

DRAFT WONG NAI CHUNG OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H7/20

**INFORMATION NOTE AND HEARING ARRANGEMENT FOR
CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS**

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 24.5.2019, the draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H7/20 (the Plan) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The amendments to the OZP mainly involve 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 (**Item A**) and the 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 (**Item B**). The Schedule of Amendments setting out the amendments incorporated into the OZP is at **Appendix I** and the locations of the amendment items are shown on **Plan P-1**.
- 1.2 During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 930 submissions were received. Amongst them, 609 representations were made in accordance with the revised requirements set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 29B (TPB PG-No. 29B)¹ by providing the full name as shown on the Hong Kong Identity (HKID) card/passport and the first four alphanumeric characters of HKID card/passport number. The remaining 321 submissions were made with missing/incomplete identity information.
- 1.3 Considering that this is the first batch of amended OZPs subject to revised submission requirements under TPB PG-No. 29B, the Town Planning Board (the Board) agreed to allow the representers with the identity information missing/incomplete in their submissions a further opportunity to submit the required information and that if such representers failed or refused to provide such identity proof, the representations would be treated as not having been made. On 6.8.2019, the Secretariat sent out letters to the concerned parties but only 25 representers subsequently submitted the required information. As no response was received from the remaining 296 submissions with identity information missing/incomplete, they should be considered as invalid and treated as not having been made pursuant to sections 6(2)(b) and 6(3)(b) of the Ordinance. Subsequently, five submissions (i.e. **R402, R407, R425, R426 and R482**)

¹ According to TPB PG-No. 29B on Submission and Publication of Representations, Comments on Representations and Further Representations under the Town Planning Ordinance, which has taken effect since 1.1.2019, representers/commenters/further representers and their authorized agents are required to provide their full name as shown on the HKID card/passport and their HKID card/passport number (only the first four alphanumeric characters are required) in the submission. For submission with no full name, incomplete and/or illegible names or no HKID card/passport number, the representation/comment/further representation concerned may be treated as not having been made.

were found to be duplicated. As a result, there were a total of 629 valid representations.

- 1.4 On 6.9.2019, the valid representations were published for public comments, and in the first three weeks of the publication period, 118 submissions were received. Amongst them, four were found to be duplicated, 105 comments were made in accordance with the revised requirements set out in TPB PG-No. 29B and the remaining 9 submissions were made with identity information missing/incomplete. On 2.10.2019, the Secretariat sent out letters to the concerned parties but none of them submitted the required information. As such, they should be considered as invalid and treated as not having been made pursuant to sections 6A(2) and 6A(3)(b) of the Ordinance. Hence, there were a total of 105 valid comments.
- 1.5 The list of representers and commenters, and the summaries of representations and comments are shown in **Appendices II, III, IV and V** respectively for Members' reference. The location of the representation site is shown on **Plan P-2**.

2. The Representations and Comments

- 2.1 There are a total of 629 valid representations, including six supporting representations (**R1 to R6**), 621 adverse representations (**R7 to R632**) and two representations (**R633 to R634**) providing views on the amendments. The views of the representations are summarized as follows :

Supporting Representations

- (a) Out of the six supporting representations, five representations (**R1 to R5**) submitted by individual support all amendment items mainly on the grounds that the amendments will provide more commercial floor space to facilitate the development of the area and allow better utilisation of land resources. 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 "C(2)" zone (i.e. Item A).

Adverse Representations

- (b) Out of the 621 adverse representations, four representations (**R7 to R10**) object to Item A, while 617 representations (**R11 to R632**) (excluding the duplicated submissions) object to all amendment items. Of these 617 representations, 580 are 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.
- (c) The adverse representations are submitted by three members of the Wan Chai District Council (Ms. NG Yuen-ting, Yolanda (**R11**), Hon. Paul TSE Wai-chun (**R12**) and Miss YEUNG Suet-ying, Clarisse (**R13**)), 16 owners corporation committees/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**) (excluding the duplicated submissions).

- (d) The main grounds of adverse representations are that there is no urgent need of land for commercial development in Causeway Bay and the proposed commercial development is not in keeping with the land use character of the locality. The proposed development intensity is considered excessive such that it will bring about additional traffic to the area thereby aggravating the existing congestion problem. The Traffic Impact Assessment conducted is considered outdated and not comprehensive. Moreover, the proposed BH is also considered excessive which will bring about adverse impacts on living environment, air ventilation, air quality, visual, solar penetration and resident's health. There is a pressing need for G/IC facilities and the deficit in local open space provision cannot be addressed. The layout as well as connectivity between the two proposed public open space that is divided by the new access is considered undesirable.
- (e) 594 adverse representations (**R6, R11 to R30, R33, R35 to R44, R47 to R355, R362 to R602, R607, R609, R616 to R625, R628 to 630 and R632**) (excluding the duplicated submissions) have made proposals, including alternative zonings, layout arrangement and building disposition; reduction in the scale of development and BH; as well as enhanced provision of open space and community facilities at the CHR Site.

Representations Providing Views

- (f) The representations providing views are submitted by individuals (**R633 and R634**). Their views are similar to that of the adverse representations as highlighted in (d) above.
- 2.2 The 105 valid comments on representations are submitted by a member of the Wan Chai District Council (Miss YEUNG Suet-ying, Clarisse (**C1**)), 10 owners corporation committees/residents groups (**C95 to C104**), two local concern groups (**C3 and C94**) and individuals (**C2, C4 to C93 and C105**). It is noted that a total of 37 commenters are also representers themselves (**Appendix III**).
- 2.3 Among them, 93 comments (**C1 to C93**) are submitted in the form of a standard letter and oppose to **R6** and **R11** mainly because of the latter's proposals for using the CHR Site for commercial development which is considered to create traffic impact. **C1 to C93** also disagree with **R6** on imposing restrictions on the floor areas to be used for community facilities and open space.
- 2.4 **C94 to C104** are also submitted in the form of a standard letter with an individual commenter providing additional comments on top and oppose to **R6**'s objection to the Gross Floor Area restriction and the requirement for G/IC facilities and open space provision at the CHR Site. They also disagree with the representer's proposal of an alternative scheme. **C94 to C104** also oppose to **R11** and **R35**, mainly on the representers' proposal of amalgamating the G/IC site with the commercial site to form a single development. **C105** supports her own representation (i.e. **R34**) who objects to both amendment items.

3. Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments

- 3.1 Under section 2A of the Ordinance, the Board is empowered to appoint a Representation Hearing Committee (RHC) from among its members to consider

representations and comments, propose amendments to the Plan to meet representations, consider further representations in respect of the proposed amendments, and consider whether to vary the proposed amendments upon consideration of any adverse further representations. Since the amendments incorporated in the Plan and the representations and comments received are of similar nature, it will be more efficient for the full Board to consider the representations and comments without resorting to the appointment of a RHC. The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary. The arrangement would not delay the completion of the representation consideration process.

- 3.2 Under section 6B(6) of the Ordinance, the Board may determine whether the representations and the related comments shall be considered at the same meeting and whether they shall be considered individually or collectively. In view of the similar nature of representations and comments, it is recommended that the hearing of the representations and comments should be considered collectively in one group.
- 3.3 In view of the large number of representations and comments received and to ensure efficiency of the hearing, it is recommended to allot a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time to each representer/commenter in the hearing session.
- 3.4 Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board under section 6B of the Ordinance is tentatively scheduled in February 2020.

4. Decision Sought

- 4.1 The Board is invited to note pursuant to sections 6(2)(b) and 6(3)(b) of the Ordinance that the 296 representations and 9 comments with the required identity information missing/incomplete as mentioned in paragraphs 1.3 and 1.4 are considered as invalid and hence disregard.
- 4.2 The Board is also invited to consider whether:
 - (a) to appoint a RHC for consideration of the representations and comments; and
 - (b) the representations and comments should be considered in the manner as proposed in paragraph 3 above.

Attachments

Appendix I	Schedule of Amendments to the approved Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H7/19
Appendix II	List of representers
Appendix III	List of commenters
Appendix IV	Summary of representations
Appendix V	Summary of comments
Plan P-1	Amendments incorporated in the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/20
Plan P-2	Location plan of the representation site

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
DECEMBER 2019**