



銅鑼灣

Causeway Bay

Annex A-2

**Minutes of Town Planning Board Meeting
held on 19.6.2020**

- (i) private developer could be a provider for GIC facilities. The trend for provision of GIC facilities in a commercial site was accepted and supported by the society. It was an efficient way to increase the supply of GIC facilities to cater to public needs; and
- (j) there were major public open spaces, including the Victoria Park, in Causeway Bay and there was no need for further large open space at the site.

14. The Chairperson summarized that Members in general supported the district court development at the CHR site but there were diverse views on the proposed commercial development at the site. Some Members considered that the “G/IC(2)” and the “C(2)” zones should be maintained while some Members considered that the “C(2)” zone was not appropriate. As Members’ views were divided, the meeting agreed to take a vote. A majority of Members considered that the “C(2)” and “G/IC(2)” zones under Amendment Items A and B should be maintained to facilitate commercial and district court development at the CHR site.

15. A Member said while the “G/IC(2)” and the “C(2)” zones were supported, the boundaries of the two zones could be suitably adjusted to allow for a more efficient site configuration for both the commercial and district court developments. Referring to the government’s layout, the Member said the residual open space at the southeastern corner of the site due to the configuration of the “C(2)” zone was not desirable. Another Member suggested that consideration might be given to swapping the open space at the southeastern corner of the site to a better position by adjusting the zoning boundaries. The Chairperson said that the government’s layout was indicative and it was only one of the design options. As indicated in the alternative schemes proposed by the representers, there was possibility for various design and layout arrangements. Members’ concern on the design and layout of the “C(2)” site could be addressed alternatively, say by requiring the submission of layout plan for approval by the Board. After discussion, Members agreed to maintain the boundaries of the “C(2)” and “G/IC(2)” zones under Amendment Items A and B.

District Court Development

16. For the district court development, the Chairperson recapitulated that some