

CONFIDENTIAL
(downgraded on 7.11.2008)

Minutes of 383rd Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held on 24.10.2008

[Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), Ms. Amy Y.M. Cheung, Senior Town Planner/HK (STP/HK) of the Planning Department, and Dr. Conn Yuen, Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Consultant, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 20

Proposed Amendments to
the Approved Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H9/14
(MPC Paper No. 29/08)

[Closed Meeting]

Presentation and Questioning Sessions

1. The Secretary reported that Dr. Daniel B.M. To had a landed interest in the item as he owned a property in Shau Kei Wan subject to the proposed amendments. The Committee noted that Dr. To had already left the meeting.

2. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms. Amy Y.M. Cheung, STP/HK briefed Members on the Paper and made the following main points :

Background

- (a) in the absence of building height control under the current Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H9/14, new developments in the area tended to get higher and higher to maximise seaview of the buildings;

- (b) while the Shau Kei Wan area (the Area) had not been subject to immense redevelopment pressure, there had recently been a number of general building plan (GBP) submissions for the construction of very tall buildings in the Area, including a proposed 60-storey (204.75mPD) commercial/residential development at Church Street;
- (c) past experience had indicated that it was insufficient to rely solely on administrative measures or lease conditions to control building height to achieve a good urban form. The stipulation of building height restrictions on the OZP was considered to be a more effective measure to regulate the height profile of the built environment. The mechanism would also ensure that all stakeholders had the opportunity to express their views on the building height restrictions in the statutory plan-making process;

Context of the Area and Existing Building Profiles

- (d) the Area could be divided into four sub-areas, namely Waterfront Area, Eastern Area, Inland Built-up Area, and Foothill Area. The boundary of each sub-area was shown in Plan 5A of the Paper;
- (e) Waterfront Area – it was predominantly occupied by high-rise public housing developments of 39 to 41 storeys built in the early years of this decade. A private residential development (Les Saisons) comprising four towers of 46 to 52 storeys had been developed at the waterfront, alongside another high-rise residential development (Grand Promenade) in the adjacent Sai Wan Ho area;
- (f) Eastern Area
 - (i) it was mainly occupied by the low-rise structures of the Hong Kong Museum of Coastal Defence and Lei Yue Mun Park and Holiday Village, all on the historic Lyemun Barracks Compound site. This historical site was situated on a green knoll and a headland guarding the eastern entrance into the Harbour (Lei Yue Mun). There were a

total of 15 graded buildings of historical significance on the site. All of them were currently used for recreational and cultural purposes; and

- (ii) to the west of the historic Lyemun Barracks Compound site was A Kung Ngam which was an old fishing village and some abandoned quarries. The area had mainly been developed into an industrial/business area. Some residential developments were in the general vicinity of Shau Kei Wan Main Street East, including Ming Wah Dai Ha;

- (g) Inland Built-up Area – the area was along Shau Kei Wan Road and Sai Wan Ho Street. It had been densely developed and was predominantly characterised by residential buildings with retail/commercial uses on the lower floors. Buildings were mainly less than 10 storeys and were built in the 1950s. A few newer and taller developments were at scattered locations;

- (h) Foothill Area – there were high-rise public housing developments of mainly 15 to 41 storeys in the southern and south-western part of the area. Resting on platforms at varying altitudes, these large-scale and massive developments presented a distinct contrast to those in the Inland Built-up Area;

- (i) in general, taller buildings were located in the northern reclamation area and the southern foothill area while lower buildings were found along the central spine in the inland area;

- (j) in terms of building age, about 27% of the buildings on the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) sites were within the range of 31 to 40 years old and about 37% were over 40 years. The older buildings were mostly found in the Inland Built-up Area. The public housing estates in the foothill area were generally under 20 years of age, while those in the reclamation area had only been built within the last decade;

Local Wind Environment

- (k) an AVA by expert evaluation of the Area was undertaken. The major findings were as follows :-
 - (i) the prevailing winds in the spring and summer months were easterlies and southerlies while the prevailing wind in the autumn and winter months was north-easterlies; and
 - (ii) the major air/breezeways in the Area were shown in Plan 10B of the Paper;
- (l) the measures recommended by the AVA were as follows :-
 - (i) existing open space and low-rise Government, community or institution (G/IC) uses along the waterfront should be maintained;
 - (ii) a more detailed AVA should be conducted for Yiu Tung Estate upon its redevelopment;
 - (iii) a breezeway should be provided across Ming Wah Dai Ha aligning with Kam Wa Street, and buildings should be set back from its southern boundary to facilitate more efficient air path along Chai Wan Road and Shau Kei Wan Road;
 - (iv) for the area bounded by Church Street, Factory Street and Shau Kei Wan Road, the provision of permeable podium was encouraged. Consideration should be given to the disposition and number of tower blocks to avoid wall effect; and
 - (v) a height difference of 15 to 25m between the sites on the two sides of Sai Wan Ho Street was recommended to allow downwash effect of southerlies into the narrow streets, and this applied to building heights of 90/100mPD and 120/125mPD respectively on the

northern and southern sides of the street;

Urban Design Principles

- (m) the following urban design principles served as the basis in deriving the building height restrictions for the Area :-
- (i) a stepped height profile was adopted through designation of different height bands for various parts of the Area. Existing low-rise waterfront developments would be kept at their existing building height levels;
 - (ii) the green and visual corridor extending from the mountain backdrop to the historic headland should be preserved and vistas along this corridor should be opened up as much as possible. The proposed height profile should avoid further obscuring the mountain backdrop when observed from sensitive viewpoints. It should echo the natural topographical profile and follow the physical terrain as appropriate. Based on the Study on “Urban Design Guidelines for Hong Kong” completed in 2003, a 20% building-free zone below the ridgeline of Mount Parker viewed from the key and popular vantage points should be preserved. This included the views from the lookout point at the Wilson Trail on Devil’s Peak in Yau Tong and Block 10 of Lei Yue Mun Park and Holiday Village;
 - (iii) Oi Yin Street and Oi Tak Street, together with the open space in the reclamation area, were also important view corridors, and could serve as breezeways to help channel the prevailing north-easterlies and southerlies into the inland area;
 - (iv) the proposed height profile should respect the low-rise heritage settings of the historic Lyemun Barracks Compound site as well as the prominent location of the A Kung Ngam area at Lei Yue Mun, the eastern gateway to Hong Kong and Victoria Harbour.

Incompatible building heights, which were visually intrusive with overwhelming and dwarfing effects on the heritage buildings, should be avoided. Building protrusions as viewed from this historic site, which might reduce the mountain backdrop, views of the Harbour or sky exposure, should be minimised. A visual buffer/transition zone should be adopted to serve as an interface between the Inland Built-up Area and this historic site;

- (v) the “G/IC” and “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) sites in various parts of the Area had largely been developed. Unless there were committed development proposals, the existing G/IC uses and the lower building heights would broadly be kept to serve as spatial and visual relief to the urban environment. Besides, “Open Space” (“O”) and “Green Belt” (“GB”) sites would generally be retained in order to preserve the existing greenery and open areas as breathing space; and
- (vi) to allow for design flexibility, minor relaxation of the building height and plot ratio (PR)/gross floor area restrictions through the planning permission system could be considered on individual merits;

Proposed Building Height Restrictions for “R(A)” Sites

- (n) Waterfront Area – the proposed height bands were :-
 - (i) maximum building height of 100mPD (i.e. about 95m) for the residential sites to the east of Oi Yin Street in the Aldrich Bay Reclamation area (covering Aldrich Garden);
 - (ii) maximum building height of 120mPD (i.e. about 115m) for the residential sites to the west of Oi Yin Street in the Aldrich Bay Reclamation area (covering Tung Tao Court, Tung Yuk Court and Oi Tung Estate); and

- (iii) maximum building height of 140mPD (i.e. about 135m) for the waterfront site covering Les Saisons. After considering the urban design principle for maintaining lower building heights at the waterfront and balancing the entitled development bulk for the site (i.e. a PR of 10), a maximum building height of 140mPD was proposed for any future redevelopment on this site and any claim for the existing building heights (i.e. 154mPD - 165mPD) would not be allowed;
- (o) Eastern Area – the proposed height bands were :-
- (i) maximum building height of 100mPD (i.e. about 95m) for the area bounded by A Kung Ngam Village Road in the north, A Kung Ngam Road in the east, Kam Wa Street in the south and Aldrich Street in the west;
 - (ii) maximum building height of 120mPD (i.e. about 115m) for the area to the south of Kam Wa Street to provide variation and interest in the height profile while maintaining the stepped-height profile; and
 - (iii) two-tier maximum building heights of 120mPD and 135mPD (i.e. about 77m to 83m) for the area covering 2-4 A Kung Ngam Road and 27-69 Chai Wan Road. The sites within this strip of land were situated at site levels rising from about 37mPD to 58mPD along Chai Wan Road;
- (p) Inland Built-up Area – the proposed height bands were :-
- (i) maximum building height of 120mPD (i.e. about 115m) for the areas along both sides of Shau Kei Wan Road; and
 - (ii) maximum building height of 135mPD (i.e. about 130m) for the areas south of Sai Wan Ho Street;

- (q) Foothill Area – the proposed height bands were :-
- (i) maximum building height of 145mPD (i.e. about 83m to 120m) for the lower platform at about 25mPD to 62mPD occupied by Yiu Tung Estate Site 2 (housing blocks of 80mPD to 129mPD) and Tung Shing Court (a single block of 146mPD), and another platform at 22mPD to 36mPD to the north-west of Yiu Tung Estate occupied by Hing Tung Estate and Tung Lam Court to generally reflect the existing heights (i.e. 131mPD to 144mPD);
 - (ii) maximum building height of 160mPD (i.e. about 110m to 118m) for the area occupied by Tung Hei Court on a platform at about 42mPD to 50mPD to generally reflect the existing heights (i.e. 150mPD to 158mPD); and
 - (iii) maximum building height of 190mPD (i.e. about 110m to 117m) for Yiu Tung Estate Site 1 and Tung Chun Court located on the highest platform at about 73mPD to 80mPD to generally reflect the existing heights (i.e. 126mPD to 188mPD);

Proposed Building Height Restrictions for “G/IC” Sites

- (r) the proposed building height restrictions for the “G/IC” sites would be in terms of number of storeys to allow some flexibility for special requirements of various G/IC facilities. Most of the restrictions were to reflect the existing building heights of the various G/IC developments;
- (s) the maximum height restriction for most of the existing/planned school sites would be 8 storeys so as to generalize the building heights of the existing school developments and to cater for the general requirements of standard school development;

Proposed Building Height Restrictions for “OU” Sites (other than “OU(Business)”

- (t) the proposed building height restrictions were as follows :-
- (i) maximum of 3 storeys for the “OU(Comprehensive Recreational Development Area)” sites covering the Hong Kong Museum of Coastal Defence and the Lei Yue Mun Park and Holiday Village to reflect the predominant existing building heights;
 - (ii) maximum of 2 storeys for the waterfront “OU(Boat Building/Repair Yards and Associated Facilities)” and “OU(Sewage Screening Plant)” sites to reflect the existing building heights;
 - (iii) maximum building height of 45mPD for the “OU(Godown)” site in close proximity to the water edge to reflect the lease conditions and the as-built condition;
 - (iv) maximum building height of 120mPD for the “OU(Residential cum Commercial and Community Facilities)” site covering Felicity Garden above the Sai Wan Ho Municipal Services Building. This building was akin to the “R(A)” type development and tallied with the height band proposed for the adjacent “R(A)” sites located to the north of Shau Kei Wan Road; and
 - (v) maximum building height not exceeding the soffit level of the Island East Corridor (IEC) for the “OU(Tram Depot)” and “OU(Chiller Plant)” sites under the IEC;

Review of “OU(Business)” Sites at A Kung Ngam

- (u) all the “OU(Business)” sites were located at A Kung Ngam, which were currently subject to a maximum building height of 63mPD and a maximum non-domestic PR of 15;

- (v) in reviewing and determining an appropriate maximum building height for these sites, due consideration had been given to maintaining the overall stepped height profile and a harmonious townscape for the Area as well as the special locational and historical setting of the A Kung Ngam area. The low-rise waterfront structures north of the sites, including the shipyards, wholesale fish market and the “OU(Godown)” site, were proposed to remain at their existing height levels. For the “R(A)” sites to the west and the Ming Wah Dai Ha site to the south-west, height bands of 100mPD and 120mPD were proposed. Under such circumstances, the maximum building height for the “OU(Business)” sites should be set at an intermediate level to allow a gradual transition of building heights;
- (w) the maximum building height to be imposed on the “OU(Business)” sites should also ensure that the view from the historic Lyemun Barracks Compound site towards the harbour would be preserved. The platform of the Compound site, which was immediately behind the “OU(Business)” sites, was at a level of about 97mPD. It was important that future redevelopment in the “OU(Business)” sites should not exceed this level;
- (x) in view of the above, it was proposed to relax the current building height restriction from 63mPD to 80mPD, and to revise the maximum non-domestic PR restriction from 15 to 12;

Review of the Ming Wah Dai Ha Site

- (y) the site was currently zoned “R(A)” which was subject to a maximum PR of 8, 9 or 10 depending on the site classification in accordance with the Building (Planning) Regulations, or a maximum non-domestic PR of 15. There was currently no building height restriction under the “R(A)” zone;
- (z) in view of the elongated site configuration and its visually prominent location, it was proposed to impose a two-tier building height profile in order to add visual interest and variation to the townscape. Taking into account the site context, proposed maximum heights of surrounding

developments, presence of the historic site in the vicinity and the green mountain backdrop, building height restrictions of 100mPD for the northern portion and 120mPD for the southern portion were recommended for the site;

- (aa) as for the development intensity of the site, a number of development options based on different PRs had been assessed in detail by concerned Government departments. The considered view of the Government was that redevelopment to a PR of 6 (to be calculated on a net site basis excluding slopes and access roads) with the two-tier building height restriction mentioned above would be the optimal scale of development for the site in enhancing land utilisation without significantly compromising the public aspirations for securing visual congruity of the townscape. To allow for design and development flexibility, provision would be made in the Notes for minor relaxation of the PR and building height restrictions;

- (bb) based on the AVA recommendations, it was suggested to specify in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP that a non-building area of at least 10m in width in the central part of the site aligning with Kam Wa Street. For the building setback at the southern boundary recommended in the AVA, specification of a non-building area on the OZP was considered more appropriate;

[Mr. Walter K.L. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

- (cc) taking into account the above considerations, it was proposed to rezone the site from “R(A)” to “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) so as to provide better planning control on future redevelopment of the site through submission of a master layout plan (MLP) for approval by Town Planning Board (TPB). Planning application should be accompanied by various technical assessments so as to address the requirements from concerned Government departments;

Other Major Rezoning Proposals

- (dd) to rezone all public housing sites (including Oi Tung Estate, Yiu Tung Estate Sites 1 and 2, and Hing Tung Estate) from “R(A)” to “R(A)1”, subject to a PR of 6 on a net site basis or the existing PR, whichever was the greater. It was noted that the existing PR of Yiu Tung Estate Site 2 was only 2.7. A redevelopment of the site into to a PR of 6 would constitute a substantial increase in development intensity and building height. In accordance with the established administrative procedure, the future redevelopment of the site would be governed by a planning brief, and the Housing Department would be required to undertake relevant assessments, including traffic impact assessment (TIA), visual impact assessment (VIA) and AVA as appropriate. As such, the PR of 6 should only be taken as the maximum development intensity that may be permitted for the site;

- (ee) to rectify the boundaries of different public housing sites, including :-
 - (i) to rezone two free-standing school sites to the west of Oi Tung Estate from “R(A)” to “G/IC” to reflect their actual uses;
 - (ii) to rezone a piece of vegetated hillslopes to the north-west and outside the boundary of Yiu Tung Estate Site 2 from “R(A)” to “GB” to safeguard it from development; and
 - (iii) to rezone the piece of land at the northern part of Hing Tung Estate from zoned “G/IC” and “GB” to “R(A)1” zone to accord with the boundary of the subject public housing development;

- (ff) to rezone a private site at Shau Kei Wan Main Street East from “O” to “R(A)” to reflect the private ownership and existing residential use as there was no development programme for the reserved open space;

- (gg) to reflect the boundary of the Aldrich Bay Park by rezoning two strips of land at Oi Shun Road from “O” to ‘Road’ and from ‘Road’ to “O” respectively;

Departmental Comments

- (hh) the proposed building height restrictions had taken into consideration the comments from concerned Government departments/bureaux. Most departments/bureaux had no adverse comment on/no objection to the proposals;

Public Consultation

- (ii) since the amendment proposals involved imposition of building height restrictions, it was considered not appropriate to carry out prior public consultation. Any pre-mature release of the information on development control might lead to rushing of GBP submissions before the control was incorporated into the OZP, thus defeating the whole purpose of development control; and
- (jj) the Eastern District Council and the Harbourfront Enhancement Committee would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition period of the draft OZP.

3. With the aid of a fly-through animation, Ms. Amy Y.M. Cheung illustrated the building height profile of the Area under the proposed amendments.

4. Members then had a discussion on the proposed amendments and the following was a summary of the discussion and views expressed by Members.

Ming Wah Dai Ha

5. Noting that the existing levels of Lei Yue Mun Park and Holiday Village to the west of Ming Wah Dai Ha were between 78.1mPD and 97.4mPD only, one Member

commented that the proposed building height restrictions of 100mPD and 120mPD for the Ming Wah Dai Ha site might block the open view currently enjoyed by visitors to Lei Yue Mun Park and Holiday Village as indicated in photomontage in Plan 14D of the Paper. This Member asked if the building height restriction could be reduced.

6. Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK, said that there had been thorough discussions among concerned Government departments on the appropriate levels of PR and building heights for the Ma Wah Dai Ha site. The considered view was that a maximum PR of 6 and a two-tier building height restriction of 100mPD and 120mPD would be the optimal development scale for the site after taking into account the site context, the height restrictions proposed for the surrounding developments, the public aspirations for securing visual congruity of the townscape, and the contribution of public housing development on the site to the wider community. Since the site was located along wind paths, a lower building height restriction for the same PR would result in a development with a higher site coverage and hence might affect air ventilation in the surrounding area. The photomontage as shown in Plan 14D of the Paper was only an indicative scheme based on the maximum PR and building height restrictions proposed. As the site was proposed to be rezoned to “CDA”, the future redevelopment would be controlled through the submission of MLP to TPB for approval so that TPB would have an opportunity to scrutinize the detailed design and layout of the scheme. The Chairperson added that the site was currently zoned “R(A)” with a maximum domestic PR of 8, 9 or 10 depending on the specific site classification. Further reduction in the building height restrictions would affect the permissible PR on the site, which in turn would affect the amount of affordable housing to be provided by Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS).

7. Another Member said that the existing low-rise development at Ming Wah Dai Ha was compatible with the surrounding environment. This Member asked if it was possible for the Government to arrange a land exchange with HKHS and to retain the Ming Wah Dai Ha site for low density and low to medium-rise residential development. The Chairperson replied that the suggestion for land exchange was at present outside Government policy. The imposition of building height restrictions in the OZP review exercise would not rule out such arrangement and the review could not be held back.

Yiu Tung Estate

8. Noting that the size of both Yiu Tung Estate Sites 1 and 2 was not small, a Member considered that the proposed maximum PR of 6 was excessive. This Member suggested rezoning some open area within the estate from “R(A)” to “O” so as to reduce the development intensity upon redevelopment and provide more public open space for the Area. Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au clarified that the boundaries of the concerned “R(A)” zone for the two Yiu Tung Estate sites were largely based on the land allocation boundary to Hong Kong Housing Authority. The vegetated hillslope surrounding the temple within Yiu Tung Estate Site 2 was proposed to be rezoned from “R(A)” to “GB” to safeguard it from development.

9. As regards the proposed maximum PR of 6 for Yiu Tung Estate, Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au explained that the PR of 6 was only used as a basis for planning assessment. In accordance with the established administrative procedure, the future redevelopment of public housing estate sites would be governed by a planning brief and Housing Department would be required to undertake relevant assessments, including TIA, VIA and AVA as appropriate, to demonstrate that the increase in development intensity was acceptable in traffic, visual and air ventilation terms. The Secretary suggested including a paragraph into the revised ES to state clearly that the maximum PR of 6 should only be taken as a reference and should not be taken as the acceptable or optimal level of PR for the site which should be ascertained by relevant assessments at a later stage. Members agreed. In response to the Chairperson’s enquiry, the Secretary confirmed that it had been stated in paragraph 9.2.5 of the revised ES in Attachment III of the Paper that areas of slopes in all public housing estates in the Area should be excluded from PR calculation.

10. Regarding the provision of public open space, Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au said that there would be a surplus of 1.85 ha of planned provision, although the existing provision was in short of 6 ha.

“R(A)” Sites in Inland Built-up Area

11. A Member commented that the proposed stepped height profile had changed the existing character of the Shau Kei Wan area in which there were taller buildings at the waterfront and the hillside, and the lower buildings in the Inland Built-up Area along Shau

Kei Wan Road and Sai Wan Ho Street had formed a “man-made valley”. This Member suggested imposing a lower building height restriction in the Inland Built-up Area so as to preserve the unique character of the “man-made valley”. Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au explained that the proposed stepped height profile for the Area was in line with the building height profile proposed for the nearby Quarry Bay area to the west. While the building height restrictions for the “R(A)” sites in the Inland Built-up Area were set at 120mPD and 135mPD, not many of the sites could achieve the maximum building height levels as they were too small in size. To achieve a maximum building height on a small site, the residential development would become a narrow block with unreasonable small flat units and there would not be much business case to develop such form of development. Under such circumstances, Ms. Au opined that under the currently proposed building height restrictions of 120mPD and 135mPD for the Inland Built-up Area, there would still be variations in the building height profile upon full redevelopment.

12. The Secretary added that not many “R(A)” sites in the Inland Built-up Area could achieve the maximum building height levels, unless the smaller sites were amalgamated for a single development. Noting Members’ concern on the development of narrow “pencil-like” buildings on the small sites, the Secretary suggested Members to consider adopting a two-tier building height restriction system currently used in some OZPs in Kowloon (i.e. to have lower building height restriction for sites less than 400m² and higher building height restriction for sites of 400m² or more).

13. A Member said that the effect of the two-tier building height restriction system in the Inland Built-up Area would depend on the market force on site amalgamation. Yet, this Member agreed to introduce the two-tier restriction system so as to give a clear signal to the public that TPB would encourage site amalgamation to avoid “pencil-like” developments. Other Members agreed and continued to discuss the boundaries which should be subject to the two-tier restriction system.

14. After some discussion, Members agreed to adopt the following two-tier building height restriction system for certain “R(A)” sites in the Area :

- (a) for the “R(A)” sites along Shau Kei Wan Road and Shau Kei Wan Main Street East which were originally imposed with a building height restriction

of 120mPD (an area broadly bounded by Hing Man Street, Nam On Street, Kam Wa Street in the north, Wang Wa Street in the east, Shau Kei Wan Road and Sai Wan Ho Street in the south and Tai Cheong Street in the west), the revised maximum building height restrictions would be 100mPD for any site with an area of less than 400m² and 120mPD for any site with an area of 400m² or more; and

- (b) for the “R(A)” sites which were originally imposed with a building height restriction of 135mPD (an area broadly bounded by Sai Wan Ho Street and Shau Kei Wan Road in the north, Ngoi Man Street in the east, Yiu Hing Road, Sun Shing Street and Wai Hang Street in the south and Tai Cheong Street in the west), the revised maximum building height restrictions would be 115mPD for any site with an area of less than 400m² and 135mPD for any site with an area of 400m² or more.

Other Aspects

Water Promenade

15. A Member enquired if there was any plan to develop a water promenade in the Area. Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au replied that there was an existing public open space along the waterfront (i.e. Aldrich Bay Promenade) which extended from Grand Promenade in the west to the Sewage Screening Plant in the east.

Transport Department’s Comments on Revised ES

16. Mr. Lam Hon suggested further revising the ES of the OZP to clearly indicate that the maximum PR of 6 for the public housing estates in the Area should only be taken as a reference for the purpose of TIA. Members agreed and noted that the suggestion had been covered by paragraph 9 above.

Deliberation Session

17. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to agree that :
- (a) subject to the relevant amendments to the OZP and its Notes as required in paragraph 14 above, the draft Shau Kei Wan OZP No. S/H9/14A and its Notes at Appendices I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
 - (b) subject to the relevant amendments to the ES as required in paragraphs 9 and 14 above, the revised ES at Appendix III of the Paper should be adopted as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP under the name of the Board.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK, Ms. Amy Y.M. Cheung, STP/HK, and Dr. Conn Yuen, AVA Consultant, for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.]