ended on 1.2.2019), a total of 4 opposing comments were received (**Annex F**) from a C&WDC member, the Chairman of the Owners' Incorporation of a residential building nearby (submitted 2 comments), and from a member of the public. The main grounds of objection can be summarised as follows:

- (a) the proposed development would adversely affect the historical setting and ambience of the area and in particular the historical entrance to Pak Tsz Lane from 36 Gage Street;
- (b) the proposed office development is incompatible with the adjacent residential neighbourhood and the restaurants proposed within the development will induce more competition to the existing shops in the vicinity;
- (c) the Site is too small for office development;
- (d) the Site should be retained for residential use in view of the acute demand for housing;

- (e) the Site is located on a slope so that future employees of the proposed office would have to walk uphill. It is inconvenient for the employees and for the disabled; and
- (f) Gage Street is a single-lane carriageway which is already very congested during daytime. The proposed development would bring additional traffic to the existing road network and cause adverse traffic impacts.

7. Planning Considerations and Assessment

- 7.1 The applicant proposes to redevelop the existing 5-storey residential building at the Site into a 21-storey office building with eating place and shop and services on the lowest three floors. The applicant also proposes to re-provide the existing Passageway in association with Pak Tsz Lane within the Site. The proposed BH of the development is 120mPD which is within the BH restriction of the OZP and a setback of more than 1m from the lot boundary fronting Gage Street has been proposed to meet the requirement stipulated on the OZP.
- 7.2 The subject application is for a review of the MPC's decision on 21.9.2018 to reject the s.16 application. The rejection reasons are mainly that the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the "R(A)9" zone for high-density residential developments; the applicant fails to demonstrate the Site is not conducive to residential development; and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the same "R(A)9" zone aggravating the shortfall in supply of housing land.
- 7.3 The applicant has submitted written representation to support the review application, mainly responding to the MPC's rejection reasons by providing a notional residential scheme and making reference to a similar application (A/H3/432) which was approved with conditions by the MPC on 7.4.2017.
- 7.4 Since the consideration of the s.16 application by MPC on 21.9.2018, there has been no material change in planning circumstances of the case. While the applicant has provided responses to the MPC's rejection reasons, the planning considerations and assessments set out in paragraph 12 of **Annex A** should remain largely valid and hence there is no new planning consideration to those submitted to and considered by the MPC resulting in its decision to reject the application.

Planning Intention and Land Use Compatibility

- 7.5 The Site is zoned "R(A)9" which is intended primarily for high-density residential development with commercial uses always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building or in the purpose-designed non-residential portion of an existing building. In general, sites should be developed in accordance with the planning intention of the zoning as shown on the OZP unless strong justifications have been provided for a departure from such planning intention.
- 7.6 The immediate neighbourhood of the Site bound by Gage Street, Peel Street, Hollywood Road and Aberdeen Street is predominantly for residential developments

with shops and restaurants on ground floor. The area across Gage Street to the north-east of the Site is an area of mixed-use developments including the planned residential development at Site A of URA Development Scheme of Peel Street/Graham Street. Although the proposed office development with shop and services/eating places on the lowest four floors is considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments, it is not fully in line with the planning intention of the “R(A)9” zone. Should there be a departure from the planning intention, it should be with strong justifications.

Optimising the Development Potential

- 7.7 While the applicant’s claim that there is a need for increasing office floor space which is also part of government land supply policy, it should be noted that the proposed office development does not comply entirely with assessment criterion (a) of the TPG PG-No.5 (paragraph 5 of **Annex A**), as the Site cannot be considered as sufficiently large to achieve a properly designed office. The Site has an area of only 88.1m². With the need to provide a setback fronting Gage Street, a lift shaft, staircases and other utilities, the effective area per floor available for office, shop and services/eating place uses would be relatively small (ranged from 18m² to 32m²).
- 7.8 The applicant has submitted a notional residential scheme to demonstrate that such a development at the Site is ineffective and undesirable due to the small size of the Site, resulting in a very small flat size (i.e. 17m²). As advised by ArchSD, however, the comparison between the notional residential scheme and the proposed office development is not made on the same basis. Besides, while the redevelopment of the Site on its own may not be the most optimal option for redevelopment, the possibility of amalgamating the adjacent sites at 28 – 34 Gage Street (which are low-rise residential developments built in the 1960s and 1970s) should be explored to achieve a better design. Approval of the subject application will set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area resulting in cumulative loss of residential land.

Similar Applications (No. A/H3/402 and A/H3/432)

- 7.9 Reference is made by the applicant to two similar applications for commercial/office developments with shops on lower floors (A/H3/402 and A/H3/432) which were approved previously by the Board, as the applicant claimed that the current application shares the same merits of these applications. It should be noted that the two applications, involving the same application site at 2-4 Shelley Street, have their unique background and planning context in that the application site was surrounded on 3 sides by existing commercial buildings, and planning permission for A/H3/402 was granted in 2012 before the policy to address the pressing need for housing had been in place. Given the differences in site context and planning history, the Board may review the current application on its own merits and is not bound by the decision in respect of Application No. A/H3/402 and A/H3/432.

Public Comments

- 7.10 There are public comments opposing the review application on various grounds including causing adverse impact on the historical setting and ambience of the area and the grade-1 historical entrance to Pak Tsz Lane, land use incompatibility, small site area, acute demand for housing, inaccessibility of Site and adverse traffic impact

caused. For the public comments, the assessment in paragraphs 7.5 to 7.9 above and the comments of the relevant government departments in paragraph 5 are relevant.

8. Planning Department's Views

- 8.1 Based on the assessment made in paragraph 7 above and having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 6, given that there has been no change in the planning circumstances since the consideration of the subject application by MPC on 21.9.2018, PlanD maintains its previous view of not supporting the application for the following reasons:
- (a) the proposed office development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group A)9” (“R(A)9”) zone which is for high-density residential developments. The applicant has not demonstrated that there are sufficient justifications to deviate from the planning intention of the “R(A)” zone; and
 - (b) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the same “R(A)9” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would aggravate the shortfall in the supply of housing land.
- 8.2 Alternatively, should the Board decide to approve the application on review, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 29.3.2023, and after the said date, the permission shall cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted is commenced or the permission is renewed. The following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are suggested for Members’ reference:

Approval Conditions

- (a) the reprovision of a pedestrian passageway together with a staircase connecting to Pak Tsz Lane Park at the existing location with a clear width not less than that of the existing passageway to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission of proposal for the reprovisioned entrance passage at No. 36 Gage Street to Pak Tsz Lane (which runs through the Site) to the satisfaction of the Antiquities and Monuments Office or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the provision of photographic and cartographic records of the existing passage at No. 36 Gage Street to Pak Tsz Lane to the satisfaction of the Antiquities and Monuments Office or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (e) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works as identified in the SIA to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board; and

- (f) the provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board;

Advisory Clauses

- (a) to apply to LandsD for licence to remove the non-offensive trades;
- (b) to note the comments of CBS/HKW, BD regarding the compliance of the proposed development with the Buildings Ordinance and practice notes;
- (c) to note the comments of D of FS regarding the requirements of EVA as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Building 2011;
- (d) to note the comments of CTP/UD&L, PlanD regarding the provision of greening;
- (e) to note the comments of AMO regarding the submission of building plans for AMO's comments; allowing AMO to conduct 3D scanning of the existing entrance passage at No. 36 Gage Street to Pak Tsz Lane before commencement of any works;
- (f) to note the comments of DFEH regarding the proposed development should not impede the operation of the Gage Street Refuse Collection Point; and
- (g) to note the comments of C for Tourism regarding the artworks to be placed along the revitalised Dr Sun Yat-sen Historical Trail.

9. Decision Sought

- 9.1 The Board is invited to consider the application for a review of the MPC's decision and decide whether to accede to the application.
- 9.2 Should the Board decide to reject the application on review, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicant.
- 9.3 Alternatively, should the Board decide to approve the application on review, Members are invited to consider the approval condition(s) and advisory clause(s), if any, to be attached to the permission.

Attachments

Drawings R-1 to R-9	Floor plans and section plan of proposed office development
Drawings R-10 to R-12	Notional Residential Scheme
Plan R-1	Location Plan
Plan R-2	Site Plan
Plan R-3	Site Plan for Pak Tsz Lane (Grade 1 Historic Structure)
Plan R-4	Location Plan on previous OZPs
Plans R-5 to R-8	Site Photos

Annex A	MPC Paper No. A/H3/436A
Annex B	Extract of minutes of the MPC meeting held on 21.9.2018
Annex C	Secretary of the Board's letter dated 5.10.2018
Annex D	Applicant's letter dated 19.10.2018 applying for a review of MPC's decision
Annex E	Applicant's letter dated 3.1.2019 including written representation
Annex F	Public Comments on the review application

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
MARCH 2019**