

**Minutes of 379<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held on 15.8.2008**

[Mr. Eric C.K. Yue, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), Miss Annie K.W. To, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K) of the Planning Department, and Professor Edward Y.Y. Ng, Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Consultant, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 19**

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Tsz Wan Shan,  
Diamond Hill and San Po Kong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K11/22  
(MPC Paper No. 25/08)

---

[Closed Meeting]

**Presentation and Questioning Sessions**

1. The Committee noted that Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim had declared an interest in the item as he was a colleague of Professor Edward Y.Y. Ng, AVA Consultant, in the Department of Architect of the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Since Professor Lim's interest in the item was indirect and insubstantial, Members agreed that he should be allowed to stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion and determination of the item.

2. The Chairperson informed Members that Planning Department (PlanD) had prepared a physical model showing the building height profile of the Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong Planning Scheme Area (the Area) under the proposed amendments. The model was placed in the meeting room for Members' reference.

3. With the aid of Powerpoint presentation, Miss Annie K.W. To, STP/K briefed Members on the item as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points :

Background

- (a) there was currently no building height restriction on the current Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). With the removal of the ex-Kai Tak Airport and the relaxation of the airport height restriction, the Area had been subject to redevelopment pressure, in particular the San Po Kong Business Area (SPKBA);
- (b) the Wong Tai Sin District Council and the locals had in recent years expressed great concerns on the excessive building heights of new developments/redevelopments within the Wong Tai Sin district as well as their impacts on air ventilation in the local area. In the absence of building height control, some incompatible developments were approved;
- (c) there was also a need to preserve the open setting of the cultural assets in the Area, including the Wong Tai Sin Temple, Chi Nin Nunnery and Nan Lian Garden. Opportunity was also taken to create a local vista along Kai Tak Nullah (Choi Hung Road Section) by controlling the building height profile alongside;
- (d) the purposes of the amendments to the OZP were threefold. Firstly, to incorporate appropriate building height restrictions in various zones of the OZP so as to provide better planning control on the building height upon development/redevelopment and to meet public concern about out-of-context or excessively tall buildings in the already densely populated urban areas. Secondly, to incorporate the recommendations of “Consultancy Study on Feasibility of Public Housing Development at ex-San Po Kong Flatted Factory Sites” recently completed by the Housing Department (HD). Lastly, to rezone several sites to reflect the latest developments in the OZP area, as well as to incorporate the Board’s decision on refinement to the Master Schedule of Notes in the OZP;

Local Contexts and Existing Building Height Profiles of Four Sub-areas

- (e) the Area could be divided into four sub-areas, namely San Po Kong Business and Residential Area, Wong Tai Sin Residential and Cultural Area, Diamond Hill Residential/Commercial and Cultural Area, and Tsz Wan Shan Residential Area;
  
- (f) San Po Kong Business and Residential Area
  - (i) the existing building heights ranged from 32.1mPD to 123mPD. The HD had recommended to rezone the two sites at ex-San Po Kong Flatted Factory (ex-SPKFF) from “Industrial” (“I”) to “Open Space” (“O”) and “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”); and
  
  - (ii) to the east of the SPKBA was Rhythm Garden, which had an average building height of 80mPD. To the west of the SPKBA was a relatively old private residential area comprising 45 housing developments, of which about 91% had building age of 30 years or more. Their existing building heights ranged from 25mPD to 107mPD. The Latitude (i.e. redevelopment at ex-San Po Kong Magistracy site) would be the tallest development (166mPD) in the area;
  
- (g) Wong Tai Sin Residential and Cultural Area
  - (i) there were four major public housing estates, including Upper Wong Tai Sin Estate (Phases 1 & 4) (52.7-136.1mPD (10-41 storeys)), Upper Wong Tai Sin Estate (Phase 3) under construction (154mPD), Chuk Yuen South Estate (97.9-118.3mPD (23-28 storeys)), and Chuk Yuen North Estate (153.2-162.5mPD (36 storeys));
  
  - (ii) there were three private residential developments to the east of Wong Tai Sin Temple along Lung Cheung Road, including Hsin Kuang Centre (129.6mPD (38 storeys)), Tropicana Gardens

(100.6mPD (30 storeys)), and a residential development at Chun Yan Street under construction (146mPD); and

(iii) there was a relatively old residential area to the immediate northeast of the Wong Tai Sin Folk Culture Area around Kam Fung Street. It included 130 existing private residential developments, among which 90% of them having building age over 30 years. The building heights ranged from 44.2mPD (4 storeys) to 194.2mPD (48 storeys). 78% of the lots were smaller than 400m<sup>2</sup>;

(h) Diamond Hill Residential/Commercial and Cultural Area

(i) it included a large green belt area, with cluster of Government, Institution or Community (G/IC) and open space uses (Po Kong Village Road School Village and District Open Space), and a cultural heritage node at Chi Lin Nunnery and Nan Lian Garden. The rest of the area comprised a mixture of private and public residential developments. Public housing developments included Lung Poon Court (maximum 130mPD (38 storeys)) and Fung Tak Estate (maximum 140mPD (35 storeys));

(ii) some large private residential developments were located on both sides of Tate's Cairn Tunnel, including Galaxia (maximum 165.1mPD (48 storeys)), Bel Air Heights (maximum 160.9mPD (49 storeys above ground)), Grand View Garden (maximum 149.4mPD (40 storeys)), and Regent on the Hill (maximum 156.7mPD (35 storeys)); and

(iii) the former Tai Hom Village site zoned "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") was currently vacant. As the Shatin-Central Link depot was proposed to be relocated to this site, a land use review was being conducted for the site, with the aim to review the development parameters;

- (i) Tsz Wan Shan Residential Area
  - (i) the area was predominantly occupied by public housing estates, with building heights ranging from 130mPD (31 storeys) to 240mPD (42 storeys). The redevelopment of Shatin Pass Estate with a maximum building height of 255mPD was underway; and
  - (ii) an area of private residential developments (about 1.3 ha) was located to the immediate south of Tsz Hong Estate. 80% of the lots were smaller than 400m<sup>2</sup>, with building heights ranging from about 82mPD (6 storeys) to 175mPD (33 storeys). Among 35 residential developments in the area, about 77% of them had building age above 30 years;

Spatial Attributes Identified in the Area

- (j) folk cultural area – including Wong Tai Sin Temple (Grade II), the Old Pillbox (Grade II), the Old Stone House (Grade III) and the Former Royal Air Force Hanger (Grade III), and Chi Lin Nunnery/Nan Lian Garden;
- (k) green visual relief – including the low rise G/IC cluster between Shatin Pass Road and Tsz Lok Estate, and the extensive green open area extended from the proposed Po Kong Village Road District Open Space in the north to Nan Lian Garden in the south;
- (l) local visual corridor – Kai Tak Nullah with improvement and landscaped works to be commenced;
- (m) street widths – due consideration would be given to the width of streets to form effective air paths in order to optimize air ventilation within the area;

### Local Wind Environment

- (n) an AVA by expert evaluation of the Area had been undertaken. The major findings were as follows :-
- (i) the annual prevailing wind of the Area came from the east and northeast. As the Area was bounded by a continuous hill range, the north/northeast wind arriving the Area would be slow and weakened by the shielding effects of the hills;
  - (ii) the Area had relatively large greenery coverage. Utilizing the green areas appropriately to formulate air paths through the Area was possible and should be attempted. Except for San Po Kong area, the ground coverage and the existing building bulk of the Area were not high;
  - (iii) there were two main north-south air paths channelling air ventilation through the Area when the wind came from the southerly directions. The first air path was originated at the southern end of the Kai Tak Nullah at Prince Edward Road East, while the second air path was originated at the open spaces near Rhythm Garden; and
  - (iv) San Po Kong was located at the windward side of the Area. The high ground coverage reduced urban porosity and the potential for air ventilation at the pedestrian level;

### Key Guiding Principles for Building Height in the Area

- (o) the six key guiding principles were as follows, including :-
- (i) to preserve the 20% building-free zone of the ridgelines, including Lion Rock, Tsz Wan Shan and Kowloon Peak;

- (ii) to create a general stepped height profile with lower developments beside G/IC cluster/open space areas and higher developments in the inland area;
- (iii) to be compatible with local character so as to avoid development of ‘pencil’ towers or out-of-context ‘sore thumb’ buildings;
- (iv) to protect the setting of cultural/heritage features, including Wong Tai Sin Temple, Chi Nin Nunnery and Nan Lin Garden;
- (v) to accommodate the permitted development intensity; and
- (vi) to preserve/create visual relief, breezeways and view corridor through linking up the low-rise G/IC facilities and open spaces in the Area;

#### Overall Building Height Concept and Proposals

- (p) in general, the building height profile should mainly follow the natural topography of the Area by stepping down from Tsz Wan Shan area in the north towards the residential area in San Po Kong area in the south. Both the existing and proposed building height profiles of the Area were below the contours of the view fan of Quarry Bay Park Vantage Point in regard of the preservation of the 20% building-free zone of the ridgelines of Lion Rock, Tsz Wan Shan and Kowloon Peak;
- (q) “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone
  - (i) “R(A)” zone was subject to a maximum domestic and non-domestic plot ratio (PR) restrictions of 7.5 and 1.5 respectively. For the smaller lots less than 400m<sup>2</sup>, it was estimated that 75m above ground (about 25 domestic floors), i.e. 80mPD with mean street level of 6-7mPD, could accommodate the permitted PR;

- (ii) for larger “R(A)” sites greater than 400m<sup>2</sup>, an extra 20m of building height would be allowed for better design of non-domestic portion and ancillary facilities. As the lots within these areas had street level difference, minor relaxation for building heights would be permitted on application to the Board; and
  - (iii) in order to create air paths/building gaps and improve permeability of large building mass within some high-density public housing sites, it was proposed to rezone some existing public roads from “R(A)” to areas shown as ‘Road’, designate some “non-building areas”, and demarcate strips of land with specific width and building height within the “R(A)” zone;
- (r) “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(Business)”) zone – the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) had advised that in order to accommodate a PR restriction of 12 or equivalent for the “OU(Business)” zone, a building height of 90m above ground should be provided for commercial development. According to the AVA Study, the building bulk in “OU (Business)” zone might form a barrier as far as air ventilation was concerned. Taking into account all the factors, building height restrictions of 100mPD and 120mPD were proposed for these sites, together with setbacks of lots from public roads to improve air paths within the zone;
- (s) “G/IC” zones
  - (i) the existing “G/IC” sites should also function as breathing space and visual relief in the built-up area. It was considered appropriate to impose building height restrictions for all these sites so as to contain their development scale and/or to reflect their existing building height;
  - (ii) the proposed building height restrictions for these “G/IC” sites were mainly to reflect the existing building heights of the various G/IC

developments, or to accommodate any planned or committed development proposals;

- (iii) building height restrictions for developments under “G/IC” zones of not more than 13 storeys were specified in terms of number of storeys. For those G/IC developments higher than 13 storeys, a building height restriction in mPD was adopted;
- (iv) the free-standing schools and G/IC buildings located within large public housing sites which were currently zoned “R(A)” should be kept as breathing spaces and visual relief to the large building masses. There were however complications to impose specific height restrictions for these buildings as many of them were within the boundaries of divested public housing estates and some of them were annex blocks to the residential towers. The Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP would set out that any redevelopment of these “G/IC” sites should not exceed their existing building heights. A separate exercise to review their zonings and building heights would be conducted; and
- (v) according to the AVA Study, the Wong Tai Sin Disciplined Services Quarters (100mPD (30 storeys)) fell within the main north-south air path in the Area along Shatin Pass Road. Opportunity would be taken to reduce the building height for this “G/IC” site by specifying that future redevelopment of the site should be subject to a maximum of 9 storeys;

#### Proposed Rezoning and Building Height Profile

- (t) San Po Kong Business and Residential Area
  - (i) “I” zone – to address the potential industrial/residential interface problem, it was proposed to rezone the northern part of the ex-SPKFF site (1.73ha) to “O” to form a buffer, and the southern

part of the ex-SPKFF site (0.93 ha) to “R(E)”, subject to a maximum PR of 6 and building height restriction of 100mPD;

- (ii) “OU(Business)” zone – a two-stepped height profile was proposed for the area with 100mPD for the developments abutting Prince Edward Road East, and 120mPD for the developments further inland;
- (iii) non-building areas – in order to improve the air flow penetration along public roads in particular Tai Yau Street and King Fuk Street and to enhance the overall streetscape setting in business area, it was proposed to stipulate in the Notes of the OZP the following setback requirements :
  - a minimum of 3m-wide “non-building area” from the lot boundary of “OU(Business)” and “R(E)” sites abutting Tai Yau Street and King Fuk Street, and a minimum of 1.5m-wide “non-building area” abutting public road(s) other than the above two roads; and
  - a 12m-wide “non-building area” within the proposed “R(E)” and “O” zones from Prince Edward Road East to Pat Tat Street;
- (iv) a maximum building height restriction of 80mPD and 100mPD was proposed for the residential developments in San Po Kong. For the residential sites to the west of SPKBA, a gradation of building heights was adopted allowing a maximum building height of 80mPD for the “R(A)” sites adjacent to school and Choi Hung Road Playground as well as Kai Tak Nullah, and 100mPD for those “R(A)” sites further towards the general business area and Kai Tak. For the residential site to the east of SPKBA (i.e. the Rhythm Garden), a maximum building height of 80mPD was proposed for the site to reflect its existing height; and

- (v) to allow penetration of summer prevailing winds from Choi Hung Road in the south into Tai Yau Street in the north, it was proposed to demarcate a strip of land of 12m wide as a building gap in north-south direction subject to a maximum building height of 22mPD starting at the Tseuk Luk Street up to Ning Yuen Street;
- (u) Wong Tai Sin Residential and Cultural Area
- (i) a maximum building height of 120mPD to 160mPD was proposed for the public housing and private housing developments. For those housing developments in close proximity to Wong Tai Sin Temple (including Upper Wong Tai Sin Estate (Phase 1 & 4), Chuk Yuen South Estate, Hsin Kuang Centre and Tropicana Gardens), a maximum building height of 120mPD was imposed. For those developments further away from the Temple (including Upper Wong Tai Sin Estate (Phase 3), Chuk Yuen North Estate, and the proposed residential development at Chun Yan Street), maximum building heights of 140mPD and 160mPD were imposed;
  - (ii) for the private residential developments around Ming Fung Street and Wan Fung Street, a maximum building height of 100mPD was proposed. However, a higher building height of 120mPD would be permitted for sites of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more. It was proposed to rezone these sites from “R(A)” to “R(A)1” to effect the proposed height control;
  - (iii) for the residential area at Kam Fung Street, a maximum building height of 120mPD was proposed. However, a higher building height of 140mPD would be permitted for sites of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more. It was proposed to rezone these sites from “R(A)” to “R(A)2” to effect the proposed height control; and
  - (iv) a strip of 15m-wide land was demarcated within the “G/IC” and “R(A)2” zones as a building gap in east-west direction from Po

Kong Village Road to Wan Fung Street subject to a maximum building height restriction of 54mPD, with an intention to create an air path from Po Kong Village Road to Kam Fung Street Sitting Out Area;

- (v) Diamond Hill Residential/Commercial and Cultural Area – three height bands were proposed for this area, including 120mPD for Lung Poon Court, 140mPD for Fung Tak Estate, Regent on the Hill and Grand View Garden, and 160mPD for Galaxia and Bel Air Heights;
  
- (w) Tsz Wan Shan Residential Area
  - (i) a maximum building height of 160mPD to 220mPD was proposed for the public housing estates/home ownership scheme developments in the area;
  
  - (ii) for the private residential area around Yuk Wah Crescent, a maximum building height of 140mPD was proposed. However, a higher building height of 160mPD would be permitted for sites of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more. It was proposed to rezone the concerned sites from “R(A)” to “R(A)3” to effect the proposed height control; and
  
  - (iii) to protect the existing air paths in the public housing estates, it was suggested to designate an existing open playground and the green areas to the west of Tsz Lok Estate (1.09 ha) as a “non-building area”, and to rezone some existing roads within Tsz Wan Shan public housing area from “R(A)” to areas shown as ‘Road’;

Proposed Building Height Proposals for General “G/IC” Zones

- (x) the proposed building height restrictions for the “G/IC” zones were mainly to reflect the building heights of the existing/planned/committed developments;

- (y) the exception was the Wong Tai Sin Disciplined Services Quarters at Shatin Pass Road (30 storeys (100mPD)). In order to be consistent with the surrounding G/IC buildings and to maintain the continuity of air flow along the two sides of Shatin Pass Road, a building height restriction of maximum 9 storeys upon redevelopment was imposed. It was proposed to rezone the site from “G/IC” to “G/IC(1)” to effect the proposed height control;

#### Other Proposed Rezoning

- (z) “G/IC” site at 99 Po Kong Village Road – the site was currently occupied by a residential development named the Forest Hill. It was proposed to rezone it to “R(A)2” to reflect the as-built condition;
- (aa) “R(A)” site at Po Kong Village Road – the site was currently occupied by Assembly of God Morrison College. It was proposed to rezone it to “G/IC” zone to reflect the as-built situation;
- (bb) “R(A)” and “G/IC” sites in front of Wong Tai Sin Temple abutting Lung Cheung Road – they included an existing temple court in front of Wong Tai Sin Temple and a proposed landscaped open space under construction by Leisure and Cultural Services Department. It was proposed to rezone the two sites to “O” in order to preserve an open view to Wong Tai Sin Temple;

#### Proposed Amendments to the OZP

- (cc) amendments to the OZP, its Notes and ES, as detailed in paragraphs 6.1 to 6.3 and Appendices I to III of the Paper were proposed to reflect the above proposed amendments. Opportunity was also taken to incorporate some technical amendments and to reflect the latest planning circumstances on the Notes and ES of the OZP respectively. The proposed amendments might be further revised to take into account Members’ views and

discussions at the meeting where appropriate;

#### Departmental Comments

- (dd) the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department commented that the market clearly indicated a preference for high-level flats than low-level flats from their respective values. The building height restriction would lower the value of the redevelopment and affect the land premium to be received by the Government in the future lease modification/land grant cases;
- (ee) it was however considered that imposition of building height restriction would ensure more compatible developments and prevent wall buildings in the densely built urban areas, and meet community's aspiration for good quality living environment;

#### Public Consultation

- (ff) since the amendment proposals involved building height control, it was considered not appropriate to carry out prior public consultation. Any pre-mature release of information might lead to people rushing to submit building plans before the control was incorporated into the OZP, thus defeating the whole purpose of development control; and
- (gg) the Wong Tai Sin District Council would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition period of the draft OZP No. S/K11/23.

4. With the aid of a fly-through animation, Mr. Eric C.K. Yue, DPO/K, illustrated the building height profile of the Area under the proposed amendments.

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

### Impacts of Private Development Rights

6. A Member asked whether any assessment had been undertaken to confirm that the proposed building height restrictions would not affect the development potential of the private land. Mr. Eric C.K. Yue referred Members to paragraph 4.5.2 of the Paper and said that for the “R(A)” zone, assessment had been undertaken to confirm that the proposed height restrictions were able to accommodate the maximum domestic and non-domestic PR of 7.5 and 1.5 respectively as stipulated under the OZP. As regards the “OU(Business)” zone, ArchSD had previously advised that a building height of 90m above ground should be sufficient to accommodate the PR restriction of 12 for the zone under the OZP. The proposed building height restrictions of 100mPD and 120mPD would therefore not affect the development potential of the “OU(Business)” sites. The same Member asked about the restrictions for the excessively tall buildings in the Area. Mr. Yue replied that according to the general principles, those excessively tall buildings, if breaching the ridgelines and/or locating at wind corridor or waterfront, would not be allowed to redevelop to their existing building heights upon redevelopment. As the tall buildings within the Area were not under these situations, they were allowed to be redeveloped to their existing building heights upon redevelopment.

### Setback Requirements for San Po Kong Business Area

7. A Members asked whether the setback proposal in SPKBA was intended for road widening to improve traffic flow in the area, Mr. Eric C.K. Yue said that SPKBA was currently subject to traffic congestion and air ventilation problems. The AVA had confirmed that Tai Yau Street and King Fuk Street were two major air paths in the area. It was therefore proposed to designate a 3m-wide setback area for all the sites on both sides of these two streets, and a 1.5m-wide setback area along the other streets so as to improve the air flow penetration along the public roads and enhance the overall streetscape setting in the area. The proposed setback requirements were largely in line with the proposals included in the “Traffic Improvement Scheme of Industrial Land in San Po Kong” prepared by the Transport Department. In response to a Member’s question, Mr. Yue said that incentive to implement the setback requirements were provided through the claiming of bonus PR under the Buildings Ordinance, and if any increase in building height was resulted, it could be accommodated by the application for minor relaxation of building height restrictions under

the OZP.

8. One Member asked why there were different setback requirements of 1.5m and 3m, and whether the 1.5m-wide setback area could be extended to 3m wide to enhance the greening and streetscape of the area. Another Member supported the setback proposal but cautioned that it might pose too much constraint to corner sites which were subject to setback requirement on two sides of the lot. Mr. Eric C.K. Yue replied that the proposed setback requirements were mainly based on the recommendations of the AVA. Miss Annie K.W. To added that some of the sites in the areas were very small and further setback at street level might affect the development potential upon redevelopment. Mr. Yue further said that according to the assessment undertaken for the sites in the area, the proposed setback requirements would not affect development potential, even for small and/or corner sites. For sites which were subject to special constraints, there was a provision under the OZP for minor relaxation of building height restrictions. He emphasised that the proposed setback requirements were only the minimum requirements and further setbacks would always be welcomed. Professor Edward Y.Y. Ng, AVA Consultant, supplemented that the proposed setback requirements along the two major streets and the five minor streets were the most effective way to improve air ventilation in the area. Though the setbacks of 1.5m along the five minor streets were narrower than that for the two major streets, there were more streets along this direction. He agreed that a wider setback would allow better ventilation but he understood that there was a need to balance other considerations.

9. The Secretary explained that the setback requirements proposed for each OZP would have to take into account the local circumstances of the area. The purposes behind each proposal might not be exactly the same. For example, the setback requirement included in the Yuen Long OZP to widen some sections of Castle Peak Road (Yuen Long) up to 35-40m was intended to improve pedestrian flow and greening of the Yuen Long Town Centre.

10. A Member said that he had no different views to the proposed setback requirement but such requirement should also take into account the need to enhance greening in the area. The proposed 1.5m setback was however not sufficient for greening purpose. This Member considered that further setback for greening should be encouraged in future. Another Member further asked if the 3m wide setback along Tai Yau Street had allowed for

road widening. Mr. Eric C.K. Yue replied that the road widening aspect had already been taken into account.

#### Building Height Restrictions for “G/IC” Sites

11. With reference to a number of representations relating to the building height restrictions of “G/IC” sites in other OZPs, a Member asked whether the current approach to impose building height restrictions for “G/IC” sites to reflect their existing building heights would be too restrictive and hence affect their chance of redevelopment. This Member agreed that “G/IC” sites should not be adopted to the maximum intensity as permitted under the Building (Planning) Regulations but consideration should be given to allow a certain percentage of increase, say 20% to 25%, above their existing building heights so as to provide some flexibility for future redevelopment. With such level of relaxation, the resulting building heights would still be much lower than that of the surrounding developments. This might help to reduce the grievances of the affected non-government organizations (NGOs) which did not have the resources to make submissions to effect their redevelopment plans. Another Member shared this Member’s view and said that the proposed restrictions of the “G/IC” sites based on their existing building heights might discourage their redevelopment plans and hence adversely affect the services to be provided for the local community in the long run. However, it was considered difficult to set a benchmark for all “G/IC” sites.

12. In response to the enquiry of a Member, Mr. Eric C.K. Yue explained that the proposed building height restrictions for the “G/IC” sites in the Area did not only reflect the existing building height but had also taken into account the redevelopment proposals known to the Government, such as the proposed redevelopment of the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority at Tseuk Luk Street. For any future redevelopment proposal, the concerned NGO could apply for minor relaxation of the building height restriction or submit a rezoning application under sections 16 and 12A of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) respectively. It would be subjective and inflexible to impose a certain percentage on top of the existing building height restrictions for the “G/IC” sites. The Chairperson opined that it was difficult to work out a basis to determine the appropriate percentage of increase in height allowed, given that there was a large variety of G/IC uses with different building height requirements.

13. The same Member said that there should be further study on the appropriate building height for G/IC uses, and Government departments should communicate with NGOs to understand their requirements. Certain standards could be set for specific use groups such as 6 to 8 storeys for standard school and 8 to 10 storeys for community uses. This Members considered it necessary to set up a mechanism for each district to allow more relaxed building height restrictions for “G/IC” sites while keeping the overall building height profile in the district, and this view should not be restricted to the subject OZP but all other OZPs under building height reviews.

14. The Chairperson indicated that it was not appropriate to consult all NGOs on their redevelopment plans given the confidential nature of the building height review exercise and not all NGOs had redevelopment plans in the foreseeable future. Some of the representations made were mainly an act to make known their future redevelopment plans. However, in formulating building height restrictions for “G/IC” sites, PlanD would, according to the established practice, consult relevant Government bureaux/departments and any information on the redevelopment plans of NGOs could be reflected in the OZP as appropriate. PlanD would also be prepared to discuss with the relevant NGOs after the OZP was exhibited

15. The Secretary further pointed out that most of the school sites were restricted to a maximum building height of 8 storeys. There were exceptions such as Diocesan Boys' School and King George V School where lower building height restrictions were imposed taking into account the setting of the sites which included some historical buildings. She noted that in some recent representations concerning “G/IC” sites, the representers proposed to relax the building height restrictions to levels similar to their surrounding residential developments. She doubted if the Member’s suggestion to allow some 20% increase on top of the currently proposed building height restrictions would be able to meet the needs of the NGOs.

#### Other Aspects

16. A Member asked whether the periphery of the SPKBA would be rezoned for residential use. Mr. Eric C.K. Yue said that most of these sites were subject to traffic noise impact from Price Edward Road East and hence were not suitable for residential purpose.

The southern part of the ex-SPKFF was proposed to be rezoned to “R(E)”, within which any proposed residential development would require planning permission from the Board. The same Member further asked whether setback requirements should also be imposed in the Tsz Wan Shan area to allow provision for an escalator system to bring people uphill and downhill. The Chairperson clarified that the provision of a public escalator was a matter of transport policy and the need was to be examined by the relevant bureau which might require a separate study. Until there was a demonstrated need, it would be difficult to justify to set aside pavement space for such use.

17. Another Member asked whether the proposed building height restrictions for the Area had taken into account the view to Lion Rock from Quarry Bay Park. Referring Members to Plans 4 and 20A of the Paper, Mr. Eric C.K. Yue said that the Area fell within the view fan of the Quarry Bay Park Vantage Point, and the proposed building height profile would not exceed the 20% building-free zone of Lion Rock ridgeline.

#### Deliberation Session

18. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to agree that :

- (a) the draft Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong OZP No. S/K11/22A (to be renumbered as S/K11/23) and its Notes at Appendices I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) the revised ES at Appendix III of the Paper should be adopted as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the 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 Mr. Eric C.K. Yue, DPO/K, Miss Annie K.W. To, STP/K, and Professor Edward Y.Y. Ng, AVA Consultant, for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.]