

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO  
THE DRAFT CAUSEWAY BAY OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H6/15  
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD  
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

**I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan**

- Item A – Revision of the building height restrictions for the “Commercial” (“C”), “Commercial(1)” (“C(1)”), “Commercial(2)” (“C(2)”) and “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Mixed Use” zones from 100mPD, 110mPD or 130mPD to 135mPD, except for the sites bounded by Lee Garden Road, Hysan Avenue, Yun Ping Road, Kai Chiu Road, Jardine’s Crescent, Jardine’s Bazaar and Hennessy Road.
- Item B1 – Revision of the building height restriction of the north-eastern part of the “C(2)” site covering Lee Garden One at 33 Hysan Avenue from 32mPD to 200mPD.
- Item B2 – Deletion of the requirement for a 2m wide non-building area along Yun Ping Road from the north-eastern part of the “C(2)” site covering Lee Garden One at 33 Hysan Avenue and stipulation of building height restriction of 200mPD for that part of the site.
- Item C1 – Revision of the building height restriction of the “C” site covering Lee Garden Two at 28 Yun Ping Road from 20mPD and 130mPD to 135mPD.
- Item C2 – Deletion of the requirement for a 2m wide non-building area along Yun Ping Road from the “C” site covering Lee Garden Two at 28 Yun Ping Road and stipulation of building height restriction of 135mPD for that part of the site.
- Item D – Revision of the building height restriction for the “Residential (Group A)1” (“R(A)1”) sites generally bounded by Tung Lo Wan Road, Wun Sha Street, King Street and Tai Hang Road from 85mPD to 100mPD.
- Item E1 – Adjustment of the width of the non-building area requirements on the northern and southern sides of Sugar Street from 2m and 4m respectively to 1.5m by deleting parts of the non-building areas and stipulating building height restriction of 135mPD for the areas concerned.
- Item E2 – Deletion of the non-building area requirements to the south of Lockhart Road and on the two sides of Great George Street and stipulation of building height restriction of 135mPD for the areas concerned.
- Item E3 – Deletion of the building gap requirement between 280 and 281 Gloucester Road.

- Item F – Stipulation of building height restriction of 200mPD for a 5m wide strip of land along the lot boundary of Hysan Place fronting Lee Garden Road.

The proposed road/tunnel reserve for the Central Wan-Chai Bypass and the railway reserve for the Shatin to Central Link are included on the Plan for information.

**II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan**

- (a) Deletion of the Remarks of the Notes for “C” zone requiring the provision of non-building area along Yun Ping Road.
- (b) Deletion of the Remarks of the Notes under “C(1)” zone requiring the provision of building gap between 280 and 281 Gloucester Road.
- (c) In relation to Amendment Item E3 on the Plan, and paragraphs (a) and (b) above, corresponding revision to the minor relaxation clause in the Remarks of the Notes for the “C” zone.
- (d) Revisions to the exemption clause on maximum gross floor area/maximum plot ratio in the Remarks of the Notes for the “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”), “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) and “OU” annotated “Residential Development with Historical Site Preserved In-situ” zones to clarify that exemption of caretaker’s quarters and recreational facilities are only applicable to those facilities for the use and benefit of all the owners or occupiers of the domestic building or domestic part of the building.

Town Planning Board

26 January 2018

EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF 1156<sup>th</sup> TPB HELD ON 17.11.2017

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Draft Causeway Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H6/15  
(TPB Paper No. 10340)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese]

68. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments were formulated upon review of the draft Causeway Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H6/15 in order to give effect to the Court's orders in respect of two judicial reviews (JRs) lodged by Hysan Development Co. Ltd (Hysan) and its subsidiaries (together, Hysan Group Companies) and by Excelsior Hotel (BVI) Limited (Excelsior) respectively. The following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in the Causeway Bay area; and/or having affiliation/business dealings with Hysan, the affiliated companies of Excelsior including the

Jardines Group Companies (Jardines), Hongkong Land (HKL) and Mandarin Oriental, and/or Designing Hong Kong Limited (DHKL), i.e. commenter on Hysan and Excelsior's representations in respect of draft OZP No. S/H6/15:

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn<br>(Chairperson) | - | co-owning with spouse a self-occupying flat and a carparking space at Broadwood Road   |
| Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong                       | - | being an ex-employee of Maxim's Group Companies, a subsidiary company of Jardines, and self-occupying a flat at Illumination Terrace, Tai Hang |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung                      | - | being an ex-employee of Jardines   |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho                        | - | having current business dealings with Hysan and HKL, and personally knowing the co-founder and Chief Executive Officer of DHKL                 |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu                          | - | having current business dealings with HKL  |
| Mr K.K. Cheung                           | ] | their firm having current business dealings  |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai                         | ] | with Jardines, HKL and Mandarin Oriental   |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu                      | - | had past business dealings with Hysan and HKL  |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam                      | - | spouse owning a flat at Caroline Hill Road   |
| Dr Lawrence K.C. Li                      | - | co-owning with spouse a flat at 1 Tai Hang Road  |
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai                       | - | spouse owning a flat in Chun Fai Terrace, Tai Hang   |

- Mr Franklin Yu - owning a unit at Stubbs Road, Wan Chai
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - his office was in Causeway Bay
- Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - close relative owning a flat in The Beverly Hill  
(*CE (Works), HAD*)
- Mr Edwin W.K. Chan - close relative owning a flat in Causeway Bay  
(*AD (R3), LandsD*)
- Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo - self-occupying a flat at Tai Hang Road  
(*Secretary*)

69. Members noted that Dr Lawrence K.C. Li, Mr H.F. Leung, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting. Members also noted that Professor S.C. Wong, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan had already left the meeting.

70. As the properties of the Chairperson, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, Mr Franklin Yu, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr Edwin W.K. Chan, and the Secretary had no direct view on the sites subject to/would not be affected by the proposed amendments, the meeting agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

71. The Secretary reported that on 16.11.2017, two letters were received from the legal representative of Hysan Group Companies and Excelsior. Both Hysan and Excelsior requested that the Town Planning Board (the Board) should be informed of their consent to the Board proposing amendments to the draft Causeway Bay OZP No. S/H6/15 with subsequent hearing of representations as a way to give effect to the Court's judgments. Hysan and Excelsior indicated that they might address the proposed amendments and make any proposals for further amendments in written representations to be made within the statutory publication period after the amended draft OZP was gazetted.

72. The Secretary also drew Members' attention to a letter received from Ms Clarisse Yeung, a member of the Wan Chai District Council, which was tabled at the meeting. Ms Yeung expressed concern on the potential adverse traffic and air ventilation impacts brought about by the proposed amendments to the OZP. The meeting noted that upon publication of the amended draft OZP, members of the public could submit representation in respect of the draft OZP in accordance with the provisions of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO).

Presentation and Question Sessions

73. The following government representatives and consultant were invited to the meeting at this point:

*Government's representatives*

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

Mr C.K. Soh - Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape (CTP/UD&L), PlanD

Ms Irene W.S. Lai - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong 2 (STP/HK2), PlanD

Transport Department (TD)

Mr Eddy K.K. Wu - Senior Engineer/Wan Chai (SE/Wa), TD

*Consultant*

Mr Derek Ho - Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Consultant

74. The Chairperson invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the Paper.

75. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, and Mr

C.K. Soh, CTP/UD&L, PlanD briefed Members on the proposed amendments, including their background, the general implications of the Sustainable Building Design Guideline (SBDG) on building profile, the building height (BH) concept on the current OZP, the proposed BH restrictions (BHRs), findings of AVA (Expert Evaluation), footpath widening, visual consideration and government's responses to Hysan and Excelsior's original representations as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10340 (the Paper)

[Mr Philip S.L. Kan left the meeting during the presentation of DPO/HK and CTP/UD&L, PlanD.]

76. As the presentation of PlanD's representatives was completed, the Chairperson then invited questions and comments from Members.

#### Court's Ruling

77. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the Court required that in imposing the development restrictions, the permitted plot ratio (PR) or gross floor area (GFA) under the OZP or the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) should not be adversely affected; and
- (b) apart from SBDG, whether other government requirements/restrictions which might affect the development intensity of individual sites would need to be taken into account in formulating the development restrictions on the OZP.

78. In response to Members' questions, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK made the following main points:

- (a) according to the Court's judgment, in determining the development restrictions on the OZP, the implications of SBDG on the development intensity should be generally taken into consideration. The Court did not hold that the permissible development intensity of concerned sites under the

B(P)R could not be adversely affected upon imposition of the development restrictions;

- (b) the Court held that in determining the development restrictions, it was not open for the Board to rely on the minor relaxation mechanism as one of the considerations and a substantive reason for rejecting the representations; and
- (c) it was the general approach in the plan making process that the permitted PR/GFA under the OZP, B(P)R and/or the lease would be taken into account in formulating the BHRs.

79. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Director of Planning (D of Plan), supplemented that the Court held that it was within the power of the Board to impose development restrictions such as BHRs, non-building area (NBA), building gap (BG) and setback requirements on the OZP. The proposed amendments were premised upon a review of the development restrictions in response to the Court's ruling that the SBDG was a relevant consideration in formulating the restrictions, and on the basis of revised assumptions. Although the Board was not required to ensure that landowners' property right would not be adversely affected by the development restrictions, any such doing should be supported with planning justifications and carefully considered by the Board. The Chairperson remarked that Members should consider whether the proposed relaxation of BHRs to take into account SBDG requirements was acceptable in terms of planning and urban design considerations.

#### Proposed BHRs

80. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) apart from the Causeway Bay OZP, whether amendments to other OZPs to assess the implications of SBDG would be required;
- (b) what the major assumptions and considerations were in deriving the revised BHRs;



- (c) whether the implications of SBDG on individual buildings on the OZP had been assessed; and
- (d) whether the BHRs of 135mPD for the commercial and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” (“OU(MU)”) sites was barely sufficient to accommodate the maximum development intensity under the B(P)R or with ample allowance after taking into account SBDG and the revised assumptions.

81. In response to Members’ questions, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, and Mr C.K. Soh, CTP/UD&L made the following main points with the aid of PowerPoint slides:

- (a) to follow up on the Court’s orders, a review of development restrictions including the BHRs and NBA/BG requirements had been conducted for all commercial, “OU(MU)” and “Residential (Group A)1” (“R(A)1”) sites on the OZP taking into account the implications of SBDG and the permissible development intensity on a general level;
- (b) pursuant to the Court’s order in respect of Hysan’s JR, apart from the Causeway Bay OZP, the Wan Chai OZP would also be reviewed. PlanD would progressively review the other OZPs with BHRs and NBA/BG requirements which were subject to JR;
- (c) for the Causeway Bay OZP, the BHRs for the concerned sites had been reviewed based on a set of development parameters and up-to-date assumptions including site levels, types of building, permissible PR and SC under the B(P)R for respective site classification, GFA concessions, podium height, floor-to-floor height, provision of carpark at basement level and refuge floor requirement. It was revealed that, in general, the minimum BHs of 135mPD and 100mPD would be sufficient to accommodate the permissible PR/GFA under the B(P)R for sites implementing SBDG requirements on building setback and building separation within the commercial/“OU(MU)” and “R(A)” sites respectively; and

- (d) for Class A sites classified under the B(P)R, the estimated BH requirement for a typical commercial building with implementation of SBDG requirements based on the updated assumptions was about 130m. Taking into account the existing site level (mainly around 5mPD), a BH of 135mPD would be barely adequate to accommodate the maximum development intensity permissible for Class A site. As for commercial buildings on Class B and Class C sites, it was estimated that BHs of 131mPD and 127mPD would be sufficient. As such, with the proposed BH of 135mPD for commercial and "OU(MU)" sites, it would generally be adequate to accommodate the development intensity permissible under B(P)R for all commercial buildings while some sites might have marginally more design flexibility owing to different site classification.

82. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, D of Plan, supplemented that under the review, the effectiveness of the existing NBA and BG requirements on the OZP in air ventilation terms had also been re-assessed. It was recommended in the updated AVA that NBA and BG requirements should be imposed at suitable locations to ensure that a minimum 15m-wide gap would be provided to connect and facilitate airflow along major air paths with district importance such as Great George Street and Sugar Street, while those NBA and BG requirements that would mainly benefit the local wind environment could be deleted as their functions were similar to those of the building setback and building separation measures advocated under SBDG.

#### Application of SBDG

83. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether the proposed BHRs would be applicable to those sites/buildings not intending to claim GFA concessions under SBDG;
  - (b) what planning benefits would be brought about by relaxing the BHRs and adopting SBDG measures; and
  - (c) whether the proposed relaxation of BHRs would encourage more buildings

to adopt SBDG measures.

84. In response to Members' questions, Mr C.K. Soh made the following main points with the aid of PowerPoint slides and a three-dimensional computer model:

- (a) the proposed BHRs would be applicable to all sites within the respective land use zones and there was no pre-requisite requirement for compliance with SBDG. Nevertheless, it was noted that out of the average approval of some two hundreds building plans each year for new buildings, more than a hundred private projects were registered under the Building Environmental Assessment Method (BEAM) Plus programme of the Hong Kong Green Building Council (HKGBC), which was one of the pre-requisites for claiming GFA concessions for green/amenity features and non-mandatory/non-essential plant rooms and services under SBDG (APP-151 and APP-152). Thus, it was estimated that about half of the new private building developments would follow the SBDG;
- (b) in general, residential developments and larger scale commercial developments were more eager to obtain such GFA concessions (e.g. residential recreational facilities, balcony for residential buildings, and high headroom/void in non-domestic developments) whilst small-scale commercial developments had relatively less incentive. Moreover, the SBDG requirements would be included as appropriate in the lease conditions of new land sale sites or lease modification/land exchange;
- (c) as ascertained in the updated AVA, in an area like Causeway Bay where buildings were tall and streets narrow, it was difficult for wind to penetrate from roof to street. BH alone would no longer be the key factor affecting pedestrian wind environment. Building design measures to reduce ground coverage and create building permeability at low level as advocated in SBDG, and effective air paths (e.g. street network) to facilitate airflow from prevailing wind directions as designated on the OZP were more important considerations. On issue of building bulk, it should be noted that in general, only two additional upper floors would be required to

accommodate the GFA displaced from lower floors for implementation of SBDG. There was an overall cap of 10% for GFA concessions for green/amenity features and non-mandatory/ non-essential plant rooms and services, and only car park located at the underground would have all its GFA be disregarded; and

- (d) the proposed relaxation in BHRs would allow sufficient flexibility for incorporation of various good building design measures in future developments to improve the overall built environment particularly at the pedestrian level. Implementation of SBDG measures would facilitate reduction in ground coverage and creation of building permeability to enhance spatial openness and visual amenity, promote air movement, and enable provision of greenery. A good example was illustrated by the Lee Garden One development which had widened the fronting Hysan Avenue for tree planting and pedestrian movement among others. Given time and the concerted effort of the Government, HKGBC and the business, it was anticipated that the general pedestrian and built environments would be improved in the long run when the number of new buildings following SBDG increased gradually, which was considered desirable from the urban design point of view.

#### Visual Impact

85. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the ridgeline behind Causeway Bay was required to be preserved;
- (b) whether there were buildings protruding into the ridgeline with reference to the photomontages (Plan H-7a and H-7b); and
- (c) what the implications of the proposed increase in BHRs were on the stepped BH concept.

86. In response to Members' questions, Mr Louis K.H. Kau and Mr C.K. Soh made

the following main points with the aid of PowerPoint slides and a three-dimensional computer model:

- (a) in order to preserve views to ridgelines/peaks and mountain backdrop with recognised importance around Victoria Harbour, a 20% building free zone below the ridgelines would need to be maintained when viewing from key vantage points. Hung Hom Promenade (shown in Plan H-7a) was not one of the key vantage points as identified in the Urban Design Guidelines. As shown in the photomontage (Plan H-7b) prepared based on the vantage point from Tsim Sha Tsui (Hong Kong Cultural Complex), the proposed BHR relaxation would not affect the views to the ridgelines to be preserved nor protrude into the 20% building free zone. While the proposed BHR relaxation might reduce the visual openness and slightly affect the original stepped BH concept, the overall BH profile under the relaxed BHRs was not incompatible with the surrounding visual context;
- (b) the building blocks rendered in brown colour on the photomontages were those buildings with general building plans approved prior to the imposition of BHRs on the OZP. Although lower BHRs for those sites had subsequently been imposed on the OZP, those buildings were regarded as committed developments on the photomontages;
- (c) as the BHRs for the commercial and "OU(MU)" sites along the coastal area were proposed to be increased to 135mPD, if a stepped height profile was to be maintained, the BHRs in the inland area might have to be relaxed to at least 155mPD. Such increase in BHR was considered unnecessary as the resultant stepped height effect would not be obvious nor facilitate air ventilation at street level. For the "R(A)1" sites in Tai Hang area, the original stepped height profile with four tiers would become three tiers which was considered acceptable from the urban design perspective;
- (d) under the current proposal, when increasing the BHRs for the "C" and "OU(MU)" zones from 100/110/130mPD to 135mPD, the variation in the stepped height profile under previous BH control would inevitably be

reduced. In return, it would allow design flexibility for future redevelopments in meeting SBDG which would improve the overall building permeability and visual amenity of the pedestrian environment. The proposed BHRs could be seen as a trade-off amongst different urban design considerations in such a dense urban core as Causeway Bay. In overall terms, the proposed BHR relaxation would not result in unacceptable visual impact; and

- (e) the built environment in Hong Kong had not been shaped by BHRs alone. It was dynamic and comprised of developments different in size, height, configuration; development scale, architectural styles and façade treatment completed in different periods of time. These varieties had constituted and contributed to the current interesting skyline and attractive image of the city.

#### Setback Requirements

87. A Member asked whether there would be any setback requirement proposed for Hennessy Road with a view to relieving the congested pedestrian environment. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that on the extant draft Causeway Bay OZP, setback requirements had been stipulated for various areas where there was a need to improve pedestrian circulation and walking environment. In addition, other measures, including the designation of pedestrian zones in Pak Sha Road and East Point Road during weekends, had been implemented for improving the pedestrian environment in Causeway Bay. Mr Eddy K.K. Wu, SE/Wa, TD supplemented that in determining the setback requirements for achieving a minimum 3.5m wide footway in "C" zones, considerations including the recommendations set out in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, pedestrian circulation and walking environment, street activities as well as scarcity of land resources were also taken into account. Though additional setback requirements at Hennessy Road had not been included in the draft OZP, the feasibility of utilisation of underground space and development of subway system was being explored by relevant departments with a view to improving the pedestrian environment at the street level.

Publication of Proposed Amendments

88. A Member enquired about the subsequent procedure if the proposed amendments to the draft OZP were agreed or not agreed by the Board. Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that if the amended draft OZP was agreed by the Board, it would be published under section 7 of the TPO, members of the public could submit representations and comments in respect of the proposed amendments, and the Board could consider whether to propose further amendments to the draft OZP upon consideration of the representations and comments. The Chairperson added that if the Board decided not to publish the amended draft OZP at the current stage, subject to the views and comments of Members at the meeting, PlanD would re-examine the proposed amendments with a view to addressing Members' comments and make a resubmission to the Board for consideration.

[Mr Patrick H.T. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

89. Members had the following views:

- (a) implementation of SBDG measures to improve the overall building permeability and amenity of pedestrian environment was supported;
- (b) the balancing between the proposed BHR relaxation against the benefits of SBDG measures and other planning considerations should be elaborated in more details;
- (c) while the proposed BHRs should allow flexibility for building design in order to prevent monotonous BHs and built forms, in determining the revised development restrictions, the potential adverse visual impact of the proposed relaxation of BHRs should be carefully examined;
- (d) while there was no strong view against the proposed amendments, the proposed relaxation of BHRs should be justified on planning grounds including visual impact and urban design considerations. In case that, after taking into account SBDG, the increase in BHs appeared to be unacceptable from the district planning and urban design points of view, the

BHRs might have to be reviewed;

- (e) upon imposition of the revised BHRs, any proposed further increase in BH should only be considered subject to individual merits of the development proposal to be provided by the proponent; and
- (f) the visual impact of the proposed relaxation of BHRs as shown on the photomontages viewing from Hung Hom Promenade and Tsim Sha Tsui (Hong Kong Cultural Centre) appeared to be apparent. In particular, the stepped height concept with lower buildings near the waterfront was no longer noticeable. There was scope for improving the presentation materials to demonstrate the potential visual impact.

90. After deliberation, the Board decided not to publish the amended draft OZP under section 7 of the TPO at the current stage subject to further supporting information to be provided by PlanD. The proposed amendments would be resubmitted to the Board for consideration.

91. The Chairperson thanked the Government's representatives and the consultant for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.



**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Item 6**

EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF 116<sup>th</sup> TPB HELD ON 5.1.2018

[Open Meeting]

Further Consideration of Proposed Amendments to the Draft Causeway Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H6/15

(TPB Paper No. 10375)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

42. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments were formulated upon review of the draft Causeway Bay Outline Zoning Plan (the draft OZP) No. S/H6/15 in order to comply with the orders of the Court in respect of two judicial reviews (JRs) lodged by Hysan Development Co. Ltd (Hysan) and its subsidiaries (together, Hysan Group Companies) and by Excelsior Hotel (BVI) Limited (Excelsior) respectively. The following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in the Causeway Bay area; and/or having affiliation/business dealings with Hysan, the affiliated companies of Excelsior including the Jardines Group Companies (Jardines), Hongkong Land (HKL) and Mandarin Oriental:

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn<br>( <i>Chairperson</i> ) | - | co-owning with spouse a self-occupying flat and a car parking space at Broadwood Road  |
| Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong                                | - | being an ex-employee of Maxim's Group Companies, a subsidiary company of Jardines, and self-occupying a flat at Illumination Terrace, Tai Hang |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung                               | - | being an ex-employee of Jardines   |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho                                 | - | having current business dealings with Hysan and HKL  |

- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with HKL
- Mr K.K. Cheung ] their firm having current business dealings  
Mr Alex T.H. Lai ] with Jardines, HKL and Mandarin Oriental
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with Hysan and  
HKL
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - spouse owning a flat at Caroline Hill Road
- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li - co-owning with spouse a flat at 1 Tai Hang  
Road
- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - spouse owning a flat in Chun Fai Terrace, Tai  
Hang
- Mr Franklin Yu - owning a unit at Stubbs Road, Wan Chai
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - his office was in Causeway Bay
- Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - close relative owning a property in Causeway  
(*CE (Works), HAD*) Bay
- Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo - self-occupying a flat at Tai Hang Road  
(*Secretary*)

43. Members noted that Dr Lawrence K.C. Li and Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting. Members also noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had already left the meeting.

44. As the interests of Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung, was remote/indirect, the meeting agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

45. As the properties of the Chairperson, Messrs Martin W.C. Kwan, Dominic K.K. Lam, Franklin Yu, and the Secretary had no direct view on the sites subject to/would not be affected by the proposed amendments, the meeting agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

46. As Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Ivan C.S. Fu, K.K. Cheung, and Stephen L.H. Liu had no involvement in Hysan's and Excelsior's sites, the meeting agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

47. The Secretary also drew Members' attention to a letter received from Ms Clarisse Yeung, a member of the Wan Chai District Council, was tabled at the meeting. Ms Yeung expressed concern on the relaxation of the building height restrictions and increase in development intensity and the potential adverse traffic and air ventilation impacts brought about by the proposed amendments to the OZP.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

48. The following government representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

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

Mr T.W. Ng - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong 2

Mr C.K. Soh - Assistant Director/Special Duties (AD/SD), PlanD

49. The Chairperson invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the Paper.

50. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD briefed Members on the justifications for the proposed revisions to building height

restrictions (BHRs), including air ventilation, urban design and visual considerations. He also presented a new set of photomontages showing the range of possible impacts of the proposed amendments based on different redevelopment scenarios, site classes under the Building (Planning) Regulations and uses to supplement the photomontages as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10375 (the Paper).

[Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting during DPO/HK's presentation.]

51. The Chairperson then invited questions and comments from Members.

*Proposed BHRs*

52. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) noting that 10% of the total floor area of a development would be disregarded from GFA calculation if the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) was complied with (10% GFA concession), whether these floor area had been taken into account and reflected in the photomontages;
  - (b) whether all concerned sites in the worst-case redevelopment scenario as shown in TPB Paper No. 10340 were assumed to be Class C sites;
  - (c) whether the concerned sites assumed for mixed commercial and residential developments were zoned "Other Specified Use" annotated "Mixed Use" ("OU(MU)") on the draft OZP and whether classification of individual sites had been considered;
  - (d) apart from the SBDG, whether there were other considerations in reviewing the development restrictions on the OZP;
  - (e) noting in the TPB Paper No. 10340 that the height of a commercial building would range from 122m to 130m after incorporating SBDG requirements subject to site classification, why BHR of 135mPD was

proposed, instead of 130mPD; and

- (f) noting that two additional storeys would be required to accommodate the permissible GFA and the SBDG requirements, why the BHR for a typical commercial building incorporating SBDG requirements would need to be relaxed from 110mPD to 135mPD.

53. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD made the following responses:

- (a) the 10% GFA concession for compliance with SBDG had been taken into account when formulating the BHRs as reflected in the photomontages;
- (b) the worst-case redevelopment scenario as shown in TPB Paper No. 10340 represented a broadbrush visual impression and had not taken into account site classification of each and every single redevelopment site;
- (c) for sites zoned "OU(MU)" on the draft OZP, they could be developed for commercial or residential or mixed uses. The application of SBDG and classification of individual sites had also been taken into account in formulating the BHRs;
- (d) according to the Court's judgment, in determining the development restrictions on the OZP, the implications of SBDG on the development intensity should be generally taken into consideration. Apart from SBDG, in the current review of the development restrictions for the OZP, factors including land use zonings, development right/permmissible development intensity, air ventilation assessment findings, urban design principles and visual appraisal findings had also been taken into consideration;
- (e) a typical commercial building, subject to site classification, would have a building height ranging from 118m to 126m for incorporating building setback requirement and from 122m to 130m for incorporating building

separation requirement. Taking into account the site level of about 5mPD, a maximum BH of 135mPD was recommended; and

- (f) apart from catering for the two additional storeys resulting from the compliance of SBDG requirements, the proposed relaxation of BHR from 110mPD to 135mPD would allow more flexibility in the building design to meet the modern standards for higher floor-to-floor height for offices. Besides, opportunity had also been taken to revisit the previous assumptions for the BHRs requiring some commercial uses as well as car park to be accommodated in the basement levels.

#### *Centralisation of Car Parking Spaces*

54. A Member said that making reference to the experience of the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) in To Kwa Wan, consideration might be given to the possibility of centralising all car parking spaces in one location in Causeway Bay in order to minimise the number of ingress and egress points of individual developments and improve the pedestrian environment. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD responded that the proposed amendments to the Causeway Bay OZP were premised upon a review of the development restrictions in response to the Court's ruling that the SBDG was a relevant consideration in formulating the restrictions. There might be practical difficulties to centralise all car parking spaces in Causeway Bay as the concerned sites had been largely developed and were under different ownership. The proposal could be further explored when opportunity arose, but would not be included in this round of the review.

#### *Court's Ruling*

55. A Member questioned whether there would be a summary listing out which amendments were the result of the BHR review taking account of the Court's ruling and which were the result of the review taking into account the SBDG. The Secretary responded that in view of the court's rulings, the Board was required to reconsider Representations R146 to R152. A summary table indicating the amendments corresponding to the respective representations had been included in the TPB Paper No. 10340. The review had also included other sites which might be affected by the

proposed BHRs after taking into account the SBDG requirements.

*Application of SBDG*

56. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the SBDG requirements were so scientific and quantitative that the proposed development intensity could be measurable and whether there was any monitoring mechanism to ensure that the SBDG requirements had been incorporated in the proposed developments;
- (b) whether the future landowners would choose not to comply with the SBDG requirements and what the impacts would be; and
- (c) noting that although the proposed relaxation of the BHR would allow flexibility for complying with the SBDG, the requirements for adopting SBDG and good building design were not reflected on the draft OZP, whether it was possible to maintain the current BHRs and stipulate a BHR relaxation clause in the Notes of the draft OZP for compliance with SBDG.

57. In response, Mr C.K. Soh, AD/SD, PlanD made the following responses:

- (a) when the Buildings Department (BD) promulgated the SBDG, two Practice Notes for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAPs) APP-151 and APP-152 were issued. The PNAPs set out clearly the pre-requisites and what green/amenity features and facilities would be allowed for claiming the 10% GFA concession. The PNAPs also provided a comprehensive methodology for quantifying the three building design elements of SBDG as well as special considerations for cases with genuine difficulties in meeting the prescribed measures;
- (b) the SBDG requirements would be included where appropriate in the

lease conditions of new land sale sites or lease modification/land exchange. It was noted that, there were some two hundreds approved building plans each year for new buildings and more than a hundred private projects were registered under the Building Environmental Assessment Method (BEAM) Plus programme of the Hong Kong Green Building Council (HKGBC), which was one of the pre-requisites for claiming GFA concessions for green/amenity features and non-mandatory/non-essential plant rooms and services under SBDG (APP-151 and APP-152). Thus, it was estimated that about half of the new private building developments would follow the SBDG. In general, residential developments and larger scale commercial developments were more eager to obtain such GFA concessions (e.g. residential recreational facilities, balcony for residential buildings, and high headroom/void in non-domestic developments) whilst small-scale commercial developments had relatively less incentive; and

- (c) the purpose of the proposed relaxation in BHRs was to allow sufficient flexibility for incorporation of various good building design measures in future developments to improve the overall built environment. It was a concerted efforts of different concerned government departments in promoting a quality building environment in the planning and development process. The SBDG provided various building design options and the GFA concession eventually claimed varied among cases. Therefore, there might be practical difficulties to stipulate a BHR relaxation clause in the Notes of the draft OZP for compliance with SBDG.

#### *Publication of Proposed Amendments*

58. A Member enquired about the subsequent procedure if the proposed amendments to the draft OZP were agreed by the Board. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD said that subject to agreement of the proposed amendments by the Board for gazetting under section 7 of the Ordinance, the Wan Chai District Council would be consulted during the 2-month statutory plan exhibition period. The public



could submit representations on the OZP to the Board during the statutory plan exhibition period. Any representation received would be duly considered according to the provision of the Ordinance. The JR lodged by the Hysan Group also covered the Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/26. To follow up the Court's rulings on the JRs, a similar review of the Wan Chai OZP would be conducted and amendments to the current development restrictions, if required, would also be proposed for the Board's consideration. The Wan Chai OZP was also the subject of another JR lodged by the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDA), who had also lodged JR appeals against another three OZPs, namely, Yau Ma Tei, Mong Kok and Kowloon Bay and Ngau Tau Kok. These OZPs will also be reviewed in due course.

59. The Secretary supplemented that Hysan Group Companies and Excelsior, which lodged the JRs to the draft Causeway Bay OZP, would be informed of the Board's consideration of their representations and the proposed amendments. They could make representations and comments in respect of the proposed amendments and their sites during the statutory plan exhibition period.

60. After deliberation, the Board agreed to:

- (a) the proposed amendments to the draft Causeway Bay OZP and that the draft Causeway Bay OZP No. S/H6/15A at Annex B1 of TPB Paper No. 10340 (to be renumbered as S/H6/16 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Annex B2 of TPB Paper No. 10340 were suitable for exhibition under section 7 of the Ordinance; and;
- (b) adopt the revised ES at Annex B3 of TPB Paper No. 10340 for the draft Causeway Bay OZP No. S/H6/15A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the draft OZP.

[Professor S.C. Wong, Dr Wilton W.T. Fok, Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu and Mr K.K. Cheung left the meeting during the presentation and question sessions.]

香港特別行政區  
第五屆灣仔區議會  
第十五次會議記錄

日期：二零一八年三月六日(星期二)

時間：下午 2 時 30 分

地點：香港軒尼詩道 130 號修頓中心 21 樓灣仔區議會會議室

出席者

主席

吳錦津議員, BBS, MH, JP

副主席

周潔冰博士, BBS, MH

區議員(依筆劃序)

李文龍議員

李均頤議員, MH

李碧儀議員

林偉文議員

黃宏泰議員, MH

楊雪盈議員

鄭其建議員

鄭琴淵博士, BBS, MH

謝偉俊議員, JP

鍾嘉敏議員

核心政府部門代表

陳天柱先生, JP

民政事務總署灣仔民政事務專員

黃詠儀女士

民政事務總署灣仔民政事務助理專員

劉希瑜女士

民政事務總署候任灣仔民政事務助理專員

陳小萍女士

民政事務總署高級聯絡主任(社區事務)

謝國偉先生

香港警務處灣仔區指揮官

陳杰峰先生

香港警務處灣仔區警民關係主任

陳倩雅女士	香港警務處北角分區助理指揮官(行動)
林綺梅女士	社會福利署署理東區及灣仔區福利專員
林志強先生	土木工程拓展署總工程師(港島)2
王慧菁女士	地政總署港島東地政專員
李佩玲女士	康樂及文化事務署灣仔區康樂事務經理
劉志強先生	食物環境衛生署灣仔區環境衛生總監
劉建國先生	運輸署總運輸主任／港島

### 其他政府部門及機構代表

應耀康先生, JP	運輸及房屋局常任秘書長(房屋)兼房屋署署長	} 出席議程第 1 項
盧穎儀女士	房屋署中央支援組主任	
顧建康先生	規劃署港島規劃專員	} 出席議程第 3 項
伍德華先生	規劃署高級城市規劃師／港島 3	
陳煒雲醫生	衛生署高級醫生(社區聯絡)2	} 出席議程第 6 項

### 缺席者

伍婉婷議員, MH

### 秘書

胡麗珊女士 民政事務總署高級行政主任(區議會)／灣仔

負責人

### 開會詞

1. 主席歡迎運輸及房屋局常任秘書長(房屋)兼房屋署署長應耀康先生及房屋署中央支援組主任盧穎儀女士出席灣仔區議會第十五次會議，與灣仔區議員交流。主席同時歡迎首次出席會議的香港警務處新任灣仔區指揮官謝國偉先生，運輸署新任總運輸主任／港島劉建國先生，以及代替葉巧瑜女士出席會議的社會福利署署理東區及灣仔區福利專員林綺梅女士。

2. 主席告知與會者，秘書處接到通知，伍婉婷議員因事未能出席今天的區議會會議。根據灣仔區議會常規第51條(1)，區議會只會同意議員因身體不適或代表區議會出席會議／活動的缺席申請，因此伍議員將會被視作缺席會議。此外，

嘗試聯絡申請人，而他真的沒有答覆，然後才把他從輪候名單中剔除。

27. 主席感謝應常任秘書長今天來到灣仔區議會與議員交流，並宣布這項議程的討論到此結束。他請副主席歡送應常任秘書長。

28. 應常任秘書長表示，多謝各位議員的提問和給予機會讓他向各位解釋政府在房屋方面的工作，希望日後有機會再與各位交流。

### **通過會議記錄**

#### **第 2 項：通過灣仔區議會第十四次會議記錄**

29. 主席表示，就第十四次會議記錄，秘書處收到楊雪盈議員提出的修訂建議，並請議員參閱置於席上的文件。如無其他修訂，則請一位議員動議，一位和議，通過會議記錄。

30. 由於席上議員沒有提出其他修訂，遂由李碧儀議員動議，謝偉俊議員和議，正式通過經修訂的第十四次會議記錄。

### **討論事項**

#### **第 3 項：《銅鑼灣分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/H6/16》所收納的修訂項目 (灣仔區議會文件第 18/2018 號)**

31. 主席歡迎規劃署港島規劃專員顧建康先生及高級城市規劃師 / 港島 2 伍德華先生出席會議。

32. 主席請規劃署代表向議員簡介文件。

33. 顧建康先生表示，會先請代表簡述是次修訂大綱圖的背景和修訂項目的詳情，然後聽取議員的意見。

34. 伍德華先生以電腦投影片向議員介紹修訂《銅鑼灣分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/H6/16》(大綱圖)的背景、檢討的主要考

慮因素、城市設計原則、主要修訂項目、對圖則《註釋》及《說明書》的修訂、大綱圖的公眾展示期等。

35. 主席請議員發表意見。

36. 黃宏泰議員表示，如規劃署日後有類似文件和電腦投影片資料，在實際可行情況下應盡早提交議會，讓議員充分了解資料內容和徵詢居民意見。規劃署若這樣遲才提供有關資料，議員根本難以消化，影響諮詢效果。

37. 楊雪盈議員提出以下意見和提問：

- (i) 她詢問按照新的大綱圖，會有多少準備重建項目。
- (ii) 希雲街的土地用途在過去十年轉變過一兩次，包括由「住宅(甲類)」轉為「其他指定用途」。她詢問希雲街他日翻新和放寬高度限制後，會否繼續用作住宅用途。
- (iii) 大坑內街即使有新建築物相繼落成，但交通配套仍維持不變，巴士線從無增加，居民對此早有微言。她詢問他日提升地積比率後，區內人口會否因大綱圖而有所變動，交通和社區配套又會如何配合。

38. 鍾嘉敏議員提出以下意見和提問：

- (i) 她同意黃宏泰議員所說，要消化整套文件和大綱圖並不容易。相反，電腦投影片的資料較為簡明，能重點介紹主要修訂。她質疑何解署方沒有盡早向議會提供這份資料。
- (ii) 過去，署方曾為希雲街的建築物訂定高度限制，當時希雲大廈正進行收購，但因署方突然提出修訂大綱圖，收購和簽約工作立即煞停，居民唯有留在原居。面對突如其來的限制和改變，居民感

到不知所措。如今署方又再修訂大綱圖，而公眾諮詢期到三月二十六日便屆滿，她詢問署方在區內進行了什麼宣傳工作。

- (iii) 她詢問署方對灣仔區的整體規劃會是怎樣。現時，波斯富街與利園山道之間為住宅樓宇，但該地帶已劃為「商業」用途。她詢問是否近時代廣場一帶的住宅日後再有轉變，便會變成商業用途，改為在維園附近才用作住宅用途。但按房屋署署長於早前討論事項中所說，根本沒有土地供應。她詢問最終居民可住在哪裏，以及灣仔區最終會否變成商業娛樂區，再沒有民居。

39. 李均頤議員提出以下意見和提問：

- (i) 有關E3項「刪除介乎告士打道280及281號之間的建築物間距的規定」，她指出那裏現時一邊是住宅大廈，一邊是怡東酒店。如放寬中間位置的建築物間距，以供將來發展大型建築大樓，那便完全沒有通風位置。
- (ii) 有關E2項「刪除駱克道南面及記利佐治街兩側的非建築用地的要求」，她指出非建築用地包括行人路，但有關位置兩邊的行人路現時已很狹窄，根本不敷應用。事實上，銅鑼灣區現已日益商業化，若把建築物高度限制提升為主水平基準上135米，她詢問這是否意味整個銅鑼灣區日後會轉為商業區。
- (iii) 她詢問會否規定行人路的寬度。根據E1項，非建築用地會修訂為1.5米，可見日後將會用盡該處作建築用途。但她擔心有沒有足夠空間用作空氣流通的通道。

40. 主席請規劃署代表回應議員第一輪的提問。

41. 顧建康先生回應如下：

- (i) 署方已按照區議會的規定在限期前把相關文件送交議會參考。至於電腦投影片，由於整理需時，因此未能提早提交議會。他表示已備悉議員的意見，日後會盡早提供所有相關文件。
- (ii) 在香港的市場經濟規律下，日後確實有多少舊樓會重建，將由市場決定。不過，署方在制訂大綱圖時估計樓高15層以下、樓齡超過30年的樓宇在將來重建機會較大，因此已把這些樓宇重建後，高度為主水平基準上135米的景觀效果在視像圖顯示出來。
- (iii) 希雲街現時屬「混合用途」地帶，即可作商業或住宅發展。在二零一零年，該處是劃為住宅用途地帶，當時高度的限制定為主水平基準上100米。城市規劃委員會(城規會)於二零一一年聽取申述人士提出的意見後，將該處改劃為「混合用途」地帶，高度限制則維持不變。是次修訂大綱圖時，署方參考了法庭判決，在考慮了《可持續建築設計指引》和其他因素後，如用作商業發展，高度限制必須達主水平基準上135米，因此建議把希雲街的高度限制由主水平基準上100米改為135米，以提供足夠的彈性，讓該「混合用途」地帶可作商業發展。
- (iv) 在是次修訂中，並無改變任何土地用途地帶，因此不涉及人口變動。
- (v) 是次修訂放寬了大坑內街的建築物高度，但並無放寬地積比率，因此發展密度並無改變。
- (vi) 波斯富街、利園山道一帶原為「商業」地帶，是次修訂亦無改變其土地用途地帶。該處原有的住宅用途不會因現時「商業」用途地帶而受影響。

如將來重建，發展商仍希望用作住宅發展，則可向城規會申請。

(vii) 刪除怡東酒店一帶的建築物間距，是因為於二零一七年檢討時，進行了空氣流通評估。結果顯示，有效的通風廊須至少闊15米。此外，根據《可持續建築設計指引》，重建時如涉及狹窄的街道，須符合建築物後移的規定，或與旁邊建築物保持適當間距。在進行是次修訂時，考慮到發展商在重建時可遵行《可持續建築設計指引》的要求，而解決通風問題，因而可刪去大綱圖上對整區通風效果未必最有影響的要求。

(viii) 刪除非建築物的要求並不會影響現有的行人路。此外，正如剛才所述，根據空氣流通評估，有效的通風廊須至少闊15米。記利佐治街闊15米多，因此無須額外後移；糖街則闊12米多，因此須修訂糖街兩邊地界後移的要求，每邊為1.5米，使糖街符合作為有效通風廊的要求。

42. 主席表示，波斯富街、利園山道一帶現時多為住宅樓宇。在改劃為「商業(1)」或「商業(2)」用地後，發展商日後重建時如有意繼續發展住宅，便須向城規會申請。但眾所周知，向城規會申請手續非常繁複，必須提供很充分的理據。此外，除上述一帶外，很多現時建有住宅的用地都改劃成「商業」或「其他指定用途」地帶。如此發展下去，灣仔區將來的常住人口可能激減，最終變成了商業購物區。可見有關修訂會使銅鑼灣甚或灣仔駱克道一帶的生態環境出現翻天覆地的變化。

43. 李均頤議員指出，現時銅鑼灣行人路不敷應用，已是不爭事實。如日後整個銅鑼灣區有那麼多地方改劃為「商業」用途地帶，加上建築物高度限制放寬為主水平基準上135米，她很懷疑行人路是否足夠應付人流所需。她詢問規劃署有沒有就行人路系統訂下標準。



(鄭琴淵博士於下午 4 時 30 分離席；謝偉俊議員於下午 4 時 32 分離席。)

44. 鍾嘉敏議員表示，按現時規定，如興建商業大廈，必須提供一定數量的停車位。波斯富街、利園山道、告士打道、謝斐道、駱克道一帶他日重建後，會全是商業用途，加上樓宇高度會放寬為主水平基準上135米，這勢必引來額外的人流和車流。她詢問當中會有多少停車位。此外，如建築物內食肆林立，渠筒定必不敷應用，渠道淤塞的問題便隨之而來。她詢問規劃署制定這份大綱圖時，究竟希望灣仔區日後變成什麼模樣。

45. 楊雪盈議員提出以下意見和提問：

- (i) 雖然重建速度和規模由市場決定，但規劃署估計樓高15層以下、樓齡超過30年的樓宇將來重建機會較大，她詢問這些樓宇涉及多少樓面面積，土地用途分類為何，以及可否提供位置圖。她認為規劃署必須在三月二十六日大綱圖的公眾諮詢完結前，向議會提供這些資料，以釋除多位議員對灣仔區日後發展所提出的憂慮。
- (ii) 大坑內街不少業主立案法團表示擔心他日放寬樓宇高度限制後，會影響通風。雖然規劃署已委聘專家進行評估，但因涉及很多技術性資料，一般市民難以明白。她認為規劃署應多做工夫，並聯同民政事務總署，多接觸居民和講解有關資料。
- (iii) 由於多位議員對灣仔區未來的發展表示憂慮，她希望規劃署清楚講解是次修訂分區大綱圖的最大原因。她詢問是否修訂大綱圖後，灣仔整體環境便會提升，包括路面更寬廣和空氣更流通。

46. 黃宏泰議員提出以下意見和提問：

- (i) 署方今天到來開會，但電腦投影片資料昨晚才做好，足見有關工作非常急趕。他詢問政府內部是否有不可告人的原因，一定要在今天大會上提出有關事項。
- (ii) 有些地帶現為民居，但他日重建後會變成商業用途，市民頓失居住權。他質疑署方何以只向小市民落手，但大財團很多匪夷所思的方案卻獲批。以皇冠酒店為例，興建不久，現在發展商卻打算拆掉作商業用途。建築物建了又拆，擾攘多年，居民無奈忍受噪音，有些甚至避走他區。他希望規劃署下次來到議會，是提出改劃皇冠酒店的方案，把皇冠酒店改劃為酒店用途，這樣肯定皆大歡喜。

47. 周潔冰博士提出以下意見和提問：

- (i) 地區的規劃應有整體方向。一個社區包含很多元素，包括居住質素、社區人情味、「政府、機構或社區」用地配套。社區的發展應以人為本，以人為單位計算各項需要，當中涉及人流、車流、通風、空氣質素等。有關大綱圖把用地劃為「混合用途」地帶為主，社區的發展頓時變得被動。她詢問灣仔區的整體發展方向是否以商業為主。
- (ii) 社區發展講求平衡，但若商業發展可帶來更高利潤，發展商便會側重商業發展。在她的選區內，酒店或商業比例大於居民住宅人口。如果每個小社區都循這方向發展下去，將會大大改變整個灣仔區日後的面貌。她認為交通、居住環境等各方面均須求取平衡，希望署方深入考慮。

48. 主席請規劃署代表回應議員第二輪的提問。

49. 顧建康先生回應如下：

- (i) 署方於二零一零年就大綱圖訂定建築物高度限制和非建築用地及地界後移的要求前，先諮詢了運輸署。運輸署當時劃訂因行人路擴闊而需地界後移的地方。規劃署於二零一七年檢討大綱圖時，同樣諮詢了運輸署。該署表示，當年建議的後移要求仍然有效。據了解，運輸署是按《香港規劃標準與準則》有關商業用地的行人路必須至少闊3.5米的要求，評估銅鑼灣的行人路是否合規。
- (ii) 在二零一零年的大綱圖中，銅鑼灣大部份劃為「商業／住宅」用途地帶。由於都會規劃檢討的建議，用地的用途應更為清晰，以便各政府部門規劃整區基建配套。因此，當年建議把已主要為商業發展的用地改劃為「商業」用途地帶；主要為住宅發展的用地則改劃為「住宅(甲類)」用途地帶。至於尚未有明顯用途趨勢的用地，如希雲街、聖保祿書院附近和百德新街附近，則改劃為「混合用途」地帶。各用途地帶於二零一零年已改劃，在今次檢討大綱圖時並無再作改動。
- (iii) 在規劃署的全港性策略規劃中，灣仔和銅鑼灣區是香港的商業中心區；灣仔北是商業中心區的延伸；而銅鑼灣區同時亦是購物中心。過往的規劃工作亦是按這意向進行。因此，軒尼詩道以北大多是商業用途地帶，軒尼詩道以南為「混合用途」地帶，灣仔道一帶則為「住宅(甲類)」用途地帶。
- (iv) 皇冠酒店所在地本身是「住宅(甲類)」用途地帶，若要興建酒店或辦公室須向城規會申請。因此，發展商當年是透過規劃申請，而非改劃申請，以發展酒店用途。

50. 主席詢問議員有沒有跟進問題。

51. 黃宏泰議員追問，可否把皇冠酒店所處用地改劃為酒店用途，以免法展商把酒店拆掉，用作其他用途。

52. 顧建康先生回應，該用地的用途地帶並無改變，依然屬「住宅(甲類)」用途地帶，不過發展商已根據《城市規劃條例》第16條向城規會申請在該用地興建辦公室。

53. 黃宏泰議員提出以下意見：

- (i) 他重申應把皇冠酒店所處地帶改劃為酒店用地，使發展商不能拆去酒店，以免對附近居民造成滋擾。
- (ii) 他不支持這份討論文件，原因是時間太倉卒，難以消化文件內容。

54. 李均頤議員提出以下意見和提問：

- (i) 根據B1、B2、C1和C2項的修訂，建築物高度限制會由主水平基準上幾十米修訂為135米。若嘉蘭中心日後變成135米高的寫字樓或商場，再加上利園二期旁邊建成50層高大廈，前來辦公和購物的人流可以是現在的四倍。但行人路標準卻依然沿用二零一零年的標準，運輸署竟然不作任何修訂，實在匪夷所思。
- (ii) 除人流外，車流也會大增。但附近一帶停車位嚴重不足，勢難承受額外的車流。她詢問當局是否會以加路連山道的用地和維園地下空間配合。但前者「十畫未有一撇」；後者則仍在研究階段，她質疑何解當局如此急於修訂有關地帶的用途。

55. 鍾嘉敏議員提出以下意見：

- (i) 自二零一零年修訂大綱圖至今，足足相距八年，橫跨兩屆區議會。其間城規政策、相關條例也多番修訂，因此當時的決定，不一定適用於今天。
- (ii) 議員提出多項關注，但署方卻未能一一解決，因

此她反對這份討論文件。雖然議會只屬諮詢架構，而非權力架構，但署方今天到來，是徵詢議員的意見。她希望署方聽到大部分議員反對的聲音，回去詳加考慮，而不會草草了事，強行通過修訂。

56. 楊雪盈議員提出以下意見和提問：

- (i) 她剛才問及樓高15層以下、樓齡超過30年的樓宇所涉及的樓面面積，土地用途分類和位置圖，但署方尚未回答。如署方手頭上沒有這方面的資料，她希望可在三月二十六日前提供給議會參考。
- (ii) 她詢問署方將如何處理議員在會上提出的意見，是否會當作公眾諮詢程序中收集到的意見處理，抑或須以區議會名義或須議員各自去信規劃署表達意見。

57. 林偉文議員對規劃署表示失望。他認為規劃署只懂把灣仔區全面商業化，最終弄得人多車多，烏煙瘴氣。他指出運輸署亦應對分區大綱圖提出意見。他反對有關修訂，並建議議會去信規劃署提出意見。

58. 顧建康先生回應如下：

- (i) 署方可在會後提供楊議員要求的位置圖，而位置圖會顯示土地用途分類。不過，要提供所涉及的樓面面積會有難度，需要很長時間蒐集有關資料。
- (ii) 署方備悉議員對大部分用地劃為商業用途的關注。日後再檢視時，會詳加考慮議員的意見。
- (iii) 議員今天的發言會收錄在會議記錄。待城規會稍後考慮申述意見時，署方會按會議記錄向城規會轉達議員的意見。

(iv) 議員如有任何意見，可於三月二十六日前直接去信城規會秘書處。

59. 楊雪盈議員提出以下意見：

(i) 她認為如有地盤面積，便應知道樓面面積。她促請署方提供大概面積供議會參考。

(ii) 她反對有關大綱圖，並在刊憲前已去信署方表達意見。她指出是次會議的會議記錄於三月二十六日前還未通過，議員今天表達的意見可能需通過其他程序才可轉達城規會。

60. 李文龍議員表示，既然大部分議員反對有關大綱圖，他建議以區議會名義去信城規會表達全體議員的意見。

61. 主席總結如下：

(i) 署方諮詢議會的工作倉卒，並沒有向議會提供電腦投影片的資料，不利議員跟進問題。

(ii) 根據大綱圖，禮頓道以北幾乎全變成商業用途。銅鑼灣區早已因空氣污染而惡名遠播，如該處的建築物高度限制全改為主水平基準上135米，空氣污染問題將更為嚴重。

(iii) 如同意有關大綱圖，等同同意把所有住宅變成商業用途，會大大改變目前的居住生態環境。

62. 顧建康先生強調，是次修訂工作並無修改土地用途地帶。相關的土地用途地帶於二零一零年已修訂。

63. 主席指出，根據大綱圖，現時用作住宅用途的「商業」用途地帶用地，他日重建時須改為商業用途，否則須向城規會申請維持為住宅發展。

64. 主席請議員舉手表決是否贊成大綱圖的修訂。在席的九位議員全部表示反對，主席請規劃署代表把議員的意見轉達有關方面考慮，並希望規劃署日後如有這類規劃諮詢，可提供圖文並茂、易於理解的資料。

(會後補註：秘書處於二零一八年三月二十二日以傳閱方式，供各議員參閱由規劃署提供，有關大綱圖範圍內樓高15層以下、樓齡超過30年的樓宇的位置圖。)

~~第4項：二〇一八／二〇一九年度灣仔區議會撥款分配  
(灣仔區議會文件第24/2018號)~~

65. 主席請議員參閱文件第24/2018號。

66. 主席表示，由於民政事務總署尚未通知二〇一八／二〇一九年度灣仔區議會的撥款總額，上述文件中的分配方法擬稿是參考二〇一七／二〇一八年度灣仔區議會的撥款總額和分配方法，以及經過他本人、副主席及各委員會主席商討後訂出的建議。撥款及常務委員會已於二〇一八年二月二十二日舉行的第十四次會議上通過上述的建議撥款分配方法，並建議提交灣仔區議會審批。有關詳情可參閱文件中附件三的最右欄。

67. 由於席上議員並無其他意見，遂由李均頤議員動議，周潔冰博士和議，通過文件中所載的二〇一八／二〇一九年度灣仔區議會撥款建議分配方法。

書面動議

~~第5項：強烈要求政府全面取消「長者生活津貼」申請人離港限制  
(灣仔區議會文件第21/2018號)~~

68. 主席請議員參閱文件第21/2018號及勞工及福利局(勞福局)提交的書面回覆。主席詢問提出書面動議的李文龍議員有否補充。

**Summary of Representations and Comments and the Planning Department's Responses  
in respect of the Draft Causeway Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H6/16**

(1) The grounds of the supportive representations (TPB/R/S/H6/16 - R1 to R101, R102 (part), R103 (part), R104 (part)) as well as responses are summarised below:

Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
<b>General Grounds of Supportive Representation</b>	
<p>A.1 The amendments have achieved balancing development and maintaining the cityscape while providing flexibility to develop Causeway Bay into a major business, retail and tourism centre.</p> <p>A.2 Causeway Bay is a major business hub, taller buildings are needed for quality offices.</p> <p>A.3 Amendments have taken into account building design which can improve both quality of building and the general environment benefiting business, local community as well as visitors.</p> <p>A.4 Relaxation of the building height restrictions (BHRs) can enhance land and property values beneficial to small property owners.</p> <p>A.5 Relaxation of the BHRs would better utilise scarce land resources in the urban area and alleviate development pressure on green belt and countryside areas.</p>	<p>(i) Noted.</p>
<p>A.6 Relaxation of building height (BH) is needed to accommodate public facilities such as public transport interchange (PTI) and green features such as podium garden (R6, R8, R10, R29, R30, R33, R36, R38, R39, R40, R46, R63, R66, R67, R68, R88, R89, R93, R96, R97, R98 &amp; R99).</p>	<p>(ii) See responses to the representor's proposal under A10 below.</p>



Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
<b>Specific Grounds Related to Amendment Items/Sites</b>	
A.7 Support Amendment Items B1, B2 (regarding the revision of the BHR and deletion of the non-building area (NBA)/stipulation of a BHR of 200mPD for the relevant parts of the "C(2)" site covering Lee Garden One site), F (regarding stipulation of a BHR of 200mPD for a 5m wide strip of land at Hysan Place along Lee Garden Road) and clarifications made with respect to the OZP (R102).	Noted.
A.8 Lee Garden Two site has considerable constraints and greater flexibility is needed to ensure quality development in meeting current design needs so as to facilitate a quality commercial/office development at the site (R7, R22, R35 & R103).	Noted. See responses to R103's proposal under A.11 below.
A.9 Support Amendment Item C2 (regarding the deletion of the 2m wide NBA requirement along Yun Ping Road for the Lee Garden Two site) which would facilitate more efficient use of land and improve townscape and avoid chopstick development (R104).	Noted.

(2) The proposals of the supportive representations (TPB/R/S/H/16 - R1 to R101, R102 (part), R103 (part), R104 (part)) as well as responses are summarised below:

Proposal of Supportive Representation	Response to Representation
<b>Further General Relaxation of the BHR</b>	
A.10 The following representers have proposed further relaxation of the BHR to facilitate the development of Grade A office for Causeway Bay to be developed into a major business, retail and tourism centre with provision of public facilities such as PTI, and green features such as podium garden:	(i) In the light of the Court's ruling on the judicial reviews (JRs) in relation to the OZP, a review of the BH and development restrictions on the OZP was conducted. The amendments incorporated into the current draft OZP has duly taken into account all relevant planning considerations, the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) requirements, various

Proposal of Supportive Representation	Response to Representation
<p>(a) from 135mPD to 200mPD (<b>R7, R36, R37, R62, R64, R65, R76, R90 &amp; R101</b>);</p> <p>(b) from 135mPD to 200mPD or above (and/or with provision of PTI, sky garden and facilities for public use):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 200mPD with PTI (<b>R89</b>);</li> <li>- 200mPD with sky garden (<b>R38, R40 &amp; R96</b>);</li> <li>- 200mPD with PTI and sky garden (<b>R30</b>);</li> <li>- 200mPD-250mPD with PTI and sky garden (<b>R98</b>);</li> <li>- 200mPD-300mPD (<b>R87</b>);</li> <li>- 240mPD with sky garden (<b>R63 &amp; R67</b>);</li> <li>- 240mPD with PTI (<b>R68 &amp; R88</b>);</li> <li>- 240mPD (<b>R75 &amp; R85</b>);</li> <li>- 250mPD (<b>R99</b>);</li> <li>- 250mPD with PTI (<b>R6 &amp; R97</b>);</li> <li>- 250mPD with sky garden (<b>R10</b>); and</li> <li>- 250mPD with 6-level basement (<b>R32</b>).</li> </ul> <p>(c) an additional BH of 50m for all developments with inclusion of PTI and/or sky garden (<b>R33</b>).</p>	<p>urban design guidelines, air ventilation assessment (AVA) by expert evaluation undertaken in 2017 and permitted development intensity.</p> <p>(ii) The current BHR of 135mPD stipulated in the OZP is able to accommodate the 25% concession under the Building (Planning) Regulation (B(P)R) which include GFA concession for green/amenity features and non-mandatory/non-essential plant rooms and services under APP-151. The current BHRs for the representation sites are considered appropriate and have already allowed design flexibility for incorporation of SBDG requirements including greenery and/or design features on ground and at podium levels to improve both living and pedestrian environment.</p> <p>(iii) Since the imposition of BHRs does not affect the permissible GFA to be accommodated within a development, it does not preclude the provision of public facilities or PTI. There is also no proposal to require provision of PTI or other facilities within the representation sites. As advised by Transport Department (TD), the need for PTI should be subject to site availability, road network, planned development and public transport needs. There is a lack of site at suitable location and of suitable size within the OZP area for the development of PTI.</p> <p>(iv) The existing and planned public facilities are sufficient to cater for the requirements of the planned population within the planning scheme area of the OZP. The representers have no specific proposal on the type of facilities for community use to be included in the representation sites. It is therefore inappropriate to stipulate such a general requirement on the OZP.</p>

Proposal of Supportive Representation	Response to Representation
	<p>(v) A blanket relaxation of the BHRs for all the representation sites from 135mPD to 200mPD or beyond is not supported as there is neither justification for nor technical assessments to substantiate that further relaxation of BHRs would not have any adverse impacts on the area (<b>R6, R7, R10, R30, R32, R33, R36, R37, R38, R40, R62, R63, R64, R65, R67, R68, R75, R76, R85, R87, R88, R89, R90, R96, R97, R98, R99 &amp; R101</b>).</p>
<p><b>Further Relaxation of the BHR for the Lee Garden Two Site</b></p>	
<p>A.11 <b>R7, R35</b> and <b>R103</b> have proposed further relaxation of BHR for Amendment Items C1 and C2 (i.e. Lee Garden Two site) or alternative amendments that the Board sees fit (<b>R103</b>) to facilitate a quality commercial/office development at the Lee Garden Two site. In particular, <b>R103</b> has queried the assumption made by PlanD for the notional scheme and provided the following justifications for relaxing the BHR to 150mPD and an alternative scheme is illustrated in <b>Drawings H-1c to H-1f (Annex VI)</b>:</p>	<p>(i) <b>R103</b> has concern on the assumptions made under PlanD's notional schemes, which included a FTF height for typical floor of 4m to 4.5m, a refuge floor with FTF height of 3m (only a 2.3m clear headroom for refuge floor is required under the Code of Practice of Fire Safety in Buildings 2011), with basement carpark only (no underground retail floor) and building setback. All relevant assumptions adopted in the PlanD's notional scheme were outlined in Annexes F1, F2 &amp; H1 of TPB Paper No. 10340<sup>1</sup>. According to the notional schemes (<b>Plan H-8</b>), a BHR of 135mPD is able to accommodate the permissible GFA under B(P)R for the Lee Garden Two site (the representation site) with 25% GFA</p>

<sup>1</sup> The major assumptions adopted for redevelopment of commercial and mixed uses sites in Causeway Bay area (Annex D2 & E1 of TPB Paper No. 10340) are: a non-domestic plot ratio of 15, a GFA concession of 25%, no basement floor, a 65% site coverage for a 3-level podium with a typical FTF height of 5m, a 60.81% to 65.86% site coverage (based on site classification) for floors above 15m of the building with a typical FTF height of 4m and a refuge floor of 3m with provision of underground carpark. The major assumptions adopted for Lee Garden Two site (Annexes F1, F2 & H1 of TPB Paper No. 10340) are: setback for the whole building, given the site area is <20,000m<sup>2</sup> and LP <60m (the ground level of 6.67m is disregarded), there is no need to meet the building separation and permeability requirements, a 85% site coverage for the podium and a 60% site coverage for the main tower and provision of underground carpark. The BHR has taken into account the permissible development intensity for commercial buildings with FTF height of 4m to 4.5m. (Please refer to TPB paper No. 10340 for details)

### Proposal of Supportive Representation

- (a) The concerned "C" zone covering the Lee Garden Two site at 28 Yun Ping Road is narrow and elongated in shape with development constraints.
- (b) With reference to SBDG, a BH of 150mPD is required to accommodate the full development potential of the site for a standard floor-to-floor (FTF) height of 4.5m for office and a FTF height of 5m for retail uses. With BH of 135mPD, development would need a total of 6-storey basement including 2.5 storeys basement for retail uses.
- (c) The assumptions adopted in the notional schemes prepared by PlanD (**Drawings H-1a & H-1b** and Plan **H-8**) are not meeting current design needs, details include:
- (i) no information on the detailed assumptions made and there is no provision for the electrical and mechanical (E&M) floors;
- (ii) retail activities are commonly found on upper floors of building, however, only 3 podium floors with a typical FTF height of 5m have been assumed;
- (iii) a minimum FTF height of 4.5m should be adopted instead of the 4m assumed for Grade A office, and a nominal height of 4.5m should be adopted for refuge floor as part of the sky garden instead of a FTF height of 2.3m adopted; and
- (iv) the office tower under the notional schemes is not practical and efficient as the building separations and permeability requirements would unlikely be waived by BD, in addition, 6 basement floors would be required to accommodate the

### Response to Representation

concession for E&M and utilities and 10% GFA concession for greenery/amenity features and non-mandatory/non-essential E&M/services as specified under APP-151.

- (ii) The alternative scheme submitted by **R103** has assumed a different land use mix, which is entirely a building design choice to be made solely by the project proponent, having taken into account all the relevant factors including the development restrictions on the OZP. As for the provision of sky garden within the development, it is a green feature rather than a SBDG requirement and purely a choice to be made by the project proponent amongst various good practice to improve the building design. Hence, there is no strong justification to further relax the BHR to beyond 135mPD for the representation site. There is also no relevant technical assessment to substantiate that the proposed further relaxation of BHR for the representation site would not have adverse impacts on the surrounding area.

Proposal of Supportive Representation	Response to Representation
<p>permitted development intensity and parking which is not considered reasonable or best practice from environmental, commercial or town planning perspective.</p> <p>(d) A planning application for an underground vehicular tunnel connecting Lee Garden Two and Lee Garden One was approved by the Board on 15.7.2016. However, with a BHR of 135mPD, it would be impossible to implement the proposed tunnel which would improve vehicular circulation between the developments and the Causeway Bay areas.</p>	<p>(iii) The proposed tunnel, as mentioned by the representer, is part and parcel of an approved planning scheme under the planning application No. A/H6/79 (approved with conditions by the Metro Planning Committee of the Town Planning Board (TPB) on 24.6.2016). The proposed tunnel would connect the Lee Garden One and Lee Garden Two at their existing basement level. The planning permission is only for the existing Lee Garden Two and the revision of the BHR for the representation site would not affect the implementation of the approved scheme. Should the existing Lee Garden Two be redeveloped in future, it would be up to the project proponent to decide whether the tunnel, if implemented as part of the approved scheme, should be maintained in the future redevelopment.</p>
<p><b>Inclusion of the Basement Requirement to Accommodate Carpark &amp; Other Facilities in the OZP</b></p>	
<p>A.12 The following representers have proposed to stipulate the provision of basements in development sites to accommodate various uses/facilities to alleviate the existing congested roads and pedestrian environment on ground, separation of pedestrian and traffic flow and better utilization of space:</p> <p>(a) a minimum of 4-storey basement under the current BHR of 135mPD (<b>R8</b>);</p> <p>(b) 6-storey basement for large scale redevelopment (<b>R7, R9, R39 &amp; R73</b>);</p>	<p>The current BHRs for the Amendment Items are imposed in mPD. There is no restriction under OZP in relation to the provision of basement nor number of basement levels. The provision and uses of basement are at the discretion of project proponent subject to building design and relevant legislations, building and other safety requirements of Government departments. The feasibility and effectiveness of basement development would be subject to site conditions of each individual site. It is not necessary to stipulate a blanket requirement for the provision of basement developments on the OZP.</p>

Proposal of Supportive Representation	Response to Representation
<p>(c) the provision of basement in development (R29, R36, R66, R68, R87, R89, R93, R96 &amp; R98); and</p> <p>(d) no restriction on basement development (R12, R18, R25, R37, R46, R52 &amp; R67).</p>	

(3) The grounds of the opposing representations (TPB/R/S/H6/16 - R105 to R244, R245 (part)) and views/concerns expressed (TPB/R/S/H6/16 - R246 and R247) as well as responses are summarised below:

Subject of Representations	Response to Representation
<p><b>General Grounds of Opposing Representations</b></p> <p>B.1 R105 to R244 oppose to all the Amendment Items (regarding the relaxation of the BHRs for various development sites and adjustment/deletion of the development restrictions including the NBA and BG and setback requirements under the OZP) and R245 opposes only Amendment Item D regarding the relaxation of the BHR for the northern part of the "R(A)1" site around Wun Sha Street.</p>	<p><b>Response to Representation</b></p> <p>(i) Set against the background of high redevelopment pressure in the Causeway Bay area and the tendency for project proponents to propose high-rise buildings to maximise views of the harbour, the main purpose of BHRs is to provide better planning control in guiding developments/redevelopments to avoid excessively tall and out-of-context developments which will adversely affect the visual quality of the area. In setting the BHRs, one of the major considerations is that the BHRs would not adversely affect the development intensity permitted under the OZP.</p> <p>(ii) In reviewing the BHRs on the OZP, due consideration has been given to the SBDG and other planning and design requirements including the existing BH profile, committed development, topography, site formation level, local characteristics, the waterfront and foothill setting, compatibility with surroundings, predominant land use and development intensity, visual impact, air ventilation and a</p>

Subject of Representations	Response to Representation
	<p>proper balance between public interest and private development right. The BHRs and development restrictions/requirements for the representation sites are considered appropriate after balancing various factors mentioned above.</p>
<p><b>Development Intensity</b></p> <p>B.2 Due to the high land value of Causeway Bay after relaxation of BHRs, project proponents would increase the development intensity (i.e. plot ratio (PR)) of their sites in Causeway Bay by transferring residual PR from other sites. Some representers propose that for sites with BH relaxation, they should be prohibited from PR increase ((<b>R106, R107, R108, R122 to R124, R126 to R135, R137, R139 to R144, R146, R147, R149 to R152, R154, R155, R159, R161 to R163, R167 to R171, R173, R175, R176, R180 to R183, R185 to R187, R189, R191 to R194, R196, R197 &amp; R200 to R244 (except R217 and R244).</b></p>	<p>There is no PR restrictions for "C", "OU" and "R(A)1" zones on the OZP. Hence, the amendments incorporated into the current OZP involve only the revisions of BRHs and NBA/BG and setback requirements which would not induce any increase in PR nor transfer of PR.</p>
<p><b>Building Design and SBDG Requirements</b></p>	
<p>B.3 SBDG is not a statutory requirement and hence could not ensure any building and environmental improvement upon redevelopment.</p>	<p>(i) SBDG was first promulgated by the BD in 2011 through Practice Notes for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAPs) APP-151 and APP-152 in response to various changes to design requirements and building features. Practice notes and guidelines would be issued by the Buildings Authority as and when necessary to reflect changing circumstances.</p>
<p>B.4 Building regulations should be regularly reviewed and updated to take into account of the latest changes (<b>R110</b>).</p>	<p>(ii) Although SBDG is not a statutory requirement, it is one of the prerequisites for granting GFA concessions for greening/amenity features and non-mandatory/non-essential plant rooms and services. Moreover, the SBDG requirements will be included where appropriate in the lease conditions of new land sale sites or lease modification/land exchange. It was</p>

Subject of Representations	Response to Representation
	<p>noted that out of the average approval of some 200 building plans each year for new buildings, about half of the new private building developments would follow SBDG. The amendments incorporated into the OZP, which have duly considered the relevant considerations including the SBDG requirements, will help achieve good building design and a sustainable environment for the Causeway Bay area.</p> <p>(iii) The need to review building legislations (<b>R110</b>) is not related to the amendments incorporated into the current OZP. Building Department (BD) will monitor changes to the building and development industries and, where appropriate, review related building legislations and practices.</p>
<p><b>Traffic and Pedestrian</b></p> <p>B.5 Causeway Bay is densely built with insufficient traffic/transport infrastructure, car parking spaces, vehicle and pedestrian roads, no specific measures have been proposed to address existing problems.</p> <p>B.6 Relaxation of the BHRs would increase the development intensity in the already congested Causeway Bay area causing further increase in pedestrian and traffic flow and affect the environment and residents in the area.</p>	<p>(i) As the revisions to the BHRs do not involve any increase in PR, significant increase in traffic and pedestrian flow is not envisaged. The need for PTV/transport facilities should be subject to site availability, road network, planned development and public transport needs. There is a lack of site at suitable location and of suitable size within the OZP area for the developments including ancillary private car parking and requirements including ancillary private car parking spaces would be considered in all development/redevelopment projects with reference to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and the advice of TD, and if necessary, traffic impact assessments as conducted by project proponent to be agreed with TD. In any case, TD will continue to monitor the traffic and parking conditions in the area and review the need for any transport facilities, road improvement works and traffic management</p>



Subject of Representations	Response to Representation
	<p>measures as appropriate.</p> <p>(ii) To improve the pedestrian circulation and walking environment in Causeway Bay area, setback requirements were previously imposed for the “C(1)”, “C(2)”, “R(A)1” and “OU(MU)” sites on the OZP. There is no change to these setback requirements under the current OZP which aim to widen the footpaths fronting Lockhart Road, Jaffe Road, Cannon Street, Lan Fong Road, Jardine’s Bazaar and Lee Garden Road to about 3.5m; and to widen the footpaths fronting Haven Street and in the Wun Sha Street area to about 2m to 2.5m (Plans 1 to 4 of the Explanatory Statement of the OZP). In addition, through the adoption of SBDG, some ground floor spaces in new developments or redevelopments would also be opened up to improve pedestrian circulation and the general wind environment.</p> <p>(iii) In general, developments and redevelopments are required to provide their own internal transport facilities, including parking spaces and loading/unloading facilities etc. in accordance with the HKPSG requirements within their sites to meet their operation needs. This will eliminate the reliance of on-street facilities to support the operational needs of the developments and redevelopments and to improve existing traffic conditions.</p>
<p><b>Environmental, Visual and Air Ventilation Aspects</b></p> <p>B.7 Relaxation of the BHRs will cause adverse impacts to the environment (such as worsening air pollution, air quality and ventilation, urban heat island (UHI) and wall effects) and the cityscape (such as natural landscape, ridgeline and sunlight penetration). Some representatives have specific concerns on possible changes to the character and air ventilation</p>	<p><u>Environment</u></p> <p>(i) Regarding the concerns on the possible adverse environmental impact of the relaxation of BHRs, since the proposed OZP amendments would not affect the development intensity</p>

Subject of Representations	Response to Representation
<p>of the areas around Wun Sha Street in Tai Hang (R106, R107, R108, R122 to R124, R126 to R135, R137, R139 to R144, R146, R147, R149 to R152, R154, R155, R159, R161 to R163, R167 to R171, R173, R175, R176, R180 to R183, R185 to R187, R189, R191 to R194, R196, R197 &amp; R200 to R244 (except R217 and R244)).</p> <p>B.8 NBA should not be removed as such requirements are essential for the already overcrowded and congested urban areas, like Causeway Bay, in order to improve pedestrian environment and safety (R105, R111 to R114).</p>	<p>permitted under the OZP, and the uses in the areas subject to the OZP amendments are not polluting in nature, the Director of Environmental Protection advises that adverse environmental impact including air and noise pollutions is not anticipated. Besides, the relaxation of BHRs would allow design flexibility and scope for development to adopt SBDG and/or design features that would improve the pedestrian environment and provision of greenery.</p> <p><u>Air Ventilation</u></p> <p>(ii) As part of the BH review, an AVA was undertaken in 2017 (Annex G1 of TPB Paper No. 10340) to evaluate the potential air ventilation impacts on the pedestrian wind environment. The AVA concluded that:</p> <p>(a) the existing wind environment in the north-western part of Causeway Bay is poor due to the high building density with tall buildings and narrow streets. With high BH to street width ratio (H/W ratio), it is difficult for wind from the roof top level to penetrate to ventilate the street level. Under such circumstances, BH alone ceases to be the key consideration in improving the pedestrian wind environment for the OZP area;</p> <p>(b) building design measures to reduce ground coverage and create building permeability, particularly at low level through provision of effective air paths to facilitate airflow from prevailing wind directions, are more important in improving the pedestrian wind environment in Causeway Bay area. Hence, relaxing the BHRs to allow flexibility for incorporation of</p>

Subject of Representations	Response to Representation
	<p>various design elements including SBDG would in general better improve air ventilation in the area; and</p> <p>(c) the relaxation of the BHRs would not have any adverse impact on the air ventilation at the street level in the area.</p> <p>(iii) NBAs have been stipulated on the OZP at various key locations, i.e. Sugar Street and on land between the western end of Kingston Street and the eastern end of Jaffe Road, to maintain the major air paths in the Causeway Bay area in order to improve district ventilation.</p> <p>(iv) Only those NBAs with localized effect were deleted. Such deletion would have no adverse impact on the air ventilation of the area, as the adoption of SBDG in the surrounding buildings upon redevelopment would have similar improvement to the local wind environment.</p> <p>(v) According to the AVA, the regular street pattern in Wun Sha Street area is well connected and aligned with the NE and SE prevailing wind directions which is important to air movement particularly at pedestrian level. The current relaxation of BHRs at Wu Sha Street area will not change the existing small streets or street pattern of the area, and there is also no change to the zoning or permitted development intensity of sites involved. The area will remain part of a larger residential neighbourhood in Tai Hang, and the characters of the area will not be affected. Hence, the relaxation of BHR from 85mPD to 100mPD, while providing flexibility for development to adopt SBDG to improve pedestrian environment, would not have any adverse impact</p>

Subject of Representations	Response to Representation
	<p>on street level air ventilation for the area.</p> <p><u>Visual</u></p> <p>(vi) Visual appraisal has been conducted as part of the BH review for the current OZP (Annex G2 of TPB Paper No. 10340 and Plans 1 to 3 and paragraphs 2.7 to 2.11 and Plans 6 to 15 of TPB Paper No. 10375). While the relaxation of the BHRs will reduce the visual openness within Causeway Bay area, it would neither affect the views to the ridgelines to be protected nor protrude into the 20% building free zone below ridgelines, in particular the ridgeline of Mount Parker as viewed from key vantage points such as the Cultural Complex at Tsim Sha Tsui (<b>Plans H-4a to H-4e</b> which are extracted from Plans 1, 8, 10, 13 to 14 of TPB Paper No. 10375). The relaxation of the BHRs is a trade-off amongst different urban design considerations, i.e. with slightly taller building for a better pedestrian environment in a dense urban district such as Causeway Bay. As a whole, the relaxation of the BHRs is considered not incompatible in scale with the surrounding and would not result in unacceptable visual impact (<b>Plans H-4b to H-4g</b>).</p> <p>(vii) The relaxation of the BHRs has allowed design flexibility for development to adopt SBDG which would reduce ground coverage and enhance the environmental quality of living space by providing opportunities for landscape and greenery, particularly at pedestrian level to mitigate various impacts including the UHI effect.</p>

Subject of Representations	Response to Representation
<p><b>Opposing Amendment Item D</b></p> <p>B.9 Revision of the BHR for the "R(A)1" sites generally bounded by Tung Lo Wan Road, Wun Sha Street, King Street and Tai Hang Road from 85mPD to 100mPD would result in adverse impact on the living environment and create wall effect, which would affect air ventilation especially around Wun Sha Street area (R245).</p>	<p>(i) The representation sites covering the northern part of the residential area in Tai Hang and under the "R(A)1" zoning comprise a number of small street blocks and relatively narrow roads with low-rise buildings of mainly 5 to 6 storeys. According to the AVA, the regular street pattern in Wun Sha Street area is well connected and aligned with the NE and SE prevailing wind directions which is important to air movement particularly at pedestrian level.</p> <p>(ii) Moreover, SBDG aims to enhance building porosity in avoiding screen wall effect and to promote air movements amongst developments to enhance better dispersion and air mixing. Building setback requirement recommended by SBDG also mitigates street canyon effect to benefit the pedestrian wind environment. The current relaxation of BHRs at Wu Sha Street area will not change the existing small streets or street pattern of the area, and there is also no change to the zoning or permitted development intensity of sites involved. The area will remain part of a larger residential neighbourhood in Tai Hang, and the characters of the area will not be affected. Hence, the relaxation of BHR from 85mPD to 100mPD, while providing flexibility for development to adopt SBDG to improve pedestrian environment, would not have any adverse impact on street level air ventilation for the area.</p>
<p><b>Express Views/Concerns on Amendment Items</b></p> <p>B.10 Installation of large illuminating advertisement signs should be prohibited (R83 &amp; R247).</p>	<p>Concern on the installation of illuminated advertisement signs is not related to the amendments incorporated into the current OZP. However, the advertisement billboard on external walls of buildings</p>

Subject of Representations	Response to Representation
	<p>is building structure subject to the approval of the Buildings Authority. Besides, to minimize light nuisance and energy wastage, the Environment Bureau (ENB) launched the Charter on External Lighting to invite owners of and responsible persons for external lighting installations to switch off lighting installations of decorative, promotional or advertising purposes which affect the outdoor environment during preset time (i.e. 11 p.m. or midnight to 7a.m. on the following day). ENB has also been recommending owners of lighting installations to observe the Guidelines on Industrial Best Practices for External Lighting Installations which outline some general good practices on design, installation and operation of external lighting for reference of lighting designers, contractors, owners and users with a view to minimizing the adverse impacts arising from external lighting.</p>

(4) The proposals of the opposing representations (TPB/R/S/H6/16 - R105 to R244, R245 (part)) and expressing views/concerns (R246 and R247) as well as responses are summarised below:

Proposal of Opposing Representation	Response to Representation
<p>B.11 To impose NBA along Lee Garden Road under Amendment Item F (R111 to R114).</p>	<p>The NBA requirement was quashed by the Courts upon JRs. Notwithstanding, the AVA concluded that under the northerly wind, Percival Street is the major air path of the area around Lee Garden Road and Hysan Place. As Lee Garden Road is not a major air path, the provision of a NBA along Lee Garden Road has only localized effect to the wind environment, whereas similar improvement to the wind environment can instead be achieved through the adoption of SBDG when the surrounding areas are redeveloped. Hence, the deletion of the NBA would not have adverse impact on the air ventilation of the area.</p>

(5) The grounds and proposals of the commenters (TPB/R/S/H6/16 - C1 to C7) as well as responses are summarised below:

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H6/16-)	Related Representation / Amendment Item	Gist of Comment	Response to Comment
C1	Support R1 to R101 Oppose R105 to R244	C.1 The Amendments Items cover different aspects, the objections lack technical, scientific and locational details or justifications on the adverse impacts stated.	Noted. Responses under A.10 to A.12 & B.1 to B.8 above are relevant.
C2 and C3	Support R102 (Amendment Items B1, B2 and F and clarifications to the Explanatory Statement) and R103 (Amendment Items C1 and C2)	C.2 The BHR should be further relaxed on Lee Garden Two Site for high quality building development in future. <u>Commenter's Proposal</u> (a) The BHR for the Lee Garden Two site should be further relaxed from 135mPD to 150mPD.	Responses under A.11 above are relevant.
C4	Support R103	C.3 The Lee Garden Two site is a narrow and unusually shaped, the 135mPD height limit is not adequate to build high quality modern and environmentally friendly building like Hysan Place in compliance with SBDG. C.4 The BHR of 135mPD would require excessive basement excavation which is neither environmentally friendly nor a good practice. <u>Commenter's Proposal</u> (a) The BHR for the Lee Garden Two site should be further relaxed from 135mPD to 150mPD.	Responses under A.11 above are relevant.

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H6/16-)	Related Representation / Amendment Item	Gist of Comment	Response to Comment
C5 (R110)	Oppose to All Amendment Items	<p>C.5 TPB is to safeguard the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community by proper town planning.</p> <p>C.6 There is a need to bear in mind the economic interests of the project proponent, but to take this into a matter of inflexible principle is plainly wrong. TPB must consider only the impact of proposals that would have on the community.</p> <p>C.7 TPB is not compelled to acquiesce to the demands of property project proponents with regard to height restrictions, setbacks, etc. for inclusion in OZP.</p> <p>C.8 The original OZP conditions were already less favourable. Additional relaxations in favour of over development would have a negative impact at street level.</p> <p>C.9 The Courts have stipulated that the OZP should be reviewed but have not required TPB to approve additional relaxations and abolition of setbacks.</p>	Noted. Responses under A.10 to A.12 & B.1 to B.8 above are relevant.
C6	Oppose R102 and R103 (Amendment Items B2 and C2)	<p>C.10 Changes are totally unacceptable in view of the recent trend to widen public pavements by setting back construction structures from site boundaries.</p> <p>C.11 No solid reason to relax the height restriction except for the good of the property project proponent.</p>	(i) Responses under B.5 to B.8 above are relevant. Though NBAs are reduced at Great George Street and Sugar Street, the remaining widths of footpaths are still maintained not less than 3.5m which is comparable to the adjacent areas.



Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H/6/16-)	Related Representation / Amendment Item	Gist of Comment	Response to Comment
	Support <b>R105</b> , <b>R106</b> , <b>R107</b> and <b>R109</b> (Amendment Items A, B1, C1, D, E1, E2 and F)	<p><u>Amendment Items A, B1, C1 and D</u></p> <p>C.12 Object to the relaxation of BH.</p> <p><u>Amendment Items E1 and E2</u></p> <p>C.13 Changes are totally unacceptable in view of the recent trend to widen public pavements to setback from site boundaries.</p> <p>C.14 The concerned locations (both sides of Sugar Street &amp; Great George Street and south of Lockhart Road) are very crowded, there is no public interest or reason to narrow the public pavement.</p> <p>C.15 Reducing the driving lanes from 2 to 1 to widen the public pavements should not be considered from transport planning and town planning view points.</p> <p><u>Amendment Item F</u></p> <p>C.16 No reason for such amendment as Hysan Place was built about 5 years ago with no redevelopment in the foreseeable future.</p> <p><u>Others</u></p> <p>C.17 No limitation on the number of basement levels for developments with no physical constraints to fully utilize land resources and not creating visual impact to the skyline and airflow.</p>	<p><u>Amendment Items A, B1, C1 and D</u></p> <p>(ii) Responses under A.10 to A.12 &amp; B.1 to B.9 above are relevant.</p> <p><u>Amendment Items E1 and E2</u></p> <p>(iii) Responses under B.5 to B.8 above are relevant.</p> <p>(iv) Regarding the comment on the reduction of driving lanes for widening of public pavement, as advised by TD, there is no plan in reducing the number of traffic lanes at Great George Street and Sugar Street in relation to this Amendment Item under the draft OZP.</p> <p><u>Amendment Item F</u></p> <p>(v) Responses under B.7, B.8 &amp; B.11 above are relevant.</p> <p><u>Others</u></p> <p>(vi) Response under A.12 above is relevant.</p>
Support <b>R246</b> and <b>R247</b>			

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H6/16-)	Related Representation / Amendment Item	Gist of Comment	Response to Comment
C7	Oppose R247	<p>C.18 To prohibit large scale advertising billboards on external walls of the buildings to avoid light pollution and traffic accidents.</p> <p>C.19 Proposal for PTI on ground is not supported for reason that there is insufficient capacity in the surrounding road network.</p>	<p>(vii) Response under B.10 above is relevant.</p>
			<p>(i) As advised by TD, the need for PTI should be subject to site availability, road network, planned development and public transport needs. There is a lack of site at suitable location and of suitable size within the OZP area for the development of PTI.</p> <p>(ii) Responses under A.10 above are relevant.</p>

(6) Major Grounds and Proposals of Respective Representations

Representer	Related Amendment Item(s)	Major Grounds/Proposal
R1	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A4
R2	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2, A4
R3	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R4	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A5
R5	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R6	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2, A5, A6, A10
R7	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2, A8, A10, A11, A12
R8	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2, A6, A12
R9	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2, A12
R10	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A3, A6, A10
R11	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A4
R12	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A12
R13	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R14	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R15	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R16	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R17	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R18	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A6, A12
R19	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R20	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R21	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A11
R22	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2, A8
R23	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A8
R24	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R25	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A12
R26	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R27	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R28	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R29	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A12
R30	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2, A6, A10, A12
R31	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A5
R32	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A10
R33	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A6, A10
R34	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A12

R35	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A8, A11
R36	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2, A6, A10, A12
R37	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A10, A12
R38	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2, A6, A10, A12
R39	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2, A6, A12
R40	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2, A6, A10
R41	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1
R42	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R43	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R44	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R45	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R46	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A6, A12
R47	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R48	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R49	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R50	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R51	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R52	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A12
R53	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R54	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R55	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A4
R56	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R57	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A5
R58	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R59	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A5
R60	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R61	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R62	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A10
R63	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A6, A10
R64	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2, A10
R65	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A10
R66	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A6, A12
R67	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A6, A10, A12
R68	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A6, A10, A12
R69	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R70	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1
R71	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2

R72	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R73	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A12
R74	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R75	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A5, A10
R76	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A10
R77	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R78	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R79	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R80	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R81	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R82	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R83	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, B10
R84	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R85	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A10
R86	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A5
R87	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A10, A12
R88	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A6, A10
R89	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A6, A10, A12
R90	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A10
R91	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R92	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2
R93	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2, A6, A12
R94	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R95	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R96	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A6, A10, A12
R97	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A6, A10
R98	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A6, A10, A12
R99	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2, A3, A6, A10
R100	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A2
R101	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	A1, A2, A10
R102	B1, B2, F	A7 (see Note 1)
R103	C1, C2	A8, A11
R104	C2	A9
R105	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6, B8
R106	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R107	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R108	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7

R109	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R110	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R111	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6, B8, B11
R112	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6, B8, B11
R113	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6, B8, B11
R114	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6, B8, B11
R115	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R116	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R117	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R118	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R119	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R120	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R121	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R122	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R123	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R124	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R125	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R126	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R127	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R128	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R129	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R130	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R131	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R132	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R133	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R134	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R135	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R136	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R137	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R138	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R139	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R140	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R141	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R142	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R143	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R144	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R145	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6

R146	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R147	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R148	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R149	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R150	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R151	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R152	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R153	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R154	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R155	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R156	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R157	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R158	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R159	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R160	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R161	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R162	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R163	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R164	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R165	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R166	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R167	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R168	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R169	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R170	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R171	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R172	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R173	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R174	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R175	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R176	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R177	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R178	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R179	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R180	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R181	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R182	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7

R183	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R184	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R185	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R186	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R187	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R188	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R189	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R190	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R191	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R192	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R193	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R194	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R195	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R196	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R197	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R198	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R199	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R200	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R201	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R202	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R203	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R204	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R205	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R206	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R207	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R208	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R209	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R210	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R211	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R212	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R213	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R214	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R215	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R216	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R217	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R218	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R219	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7



R220	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R221	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R222	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R223	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R224	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R225	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R226	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R227	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R228	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R229	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R230	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R231	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R232	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R233	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R234	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R235	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R236	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R237	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R238	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R239	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R240	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R241	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R242	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R243	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1 to B7
R244	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	B1, B3 to B6
R245	D	B9
R246	---	A12
R247	---	A2, B10

*Note 1:* R102 only states the support to Amendment Items B1, B2 & F and clarifications to the OZP without providing any reasons for support.

#### Gist of Respective Comments on Representations and Response

Commenters	Related Amendment Item(s)	Gist of Comments and Response
C1	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	C1, A10, A11, A12, B1 to B8
C2	B1, B2, C1, C2 F	C2, A11
C3	B1, B2, C1, C2 F	C2, A11

C4	C1, C2	C3, C4, A11
C5	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F	C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, A10, A11, A12, B1 to B8
C6	A, B1, B2, C1, C2, D, E1, E2, E3, F A, B1, C1, D E1, E2 F ---	C10, C11, B5 to B8 C12, A10 to A12, B1 to B9 C13, C14, C15, B5 to B8 C16, B7, B8, B11 C17, C18, A12, B10
C7	---	C19, A10

**List of Representers in respect of  
Draft Causeway Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H6/16**

<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Name of 'Representer'</b>
TPB/R/S/H6/16-1	馮先生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-2	姜生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-3	李女士
TPB/R/S/H6/16-4	阮先生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-5	Anson Yip
TPB/R/S/H6/16-6	Christ Yeung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-7	陳宏亮
TPB/R/S/H6/16-8	陳國強
TPB/R/S/H6/16-9	張先生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-10	李志明
TPB/R/S/H6/16-11	Jimmy Fong
TPB/R/S/H6/16-12	陳先生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-13	莊小姐
TPB/R/S/H6/16-14	文子昱
TPB/R/S/H6/16-15	嚴先生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-16	Michael Leung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-17	Johnny Fung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-18	Cathy Li
TPB/R/S/H6/16-19	Babi Chan
TPB/R/S/H6/16-20	Jane Chang
TPB/R/S/H6/16-21	陳國權
TPB/R/S/H6/16-22	陳彩霞
TPB/R/S/H6/16-23	陳先生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-24	文生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-25	吳先生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-26	Winnie Cheung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-27	K K Lee
TPB/R/S/H6/16-28	陳智明
TPB/R/S/H6/16-29	黃智星
TPB/R/S/H6/16-30	Chan Hoi Man
TPB/R/S/H6/16-31	Dennis Chui
TPB/R/S/H6/16-32	Cindy Kwok
TPB/R/S/H6/16-33	Chris Lau
TPB/R/S/H6/16-34	Natalie Mak
TPB/R/S/H6/16-35	Francis Neoton Cheung

<b>Representation No.</b>	<b>Name of 'Representer'</b>
TPB/R/S/H6/16-36	鄭先生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-37	吳偉雄
TPB/R/S/H6/16-38	施澤成
TPB/R/S/H6/16-39	Chan Ka Chung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-40	Jack Wong
TPB/R/S/H6/16-41	Issac Au
TPB/R/S/H6/16-42	Ray Leung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-43	Bob Pang
TPB/R/S/H6/16-44	Terry Wu
TPB/R/S/H6/16-45	秦先生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-46	戴先生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-47	Ben Choi
TPB/R/S/H6/16-48	Martin Tsang
TPB/R/S/H6/16-49	Harrison Ho
TPB/R/S/H6/16-50	John Lam
TPB/R/S/H6/16-51	Kelvin Chan
TPB/R/S/H6/16-52	Vincent Chen
TPB/R/S/H6/16-53	Nelson Cheng
TPB/R/S/H6/16-54	Paul Hui
TPB/R/S/H6/16-55	Mark Hung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-56	Louisa Jade
TPB/R/S/H6/16-57	Mary Lam
TPB/R/S/H6/16-58	Rocky Tam
TPB/R/S/H6/16-59	Eagle Tang
TPB/R/S/H6/16-60	Tim Zhao
TPB/R/S/H6/16-61	Gordon Ford
TPB/R/S/H6/16-62	Tammy Leung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-63	James Thiem
TPB/R/S/H6/16-64	Gordon Cheng
TPB/R/S/H6/16-65	Billy Lee
TPB/R/S/H6/16-66	張炳權
TPB/R/S/H6/16-67	梁女士
TPB/R/S/H6/16-68	文世澤
TPB/R/S/H6/16-69	蔣先生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-70	張先生

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H6/16-71	顧先生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-72	李小姐
TPB/R/S/H6/16-73	呂先生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-74	孫先生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-75	王智文
TPB/R/S/H6/16-76	Chi Chan
TPB/R/S/H6/16-77	Henry Chan
TPB/R/S/H6/16-78	Edward Law
TPB/R/S/H6/16-79	Ronald Ng
TPB/R/S/H6/16-80	Man Yee Wong
TPB/R/S/H6/16-81	David Yeung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-82	Tommy Yuen
TPB/R/S/H6/16-83	Woody Lee
TPB/R/S/H6/16-84	陳先生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-85	陳樹
TPB/R/S/H6/16-86	陳國勝
TPB/R/S/H6/16-87	張天龍
TPB/R/S/H6/16-88	林志明
TPB/R/S/H6/16-89	李同
TPB/R/S/H6/16-90	童叔
TPB/R/S/H6/16-91	蘇生
TPB/R/S/H6/16-92	楊福祥
TPB/R/S/H6/16-93	Lau Siu Cheong
TPB/R/S/H6/16-94	Steven Chou
TPB/R/S/H6/16-95	Oscar Du
TPB/R/S/H6/16-96	Rita Kwok
TPB/R/S/H6/16-97	Ruby Lam
TPB/R/S/H6/16-98	Simon Lee
TPB/R/S/H6/16-99	Jacky Li
TPB/R/S/H6/16-100	Stella So
TPB/R/S/H6/16-101	Steven
TPB/R/S/H6/16-102	Hysan Development Company Limited
TPB/R/S/H6/16-103	Barrowgate Limited

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H6/16-104	Uncle Ng
TPB/R/S/H6/16-105	灣仔區議會 Wan Chai District Council
TPB/R/S/H6/16-106	鄭俊宇立法會議員辦事處 Office of Hon Kwong Chun Yu Legislative Council Member
TPB/R/S/H6/16-107	楊雪盈議員辦事處 Office of Clarisse Yeung District Councilor
TPB/R/S/H6/16-108	大坑坊眾福利會 Tai Hang Residents' Welfare Association
TPB/R/S/H6/16-109	環保觸覺 Green Sense
TPB/R/S/H6/16-110	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/H6/16-111	Evelyn Moore
TPB/R/S/H6/16-112	John Moore
TPB/R/S/H6/16-113	Melanie Moore
TPB/R/S/H6/16-114	Genevieve Moore
TPB/R/S/H6/16-115	Johnny Ng
TPB/R/S/H6/16-116	Karson Ho
TPB/R/S/H6/16-117	Leung Mei Yee
TPB/R/S/H6/16-118	Belle Choi
TPB/R/S/H6/16-119	Frank Ho
TPB/R/S/H6/16-120	Carlos Ho
TPB/R/S/H6/16-121	Ma Shu Wei
TPB/R/S/H6/16-122	Jackson Hung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-123	Danny Hung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-124	Ammy Ho
TPB/R/S/H6/16-125	Shannon Hoo
TPB/R/S/H6/16-126	Lee Kai Wah
TPB/R/S/H6/16-127	Stella Li
TPB/R/S/H6/16-128	Daisy Mak
TPB/R/S/H6/16-129	Mak Aaron
TPB/R/S/H6/16-130	Yeung Kam Piu
TPB/R/S/H6/16-131	Randi Young
TPB/R/S/H6/16-132	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-133	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-134	鄭子健
TPB/R/S/H6/16-135	江超良

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H6/16-136	柯曉恩
TPB/R/S/H6/16-137	吳甲川
TPB/R/S/H6/16-138	彭政逸
TPB/R/S/H6/16-139	任榮華
TPB/R/S/H6/16-140	Yeung Steve
TPB/R/S/H6/16-141	楊春明
TPB/R/S/H6/16-142	唐宅
TPB/R/S/H6/16-143	駱錫鴻
TPB/R/S/H6/16-144	Chan Tze Yin
TPB/R/S/H6/16-145	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-146	Joanne
TPB/R/S/H6/16-147	Kong Se Ping David
TPB/R/S/H6/16-148	Lam Wai Wou
TPB/R/S/H6/16-149	Lai Kiu Kai
TPB/R/S/H6/16-150	Lai Sek Fun
TPB/R/S/H6/16-151	Leung Wing Yi
TPB/R/S/H6/16-152	Tsang Wai Ngan
TPB/R/S/H6/16-153	Katie Poon
TPB/R/S/H6/16-154	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-155	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-156	歐陽瑞愛
TPB/R/S/H6/16-157	陳美貞
TPB/R/S/H6/16-158	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-159	陳鳳琴
TPB/R/S/H6/16-160	張太
TPB/R/S/H6/16-161	張燕飛
TPB/R/S/H6/16-162	周麗嫦
TPB/R/S/H6/16-163	朱少梅
TPB/R/S/H6/16-164	鍾少開
TPB/R/S/H6/16-165	傅振霞
TPB/R/S/H6/16-166	馮麗芬
TPB/R/S/H6/16-167	郭大偉
TPB/R/S/H6/16-168	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-169	林亮豪
TPB/R/S/H6/16-170	劉惠芳

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H6/16-171	李小慶
TPB/R/S/H6/16-172	李英華
TPB/R/S/H6/16-173	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-174	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-175	梁志遠
TPB/R/S/H6/16-176	利汝滔
TPB/R/S/H6/16-177	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-178	麥苑容
TPB/R/S/H6/16-179	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-180	麥志強
TPB/R/S/H6/16-181	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-182	戴國強
TPB/R/S/H6/16-183	鄧建達
TPB/R/S/H6/16-184	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-185	胡雪文
TPB/R/S/H6/16-186	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-187	黃文聰
TPB/R/S/H6/16-188	袁潔芝
TPB/R/S/H6/16-189	袁浩田
TPB/R/S/H6/16-190	袁天祐
TPB/R/S/H6/16-191	Au Mei Yee
TPB/R/S/H6/16-192	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-193	Chow Kit Bing
TPB/R/S/H6/16-194	Jenny
TPB/R/S/H6/16-195	Kwok H H
TPB/R/S/H6/16-196	Irene Mok
TPB/R/S/H6/16-197	Tse Sui Ying
TPB/R/S/H6/16-198	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-199	姓名不詳 Name illegible
TPB/R/S/H6/16-200	Christopher Taung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-201	Tang Chung Shun
TPB/R/S/H6/16-202	Wong Bik Ching
TPB/R/S/H6/16-203	Li
TPB/R/S/H6/16-204	Lee Dorcas
TPB/R/S/H6/16-205	胡國海

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H6/16-206	Hui
TPB/R/S/H6/16-207	Wong Jason
TPB/R/S/H6/16-208	陳志明
TPB/R/S/H6/16-209	Lam Poa Yuen
TPB/R/S/H6/16-210	Ho Hoo Wah
TPB/R/S/H6/16-211	Law Yu Kwan
TPB/R/S/H6/16-212	Y K
TPB/R/S/H6/16-213	Leung Yin King
TPB/R/S/H6/16-214	Alvin Cheung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-215	K Y Au
TPB/R/S/H6/16-216	Law Wai Shan
TPB/R/S/H6/16-217	袁寶潔
TPB/R/S/H6/16-218	Cho Heung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-219	Lee Chi Hoi
TPB/R/S/H6/16-220	P Mou
TPB/R/S/H6/16-221	Lau Ching Wa
TPB/R/S/H6/16-222	Yuen Chi Yan
TPB/R/S/H6/16-223	張啟昕
TPB/R/S/H6/16-224	Teresa
TPB/R/S/H6/16-225	Fi Wong
TPB/R/S/H6/16-226	Lee Hing Fai Humphrey
TPB/R/S/H6/16-227	Chan Wing Yu
TPB/R/S/H6/16-228	Alan Lee
TPB/R/S/H6/16-229	Lam Chi Man
TPB/R/S/H6/16-230	Ming Yin Kung

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H6/16-231	Johnny Ng
TPB/R/S/H6/16-232	John Cheung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-233	Phoebe Chan
TPB/R/S/H6/16-234	Ng K L
TPB/R/S/H6/16-235	Yu Koon Yin
TPB/R/S/H6/16-236	Victor Chan
TPB/R/S/H6/16-237	Jason Hung
TPB/R/S/H6/16-238	C K Mak
TPB/R/S/H6/16-239	Cleo Wong
TPB/R/S/H6/16-240	Cheung Chi Wai
TPB/R/S/H6/16-241	Helen Tsui
TPB/R/S/H6/16-242	Ivan Lam
TPB/R/S/H6/16-243	Joan Shang
TPB/R/S/H6/16-244	梁洪恩
TPB/R/S/H6/16-245	光明臺業主委員會
TPB/R/S/H6/16-246	Frank Yip
TPB/R/S/H6/16-247	Edward Chu

**List of Commenters in respect of  
Draft Causeway Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H6/16**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Name of 'Commenter'</b>
TPB/R/S/H6/16-C1	Excelsior Hotel (BVI) Ltd. & The Excelsior Hotel (HK) Ltd.
TPB/R/S/H6/16-C2	Ava Lau
TPB/R/S/H6/16-C3	Chan Shek Kwong
TPB/R/S/H6/16-C4	Yun Fan Lai
TPB/R/S/H6/16-C5	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/H6/16-C6	Sun Shun Kei
TPB/R/S/H6/16-C7	Mr. Yeung