

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**(Downgraded on 24.2.2012)**

**Minutes of 460th Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 10.2.2012**

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

[Mr. Wilson Chan, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK), Mr. K.T. Ng, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), Mr. Lawrence Chau, Senior Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (STP/UD&L), Miss Yvonne Leong, Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK) were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 16**

[Closed Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/28  
(MPC Paper No. 2/12)

---

1. With the aid of a powerpoint and a fly-through simulation, Mr. K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, presented the proposed amendments to the Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TW/28 as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

**Background**

- (a) the Tsuen Wan (TW) Planning Scheme Area (the Area) had been well developed and was one of the oldest new towns in the Territory. There had been building plan submissions for the development of tall buildings, and more building plan submissions were expected since there were some old buildings ripe for redevelopment. Thus, there was a need to incorporate building height restrictions (BHRs) into the OZP to provide proper guidance for developments in the Area;

- (b) under the current OZP, BHRs in terms of metres above Principal Datum (mPD) or number of storeys were already in force in the “Commercial (5)” (“C(5)”), “Comprehensive Development Area (2)” (“CDA(2)”) to “CDA(6)”, “Residential (Group B) 2” (“R(B)2”), “R(B)3”, “Residential (Group C) 1” (“R(C)1”), “Village Type Development” (“V”), “Government, Institution or Community (1)” (“G/IC(1)”) to “G/IC(8)”, and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sports and Recreation Club” (“OU(Sports and Recreation Club)”) zones. The current OZP review was to propose appropriate BHRs for the remaining development zones, except for the “Undetermined” (“U”) zone. A separate land use review would be undertaken for the “Undetermined” zone and BHR would be incorporated upon completion of the land use review;
  
- (c) building developments were concentrated in the town centre area with high-rise commercial and residential developments above and around the two MTR stations (i.e. Tsuen Wan Station and Tsuen Wan West Station). The western (i.e. Tsuen Wan Bay Western Area) and north-western (i.e. Tsuen King Circuit) parts were two major extensions of the town centre and were mainly occupied by large-scale comprehensive residential developments, while the eastern part (i.e. Shing Mun Valley) was mainly occupied by public rental housing estates. Bounded by two industrial areas, the middle of the town centre mainly consisted of low- to medium-rise old tenement buildings. The Area had largely been developed and major development opportunities mainly came from redevelopment in the town centre area and the industrial areas;
  
- (d) in general, developments within the old town centre were subject to a maximum domestic plot ratio of 5 or a maximum non-domestic plot ratio of 9.5. Developments within the industrial areas were subject to a maximum plot ratio of 9.5;
  
- (e) taking into account the topography, local character, existing BHs and road pattern, the Area could be divided into the following 5 sub-areas (Plan 4 of the Paper):

Sub-Area 1 – Tsuen Wan Town Centre

Sub-Area 2 – Sheung Kwai Chung and Shing Mun Valley

Sub-Area 3 – Tsuen Wan Bay Western Area and Yau Kom Tau

Sub-Area 4 – Tsuen King Circuit and Tso Kung Tam

Sub-Area 5 – Fu Yung Shan and Wo Yi Hop

#### Existing BH Profile and Redevelopment Potential

- (f) the existing BH profile in the Area was rather mixed in character. In general, the existing BH profile was predominantly low- to medium-rise (under 100 mPD) in character except for the high-rise commercial and residential developments around the two key transportation nodes (i.e. MTR Tsuen Wan Station and Tsuen Wan West Station) and the large-scale comprehensive residential developments along Tsuen Wan Bay Western Area and Tsuen King Circuit, and the public rental housing estates in Shing Mun Valley. Major low-rise developments were the clusters of monasteries in Fu Yung Shan and village settlements scattered in Sheung Kwai Chung, Yau Kom Tau and Fu Yung Shan;
- (g) majority of the buildings in the Area were between 31 to 50 years of age (55%) with some over 50 years (4%). Most of the older buildings were concentrated in the old town centre and the two main industrial areas at the flanks. Buildings of 10 years or under represented only about 10%;
- (h) as most lots in the old town centre were small in size, it would not be unrealistic to assume some site amalgamation, which would result in taller buildings than those for piecemeal development on individual lots. The current review had identified around 70 buildings (mainly within the old town centre and the northern part of Tsuen Wan East Industrial Area) that might have potential for redevelopment; .

#### Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA)

- (i) an AVA by expert evaluation had been undertaken to provide a qualitative assessment of the wind environment within the Area. Detailed findings, recommendations and proposals of the AVA were summarised in paras. 6.2 to 6.7 and shown in Plan 9 of the Paper;
- (j) in general, the major annual prevailing winds came from the north, north-east and east. In summer, the winds were from east, south and south-west. Roads, open spaces, parks, low-rise government/institution/community (GIC) developments, slopes and hills were essential to air ventilation or could be key wind corridors to ventilate the Area. Therefore, green belts, open spaces, GIC facilities, village settlements and roads were proposed to be preserved. Heights of most GIC facilities were kept to the existing BHs and lower BHR for the old town centre and the two industrial areas were proposed to enhance air ventilation. Moreover, building gaps above podium levels at West Rail Sites TW5 to TW7 and Waterside Plaza along the waterfront, a 20-m wide non-building area (NBA) at the western boundary of Sun Fung Centre, and NBAs for the open area at Nina Tower (TWTL 353) were proposed. For the proposals to introduce air paths / large courtyards in large residential sites, including Fuk Loi Estate, Luk Yeung Sun Chuen, Shek Wai Kok Estate and Lei Muk Shue Estate upon redevelopment, they should be considered under detailed AVAs to be prepared for the future redevelopment of these sites;

#### Urban Design Principles

- (k) in conducting the BH review, the broad urban design principles set out in the Urban Design Guidelines, Chapter 11 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and all other planning considerations should be taken into account. The BHRs were also formulated on the following basis (Plan 10 of the Paper):
- the landmark building of Nina Tower and the high-rise developments around the twin town nodes (i.e. the MTR Tsuen Wan Station and Tsuen Wan West Station) were respected and consolidated;
  - further proliferation of high-rise buildings in the old town centre and

the industrial areas and further excessively tall buildings along the waterfront should be avoided;

- stepped BH profile should be adopted from waterfront to inland in Sub-Area 3 and following the terrain in Sub-Areas 2, 4 and 5;
- the BH profile should create diversity and variety to enhance visual interest and be sympathetic and compatible with the surrounding developments;
- existing green/ visual corridors and major air paths, open spaces and low-rise “G/IC” sites together with its existing height profile should be retained to serve as visual and spatial relief; and
- the proposed BH bands should ensure that the urban design principles would not be negated while still accommodating the permissible development intensity under the OZP.

#### Proposed BH Concept

- (l) the Area was hilly, except the town centre to the south of Castle Peak Road, The proposed BH profile was developed on the basis of the natural topography. The proposed BH concept was shown in Plan 10 of the Paper;

#### Tsuen Wan Town Centre (Sub-Area 1)

- (m) the BH profile of the existing / proposed high-rise commercial and residential developments at and around the twin town nodes (including the landmark building of Nina Tower and the proposed comprehensive developments at West Rail Sites TW5 to TW7), which contributed to project a positive and recognizable image for the Tsuen Wan area (Plan 5A-2 of the Paper), should be respected. BH descending gradually from the landmark building towards the surrounding areas should be respected and consolidated;
- (n) the old town centre sandwiched between the twin town nodes were mainly occupied by old tenement buildings in small lot size. A lower height profile would enhance air ventilation. To cater for amalgamation of sites for larger

developments with the provision of more design flexibility, a two-tier BHR with a maximum BH of 80 mPD / 100 mPD should be adopted. For residential sites with an area of 400 m<sup>2</sup> or more, an additional BH of 20 m would be allowed;

- (o) for the industrial areas bounding the old town centre, a lower BH should be adopted as a mitigation strategy for better air ventilation;

*Shing Mun Valley and Sheung Kwai Chung (Sub-Area 2)*

*Tsuen King Circuit and Tso Kung Tam (Sub-Area 4)*

*Fu Yung Shan and Wo Yi Hop (Sub-Area 5)*

- (p) a stepped height concept respecting the terrain and to echo with the natural topographical profile was generally adopted for the hilly areas surrounding the town centre;.

*Tsuen Wan Bay Western Area and Yau Kom Tau (Sub-Area 3)*

- (q) a BH profile stepping up from the waterfront towards the mountain backdrop was adopted for both Tsuen Wan Bay Western Area and Yau Kom Tau. Excessively tall and out-of-context buildings at the Yau Kom Tau waterfront should be avoided in view of the waterfront setting and urban fringe character of the Area;
- (r) the BH of The Westminster Terrace, which was located near the Yau Kom Tau waterfront, deviated significantly from the developments of the surrounding areas, resulting in an incongruous height profile. Redevelopment of the building should conform to the BHR under the OZP so as to preserve the urban fringe character of the Sub-Area as well as to help restore a waterfront setting with developments of appropriate scale and height in the long-term;

*“G/IC”, “OU” and “O” Sites*

- (s) taking into consideration the recommendations of the AVA, the existing low-rise “G/IC” and “OU” (except “OU(B)” and “OU(Mass Transit Railway Depot with Commercial and Residential Development Above)”) clusters would be maintained as far as possible to serve as spatial and visual relief. “O” sites would generally be retained so that the existing greenery and open area could be preserved as breathing space;

Proposed BHRs (Amendment Item A)

Sub-Area 1 – Tsuen Wan Town Centre (Plans 10 and 11A)

Old Town Centre

- (t) a two-tier BHR with a maximum BH of 80 mPD and 100 mPD under the two-tier height control (i.e. about 74 m to 94 m) was proposed for the old town centre. A maximum BH of 100 mPD would be permitted for sites with an area of 400 m<sup>2</sup> or more;
- (u) a maximum BH of 100 mPD was proposed for Fuk Loi Estate and Moon Lok Dai Ha at the north-western fringe of the old town centre, each occupying a sizeable area larger than 400m<sup>2</sup> so as to tally with the two-tier height control;

Twin Town Nodes and Surrounding Areas

- (v) for the areas around the MTR Tsuen Wan Station, maximum BHs of 100mPD to 150mPD were proposed. These included BHR of 100mPD for a number of commercial and residential developments to the east of the Station, BHR of 110mPD for government office development of Tsuen Wan Station Multi-storey Carpark Building and Luk Yeung Sun Chuen, BHR of 110mPD for Tsuen Kam Centre together with various commercial and industrial developments to the west of the Station and BHR of 150mPD for Discovery Park;
- (w) for areas around the MTR Tsuen Wan West Station, maximum BHs of

110mPD to 300mPD were proposed. These included BHR of 185mPD for Vision City (TWTL 398) which was a commercial-residential development with GIC facilities and public open space, and BHRs of 40mPD (podium portion), 170mPD and 300mPD (for the two building towers respectively) for Nina Tower which was a commercial development to reflect the landmark development;

- (x) for the waterfront area, BHR of 80 mPD, 115 mPD, 150 mPD (for the Cityside portion) and 160 mPD (for the Bayside portion) for the proposed comprehensive commercial and residential development at West Rail Site TW5, BHR of 175 mPD for the proposed comprehensive residential development at West Rail Site TW6 and BHR of 150 mPD for the proposed comprehensive residential development at West Rail Site TW7 were proposed;
- (y) as regards the industrial area, BHR of 100 mPD was imposed for Chai Wan Kok Industrial Area and the southern part of Tsuen Wan East Industrial Area;

#### Sub-Area 2 – Sheung Kwai Chung and Shing Mun Valley

- (z) BHR stepping up from Kwok Shui Road (120 mPD) northward and Shek Wai Kok Estate (130 mPD) north-eastward to Lei Muk Shue Estate (190 mPD) was proposed. For the comprehensive residential development, Primrose Hill, BHR of 210mPD was proposed;

#### Sub-Area 3 – Tsuen Wan Bay Western Area and Yau Kom Tau

- (aa) Tsuen Wan Bay Western Area was predominantly occupied by large-scale high-density comprehensive residential developments. The BH gradually descended westward to Yau Kom Tau with medium- to low-density developments on sloping areas of varying heights rendering an interesting transition height profile along the waterfront. Taking into account the topography, existing height profile and its location fronting the Harbour,

BHRs from 100mPD to 140mPD at Tsuen Wan Bay Western Area and BHRs of 60mPD to 140mPD for Yau Kom Tau stepping up from the waterfront towards the north were proposed;

- (bb) for The Westminster Terrace with existing BH of about 183 mPD, given its prominent waterfront location and the BH profile of the neighbourhood, a BHR of 140 mPD, which tallied with the existing BH of the adjacent Hanley Villa, was proposed for the development. The provision for redevelopment to the existing BH was not allowed so as to preserve the urban fringe character as well as to help restore a waterfront setting with developments of appropriate scale and height in the long-term;

#### Sub-Area 4 – Tsuen King Circuit and Tso Kung Tam

- (cc) developments in this Sub-Area were mainly large-scale comprehensive residential developments concentrated along the access road, Tsuen King Circuit, on a hilly topography. Taking into account the topographical condition, local character and predominant land uses, BHR from 120mPD to 180mPD stepping up north-westward following the access road, Tsuen King Circuit, was proposed. For the recently completed large-scale comprehensive residential development (Summit Terrace) at Castle Peak Road, BHR of 150 mPD was proposed to generalise the BH (about 144 – 156 mPD) of the as-built development on site;

#### Sub-Area 5 – Fu Yung Shan and Wo Yi Hop

- (dd) appropriate BHRs had been incorporated into the current OZP for all the development zones within Sub-Area 5;

#### “G/IC” Sites

- (ee) other than those sites zoned “G/IC(1)” to “G/IC(8)”, there were 99 “G/IC” sites (including those 26 sites proposed to be rezoned to “G/IC”) occupying a total area of about 80.2 ha in the Area. The majority of these “G/IC” sites

had been developed to their designated uses or occupied by temporary uses. Of these, 14 sites were used for community uses, 30 sites for educational uses, 17 sites for various government uses and 38 sites for utility installation facilities/other uses;

- (ff) the proposed BHRs for the “G/IC” zones would be in terms of number of storeys for low-rise development or the buildings not taller than 13 storeys to allow some flexibility for specific functional requirements of various GIC facilities, and in terms of mPD for office or institutional type medium- or high-rise development (Plan 12 of the Paper). Most BHRs were to reflect the existing BHs of the respective GIC facilities;
- (gg) for the future redevelopment of Tsuen Wan Adventist Hospital at Tsuen King Circuit, BHRs of 63 mPD and 157 mPD, which were in accordance with the conditions of the relevant land exchange, were proposed;
- (hh) BHR of 10 storeys for the future redevelopment of Caritas Community Centre at 9 Shing Mun Road (Lot No. 2121 in D.D. 449 and the Extension thereto) was proposed. The proposed BHR for the subject site was to reflect the agreed redevelopment scheme of the site;
- (ii) BHR of 90 mPD for the proposed development of a Joint Universities Research Archive (JURA) at the ex-Kwai Chung Public School site at Kwok Shui Road was proposed. The proposed JURA development comprised the High Block and the Low Block. The High Block was an Automatic Retrieval System (ARS) Storage Compartment and the Low Block was an Administration Office Block. The proposed private treaty grant for the JURA with a maximum BHR of 90 mPD for the site was approved by the Lands Department on 28.9.2011. The proposed BHR for the site was to reflect the agreed development proposal of the site.
- (jj) a summary of the existing BH for GIC developments within “G/IC” zones and their respective proposed BHRs was at Attachment IV of the Paper;

### “OU” Sites

(kk) the intention of the “OU” sites was to provide/reserve land for specific purposes and uses. Other than “OU(Sports and Recreation Club)”, “OU(Amenity)”, “OU(B)” and “OU(Mass Transit Railway Depot with Commercial and Residential Development Above)” zones, there were four existing “OU” sites on the OZP annotated “MTR”, “Petrol Filling Station” (“PFS”), “Pier” and “Ventilation Building”. BHRs from 1 storey to 4 storeys, which mainly followed/generalized the existing BHs for respective sites, were proposed and shown in Plan 12 of the Paper. A summary of the “OU” developments within “OU” zones and their respective proposed BHRs was at Attachment V of the Paper;

### Designation of NBAs and Demarcation of Building Gaps (Amendment Items B1 to B6)

(ll) a NBA (20 m wide) at the western boundary of Sun Fung Centre at 88 Kwok Shui Road (TWTL 344) was proposed. The proposed NBA was now partly occupied by the building block of Sun Fung Centre and should be provided upon redevelopment of the site;

(mm) the existing open area (about 0.14 ha) at the north-western corner of the site (i.e. at the junction of Yeung Uk Road and Tai Ho Road) of Nina Tower (TWTL 353) was proposed to be designated as NBA;

(nn) a total of four building gaps within the proposed developments in West Rail Sites TW5 (50m wide above 27mPD at the Bayside), TW6 (20m wide above 18mPD) and TW7 (20m wide above 19mPD) in line with the respective approved Master Layout Plans and Waterside Plaza (TWTL 318) (20m wide above 19mPD) were proposed to create air paths for the town centre;

### Review of “Open Space” Sites

- (oo) there were altogether 26 “O” sites in the Area. A summary of the findings was at Attachment VIII of the Paper. The 19 (No. 1 to 19) sites without private land together with the five sites involving private land (No. 20, 21, 23, 25 and 26) (Plan 13 of the Paper) had been developed as open space and/or the long term planning intention of these sites for open space was still valid. The “O” zoning of these 24 sites was considered appropriate;
- (pp) for the remaining two “O” sites (No. 22 and 24) involving private land, there was no definite implementation programme and the planning intention for open space was no longer valid. Government land at Site No. 22 had been developed into Sha Tsui Road Playground and therefore the “O” zoning of this part of the site would be retained. As the private land (about 0.08 ha) at the south-western corner had been developed into an electricity substation (ESS) (i.e. Sha Tsui Road Residential Substation) and there was no intention to re-develop the existing ESS into open space, this piece of private land was proposed to be rezoned from “O” to “G/IC” (Amendment Item G2);
- (qq) for Site No. 24 adjacent to Tuen Mun Road, it was partly a piece of government land and partly under private ownership, including part of an existing religious institution, Wang Fat Ching She (弘法精舍). There was no implementation programme for the “O” site. As the religious institution straddled across three different zones (“G/IC”, “O” and “GB”), to rationalize the zoning boundaries to tally with the lot boundary, it was proposed to rezone the western part of the Site No. 24 and a narrow strip of land to the immediate south occupied by Wang Fat Ching She (弘法精舍) from “O” and “GB” to “G/IC” (Amendment Item L1) (about 0.3 ha). The remaining areas of Site No. 24 together with the strip of government land sandwiched between Wang Fat Ching She (弘法精舍) and Tuen Mun Road mainly covered by dense vegetation would be rezoned from “O” and “G/IC” to “GB” (Amendment Item L2) (about 0.4 ha) to tally with the lot boundaries of the subject religious institution;
- (rr) after rezoning of the above two “O” sites, there would still be adequate

provision of open space in the Area according to the standards laid down in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG);

Rezoning Proposals

- (ss) various areas in Tsuen Wan Town Centre bounded by Castle Peak Road, Kwan Mun Hau Street, Luen Yan Street, Yeung Uk Road, Hoi Shing Road and Tai Chung Road were proposed to be rezoned from “R(A)” to “R(A)13” and a BHR of 80mPD and 100mPD under the two-tier height control would be stipulated (Amendment Item C);
- (tt) a site occupied by The Westminster Terrace at Yau Kom Tau was proposed to be rezoned from “R(B)” to “R(B)5” and a BHR of 140 mPD without the provision of the claim for the existing BH was stipulated (Amendment Item D);
- (uu) 8 free-standing GIC facilities in Cheung Shan Estate and Shek Wai Kok Estate were proposed to be rezoned from “R(A)” to “G/IC” and the respective BHRs would be stipulated (Amendment Items E1 to E6). Details were shown in para. 14.4 of the paper;
- (vv) 12 major free-standing GIC facilities interspersed among the commercial/residential developments in Tsuen Wan Town Centre were proposed to be rezoned from “R(A)” or “C” to “G/IC” and the respective BHRs would be stipulated (Amendment Items F1 to F12). Details were shown in para. 14.6 of the Paper;
- (ww) three electricity substations were proposed to be rezoned from “V”, “O” or “I” to “G/IC” and the respective BHRs would be stipulated (Amendment Items G1 to G3). Details were shown in para. 14.8 of the Paper;
- (xx) Wo Yi Hop Road Garden to the immediate south of Wo Yi Hop Road Substation was an existing sitting-out area. The sitting-out area and the adjoining small strip of government land mainly covered by dense vegetation with a total land area of 0.03 ha were proposed to be rezoned

from “V” to “O” (Amendment Item H) to better reflect the planning intention and the as-built development on site;

(yy) Chinachem Tsuen Wan Plaza was proposed to be rezoned from “I” to “C(6)” (Amendment Item J) subject to a maximum GFA of 14,915 m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum BH of 100 mPD to better reflect the planning intention and the as-built commercial development of the site;

(zz) two narrow strips of government land occupied by Tsuen Wan Fresh Water Service Reservoir and Treatment Works were proposed to be rezoned from “V” and “O” to “G/IC”(Amendment Item K);

(aaa) the annotation of the “OU” zone for Mass Transit Railway was revised from “Mass Transit Railway” to “Railway”(Amendment Item M);

(bbb) Primrose Hill was proposed to be rezoned from “R(E)” to “R(A)14” (Amendment Item N) with a domestic GFA of about 35,974 m<sup>2</sup> and non-domestic GFA of about 1,000 m<sup>2</sup>, and a maximum BH of 210 mPD to reflect the development parameters under the approved scheme;

(ccc) a piece of government land at the junction of Yeung Uk Road and Ma Tau Pa Road, namely TWTL 393 subject to a maximum plot ratio of 9.5 and no BHR, was previously included in the 2008-09 Application List of the Land Sale Programme for hotel development. In response to a recent concern from the TWDC over the development intensity of the site and the overall demand and supply condition of hotel sites, the Administration decided to remove the site from the Application List so as to examine in more details the impact of the site towards the development of the local community. In this connection, the land use including the development parameters of this site would be subject to further review. The site was recommended to be rezoned from “C” to “U”(Amendment Item P) pending the findings of the review;

(ddd) a section of Yeung Uk Road was proposed to be rezoned from “C” and

“R(A)” to area shown as ‘Road’ to reflect the as-built alignment of the road (Amendment Item Q);

Proposed Amendments to the Notes and ES

(eee) the Notes and the ES of the OZP were also proposed to be amended correspondingly; and

Public Consultation

(fff) since the amendment proposals involved imposition of BHRs, it was considered not appropriate to carry out prior public consultation. The Tsuen Wan District Council would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition period of the amendments to the OZP.

2. With reference to Site C10 in Attachment IV of the Paper, Mr. Eric Hui, Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department (HAD), raised concern on the proposed BHR of 1 storey for Shek Wai Kok (SWK) Community Hall. He said that in response to the recent request of the Property Strategy Group, sites reserved for GIC uses with no development plan had to be released for other uses. With less reserved sites available and coupled with the Legislative Council’s latest requirement for the provision of more multi-function rooms within a community hall in Tuen Mun, redevelopment of the existing community halls would need to be speeded up. He proposed to increase the BHR of SWK Community Hall from 1 storey to 3 storeys to facilitate its redevelopment in future. He drew reference to the case of Hing Wah Community Hall in Chai Wan where the BHR was increased from 2 storeys to 3 storeys after liaison with Planning Department (PlanD). Furthermore, he asked members to consider setting a standard BHR of 3 storeys for community hall, as similar to the current approach of adopting a standard BHR of 8 storeys for school.

3. The Chairman asked whether there was a standard design for community hall at this moment. Mr. Eric Hui responded that a standard set of facilities for community hall had been submitted to Legislative Council recently but no specific BH was proposed as that would depend on the size and the constraints of the site involved. For example, Hing Wah Community Hall was surrounded by slopes and roads and hence a higher BH was necessary

due to site constraints. For SWK Community Hall, it was surrounded by SWK Estate of Housing Department (HD). If the Community Hall had to be redeveloped, it would be constrained by the existing size of the site. The existing BH of the Community Hall would need to be increased to accommodate the standard set of facilities. Therefore, relaxing the BHR of SWK Community Hall to 3 storeys would be necessary to facilitate its redevelopment.

4. A Member opined that for schools, there was a standard design to support its BHR of 8 storeys. For “G/IC” sites which were privately owned, it was the established practice of the Board to require the project proponent to obtain policy support and to provide a conceptual development scheme to justify the increase in BH. If a conceptual development scheme for SWK Community Hall was not available, allowing a BHR above the height of the existing building in the absence of a scheme would set an undesirable precedent for the Board in considering proposals for privately owned “G/IC” sites. Relaxing the BHR to 3 storeys for SWK Community Hall could be considered if HAD could confirm that the BH of 3 storeys was a standard for community hall.

5. Mr. Wilson Chan, DPO/TWK, said that PlanD had consulted HAD when the BH review exercise was conducted. For the Princess Alexandra Community Centre, HAD had confirmed that the extension proposal would not result in an increase in the height of the existing building as only one annex block would be added. Therefore, the BHR was stipulated as the existing BH of 5 storeys. However, there was no information about the expansion plan of SWK Community Hall. On the other hand, if a BHR of 3 storeys was imposed on the SWK Community Hall site, DC members might query why they were not informed about the redevelopment plan. Mr. Chan said that unless there was redevelopment proposal for SWK Community Hall, the established principle that the BHR should reflect the existing BH of “G/IC” sites should be kept.

6. The Vice-chairman opined that there should be a set of principles in the formulation of BHR and the Board should avoid favouring any particular party. The BHR of 8 storeys for schools basically followed the standard requirement for schools. However, it was noted that the site area of community halls varied depending on the time they were built. If HAD could provide the total gross floor area of the facilities required for a community hall, then the number of storeys to meet the accommodation requirement could be worked out

based on the size of individual site. If no such information was available, the existing BH of the community hall should be adopted as the BHR.

7. Mr. Eric Hui agreed that an appropriate BH for community hall would depend on individual site characteristics. For new development site, HAD would strive for a sufficiently large site for building a community hall. However, extensions of existing community hall sites were constrained by existing developments in the surrounding. Regarding PlanD's concern that DC members were not informed about the redevelopment plan of SWK Community Hall, he said that it was not practical to ask for consultation with DC before a higher BHR could be proposed. For the case of Hing Wah Community Hall, HAD had worked with PlanD to determine the BHR without ensuring that DC was informed. In this case, HAD could also work out a proposal for SWK Community Hall. It would therefore be better not to impose the BHR of 1 storey for the SWK Community Hall site at this stage.

8. The Secretary explained that according to the established practice of the Board, there must be at least a conceptual redevelopment scheme showing the facilities to be included and also relevant policy support for the Committee to consider a higher BHR over the existing BH. Prior consultation with DC was not strictly necessary. This practice applied similarly to both government and private "G/IC" sites. For the Hing Wah Community Hall case, PlanD had liaised with HAD and other relevant government departments and a redevelopment scheme had been worked out and submitted for the consideration of the Committee. The Committee should be mindful in avoiding differential treatment between private and public projects. PlanD could continue to liaise with HAD in the review of BHR for community halls in different districts. The BHR could be further amended if there was information to justify the amendment. However, there was no sufficient information at this stage to increase the BHR of SWK Community Hall.

9. Another Member considered that the same approach should be adopted for private and public projects. Otherwise, the Committee would be accused for being unfair. In future, when there was a redevelopment proposal of SWK Community Hall, there might not be strong objection from the public to increase the BHR as the proposal was for public interest.

10. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Mr. Eric Hui explained that originally

there was no plan to redevelop the existing community hall. However, with more reserved “G/IC” sites identified for other uses, the existing community hall would need to be redeveloped to meet the new requirement for more facilities. The approach to adopt a standard design for community hall, as similar to the approach adopted for designating the BHR of school should be considered.

11. The Chairman said that if there was a standard design for community hall, a standard BHR could be applied to all community halls. As the standard design was not yet available, it would be more appropriate for the BHR of the SWK Community Hall site to maintain as 1 storey to reflect the existing BH. Members agreed.

12. A Member asked whether the proposed BHRs along the waterfront were excessive as the BHR further inland was lower than that along the waterfront. This Member also asked whether there would be any restriction for the podium to allow better permeability in terms of air ventilation. Mr. Wilson Chan replied that the proposed BHRs had respected the high-rise profile of development around the twin town nodes at MTR Tsuen Wan Station and Tsuen Wan West Station. The developments of the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) sites (TW5, 6 and 7) at Tsuen Wan West Station along the waterfront had been previously approved by the Committee. Technical assessments, including visual impact assessment, had been conducted to support these CDA developments. Breezeway/visual corridors with the widest one of about 50m had been proposed in these developments to minimize any adverse visual and air ventilation impact.

13. In response to the Chairman’s enquiry, Mr. Wilson Chan confirmed that all developments on the OZP could be redeveloped up to the BHR or the existing BH whichever was the greater except one development named The Westminster Terrace at Yau Kom Tau. The existing BH of The Westminster Terrace was about 180mPD which was considered excessive when compared with other developments at Yau Kom Tau with existing BH ranging from about 60mPD to about 150mPD. From Plan D-2, it was apparent that The Westminster Terrace was incompatible with the surrounding developments. Therefore, it was proposed that The Westminster Terrace could only be redeveloped up to the BHR of 140mPD in keeping with the surroundings. In response to the question from Ms. Olga Lam, Assistant Director/Kowloon, Lands Department, Mr. Chan further confirmed that The Westminster Terrace site was the only site in the same OZP that was not allowed to build up to the existing

BH upon redevelopment. The Chairman further asked whether a 20% mountain backdrop could be kept with a BHR of 140mPD for The Westminster Terrace. Mr. Chan replied in the affirmative.

14. Ms. Olga Lam asked whether the existing GFA of The Westminster Terrace could be accommodated upon redevelopment given that there was a reduction of BH from the existing 180mPD to 140mPD. Mr. Wilson Chan responded that the BHR of 140mPD would be able to accommodate the existing GFA as there was scope to increase the site coverage.

15. Regarding the “O” zone review, a Member considered the rezoning of two “O” sites to other uses might not be welcomed by the public as there would be less open space in the area although the total amount of open space could meet the requirement of HKPSG. This Member asked whether it was possible to compensate the loss in other areas. Mr. Wilson Chan responded that the proposals of rezoning an ESS from “O” to “G/IC” and the Wang Fat Ching She from “O” and “GB” to “G/IC” were considered appropriate as the former would not be changed to other use in the short run while the latter involved private land. Leisure and Cultural Services Department had confirmed that there was no programme to implement these two “O” zones and had no objection to the rezoning proposals. The total area of open space in Tsuen Wan was much higher than the minimum requirement under HKPSG as well as other districts. Moreover, the rezoning of a “V” zone to “O” zone as illustrated in Plan H1 of the Paper would help compensate the loss of open space and there would not be much difference as compared with the existing situation. The Secretary supplemented that in 2005 when the Board considered the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong’s objections to 11 OZPs, it was agreed that “O” zone was intended for open space used by the public. The Board then requested PlanD to separately review the “O” zones covering private land on all OZPs. If there was no intention to develop the concerned “O” sites as public open space, they should be rezoned to other more appropriate zoning when opportunity arose. Since then, PlanD had been conducting “O” zone review progressively.

16. With reference to Plan 9 of the Paper, a Member asked what was the purpose of designating the open areas at Nina Tower and Vision City as NBA. Mr. Wilson Chan replied that the open area at the north-western corner of Nina Tower was proposed to be designated as NBA for air ventilation purpose according to the recommendations of AVA. This would prevent the area to be built upon. For Vision City, Plan 9 had mistakenly indicated that

maintaining the existing open area was one of the recommendations of AVA. The open area was a public open space required under the lease and it was not necessary to designate it as NBA. Plan 9 would be rectified accordingly.

17. The Secretary said that the Secretariat would further check the accuracy of the proposed amendments to the OZP, Notes and ES. The above documents, after incorporating the refinements (if any), would be published under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance.

18. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/28 and that the draft Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/28A at Attachment I of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/TW/29 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment III of the Paper for the draft Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/28A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zones on the Plan and be issued under the name of the Board, and the revised ES would be published together with the Plan.

[The Chairman thanked Mr. Wilson Chan, DPO/TWK, Mr. K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, Mr. Lawrence Chau, STP/UD&L and Miss Yvonne Leong, TP/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]