

Meeting re-scheduled for
8.5.2020

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

TPB Paper No. 10623
For Consideration by
The Town Planning Board on 3.2.2020

CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS TO
THE DRAFT WONG NAI CHUNG
OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H7/20

TPB Paper No. 10623
 For consideration by
 the Town Planning Board
 on 3.2.2020

**DRAFT WONG NAI CHUNG OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H7/20
 CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/H7/20-1 TO 634
AND COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/H7/20-C1 TO C105**

Subject of Representations	Representers (No. TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Commenters (No. TPB/R/S/H7/20-)
<p>Amendment Item A - Rezoning of the northern and eastern part of the Caroline Hill Road (CHR) Site fronting Leighton Road from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sports and Recreation Club” (“OU (SRC)”) and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Commercial (2)” (“C (2)”) with revision to the maximum building height (BH) from 2 storeys and 3 storeys to 135mPD.</p> <p>Amendment Item B – Rezoning of the southern part of the CHR Site from “G/IC” to “G/IC (2)” with revision to the maximum BH from 3 storeys to 135mPD.</p>	<p>TOTAL: 629 <u>Support (6)</u></p> <p><u>All Items</u> R1 to R5: Individual</p> <p><u>All items but objects to the amendment of Notes</u> R6: Hysan Development Company Limited</p> <p><u>Oppose (621)</u> <u>Item A</u> R7 to R10: Individual</p> <p><u>All Items</u> R11: Ms. NG Yuen-ting, Yolanda (former Wan Chai District Council (WCDC) Member)</p> <p>R12: Hon. Paul TSE Wai-chun (WCDC Member)</p> <p>R13: Miss YEUNG Suet-ying, Clarisse (WCDC Member)</p> <p>R14: 香港希雲街 13 號至 15 號 A 業主立案法團 The Incorporated Owners (IO) of 13-15A, Haven</p>	<p>TOTAL: 105 <u>Support (1)</u></p> <p><u>R34</u> C105: Individual</p> <p><u>Oppose (104)</u> <u>Oppose R6 and R11</u> C1: Miss YEUNG Suet-ying, Clarisse (WCDC Member)</p> <p>C2, C4 to C93: Individual</p> <p>C3: 灣仔起步 Kickstart Wan Chai</p> <p><u>Oppose R6, R11 and R35</u> C94: Caroline Hill Planning Concern Group</p> <p>C95: Jardine's Lookout Concern Group</p> <p>C96: OCC of Linden Height</p> <p>C97: OCC of Flora Garden</p> <p>C98: OCC of Cavendish Heights (Block 8)</p>

	<p>Street, Hong Kong</p> <p>R15: 香港希雲道 17 號至 19 號 A 業主立案法團 IO of 17-19A, Haven Street, Hong Kong</p> <p>R16: 禮信大廈業主立案法團 IO of Lei Shun Court</p> <p>R17: Caroline Hill Planning Concern Group</p> <p>R18: 香港加路連山道 13, 13A, 15 及 15A 號業主立案法團 IO of No. 13, 13A, 15 & 15A Caroline Hill Road, Hong Kong</p> <p>R19: The Owners Corporation Committee (OCC) of Tai Hang Terrace</p> <p>R20: OCC of Park Garden, Tai Hang Drive</p> <p>R21: OCC of Wing On Towers</p> <p>R22: OCC of Butler Towers</p> <p>R23: OCC of Cavendish Heights (Blocks 1-7)</p> <p>R24: Jardine's Lookout Concern Group</p> <p>R25: OCC of Cavendish Heights (Block 8)</p> <p>R27: 加路連花園業主委員會委員 Caroline Garden OCC</p>	<p>C99: OCC of Cavendish Heights (Blocks 1-7)</p> <p>C100: OCC of Wing On Towers</p> <p>C101: OCC of Park Garden, Tai Hang Drive</p> <p>C102: OCC of Tai Hang Terrace</p> <p>C103: Residents of Jardine's Lookout</p> <p>C104: Individual</p>
--	--	---

	<p>R28: Residents of Jardine's Lookout</p> <p>R29: OCC of Linden Height</p> <p>R30: OCC of Flora Garden</p> <p>R31: 比華利山業主立案法團 IO of Beverly Hill</p> <p>R32: 大坑關注社 (夾附 570 個簽名) Tai Hang Concern Association (with 570 signatures enclosed)</p> <p>R33: Best Epoch Holdings Limited</p> <p>R35: 博匯 Doctoral Exchange</p> <p>R26, R34 and R36 to R632: Individuals</p> <p><u>Providing Views (2)</u> R633 to R634: Individuals</p>	
--	--	--

Note: The names of all representers and commenters are attached at **Appendix V**. Soft copy of their submissions is sent to the Town Planning Board Members via electronic means; and is also available for public inspection at the Town Planning Board's website at https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/plan_making/S_H7_20.html and the Planning Enquiry Counters of the Planning Department in North Point and Sha Tin. A set of hard copy is deposited at the TPB Secretariat for Members' inspection.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 24.5.2019, the draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H7/20 (**Appendix I**) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Schedule of Amendments setting out the amendments is at **Appendix II** and the locations of the amendment items are shown on **Plan H-1**.

- 1.2 During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 629 valid representations were received. On 6.9.2019, the representations were published for public comments. A total of 105 valid comments were received.
- 1.3 On 6.12.2019, the Town Planning Board (the Board) agreed to consider the representations and comments collectively. This paper is to provide the Board with information for consideration of the representations and comments. The representers and commenters have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the Ordinance.

2. Background

- 2.1 As announced in the Policy Address of the Chief Executive in October 2017, the Government is committed to improving court facilities, including the construction of a District Court comprising the District Courts, Family Courts and Lands Tribunal at CHR. The 2017-18 Budget also indicated that to maintain Hong Kong's status as an international financial centre, it is necessary to ensure a continual supply of office space, especially Grade A office space. In this regard, to meet the long-term needs of District Court-level judicial facilities and to make good use of government land in the core business district, the CHR Site is proposed for District Court and commercial development.
- 2.2 The CHR Site (about 2.66 hectares) was occupied by the ex-Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) Headquarters, the ex-Civil Aid Service (CAS) Headquarters, the ex-Post Office Recreation Club and the PCCW Recreation Club. All except the ex-EMSD Headquarters and ex-CAS Headquarters were low-rise buildings. Vehicular accesses to the CHR Site are via eastern and western sections ends of CHR. The CHR Site is generally demarcated by two platforms at about 10mPD (fronting Leighton Road) and 15mPD (fronting South China Athletic Association (SCAA)).
- 2.3 On 8.3.2019 and 3.5.2019, the Board considered the proposed amendments to the approved Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/19 and agreed that the proposed amendments are suitable for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. The relevant MPC Papers No. 1/19 and 5/19 are available at the Board's website at (https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/papers/MPC/623-mpc_1-19.pdf and https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/papers/MPC/626-mpc_5-19.pdf respectively) and the minutes of the respective MPC meetings are at **Appendix III(a)** and **Appendix III(b)**. Accordingly, the OZP renumbered to S/H7/20 was gazette on 24.5.2019.

3. Consultation with the Wan Chai District Council

- 3.1 The proposed development at the CHR Site and the current amendments incorporated into the OZP were presented to the Wan Chai District Council (WCDC) on 8.5.2018, 8.1.2019 and 4.7.2019. On 8.5.2018, majority of the WCDC members objected to the proposed amendment primarily on traffic grounds, while individual members considered that G/IC facilities which would benefit the Wan Chai District should be provided within the CHR Site. Minutes of the WCDC meeting on 8.5.2018 is at **Appendix IV(a)**. In response to the suggestion of providing community facilities on the CHR Site, after consultation with related government departments, one District Health Centre (DHC) and one Child Care Centre (CCC) were proposed to be provided in the commercial development. On 8.1.2019, PlanD further consulted WCDC on the revised development proposals and majority of the WCDC members supported the provision of DHC and CCC but some considered that more G/IC facilities should be provided. WCDC still had concern on the traffic impacts of the proposed developments at the CHR Site. Minutes of the WCDC meeting on 8.1.2019 is at **Appendix IV(b)**.
- 3.2 When the proposed amendments to OZP were submitted to WCDC for consultation on 4.7.2019, WCDC members expressed concern on the traffic impact as well as the assumptions adopted in the Traffic Review. Other concerns include the need of the commercial development, the proposed BH of the District Court and the impacts of the proposed developments on the surrounding area were also raised. Before the WCDC meeting, a motion together with a list of questions objecting to the rezoning proposal and requesting the Government to work out a new proposal with community facilities, civic centre and public green space was proposed. Government's written responses to the list of questions issued before the WCDC meeting and government representatives' responses to the concerns raised at the meeting were at **Appendix IV(c)** and **Appendix IV(d)** respectively. The motion was eventually passed by WCDC at its meeting on 4.7.2019. Some members of WCDC also subsequently submitted representations (**R11, R12 and R13**) and comment (**C1**) to the Board.

4. The Representations

4.1 Subject of Representations

- 4.1.1 There are a total of 629 valid representations, including six supportive representations (**R1 to R6**), 621 adverse representations (**R7 to R632**) (excluding 5 duplicated representations)ⁱ and two representations

ⁱ **R402, R407, R425, R426 and R482** were duplicated submissions.

(**R633 to R634**) providing views on the amendments. The list of representers is at **Appendix V**. Location of the IOs/OCCs can be found on **Plan H-9**.

- 4.1.2 Among the supportive representations, five representations (**R1 to R5**) submitted by individuals support all amendment items with some providing comments on the amendments. The remaining one representation submitted by a private company (**R6**) supports all amendment items in principle but objects to the amendments to the Notes for “Commercial (2)” (“C(2)”) zone.
- 4.1.3 The remaining 621 representations are adverse representations. Out of which, four representations (**R7 to R10**) object to Item A, while 617 representations (**R11 to R632**)ⁱ object to all amendment items. Of these 617 representations, 580 were submitted in the form of six types of standard letters or questionnaire (i.e. **R14 to R30, R32, R36 to R599 and R629 to R630**) with individual representers providing additional comments on top. The adverse representations were submitted by three former or incumbent members of the WCDC (Ms. NG Yuen-ting, Yolanda (**R11**), Hon. Paul TSE Wai-chun (**R12**) and Miss YEUNG Suet-ying, Clarisse (**R13**)), 16 IO/OCC/residents groups (**R14 to R16, R18 to R25 and R27 to R31**), three local concern groups (**R17, R32 and R35**), one private company (**R33**) and individuals (**R7 to R10, R26, R34, R36 to R632**)ⁱ.
- 4.1.4 A summary of the grounds of representations and comments as well as their proposals, and PlanD’s responses, in consultation with the relevant government departments, is at **Appendix VI**.

4.2 Supportive Representations

Major Grounds of Supportive Representations

- 4.2.1 **R1 to R5** support all the amendment items in the OZP. **R3** considers that the CHR Site can provide more commercial land conducive to effective use of government land. **R1, R4 and R5** consider that the conceptual layout is not the most beneficial design and more focus should be placed on providing benefits for the neighbourhood. **R2** is of the view that the public space in the conceptual layout is too fragmented and there is a need for good pedestrian circulation through and around the development.
- 4.2.2 **R6** supports in principle all the amendment items but objects to the Notes for “C(2)” zone. **R6** is of the view that the conceptual layout is very constrained. The proposed internal road and ventilation gap split the CHR Site into small dimension and result in fragmented layout and open space. A more comprehensive mix of community facilities should be accommodated. In this regard, **R6** considers that

comprehensive design and total integration of the whole site could be achieved through the submission of Master Layout Plan (MLP) to the Board.

Major Proposal from R6

4.2.3 To achieve better integration, **R6** proposes to rezone the whole CHR Site to “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) for integrated design/development with submissions of MLP (known as **Option 1**). If Option 1 is not pursued, another option is to require the submission of MLP for the “C(2)” zone while the “G/IC(2)” for District Court development remain unchanged (known as **Option 2**). **R6** also submits an alternative layout (**Drawing H-1**) in which the whole CHR Site including the access road is decked over to a maximum level of 19mPD with the provision of a wider range of community facilities including a District Elderly Centre, Community Hall and study room in addition to DHC and CCC with a total Net Operational Floor Area (NOFA) of 3,563m² ⁱⁱ.

4.3 **Adverse Representations**

4.3.1 **R7 to R10** object to Item A while **R11 to R632** ⁱ object to all Items. While there are contrasting views among the adverse representations, the major grounds of the adverse representations are as follows:

Need for Development and Land Use

- (a) The proposed development does not take into account the actual need of the immediate area and will only benefit the developers and against the principle of proper use of public land. The proposed development will destroy the neighbourhood or bad for the district and does not match with the neighbourhood. Rezoning of the CHR Site represents a loss of community area.
- (b) Specifically for the commercial development, there is no urgent need/ justified need of land for commercial development in Causeway Bay. It is also considered that the proposed commercial development is not in line/ incompatible with land use character of the locality.
- (c) Regarding the provision of retail facilities at the proposed commercial development at the CHR Site, some representers consider that there are sufficient retail facilities in the area. Also, there are views that hotel development should not be allowed as of right.

ⁱⁱ No specific GFA of DHC and CCC is stipulated in the Notes of “C(2)” zone on the OZP. Only NOFA of about 1,000m² and 531m² for DHC and CCC respectively are stated in the ES of the OZP.

Development Intensity and BH

- (d) The proposed development intensity is considered excessive. The proposed development is too congested and the proposed BH is significantly different from the neighbouring developments. It will bring about adverse impacts on landscape/ pedestrian flow/ living environment/ air ventilation/ air quality/ visual/ sunlight penetration/ residents' health.
- (e) The maximum permissible GFA of the proposed District Court exceeds the requirements of the Judiciary. The permissible BH of the proposed District Court should be reduced to follow the dimension of a regular G/IC facility.

Conceptual Layout and Building Disposition

- (f) The proposed conceptual layout (**Plan H-5**) is undesirable as (i) the building massing is bulky with narrow building gap; (ii) there is a lack of void to allow air ventilation; (iii) the proposed green area and landscaping areas are segregated and divided by roads; and (iv) the G/IC facilities are scattered. The layout and connectivity between the two public open spaces, divided by the new access road, is undesirable.
- (g) The disposition of the buildings is undesirable as the building gap with the neighbouring residential block is narrow. Regarding the proposed disposition of the District Court, it is considered that the buildings are in close proximity to the neighbouring residential development and will affect sunlight penetration. The District Court should be shifted eastwards to allow building gaps of 50m from the Caroline Garden or 40m from south-eastern boundary of the CHR Site in order to create sufficient separation.
- (h) The disposition of the proposed open space should be relocated to the south.

Traffic Impact and Transport Facilities

- (i) The existing area is already congested and there is no spare traffic capacity to accommodate the proposed development. The proposed development will bring about additional traffic to the area thereby aggravating the existing congestion problem/ bring about traffic impact. Some representers consider that TIA conducted is outdated as it relies on survey result that was conducted in 2017. The TIA is also considered not comprehensive as flawed assumptions were adopted without considering holidays, weekends and special events. The TIA

finding is substandard to the Transport Department's minimal acceptable level and there is a need to update the TIA to reflect the 2019 situation.

- (j) Some representers question the need of providing 600 parking spaces and whether CHR Site is able to accommodate the parking facility. Such facilities should be located underground in the form of an integrated basement. The proposed traffic management measures, including the new roundabout and road widening cannot solve traffic problem. Besides, the proposed new road cannot divert traffic but create tailing back to CHR. Instead, a proper roundabout and widening of CHR and Cotton Path should be considered to address the traffic problem. Direct access to Leighton Road (eastbound), Link Road, Cotton Path or at the rear of the CHR Site should be provided.
- (k) The relocation of the minibus terminus to the CHR Site is opposed as it is considered inconvenient.

Provision of G/IC Facilities and Open Space

- (l) Some representers are of the view that there is a pressing need for G/IC facilities and the deficit in local open space provision has not been addressed. The proposed development has not addressed the concerns on the needs of more G/IC facilities. In this regard, the CHR Site should be designated for G/IC uses or park in lieu of commercial development. Some representers also consider that active open space, including sport grounds should be provided to compensate the loss in Moreton Terrace.

Management of Open Space in Private Development

- (m) Regarding the provision of 6,000m² of public open space in the commercial development by the developer, some representers consider that entrusting the public facilities and open space to private management is not desirable and cannot cater for the needs of the residents. Such arrangement will result in having the open space to be used as a profit making tool for the developer. Also, it is considered that the planned open space should be rezoned from "C" to "O" for management by the Government.

Public Consultation

- (n) Public consultation is considered not sufficient and comprehensive. Local residents are not consulted properly and there is a need to undertake thorough public consultation.

Alternative Schemes from Adverse Representations

4.3.2 Six alternative schemes (**Drawing H-2 to Drawing H-7**) are proposed by some representers (**R11, R14 to R27, R29 to R30, R35 and R594 to R599**).

- (a) The alternative scheme put forward by **R11 (Drawings H-2a and H-2b)** mainly involves a reduction in the scale and number of towers for commercial development and the adoption of a single slab block design for the District Court situated on a podium for provision of retail/ G/IC facilities. The proposed BH for the District Court and commercial cum G/IC uses is set as 135mPD and 112mPD respectively. The open space shall be doubled in size (i.e. from 6,000m² to 12,000m²) and the proposed GFA of GIC facilities shall be increased from 3,000m² to 8,000m². An integrated basement carpark design is also proposed. The CHR Site is served by a single access at the back fronting SCAA.
- (b) An alternative scheme (namely Scheme A) is put forward by **R14 to R18 and R27 (Drawing H-3)**. It mainly involves the relocation of the District Court to the east of the CHR Site with a revised BH of 13 storeys. With such arrangement, the zoning boundaries for the “C(2)” and “G/IC(2)” zones are correspondingly adjusted. A building gap requirement of 50m from Caroline Garden and at-grade open space in the southern portion facing CHR are proposed.
- (c) Similar to Scheme A in (b) above, two alternative schemes (namely Scheme B and Scheme C) are put forward by **R19 to R26 and R29 to R30 (Drawing H-4 and Drawing H-5)** which involve changes in the zoning boundaries. Under both Schemes B and C, the District Court is proposed to be relocated eastward but with a different orientation. The proposed BH of the District Court is the same as that suggested by Scheme A (i.e. 13 storeys). A single slab block commercial tower of 135mPD is also proposed. For Scheme B, a building gap requirement of 40m from the south-western site boundary and the requirement of providing at-grade open space in the southern portion facing CHR(West) are proposed. For Scheme C, the proposed GFA for the commercial development is reduced by 10% and an area of 0.7ha within the CHR Site is proposed to be rezoned to “O”.
- (d) The alternative scheme put forward by **R35 (Drawings H-6a and H-6b)** resembles that submitted by **R11**. Under which, the open space and the GFA of G/IC facilities are proposed to be increased. Integrated basement arrangement and single slab block design for the District Court (situated on a podium for provision of retail/ G/IC facilities) are also adopted under this alternative scheme. The scale of the commercial development

is proposed to be reduced by 30% to 50%. The proposed BH for the District Court and commercial cum G/IC uses is set as 135mPD and 100mPD respectively. Also, it is proposed to rezone the entire site to “Other Specific Uses” annotated “G/IC cum Commercial” (“OU(G/IC cum Commercial)”).

- (e) The alternative scheme put forward by **R594 to R599 (Drawing H-7)** mainly involves a reduction in the overall GFA of the CHR Site by at least 30%. Similar to Schemes A, B and C in (b) and (c) above, the District Court is proposed to be relocated eastward. The BH restrictions (BHRs) for the District Court are proposed to be 80mPD and 100mPD. The number of building block for commercial development is proposed to be reduced from two to one with a BH of 150mPD. Under the scheme, sports grounds and a 6-storey GIC block are also proposed at the southern side of the CHR Site. Also, the number of entry/ exit points are proposed to be increased from two to three.

5. Comments on Representations

- 5.1 The 105 comments on representations were submitted by a WDC member (Miss YEUNG Suet-ying, Clarisse (**C1**)), 10 OCC/residents groups (**C95 to C104**), two local concern groups (**C3 and C94**) and individuals (**C2, C4 to C93 and C105**). 37 commenters are also representers themselves. Please refer to the list of commenters at **Appendix V**. Location of the OCCs can be found on **Plan H-9**.
- 5.2 93 comments (**C1 to C93**) are submitted in the form of a standard letter and they oppose to **R6 and R11**. 11 comments (**C94 to C104**) are also submitted in the form of a standard letter with an individual commenter providing additional comments on top and they oppose to **R6, R11 and R35**. **C105** supports her own representation (i.e. **R34**) which objects to all amendment items.
- 5.3 The major grounds of the comments are summarised as follows:
 - (a) **C1 to C93** oppose to **R6 and R11** in that it is inappropriate to include commercial development at the CHR Site due to concern on traffic and noise pollution. The commenters also oppose to the representations on the issues relating to the restriction of the GFA for community facilities and open space (**R6**) as well as the relocation of minibus station (**R6 and R11**). In this regard, the commenters support the provision of more G/IC facilities at the CHR Site and the provision of open space that are managed by the Government.
 - (b) **C94 to C104** oppose to **R6** in that creating CHR Site into a

community focal point will worsen the existing traffic and environmental condition. The commenters also oppose to **R6**'s proposal of integrating District Court with commercial and community uses and rezoning the whole CHR Site to "CDA". The commenters are also of the view that it is important to impose restriction on GFA of commercial development to ensure that the carrying capacity of the local district will not be exceeded. Moreover, additional community facilities proposed should be accountable towards the overall GFA of the commercial development. Besides, it is considered that a minimum setback requirement of 40m at the open space shall be incorporated and should MLP submission be required, an updated TIA should be submitted.

- (c) **C94 to C104** oppose to **R11** and **R35** in that it is undesirable to integrate the District Court with the commercial development. The commenters also oppose to the representers' proposed amphitheatre as it will create noise impacts; the single slab block design as it is incompatible with the surrounding and will cause adverse impact; and the proposed road design with only one one-way vehicle access is inappropriate. The commenters are also of the view that entrusting a private developer to design and construct government facilities is impractical and vulnerable and they also raise concern on the management of the public open space in private development. Besides, the commenters oppose to the incorporation of hotel use in the CHR Site as there is sufficient hotel development in the area.
- (d) **C105** supports her own representation (**R34**) and considers that there are bias in complying with government policy which has led Members of the Board to ignore the duty to examine the long term effect of the development proposal.

6. Planning Consideration and Assessment

6.1 The Representation Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans H-1 to H-4)

- 6.1.1 The CHR Site (i.e. the representation site) is at the fringe of the core commercial and business areas of Causeway Bay. It is a piece of government land. The northern portion of the CHR Site (about 1.6 ha) abutting Leighton Road is proposed for commercial development with a maximum BH of 135mPD and maximum GFA of 100,000m², which is equivalent to a plot ratio (PR) of about 11 based on a development site area of about 8,953m².
- 6.1.2 The southern portion of the CHR Site (about 1.06 ha) adjoining the SCAA is proposed for the development of the District Court with a

maximum BH of 135mPD and maximum GFA of 70,000m², which is equivalent to PR of about 6.6 based on a development site area of 1.06 ha. The proposed development will consist of the District Court, Family Court and Lands Tribunal with the former two relocated from the Wan Chai Government Offices Compound while latter from Gascoigne Road, Kowloon.

6.1.3 The pedestrians in Caroline Hill area rely on at-grade footpaths and pedestrian crossings including signalised and cautionary crossings along CHR(East), CHR (West) and Leighton Road to/from the central area of Causeway Bay, MTR Station and public transport facilities. The major pedestrian corridors from the MTR Station to the CHR Site are mainly along Leighton Road and Yun Ping Road (**Plan H-10**). The future developer of the commercial site will be required to reserve an underground opening for possible pedestrian connection to MTR Station which is subject to further feasibility study. A new access road will be constructed within the CHR Site connecting eastern and western sections of CHR to serve the District Court and the commercial development. The stone retaining walls (including drainage pipes) are located at the northern and eastern peripheries of the CHR Site, of which those situated at the eastern boundary are confirmed as Grade 3 historic building by the Antiquities Advisory Board on 12.12.2019.

6.1.4 The areas to the northwest of the CHR Site across Leighton Road are zoned “Commercial” (“C”) with a BHR of 135mPD on the Causeway OZP No. S/H6/17 which are the core commercial and business areas of Causeway Bay (**Plan H-6**). To the northeast across CHR(East) are existing residential developments at Haven Street and a “G/IC” cluster including St. Paul Hospital. The former is zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” (“OU(MU)”) with a BHR of 135mPD on the Causeway Bay OZP, while the St. Paul Hospital is zoned “G/IC” with a BHR of 5 storeys (fronting CHR(East)). To the immediate south and south-east of the CHR Site comprises an area of “OU” and “G/IC” zones which are used for sports and recreation clubs, sports ground, schools and hospital with BHRs ranging from 1 to 12 storeys. To the immediate west across CHR(West) is Po Leung Kuk which is also zoned “G/IC” with maximum BHRs of 2 storeys, 19 storeys/90mPD and 80mPD (**Plan H-6**). To the further west at uphill locations along Link Road are residential developments under “Residential (Group B)” zone with maximum BHRs ranging from 100 to 170mPD.

6.2 Planning Intention

6.2.1 The planning intention of the zones which are the subjects of representations and comments are as follows:

- (a) “C” - primarily for commercial developments, which may include uses such as office, shop, services, place of entertainment, eating place and hotel, functioning as territorial business/financial centre(s)

and regional or district commercial/shopping centre(s). These areas are usually major employment nodes; and

- (b) “G/IC” - primarily for the provision of Government, institution or community facilities serving the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district, region or the territory. It is also intended to provide land for uses directly related to or in support of the work of the Government, organizations providing social services to meet community needs, and other institutional establishments.

6.3 Responses to Grounds and Proposals of Representations

Supportive Representations

- 6.3.1 The supportive views of **R1 to R5** and **R6 (partial)** are noted.
- 6.3.2 For the remaining views of **R6** and his proposal, they would be dealt with together with the adverse representations below. In gist, for the reason stated in paragraph 6.3.13 below, rezoning the whole CHR Site (Option 1 proposed by **R6**) or commercial portion (Option 2 proposed by **R6**) of the CHR Site for “CDA” to ensure physical and design integration is considered not necessary. Regarding **R6**’s proposed requirement of MLP submission for the “C(2)” zone, given the proposed development resembles other ordinary commercial developments governed under “C” zone, MLP submission is also considered not necessary. Moreover, other important attributes that are situated on the CHR Site, such as OVT and masonry wall, can be protected via established mechanisms.

Adverse Representations

- 6.3.3 For the grounds and proposals of the representations **R6 to R632** as detailed in paragraphs 4.2.2 to 4.3.2 above, PlanD, in consultation with relevant government departments, has the following responses:

Need for Development and Land Use

- 6.3.4 As mentioned in paragraph 2.1 above, to meet the long-term needs of District Court-level judicial facilities and to make good use of the government land in the core business district, the CHR Site is proposed for District Court and commercial development. The CHR Site is considered suitable for the commercial development. The areas to the north across Leighton Road are zoned “C” which are the core commercial and business areas of Causeway Bay and the CHR Site is located at the fringe of this commercial core. Hence, locating the commercial developments at the northern portion fronting Leighton Road is a natural extension of the “C” zone from the commercial core of Causeway Bay (**Plan H-6**). Besides, according to the “Review of Land

Requirement for Grade A Offices, Business and Industrial Uses” conducted under the Hong Kong 2030+ Study, there is a long-term shortage of Grade A office of 1.06 million m² GFA in Hong Kong. The vacancy rate of the Grade A office in Wan Chai/ Causeway Bay (4.5% in end-2018) has always been relatively low compared with the territorial total (8.7% in end-2018). Hence, there is a demand for commercial floor space in Hong Kong.

- 6.3.5 In order to minimise the traffic impact of the proposed commercial development, it is specified in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP for the “C(2)” zone that a maximum of 10,000m² GFA will be for retail use in the CHR Site, which will also be incorporated in the lease. Given the surrounding area is predominantly used for commercial purposes, hotel is considered to be compatible with these commercial uses and would not result in unacceptable impact. It is considered appropriate to retain hotel as always permitted use in the “C(2)” zone. Nonetheless, whether the site will be used for office or hotel or a mix of both will be subject to market condition.
- 6.3.6 As for the District Court, it should be noted that the CHR Site, being located at the prime business district on Hong Kong Island that is convenient to legal professionals and users from all districts, is suitable to meet the requirements of the Judiciary. Apart from the District Court, a DHC and a CCC will also be provided within the CHR Site to meet the needs of the community.

Development Intensity and BH

- 6.3.7 Given the scarcity of land resources, especially in the prime urban locations in Hong Kong, development intensity should be optimized wherever possible as long as it will not generate unacceptable impacts on the surrounding area. It should be noted that not the whole CHR Site (area of 2.66ha) is utilized for development. About 17% of which will be set aside for road improvement to address the traffic condition of the area and the construction of the new access road serving both the commercial development and the District Court. The commercial development will have a total GFA of 100,000m² which is equivalent to a PR of about 11 based on a development site area of about 8,953m². The PR is about 25% lower than the general development intensity of high-rise commercial buildings under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) (i.e. a PR of 15).
- 6.3.8 As for the new District Court, it will have a total GFA of 70,000m² is required (equivalent to PR of about 6.6) to cater for the long term accommodation needs of the Judiciary for the District Court, Family Court and Lands Tribunal.
- 6.3.9 In relation to the proposed BH, the CHR Site is located in a transition area with the Causeway Bay commercial district to the north and east

with a BH profile of 100mPD, 135mPD and 200mPD; while to the west and south are a mix of high-rise residential developments of 100mPD and 170mPD and some low or medium-rise GIC facilities. The proposed maximum BH of 135mPD resembles the existing BH restriction of the neighboring areas and is considered in line with the BHR of “C” zone in Causeway Bay across Leighton Road (**Plan H-6**). In deriving the BH for the District Court, reference has been made to the West Kowloon Law Courts Building which has a higher floor-to-floor height (5.5m to 6.5m for court floors) when compared with that of general office building. The same BHR of 135mPD as the “C(2)” zone is imposed on the “G/IC” zone to allow for design flexibility. In this regard, the project proponent of the District Court considers that any reduction of the BHR for the District Court will limit flexibility in disposition and design of the building mass while achieving the permissible development intensity of the District Court. As advised by the project proponent of the District Court, stepped BH profile will be adopted in the two court buildings to allow height variation.

- 6.3.10 A building gap of not less than 25m in width across the northern portion of the CHR Site generally aligning with the Old and Valuable Tree (OVT) (No. HKP WCH/1) abutting Leighton Road and a building gap of not less than 20m across the southern portion generally aligning with the OVT (No. EMSD WCH/1) were assumed within the CHR Site to facilitate air ventilation as indicated in the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) conducted for the conceptual scheme. Moreover, the future developer of “C(2)” zone shall be required to provide 6,000m² at-grade open space. This open space, together with the building gaps as assumed in the conceptual layout would help alleviate the visual impact and enhance visual openness of the CHR Site as well as improve visual permeability by breaking up the perceivable building mass (**Plan H-5**). In this regard, as stipulated in the ES of the “C(2)” zone and under lease, the future developer shall undertake a quantitative AVA at the detailed design stage to identify the exact alignment of the building gap. Similar requirements will be incorporated into the land allocation for the District Court where applicable.
- 6.3.11 On the potential blockage of views, with reference to the Town Planning Board Guideline No. 41 on “Submission of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board” (TPB PG-No. 41), private views from residential or commercial towers are not considered as it is not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations in the highly developed context of Hong Kong. In the interest of the public, it is far more important to protect public views from key strategic and important public viewing points. Based on the conceptual scheme, a visual appraisal has also been conducted in accordance to TPB PG-No.41 and it has concluded that the proposed development in overall terms would not result in unacceptable visual impact.

Conceptual Layout and Building Disposition

- 6.3.12 A conceptual layout (**Plan H-5**) and major development parameters were drawn up to illustrate the land use distributions serving as the basis of carrying out various technical assessments to support the rezoning of the CHR Site. Nonetheless, the conceptual scheme only shows one of the possible designs. It was prepared only for the purpose of illustrating the feasibility of development. Hence, the disposition, layout and detailed design are subject to the consideration of the future developer (for commercial site) and the project proponent (for the District Court). In other words, the specific block disposition and layout will be subject to detailed design at the implementation stage. Given the proposed commercial development resembles other ordinary commercial developments governed under “C” zone and other important attributes that are situated on the CHR Site, such as OVT and masonry wall, can be protected via established mechanisms, it is considered that **R6**’s proposal of MLP submission for the “C(2)” zone is not necessary.
- 6.3.13 Regarding the representers’ views on the fragmented layout due to the access road and air paths as well as the segregation with the District Court, it should be noted that in view of its security needs, the District Court will need to be fenced off with a single public entrance point for conducting security screening before entering the court facilities. Unrestricted integration at the deck level or integrated design between the commercial development and the District Court as proposed by some representers are considered not feasible based on the limited available information. Having said that, integration of the open spaces and commercial development in a visually coherent manner is still possible with appropriate decking over design within the “C(2)” zone, provided that the security of the District Court is not compromised (**Plans H-7a to H-7b**). Hence, maintaining separate zonings for the commercial development and District Court as “C(2)” and “G/IC(2)” is considered appropriate and rezoning of the entire site to “CDA” or “OU(G/IC cum Commercial)” is not necessary.
- 6.3.14 Regarding the disposition and design of the District Court, similar to other government projects, a basket of considerations will be taken into account by the project proponent of the District Court with the advice of its works agent(s) at the detailed design stage, including stepped building design as well as a separation of at least 20m between building block (at west) and the residential blocks across CHR(West). The current disposition of the District Court will allow similar separation with the existing residential development across CHR(East). The development of the District Court will also need to comply with the greening ratio and tree preservation requirements as stipulated in the Sustainable Building and Design Guidelines (APP-152). As part of the development process of any public works project, the project proponent will consult WCDC on the development of the District Court at appropriate stage of the project before works commencement.

- 6.3.15 Regarding the public open space, it is specified in the ES of the OZP for “C(2)” zone that the open space shall be provided in the eastern portion facing CHR and at-grade in the northern portion fronting Leighton Road to enhance visual openness and to ensure easy accessibility by public. In this regard, the future developer is required to submit a Landscape Master Plan (LMP) under the lease.

Traffic Impact and Transport Facilities

- 6.3.16 A Traffic Review was conducted to assess the traffic impact arising from the proposed development at the CHR Site on the surrounding road network and to assess the adequacy of the pedestrian facilities. The Traffic Review was conducted by following the standard engineering practice and procedures which have been adopted in many previous projects in Hong Kong.
- 6.3.17 The proposed development intensity of the CHR Site is also formulated with due regard to the carrying capacity of the local road network supported by the findings of the Traffic Review. As reflected in the Traffic Review, retail uses would generally generate comparatively more traffic than other commercial uses like office and hotel. In this regard, to minimise the traffic impact, the future commercial development will be restricted to a maximum retail GFA of 10,000m² (i.e. about 10% of the total GFA for the commercial development) as stated in the ES of the OZP.
- 6.3.18 According to the Traffic Review, the proposed developments including the overall provision of 600 parking spacesⁱⁱⁱ, will not generate unacceptable traffic impact after implementation of the proposed road junction improvement works (**Plan H-8**). Through the road improvement works, especially the additional left-turn lane at Leighton Road, modification of left-turn lane to “left-turn and right-turn” shared lane at CHR(West) northbound, and roundabout at CHR(West)/ Link Road, it is expected that the traffic movements at CHR(West) will be smoothed and the existing conflicting movements at CHR(West) northbound between Link Road and Leighton Road will be reduced. The new access road within the CHR Site will provide an additional connection between CHR(West) and CHR(East). In general, most vehicles are able to clear the junctions without waiting for more than one traffic signal cycle during peak hours. Regarding the concern on the specific details of the TIA, detailed responses are at **Appendix VII** with the major points summarized in the following paragraphs.
- 6.3.19 Some representers consider that traffic in weekend is heavier than that in weekdays and should be adopted to assess the traffic impact of the

ⁱⁱⁱ The total number of parking spaces include the car parking spaces that are derived based on the provision of office, hotel and retail uses at the CHR Site by making reference to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (subject to refinement upon adjustment in the mix at detailed design stage upon land disposal) as well as additional public parking spaces for private cars (100) and commercial vehicles (25) to serve the local needs.

proposed developments. According to the traffic data from Annual Traffic Census 2015 to 2018, however, the average peak hour traffic flow in weekday AM peak was higher than that in weekend AM peak, while the weekday PM peak hour traffic flow was in the same order as that of the weekend PM peak. This justifies the use of typical weekday traffic in the traffic model, which is also a standard practice for TIA.

- 6.3.20 Some representers consider that the TIA is outdated as the traffic survey was conducted in 2017. In assessing the traffic impact, the 2017 observed traffic data was only adopted as the baseline condition and an annual traffic growth rate of 0.1% was assumed for the background traffic forecast up to the design year (2031). The 0.1% growth rate is considered to be conservative when compared with the gradual decrease in traffic flow as observed in the Causeway Bay area over the past few years.
- 6.3.21 Some representers consider that with the proposed development, individual junctions' capacity has reduced or maintained at a level of below 15% which is not the usual level acceptable to TD. A reserve capacity of 15% is the most preferable scenario for planning new development areas but not an absolute cut-off and any positive figures already implies spare capacity. In addition, the anticipated traffic queue at all junctions would not extend to the next junction in the upstream, which is considered acceptable.
- 6.3.22 Regarding the level of service (LOS) D^{iv} at the pedestrian crossing of Pennington Road/ Leighton Road, although there may be friction between pedestrians (e.g. speed and position), reasonable fluid flow is still provided and considered acceptable.
- 6.3.23 In relation to the concern relating to the relocation of minibus station, while there is a provision for such under the current zoning, the final arrangement and the exact relocation programme, is subject to TD's further study and consultation with the stakeholders.

Provision of G/IC facilities and Open Space

- 6.3.24 Regarding the provision of G/IC facilities, based on a planned population of about 185,200 persons, there is no shortfall of major G/IC facilities in Wan Chai area, except day care centres for the elderly and residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) where the population-based standards were reinstated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) in end-2018^v. The provision of RCHE is generally determined by a list of factors including the characteristics of

^{iv} LOS D means "freedom to select individual walking speeds and bypass other pedestrians is restricted. Where crossing or reverse-flow movements exist, the probability of conflict is high and its avoidance requires changes of speeds and position. The LOS provides reasonable fluid flow; however, considerable friction and interaction between pedestrian are likely to occur".

^v The revised standards reflect the long-term target towards which the provision of elderly services and facilities would be adjusted progressively.

the population, geographic concerns and the need of such facility. As the CHR Site is mainly used for commercial and district court purposes, after taking into account different factors (including development intensity and the appropriateness of locating social welfare facilities), it is considered that priority should be given to the provision of DHC and CCC. Nevertheless, SWD has indicated that multi-pronged approaches would be adopted to increase supply of such elderly care facilities in Wan Chai district.

- 6.3.25 Regarding the proposal of locating a civic centre at the CHR Site as suggested by some representers, according to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), civic centre is planned on a district-wide basis and the current provision of which on Hong Kong Island is considered sufficient. For the community hall, there is no population-based standard in the HKPSG and there is currently an existing community hall in Wan Chai area and a new multi-purpose Moreton Terrace Activities Centre under the Signature Project Scheme is now under construction and scheduled for completion in 2021. HAD advises that they will continue to monitor the supply and demand situation of community hall facilities in Wan Chai.
- 6.3.26 For the provision of open space at the District Council level, there will be an overall surplus of about 19.2 ha in Wan Chai with the existing and planned provision of 56.23 ha open space (including 15.97 ha local open space and 40.26 ha district open space), despite there will be a deficit of local open space of about 2.55 ha. As per Wong Nai Chung OZP, there will be an overall surplus of 4.07 ha of open space with the existing and planned provision of 11.05 ha open space (including 2.83 ha local open space and 8.22 ha district open space), though there will be a deficit of local open space of about 0.66 ha. In response to the local needs and WCDC's previous request, a public open space of not less than 6,000m² will be provided within the CHR Site. The provision level is to strike a balance between the need of local open space and the feasibility of accommodating the proposed commercial development and District Court within the CHR Site. Hence, there is no strong planning justification for the representers' proposal of increasing the provision of open space within the CHR Site.
- 6.3.27 Regarding the loss of volley ball court in Moreton Terrace, it is noted that the volleyball courts have been combined with the handball court in the Victoria Park as the handball-cum-volleyball courts. In this regard, LCSD has previously advised that the usage rate of the handball-cum-volleyball courts in Victoria Park which included a handball court and two volleyball courts had yet to reach the saturation level at present. Therefore, after the closure of the volleyball courts at Moreton Terrace, the handball-cum-volleyball courts in Victoria Park would still have capacity to absorb some of the demand from users of the volleyball courts at Moreton Terrace. Nonetheless, LCSD will contact the organisations who are the usual hirers of the volleyball courts and coordinate their usual bookings, in order to minimise the inconvenience

caused to them.

Management of Open Space in Private Development

6.3.28 The developer is required to provide a public open space within the proposed commercial development which will ensure that an integrated design will be adopted. To ensure proper location and disposition of the open space thereby facilitating easy accessibility by the public, the future developer is required under the lease to submit a LMP. Besides, the future developer is also required to follow DEVB's "Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines" in designing and managing the public open space within the proposed commercial development. Given the location of the public open space has yet been determined, the designation of the concerned area to "O" as proposed by some representers is not supported. It will also render the commercial development to be accommodated in a cramped site not conducive to an integrated design.

Public Consultation

6.3.29 Amendments to the OZP were exhibited for public inspection for a period of two months in accordance with the provisions of the Ordinance. The exhibition process itself is a public consultation to seek the representations and comments on the draft OZP. In addition, as mentioned in paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2 above, the Planning Department together with concerned government departments consulted WCDC three times for the proposed developments at the CHR Site. All the key assessment findings were presented to WCDC in the above consultations and the concerns of the WCDC members were responded.

6.3.30 Apart from consultations with WCDC, representatives of concerned government departments also attended two residents' forums on 10.6.2019 and 13.6.2019 to explain the land use proposals and respond to residents' concerns. The two forums together were attended by about 80 participants.

6.3.31 In regard to a commenter's remark that Members of the Board were biased in complying with government policy, it should be noted all relevant information on the proposed amendments to the OZP together with views of representers/commenters are submitted to the Board for consideration to allow Members to make an informed decision.

Alternative Schemes Submitted by Representers

6.3.32 For all the alternative schemes proposed by **R6, R11, R14 to R27, R29 to R30, R35 and R594 to R599**, it should be noted that the representers do not provide technical justifications for the schemes and without the necessary details, the technical feasibility of such schemes cannot be ascertained.

- 6.3.33 For the alternative scheme proposed by **R6**, as mentioned in paragraph 6.3.13 above, unrestricted integration at the deck level or integrated design with the District Court is not feasible. As for the proposed provision of the G/IC facilities, the responses in paragraphs 6.3.24 and 6.3.25 above are relevant. Besides, for the proposed rezoning of the whole CHR Site as “CDA”, the response in paragraph 6.3.13 above is relevant.
- 6.3.34 For the alternative schemes proposed by **R11** and **R35**, it is considered that the current GFA of 100,000m² for the commercial development is appropriate as it would not result in unacceptable impact on the surrounding area. Given the scarcity of land resources, especially in the prime urban locations in Hong Kong, development intensity should be optimized wherever possible as long as it will not generate unacceptable impacts on the surrounding area. Besides, the proposed traffic arrangement may affect the provision of three ingress/egress (at least two separate vehicular accesses and one separate emergency vehicular exit) serving the District Court site as required by the project proponent. As for the proposed provision of the G/IC facilities and open space, the responses in paragraphs 6.3.24 and 6.3.25 above are relevant. Besides, for the proposed rezoning of the entire site to “OU(G/IC cum Commercial)”, the response in paragraph 6.3.13 above is relevant.
- 6.3.35 For the alternative schemes (Schemes A, B and C) put forward by **R14 to R27 and R29 to R30**, it is considered that the proposed traffic arrangement may affect the provision of three ingress/egress (at least two separate vehicular accesses and one separate emergency vehicular exit) serving the District Court site as required by the project proponent. Besides, the existing masonry walls are likely to be affected by the developments proposed under Schemes B and C. For the proposed reduction in the BH of the District Court and the proposed building gap from southern-west boundary, responses in paragraphs 6.3.9 and 6.3.10 above are relevant. As for the proposed reduction in the scale of commercial development by 10%, it is considered that the current GFA of 100,000m² for the commercial development is appropriate as it would not result in unacceptable impact on the surrounding area. Given the scarcity of land resources, especially in the prime urban locations in Hong Kong, development intensity should be optimized wherever possible as long as it will not generate unacceptable impacts on the surrounding area. As for the proposed increase in open space in the Schemes, the response in paragraph 6.3.26 above is relevant. For the proposed designation of the open space as “O” zone under Scheme C, the response in paragraph 6.3.28 above is relevant.
- 6.3.36 For the alternative scheme put forward by **R594 to R599**, it is considered that the current GFA of 100,000m² for the commercial development is considered appropriate as it would not result in unacceptable impact on

the surrounding area. Given the scarcity of land resources, especially in the prime urban locations in Hong Kong, development intensity should be optimized wherever possible as long as it will not generate unacceptable impacts on the surrounding area. The proposed BH of 150mPD is considered excessive when compared to the BHR of the “C” zone in the vicinity. As for the proposed reduction in the BH of the District Court, the response in paragraph 6.3.9 above is relevant. In addition, providing an additional ingress/egress through Leighton Road which is a major district distributor is technically infeasible as it may cause vehicular conflict with Leighton Road. It will also likely affect the OVT situated on the masonry wall fronting Leighton Road.

6.3.37 Given the reasons detailed above, all the alternative schemes proposed by the representers are not supported.

6.4 Responses to Grounds of Commenters

The grounds of comments are largely similar to those raised in the adverse representations. The responses to the representations in paragraphs 6.3.4 to 6.3.37 are relevant. The major grounds of comments and response are in **Appendix VI**.

7. Consultation

The following government departments have been consulted and their comments have been incorporated in the above paragraphs and **Appendix VI** where appropriate.

- (a) Chief Secretary for Administration’s Office
- (b) Secretary for Development
- (c) Judiciary
- (d) District Lands Office/Hong Kong West and South, Lands Department
- (e) Chief Estate Surveyor/Land Supply Section, Lands Department
- (f) Assistant Commissioner for Traffic Engineering (HK) Division/Urban Regional Office, Transport Department
- (g) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department
- (h) Project Manager (South Development Office), Civil Engineering and Development Department
- (i) Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department
- (j) Chief Project Manager 103, Architectural Services Department
- (k) District Officer (Wan Chai), Home Affairs Department
- (l) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East District and Maintenance Division, Highways Department
- (m) Major Works Officer (2), Major Works Project Management Office, Highways Department
- (n) Chief Highway Engineer/Urban Region (Hong Kong Office),

- Highways Department
- (o) Chief Engineer, Railway Development Division 2-2, Railway Development Office, Highways Department
 - (p) Director of Social Welfare
 - (q) Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene
 - (r) Director of Environmental Protection
 - (s) Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong East and Heritage, Buildings Department
 - (t) Government Property Agency
 - (u) Chief Engineer/Construction Division, Water Supplies Department
 - (v) Chief Engineer/Hong Kong and Islands Division, Drainage Services Department
 - (w) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services Department
 - (x) Antiquities and Monuments Office
 - (y) Director of Fire Services
 - (z) Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
 - (aa) Commissioner of Police
 - (bb) Director of Electrical & Mechanical Services
 - (cc) Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape Section
 - (dd) Chief Town Planner/Strategic Planning Section
 - (ee) Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board Section (1)
 - (ff) Chief Town Planner/Housing and Office Land Supply Section

8. Planning Department's Views

- 8.1 The supportive views of **R1 to R5** and **R6 (part)** are noted.
- 8.2 Based on the assessment in paragraph 6 above, PlanD does not support the remaining part of the representation **R6** as well as representations **R7 to R634** and consider that the OZP should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:
 - (a) the proposed “C” and “G/IC(2)” zones are considered appropriate as there is a need to ensure a continual supply of office space to maintain Hong Kong’s status as international financial centre and to meet the long-term needs of District Court-level judicial facilities;
 - (b) the proposed maximum GFA of 100,000m² and 70,000m² and BHR of 135mPD for the commercial development and District Court respectively are commensurate with that of the surrounding developments. The proposed development intensity and BHR are formulated with due regard to all relevant planning factors including traffic, visual, air ventilation, landscape and surrounding land uses. It will not bring about unacceptable impacts on the surrounding areas;
 - (c) the conceptual layout is only to illustrate the land use distributions serving as the basis of carrying out various technical assessments.

The disposition and layout of the proposed developments will be subject to the detailed design of the future developer (for commercial site) and the project proponent (for District Court). There are existing mechanisms to ensure the provision of building gaps and public open as well as the preservation of OVTs and stone retaining wall within the CHR Site;

- (d) the proposed developments will not generate unacceptable traffic impact on the surrounding areas with the implementation of the proposed road junction improvement works. The Traffic Review was conducted according to the standard engineering practice and procedures which have been adopted in many previous projects in Hong Kong. The relocation of the green minibus terminus will be subject to further study by the Transport Department in due course;
- (e) despite there will be an overall surplus of open space provision in Wan Cha District, a public open space of not less than 6,000m² will be provided within the proposed commercial development to address the deficit of local open space in the area. In addition, a DHC and a CCC will also be provided to meet the need of the local community. For other G/IC facilities, there are either sufficient provisions or actions are being taken to provide such facilities in other localities in Wan Chai District;
- (f) the two-months statutory exhibition period and provision for representations and comments formed part of the public consultation process. Consultation with WCDC and local forums were also made;

Representers' Proposals

- (g) locating the commercial developments at the northern portion fronting Leighton Road is a natural extension of the "C" zone from the commercial core of Causeway Bay. There are no strong planning justifications to adjust the boundaries of the "C(2)" and "G/IC(2)" zones (**R11, R14 to R27, R29 to R30, R35 and R594 to R599**);
- (h) there are no technical justifications provided for the alternative schemes and without the necessary details, the technical feasibility of these proposals cannot be ascertained (**R11, R14 to R27, R29 to R30, R35 and R594 to R599**);
- (i) since the proposed "C" and "G/IC(2)" zones are considered appropriate, there is no strong planning justifications for rezoning the whole CHR Site to "CDA" (**R6**) or "OU(G/IC cum Commercial)" (**R35**);

- (j) as the location of the public open space within the proposed commercial development is yet to be determined, the proposed designation of the open space as “O” is not supported (**R19 to R26 and R29**). It will also render the commercial development to be accommodated in a cramped site not conducive to an integrated design;
- (k) given the scarcity of land resources, development intensity should be optimized wherever possible as long as it will not generate unacceptable impacts on the surrounding area. As for the District Court, it is required to cater for the long-term needs of District Court-level judicial facilities. Hence, the proposed reduction of development intensity and BH of the proposed commercial development (**R11, R35 and R594 to R599**) and the BH of District Court (**R594 to R599**) are not supported; and
- (l) there is no strong planning justification for relaxing the proposed BH of the commercial development to 150mPD (**R594 to R599**) which is considered excessive when compared to the BHR of the “C” zone in the vicinity.

9. Decision Sought

- 9.1 The Board is invited to give consideration to the representations and comments taking into consideration the points raised in the hearing session, and decide whether to propose/not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet/partially meet the representations.
- 9.2 Should the Board decide that no amendment should be made to the draft OZP to meet the representations, Members are also invited to agree that the draft OZP, together with their respective Notes and updated Explanatory Statements, are suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C for approval.

10. Attachments

- Appendix I** Draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/20 (reduced size)
- Appendix II** Schedule of Amendments to the Draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/20
- Appendix III(a)** Minutes of 623th MPC Meeting held on 8.3.2019 (Extracted)
- Appendix III(b)** Minutes of 626th MPC Meeting held on 3.5.2019 (Extracted)
- Appendix IV(a)** Minutes of Wan Chai District Council meeting on 8.5.2018 (Extracted)
- Appendix IV(b)** Minutes of Wan Chai District Council meeting on 8.1.2019

	(Extracted)
Appendix IV(c)	Reply to Wan Chai District Council's Motion
Appendix IV(d)	Minutes of Wan Chai District Council on 4.7.2019 (Extracted)
Appendix V	List of Representers (R1 to R634) and Commenters (C1 to C105) in respect of draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/20
Appendix VI	Summary of Representations and Comments and PlanD's Responses
Appendix VII	Full responses on traffic and transport facilities
Appendix VIII	Provision of Major G/IC Facilities in Wan Chai District
Drawings H-1a to H-1c	Proposed Scheme submitted by Representer R6
Drawings H-2a to H-2b	Proposed Scheme submitted by Representer R11
Drawing H-3	Proposed Scheme submitted by Representatives R14 to R18 and R27
Drawing H-4	Proposed Scheme submitted by Representatives R19 to R26 and R29 to R30
Drawing H-5	Proposed Scheme submitted by Representatives R19 to R26 and R29 to R30
Drawings H-6a to H-6b	Proposed Scheme submitted by Representer R35
Drawing H-7	Proposed Scheme submitted by Representatives R594 to R599
Plan H-1	Amendments incorporated in draft OZP No. S/H7/20
Plan H-2	Location Plan of Representations and Comments
Plan H-3	Existing Building Height Profile
Plan H-4	Aerial Photos of Amendment Items A and B
Plan H-5	Conceptual Layout of CHR Site
Plan H-6	Location Plan Showing the Zoning in the Vicinity of the CHR Site
Plans H-7a to H-7b	Conceptual Illustration showing Possible Integration of Open Space with Commercial Development
Plan H-8	Proposed Road Improvement Works of Caroline Hill Road
Plan H-9	Location of Representations/ Comments of IOs/OCCs to the

Plan H-10 Draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan
Conceptual Layout of Pedestrian Route for the CHR Site

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
FEBRUARY 2020