

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**(Downgraded on 24.9.2010)**

**Minutes of 426th Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held on 10.9.2010**

**Hong Kong District**

[Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), Mr. Tom C.K. Yip, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), and the AVA Consultant, Dr. Conn Yuen were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 11**

[Closed Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the

Approved Causeway Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H6/14

(MPC Paper No. 21/10)

---

1. The Secretary reported that Mr. Roger K.H. Luk had declared an interest in this item as his spouse owned a property within the Causeway Bay Planning Scheme Area (the Area). The Committee also noted that the mother of the Chairman and Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee owned properties within the Area and hence they had declared their interests in this item. The Committee considered that their interests were direct and they should leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As the Chairman had to withdraw from the meeting, the Committee agreed that the Vice-chairman should take over and chair the meeting in his stead. The Vice-chairman chaired the meeting at this point.

[Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung and Mr. Roger K.H. Luk left the meeting temporarily at this point whereas Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee left the meeting at this point.]

## Presentation and Question Sessions

2. Mr. Tom C.K. Yip, STP/HK, said that the replacement of P.10, P.23, Plan 19, Plan 10B, Plan B1 and Plan B4a of the Paper, extract of Attachment I of the Paper, as well as P.6 and P.8 of Attachment III of the Paper were tabled at the meeting. With the aid of a powerpoint and a fly-through animation, Mr. Yip then presented the proposed amendments to the approved Causeway Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H6/14 and covered the following main points as detailed in the Paper :

### Review of Building Height (BH) Restrictions

- (a) under the extant Causeway Bay OZP, BH restrictions had already been imposed on the “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) zone, “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) zone and the portion of the “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Residential Development with Historical Site Preserved In-situ” zone occupied by a residential development, the Legend. These BH restrictions would be retained. The current BH review covered the remaining development zones, including the “Commercial/Residential” (“C/R”), “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”), “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and various “OU” zones which were not subject to BH restrictions;

### General Context of the Area

- (b) in general, the Area could be divided into seven sub-areas with their characteristics detailed in paragraph 5 of the Paper. In brief, the Causeway Bay Mixed Commercial and Residential Cluster had been transformed into a commercial and entertainment hub. This cluster could be further divided into the Hennessy Road North and Hennessy Road South Areas. The four residential clusters in the Area were at Haven Street, Moreton Terrace, Wun Sha Street and Tai Hang. The Causeway Bay and So Kon Po Government, Institution or Community (GIC) and Recreation Cluster in the central part of the Area was a cluster of low-rise GIC facilities and district recreational facilities while a green mountain backdrop was located to the west of Tai Hang Road;

Local Wind Environment

- (c) an air ventilation assessment (AVA) by Expert Evaluation (EE) for the Area had been undertaken. The major findings and recommendations of the AVA were detailed in paragraph 7 and Attachment IX of the Paper;
- (d) the AVA recommended that the existing open and low-rise areas such as Victoria Park, Causeway Bay Sports Ground, Moreton Terrace Temporary Playground, Hong Kong Stadium and So Kon Po Recreation Ground should be maintained to allow the penetration of wind to the inland areas. The existing major breezeways as mentioned in paragraph 7.3 of the Paper should not be obstructed. Besides, the future developments in the Area should be encouraged to adopt suitable design measures to minimize any possible adverse air ventilation impacts;
- (e) Hennessy Road and Yee Wo Street were the busiest major roads in the Area. The AVA recommended to provide a 15m-wide non-building area (NBA) to the west of East Point Centre aligning with Cannon Road to serve as a major north-south air corridor. For east-west air ventilation, another 15m-wide NBA was recommended at the southern part of 51 Paterson Street and the adjoining lane of 47 Paterson Street to align with Kingston Street. However, the proposed 15m-wide NBAs would take up a substantial part of some lots to the west of East Point Centre and of 51 Paterson Road. Upon balancing the air ventilation consideration and the impact on the redevelopment potential of the sites, it was proposed to adopt a 8 to 12m-wide NBA for the East Point Centre site and a 8m-wide NBA linking up the western end of Kingston Street and the eastern end of Jaffe Road as shown on Plans B2a and B4a of the Paper respectively;
- (f) to improve the air ventilation in the Hennessy Road North Area, the AVA recommended to provide a building gap with a width of 10m and a vertical clearance of 8m above the ground level between World Trade Centre and the Excelsior Hotel, and to designate NBAs on the two sides of Great George Street and Sugar Street to achieve a wider air path of 25m and 18m respectively;

- (g) as for the Hennessy Road South Area, the AVA identified that the air ventilation in the Pak Sha Road area had deteriorated as it was surrounded by tall and large-scale developments including Lee Gardens Manulife Plaza, Caroline Centre and the commercial development currently under construction at 500 Hennessy Road. It was thus recommended to stipulate a 5m-wide NBA along Lee Garden Road for the site at 500 Hennessy Road and a 2m-wide NBA along Yun Ping Road for the other two developments. As an additional measure, the podium of the Caroline Centre and Lee Gardens Manulife Plaza would be subject to BH restrictions of 20mPD and 32mPD respectively in order to preserve the existing major building gaps above the podia to facilitate air ventilation;
- (h) in the Wun Sha Street Residential Cluster, the AVA recommended to adopt a stepped BH profile of 85mPD, 100mPD and 115mPD increasing from Tung Lo Wan Road to Sun Chuen Street. This could achieve a discernible height variation and facilitate the downwashing of wind to the pedestrian level;
- (i) although the Haven Street and Moreton Terrace Residential Clusters were close to Victoria Park and clusters of GIC and “OU” sites, the AVA recommended to reduce the maximum BH for these two areas to facilitate air ventilation;
- (j) the AVA also recommended to impose more stringent BH restrictions for the sites on Cannon Street, Paterson Street, Percival Street and Lee Garden Road. However, consideration needed to be given to the overall BH profile and concept of the Area as well as the permissible development intensity under the Building (Planning) Regulations. The adoption of a stepped BH profile for the Hennessy Road North and South Areas would also help improve air ventilation by facilitating the downwash effect along Hennessy Road and Yee Wo Street;
- (k) the AVA had concluded that the proposed reduction in BH restrictions, NBAs and building gaps in general could help mitigate the possible adverse

air ventilation impact upon redevelopment and improve the air ventilation in the Area;

#### Urban Design Principles

- (l) the formulation of BH restrictions in the Area had taken into account the findings and recommendations of the AVA as appropriate and a list of urban design principles as detailed in paragraph 9 of the Paper. In particular, a lower BH should be adopted for the developments facing the harbour, major open spaces and low-rise GIC clusters. The view to the ridgelines and mountain backdrops of Mount Parker from the vantage point at Cultural Complex at Tsim Sha Tsui as well as the existing green/view corridors in the Area should be preserved. The height profile should also pay due regard to the BH restrictions already imposed on the adjoining area under the Wong Nai Chung OZP and those proposed for the Wan Chai OZP area;

#### Proposed BH Concept

- (m) as the Causeway Bay Mixed Commercial and Residential Cluster was generally intended for commercial developments with higher development intensity, a higher maximum BH would be allowed. However, to respect the existing view from the vantage point at the Cultural Complex in Tsim Sha Tsui towards the ridgeline of Mount Parker and to achieve a discernible BH profile, a stepped height concept should be generally adopted with a lower BH for the Hennessy Road North Area near the waterfront and a higher BH for the Hennessy Road South Area;
- (n) in general, existing buildings that had already exceeded the relevant BH restrictions were allowed to be redeveloped to the height of the existing buildings upon redevelopment. As such, the BH restriction for Lee Gardens Manulife Plaza (208mPD) would generally reflect the existing BH. Besides, the commercial development currently under construction at 500 Hennessy Road (199mPD) would also generally reflect the approved BH. Such BH restrictions would not violate the urban design principles in that both developments were not located near the waterfront and did not breach

the ridgeline of Mount Parker. Together with Times Square falling within the Wan Chai OZP area, they would form a triangular node for shopping and entertainment in the Area and were landmark buildings in the Area;

- (o) the BH restriction for the existing secondary office node bounded by Hysan Avenue and Leighton Road should have regard to its proximity to the low-rise developments to the south, the existing BHs of around 100mPD in the area, and the BH restriction for the adjoining area under the Wong Nai Chung OZP;
- (p) for the Pak Sha Road area, the leases (various sub-sections of section Q of IL 29) were virtually unrestrictive except for the non-offensive trade and rate and range clauses. However, under the agreement between the original owner Lee Hysan Estate Company Limited (LHECL) and the sub-leasees, there was a restrictive covenant requiring the sub-leasees “to keep and maintain European style dwelling houses of a uniform design”. As such, the existing dwelling houses in this area had maintained their original unique building style and were low-rise (4-5 storeys or around 20-30mPD) providing visual relief and breathing space in the Area. While there was a general intention to maintain the BH profile for this area, it was recognized that the concerned leases were virtually unrestrictive and the area could be subject to greater redevelopment potential if the restrictive covenant could be relaxed with agreement between LHECL and the current lot owners. Nevertheless, given the special character of the area, piecemeal redevelopment of individual lots was not encouraged. Should the area be ripe for redevelopment in future, the concerned parties could submit a comprehensive redevelopment scheme supported by an urban design plan and technical assessments to the Town Planning Board (the Board) for consideration through the section 12A application procedure;
- (q) for the Haven Street and Moreton Terrace Residential Clusters, the general intention was to adopt a BH restriction which could generally maintain their existing medium-rise character while accommodating the permissible

development intensity under the OZP;

- (r) the Wun Sha Street Residential Cluster had a low-rise character and was bounded by low-rise GIC and “OU” facilities in the north and low to medium-rise residential developments on the other sides. The adoption of a stepped BH profile increasing from the north to south as recommended by the AVA would help improve the air ventilation;
- (s) the proposed BH restrictions for the “G/IC” and “OU” sites were mainly to reflect the existing heights to serve as spatial and visual relief in the Area unless there were committed proposals for known developments or a need to meet the minimum height requirement (e.g. standard requirement of eight storeys for school development);

Proposed BH Restrictions for the “C/R” and “R(A)” Sites

- (t) a maximum BH of 110mPD was proposed for the existing “C/R” sites to the north of Hennessy Road/Yee Wo Street to form a stepped BH profile with the developments to the south of Hennessy Road. This could also provide a lower BH near the waterfront and facilitate air ventilation;
- (u) a maximum BH of 130mPD was proposed for the existing “C/R” sites to the south of Hennessy Road/Yee Wo Street and north of Hysan Avenue/Leighton Road to form a stepped BH profile with the developments to the north of Hennessy Road;
- (v) a maximum BH of 200mPD was proposed for the existing “C/R” sites occupied by Lee Gardens Manulife Plaza and the commercial development currently under construction at 500 Hennessy Road as landmark buildings in the Area;
- (w) a maximum BH of 100mPD was proposed for the existing “C/R” sites bounded by Hysan Avenue and Leighton Road to generally reflect the existing BHs and for compatibility with the BH restriction already stipulated for the adjoining area under the Wong Nai Chung OZP;

- (x) a maximum BH of 30mPD was proposed for the existing “C/R” sites in the Pak Sha Road area to reflect the intention of keeping the existing low-rise neighbourhood as a place of character in the Area;
- (y) a maximum BH of 100mPD was proposed for the “R(A)” sites in the Haven Street and Moreton Terrace Residential Clusters to reflect the intention of maintaining these two areas as medium-rise residential neighbourhood and the recommendation of the AVA to reduce the maximum BH for these areas;
- (z) maximum BHs of 85mPD, 100mPD and 115mPD were proposed for the “R(A)” sites in the Wun Sha Street Residential Cluster in order to achieve a stepped BH profile which would create a more discernible height profile and facilitate the downwash of wind to the pedestrian level;
- (aa) maximum BHs of 165mPD and 8 storeys were proposed for the “R(A)” sites covering Illumination Terrace and two Buddhist monasteries at Tai Hang Road respectively to reflect their existing heights;

Proposed BH Restrictions for the “G/IC” Sites

- (bb) there were a total of 28 “G/IC” sites in the Area. They had been developed to their designated uses, except the site currently occupied by three residential buildings under private ownership at Warren Street/Brown Street, Tai Hang. In the 1980’s, the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) and the then Urban Services Department had an in-principle agreement for a joint venture residential cum market development at this site. However, the HKHS had advised that the above proposal would no longer be pursued whereas the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department had confirmed that the site was no longer required for the purpose. As such, it was proposed to rezone the site to “R(A)1” to reflect the existing private residential use on site with footpath widening upon redevelopment as stated in paragraph 12.3 of the Paper and subject to a BH restriction of 100mPD as adopted for the middle part of the Wun Sha Street Residential Cluster;



- (cc) in addition, it was proposed to rezone a site from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “G/IC” to reflect the existing uses on site, namely, the So Kon Po Pumping Station of the Water Supplies Department and the Hong Kong and Islands Clearance Unit of the Lands Department;
- (dd) the proposed maximum BH restrictions for the low-rise “G/IC” sites ranged from 1 storey to 10 storeys as detailed in paragraphs 11.7(a) to (c) of the Paper. For the high-rise “G/IC” sites, a maximum BH of 100mPD was proposed to generally reflect the height of the newly completed New Block of St. Paul’s Hospital (95mPD), the approved Phase 2 redevelopment of the hospital (113mPD) and the approved redevelopment of China Congregational Church (122mPD), taking into account the BH band of 100mPD in the surrounding areas;

Proposed BH Restrictions for the “OU” Sites

- (ee) there were a total of 6 “OU” sites in the Area. The portion of the “OU” annotated “Residential Development with Historical Site Preserved In-situ” zone occupied by the Haw Par Mansion and its garden was currently not subject to BH restriction. As the intention was to preserve them in-situ, it was proposed to restrict this portion of the “OU” zone to the existing heights of 4 storeys. Besides, a maximum BH of 12 storeys was proposed for the “OU” annotated “Library” zone covering the Hong Kong Central Library to reflect its existing height;
- (ff) as the So Kon Po Recreation Ground under the “OU” annotated “Sports and Recreation Club” (“OU(SRC)”) zone was a public open space, it was proposed to rezone it to “O” to reflect the existing use on site. Three recreation clubs in the Area were also zoned as “OU(SRC)”. It was proposed to impose BH restrictions on the built-over part of these clubs i.e. 5 storeys for the Disciplined Services Sports and Recreation Club; 2 storeys for the Indian Recreation Club; as well as 4 and 8 storeys for the Chinese Recreation Club to generally reflect the heights of the existing buildings on site. The existing open sports fields of these clubs provided important visual relief and ventilation space for the Area. It was thus proposed to

stipulate in the Notes for the “OU(SRC)” zone that any new development or redevelopment within the sport fields required planning permission from the Board. It was proposed to stipulate the same requirement in the Notes for the “G/IC” zone to preserve the open character of the sports field within the Hong Kong Stadium;

#### Review of the “C/R” Zone

- (gg) in accordance with the recommendations of the “Stage II Study on Review of Metroplan” completed in 2003, a land use review of the “C/R” sites on the OZP had been undertaken with a view to rezoning them to appropriate zonings so as to provide a clear planning intention;
  
- (hh) the “C/R” sites in the Haven Street and Moreton Terrace Residential Clusters were predominantly residential in nature with retail shops on the lower floors. They were considered suitable for rezoning to “R(A)”. The “C/R” sites in the Hennessy Road North Area and the Hennessy Road South Area were proposed to be rezoned to “Commercial” (“C”) to reflect the trend of commercial developments in these areas, except for the Paterson Street area. There was provision for residential development under the proposed “C” zoning and for commercial development under the “R(A)” zoning through the planning permission system;
  
- (ii) the Peterson Street area was currently occupied by residential buildings of 12 to 18 storeys with the lower floors for shop and restaurant uses. Considering the unique neighbourhood environment and to allow flexibility to retain the residential use and opportunity for future commercial development, if necessary, it was proposed to rezone the “C/R” sites in this area to “OU” annotated “Mixed Use” (“OU(MU)”) which was intended primarily for mixed non-industrial land uses. The existing C/R buildings within the “OU(MU)” zone would be allowed to continue to exist and subject to control under Schedule III of the Notes for the zone. New developments would have to confirm with Schedules I or II of the Notes;

Proposed Footpath Widening

- (jj) to meet the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), the Transport Department (TD) had proposed to (i) widen the footpaths fronting Lockhart Road, Jaffe Road and Cannon Street to at least 3.5m due to the heavy demand for kerbside loading/unloading activities; (ii) widen the footpaths fronting Lan Fong Road, Jardine's Bazaar and Lee Garden Road to at least 3.5m due to the heavy pedestrian flows; and (iii) widen the footpaths at Haven Street and in the Wun Sha Street Residential Cluster to 2m to improve the pedestrian walking environment;
- (kk) to take forward TD's proposals, it was proposed to (i) rezone the "C/R" sites bounded by Gloucester Road, Paterson Street, Cannon Street, Jaffe Road, Percival Street and Hennessy Road, on Jardine's Bazaar, and to the west of Lee Garden Road from "C/R" to "C(1)" to stipulate the provision of a minimum setback of 0.5m from the lot boundary fronting these roads (except for the sites at 30-34 and 37-39 Jardine's Bazaar as well as 1-7 Cannon Street which had been setback); (ii) rezone the "C/R" sites on the two sides of Lan Fong Road and Pak Sha Road, and to the west of the commercial development currently under construction at 500 Hennessy Road from "C/R" to "C(2)" to stipulate the provision of a minimum setback of 1.5m from the lot boundary fronting Lan Fong Road and Lee Garden Road; (iii) rezone the "R(A)" sites in the Wun Sha Street Residential Cluster to "R(A)1" to stipulate the provision of a minimum setback of 0.5m from the lot boundary fronting the streets in the area; and (iv) rezone the "C/R" sites in the Haven Street Residential Cluster to "R(A)1" to stipulate the provision of a minimum setback of 0.5m from the lot boundary fronting Haven Street;

[Mr. Clarence W.C. Leung left the meeting at this point.]

Review of the Open Space Sites

- (ll) there was a total of 13 open space sites in the Area which were all under Government ownership. They had been developed into public open space,

sitting-out area or amenity area, except the hill slope area adjoining the Tai Hang Road Children's Playground at Site 12. As the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services had confirmed that the above area was no longer required for open space use, it was proposed to rezone it from "O" to "GB" to reflect the existing site condition with dense natural vegetation. Site 1 and part of Site 8 were small roadside sitting-out areas circled by roads whereas part of Site 9 might be required for the future widening of Tai Hang Road. As such, it was proposed to retain their current designations as 'Road' on the OZP in which amenity planting and open space uses were always permitted. The existing open yard at Site 11 was within the Kung Lee College. To reflect the existing use on site and the allocation boundary of the school, it was proposed to rezone it from "O" to "G/IC". As for the remaining sites, it was proposed either to retain the current "O" zoning subject to rationalisation of the zoning boundaries, or be rezoned from other zonings to "O" to reflect the as-built conditions;

[Mr. Anthony Loo and Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

#### Other Rezoning Proposals

(mm) apart from the rezoning proposals as mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, various rezoning proposals to reflect the existing uses on sites and/or the allocation/road boundary were also proposed. They were detailed in paragraph 14 of the Paper. In addition, the proposed road junction at Tai Hang Drive as shown on the OZP would be deleted as TD and the Highways Department had confirmed that it was no longer required;

#### Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (nn) the proposed amendments to the Notes of the OZP included the followings:
- (i) revision of the Remarks of the Notes for the "R(A)", "G/IC" and "OU" zones to incorporate the BH restrictions and minor relaxation clause for the BH restrictions and setback requirements;

- (ii) deletion of the Notes for the “C/R” zone; and
- (iii) incorporation of new sets of Notes for the “C” and “OU(MU)” zones;

Departmental Consultation and Public Consultation

- (oo) the proposed BH restrictions and rezoning proposals had been circulated for departmental comments. Most departments did not have adverse comment on or objection to the proposals. The proposed BH restrictions had taken into account the comments from relevant departments, where appropriate; and
- (pp) upon agreement of the Committee, the proposed amendments to the OZP would be published under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance for public inspection. The Wan Chai District Council would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition period of the draft Causeway Bay OZP No. S/H6/14A (to be renumbered to S/H6/15 upon exhibition).

[Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

3. A Member said that the old residential areas along Wun Sha Street and Pak Sha Road were characterized by arrays of narrow local streets running at right angle to each other and forming a grid pattern. Such street pattern was conducive to physical connectivity, visual permeability and pedestrian movement within the residential neighbourhoods and hence should be preserved. While this Member had no in-principle objection to the proposed stepped height profile for the Wun Sha Street area, this Member asked if there was any mechanism to preserve the existing low-rise character and street pattern in the Wun Sha Street area to provide a comfortable pedestrian environment. The Vice-Chairman also shared the same views and raised a concern that the existing street pattern might be affected by the redevelopment of the area if the existing roads were not excised from the land use zones and shown as ‘Road’ on the OZP.

4. In response, Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK, said that in accordance with Chapter 2 of HKPSG, the Wun Sha Street area fell within the Residential Density Zone 1 and the

maximum permissible plot ratio for domestic buildings was 8/9/10 depending on the class of the sites. In formulating the BH restrictions for the Wun Sha Street area, while respecting the low-rise character of the area, it was also necessary to ensure that the maximum permissible plot ratio/gross floor area (GFA) for the sites under the OZP could still be accommodated under the proposed BH restrictions. Moreover, in accordance with the recommendation of the AVA, a stepped height profile of 85mPD, 100mPD and 115mPD had already been proposed for this area so as to facilitate the downwashing of wind to the pedestrian level. The Pak Sha Road area was, however, subject to the restrictive covenant as detailed in paragraphs 10(d) and (e) of the Paper. Taking into consideration the restrictive covenant and the special character of this low-rise cluster, there was a general intention to maintain the existing BH profile for the Pak Sha Road area.

5. Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au continued to say that there were small strips of land not intended for building development purposes and carried no development right under the lease within the residential zones, areas restricted for garden, slope maintenance and access road purposes were some of the examples. As a general principle, such areas would not be taken into account in plot ratio and site coverage calculations. Development within the residential zones should be restricted to the building lots carrying development right in order to maintain the character of the Area and not to overload the road network in this area.

6. The Secretary said that if the Committee considered it was desirable to preserve the intimately-scaled street character in the Wun Sha Street area, Members could consider excising the public roads from the land use zones for designating as 'Road' on the OZP. Similar amendments to rezone the existing public roads within the "R(A)" zones to areas shown as 'Road' had been made in other OZPs. However, as the scale of the Causeway Bay OZP was small which render showing the public roads on the OZP difficult. As such, one possible way was to reflect the intention of preserving the existing street character in the Wun Sha Street area in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP. Members agreed.

[Mr. Felix Fong left the meeting at this point.]

7. The Secretary said that in view of the growing community aspirations for better living environment, the Board in recent years had been reviewing the OZPs progressively to stipulate BH restrictions. Such review did not include a review of plot ratio restrictions.

As such, a general principle in formulating the BH restrictions was to ensure that the maximum plot ratio/gross floor area permissible under the OZP could be accommodated under the proposed BH restrictions, taking into account the development restrictions under the lease. In considering a s.12A application No. Y/H3/3 on 8.5.2009, the Committee discussed about the issue of preserving the local character of some old areas while not jeopardizing the private development rights. In that s.12A application, the applicant proposed to reduce the plot ratio of the whole 'Old City' area of Central to 5 so as to preserve the character of the 'Old City'. At that meeting, the Committee was of a view that any reduction of plot ratio would have wide ramifications and hence had to be supported by a thorough study to assess the implications. Such proposals would also have policy implications and needed to be carefully considered at the policy level.

[Professor P.P. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

8. The Secretary informed Members that since 2008, the Development Bureau had been undertaking a comprehensive review of the Urban Renewal Strategy (URS). Under the URS review, it was recognised that urban renewal should be planned at the district level with a "people-centred" approach and a "bottom-up" public engagement process. To this end, one of the preliminary proposals under the URS review was to set up a District Urban Renewal Forum (DURF) in each old district so as to strengthen urban renewal planning at the district level. It was also proposed to launch a pilot run of DURF in one or two old districts. The above proposals would, however, be subject to the final recommendations of the URS review.

9. A Member welcomed the proposed demarcation of building setbacks and NBAs on the OZP. However, this Member expressed concern that the Causeway Bay area was subject to great redevelopment pressure. Upon redevelopment, there could be additional traffic in the Area which would worsen the local traffic conditions. This Member therefore asked if the Government had conducted any traffic study in reviewing the development restrictions for the development zones in the Area.

10. In response, Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au said that Transport Department (TD) had completed the "Study on Pedestrian Subways and Related Traffic Improvement Measures in Causeway Bay" in March 2010. This study recommended that some streets should be used

as part-time pedestrian streets to improve the pedestrian environment. The study recommendations had been included in paragraph 9.3 of the Explanatory Statement of the OZP. Moreover, in applying for planning approval, an applicant had to submit various technical assessments (such as Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA)) to demonstrate that the proposed development would not cause adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. At building plans submission stage, TD and Buildings Department would also ensure that the proposed provision of car parking spaces and loading/unloading bays within the proposed development was appropriate.

11. The Secretary supplemented that technical assessment such as TIA would be carried out in planning studies. The Kowloon Density Study (KDS) completed in 1993 was an example which aimed at devising a new basis for the control of building density in Kowloon and New Kowloon with the lifting of the airport height restrictions in the area upon relocation of the Kai Tak airport. Under the KDS, the development capacity of the infrastructure and environment had been examined to determine the level at which the permissible plot ratio would need to be set in order for redevelopment levels to remain within that capacity. Currently, there had been liaisons and discussions with TD on whether a comprehensive transport study for Hong Kong Island North was necessary. This study would provide inputs to devise similar basis for control of building density in Hong Kong Island. TD had also conducted some regional transport studies such as the Traffic Study for Mid-levels Area.

#### Deliberation

12. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to :
- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Causeway Bay OZP No. S/H6/14 and that the draft Causeway Bay OZP No. S/H6/14A (to be renumbered to S/H6/15 upon exhibition) at Attachment I and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
  - (b) adopt, subject to the amendment in paragraph 6 above, the revised Explanatory Statement at Attachment III of the Paper for the draft



Causeway Bay OZP No. S/H6/14A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings on the OZP and agree that the revised Explanatory Statement was suitable for exhibition together with the OZP under the name of the Board.

[The Vice-chairman thanked Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK, Mr. Tom C.K. Yip, STP/HK, and Dr. Conn Yuen, AVA Consultant, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung and Mr. Roger K.H. Luk returned to join the meeting at this point.]

13. As various Members would need to declare their interests in Agenda Item 12 and withdraw from the meeting, the Secretary suggested and the Committee agreed to proceed with Agenda Item 13 first.

### **Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

[Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK), Mr. C.K. Soh, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), Mr. Simon P.H. Chan, Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK), and Mr. Calvin Chiu, Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Consultant, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 13**

[Closed Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the  
Draft Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K3/27  
(MPC Paper No. 19/10)

---

14. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments of the draft Mong Kok

OZP No. S/K3/27 involved completed redevelopment sites of the Urban Renewal Authority (URA). The following Members had declared interests for this item:

Mr. Jimmy Leung as the Director of Planning	being a non-executive director of the URA;
Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee	being a former non- executive director of the URA with the term of office ended on 30.11.2008;
Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan	being a Member of the Home Purchase Allowance
Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan	(HPA) Appeals Committee;
Ms. Anita Lam as the Assistant Director of Lands Department	being an assistant to the Director of Lands who was a non-executive director of the URA; and
Mr. Andrew Tsang as the Assistant Director of Home Affairs Department	being an assistant to the Director of Home Affairs who was a non-executive director of the URA

15. The Secretary said it was the Board's practice that Members could stay in the meeting for the item related to plan-making after interests were declared. Members noted that Mr. Andrew Tsang had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting, Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee, Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan, Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan had left the meeting. The Committee agreed that other Members who had declared an interest could stay at the meeting.

16. The Secretary said that Mr. Roger K.H. Luk had declared an interest in this item as the site occupied by the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) School of Continuing and Professional Studies was subject to the proposed amendments under consideration and he was the council member of CUHK. The Committee considered that his interest was direct and he should withdraw from the meeting.

[Mr. Roger K.H. Luk left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

[Mr. Laurence L.J. Li left the meeting at this point.]

## Presentation and Question Sessions

17. With the aid of a powerpoint and a fly-through animation, Mr. C.K. Soh, STP/TWK, presented the proposed amendments to the draft Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K3/27 and covered the following main points as detailed in the Paper :

### Background to the Proposed Amendments

- (a) the Mong Kok Planning Scheme Area (the Area), being one of the oldest urban areas in Hong Kong, was subject to great redevelopment pressure. Currently, there was no building height (BH) control on various land use zones in the Area. Therefore, there was a need to impose such control in the Area to guide future development/redevelopment to meet public aspirations for better living condition and greater certainty and transparency in the statutory planning system;

### General Context of the Area and Local Wind Environment

- (b) taking into account of the topography, local character, existing BH and street pattern, the Area was divided into four sub-areas (SAs) as detailed in paragraph 5 of the Paper. An air ventilation assessment (AVA) by Expert Evaluation (EE) for the Area had been undertaken. The major findings and recommendations of the AVA were detailed in paragraph 7 and Attachment IV of the Paper. The planning context and local wind environment of the four SAs were highlighted below :

#### *Area to the West of Tai Kok Tsui Road (SA1)*

- (i) SA1 was located the nearest to the seashore within the Area and separated from the main Mong Kok area by West Kowloon Corridor/Tai Kok Tsui Road. It was mainly zoned “Residential Group A)” (“R(A)”) and “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”). The building cluster was of 6 to 15 storeys high (25 to 50 metres above Principal Datum (mPD)). It followed the grid street pattern with the longer aspects along the east-west axis, causing the least obstruction to the westerly and easterly wind flow. The major carriageways within SA1 were also along the east-west axis. Therefore, SA1 was

expected to have little air ventilation problem;

*Area Bounded by Tai Kok Tsui Road, Tung Chau Street, Boundary Street, Portland Street, Lai Chi Kok Road, Tong Mei road and Cherry Street (SA2)*

- (ii) SA2 was located to the immediate east of SA1 and comprised a mix of land uses which were zoned “R(A)”, “R(E)”, “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”), “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) and “Open Space” (“O”). The old developments were of 6 to 20 storeys high whereas the new/committed developments were over 100mPD in height. Southerly wind penetrated well through the southern part of the area but had difficulty to penetrate further to the inner region to the north. The air ventilation of the northeast part of SA2 was not satisfactory due to the lack of linkage to major air paths of the area;

*Area Bounded by Dundas Street, Ferry Street, Tong Mi Road, Prince Edward Road West, Portland Street, Boundary Street, Sai Yee Street, Argyle Street, Peace Avenue and Waterloo Road (SA3)*

- (iii) SA3 was dominated by residential developments with commercial/retail uses on the lower three floors and commercial developments. It was served by a grid street pattern with Nathan Road in the middle serving as the major north-south traffic axis. Most of the residential developments were of 6 to 20 storeys high. Some existing industrial developments were of 11 to 20 storeys high and were located at the north-western part of the sub-area. Because of the high accessibility, many parts of the sub-area had been redeveloped for commercial uses, most notably was the Langham Place (260mPD), which served as a landmark building in the Area. The orientation of building cluster blocked against the easterly and westerly wind flow whereas some new developments blocked the wind passage through the carriageway. The potential air path along the northeast-southwest axis comprising a nullah, Nullan Road and Cheung Wong Road was not effective at present. Moreover, some committed developments would affect linkage to air corridor;

*Area Bounded by Boundary Street, Sai Yee Street, Argyle Street and the East Railway Line (SA4)*

- (iv) SA4 consisted of the Flower Market area (zoned “R(A)”), the MTR Mong Kok East Station and its railway development (zoned “OU”) and various Government, institution or community (GIC) developments. Buildings in the “R(A)” zone were below 15 storeys whereas those in the “OU” zone were of 13 to 18 storeys. The railway development on a topographically higher area obstructed the easterly and westerly wind flow. In addition, the north-easterly wind could not reach Prince Edward Road West due to inadequate linkage;

*Recommendations for SA1 to SA4*

- (v) the AVA recommended that SA1 and SA4 should continue to function as the major entrances for the incoming of westerly and north-eastern wind into the Area and the existing open space and the low-rise GIC developments in the Area should be maintained. Moreover, improvement measures like provision of wider north-south and east-west air paths by street widening, setting back of buildings and provision of building gaps should be adopted to improve the general wind environment of the Area;

Proposed BH Concept

- (c) urban design principles set out in the Urban Design Guidelines (Chapter 11 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines) and the recommendations of the AVA for the Area had been taken into account in the BH concept. Specifically:
  - (i) the existing building height profile including landmark building (e.g. Langham Place) and the development character of the Area like commercial developments along Nathan Road and nearby MTR stations should be recognized;

- (ii) the height profile should be sympathetic and compatible in scale and proportion with the surrounding developments; and
  - (iii) the grid street pattern of the Area served as an important wind path system that should be preserved as far as possible;
- (d) the proposed BH concept as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper was highlighted below :
- (i) a stepped height concept was generally adopted with the BH profile gradually radiating from Nathan Road. BH restrictions of 100mPD and 120mPD were proposed for the “C” sites along Nathan Road to provide variation in the height profile and facilitate better air ventilation. Lower BH would be proposed for the sites in windward direction located on the two sides of the Area to allow better intake of easterly and westerly wind;
  - (ii) the height profile should be sympathetic and compatible in scale and proportion with the surrounding developments. The BH profile should not exceed the maximum BHs already stipulated for the area to the immediate east under the Ho Man Tin OZP No. S/K7/20 so as not to block the flow of westerly wind into the hinterland;
  - (iii) existing buildings/committed developments that had already exceeded the relevant BH restrictions were allowed to be redeveloped to the height of the existing buildings upon redevelopment;
  - (iv) the proposed BH bands would ensure that the urban design principles would not be negated while accommodating the permissible development intensity under the OZP;
  - (v) the existing “G/IC” and “OU” (except “OU” annotated “Business” (“OU(Business)”) sites would broadly be kept to their existing

heights to serve as spatial and visual relief. Moreover, “O” sites would generally be retained such that the existing greenery and open areas could be preserved as breathing space;

- (vi) the AVA recommended that existing streets especially those in the north-south direction serving as air paths should be widened through building setback above podium level upon redevelopment; and
- (vii) a two-tier BH approach was proposed for small lots to encourage site amalgamation for better-designed developments and inclusion of on-site parking, loading/unloading and other supporting facilities;

Proposed BH Restrictions

- (e) details of the proposed BH restrictions as detailed in paragraph 11 and shown on Plan 12 of the Paper were highlighted below:

*SA1*

- (i) to allow wind to reach the inner parts of the Area, a maximum BH of 60mPD was proposed for the “R(A)” and “R(E)” sites sandwiched between Sham Mong Road and Kok Cheung Street. For the other “R(A)” sites in SA1, a maximum BH of 80mPD was proposed. Besides, a two-tier BH approach would be adopted. For residential sites with areas of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more, an additional BH of 20m would be allowed. For the “OU(Business)” site sandwiched between Sham Mong Road and Kok Cheung Street, a maximum BH of 60mPD was proposed, with an additional 20m for sites with area of 400m<sup>2</sup> or larger. To reflect the existing BHs under comprehensive development, a maximum BH of 156mPD for the existing “R(A)1” zone and maximum BHs of 154mPD and 169mPD for the proposed “R(A)2” zone were adopted;

*SA2*

- (ii) in order to complement the open space at Cherry Street to welcome the inflow of southerly wind, a maximum BH of 60mPD was

proposed for the “Commercial(1)” (“C(1)”) zone. A maximum BH of 80mPD was proposed for all residential zones. A two-tier BH concept would be adopted. For residential sites with areas of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more, an additional BH of 20m would be allowed. For the “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) zone at Fuk Tsun Street of which the planning intention was for residential and/or commercial uses, a maximum BH of 80mPD was proposed. For the “OU(Business)” sites abutting Maple Street and Walnut Street, a lower maximum BH of 80mPD was proposed as they were located near the open space at Willow Street. For the other “OU(Business)” site at the junction of Ivy Street and Tai Kok Tsui Road, a maximum BH of 100mPD was proposed;

*SA3 (part) – Areas along Nathan Road (Area bounded by Sai Yeung Choi Street South, Boundary Street, Portland Street and Dundas Street)*

- (iii) maximum BHs of 100mPD and 120mPD were proposed for the “C” zones along Nathan Road mainly to improve the air ventilation and help avoiding monotonous BHs along Nathan Road. They would form the higher height band in the Area with the lower height bands of 80mPD and 60mPD descending to the east and west;
- (iv) a maximum BH of 120mPD was proposed for “C” zones between Argyle Street and Mong Kok Road. A maximum BH of 120mPD was also proposed for “C” zones between Boundary Street and Prince Edward Road West as the stronger downwash effect was required for Ki Lung Street and Tai Nam Street areas where stagnant flow problem was identified;

*SA3 (part) – Areas bounded by Sai Yeung Choi Street South, Boundary Street, Sai Yee Street, Argyle Street, Yim Po Fong Street, Waterloo Road and Dundas Street and Area bounded by Portland Street, Prince Edward Road West, Tong Mi Road and Dundas Street*

- (v) with the increase in distance away from Nathan Road, a lower maximum BH of 80mPD was proposed for all residential sites in this



area for compatibility with the existing BH restrictions already imposed on the adjoining Ho Man Tin area and to maintain a general BH profile in Kowloon Peninsula. This was important to allow the flow of easterly wind to flow into the inner part of the peninsula. A two-tier BH concept would be adopted. For residential sites with areas of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more, an additional BH of 20m would be allowed. A maximum BH of 100mPD was proposed for the existing “OU(Business)” zone in the area. Besides, maximum BHs of 95mPD, 179mPD and 260mPD were proposed for the “C(2)” zone to reflect the existing BHs of Langham Place;

*S44*

- (vi) Mong Kok Stadium and the adjoining open space functioned as an important entrance for the flow of prevailing annual and summer wind from the east and northeast to enter the Area. To ease wind flow, a lower BH restriction of 60mPD was proposed for the residential sites sandwiched between Prince Edward Road West and Flower Market Road in accordance with the recommendations of the AVA. A two-tier BH concept would be adopted. For residential sites with areas of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more, an additional BH of 20m would be allowed. The “R(A)3” zone would be subject to maximum BHs of 60mPD and 80mPD under the 2-tier height control; and

*Developments within the “G/IC” and “OU” zones of the Area*

- (vii) the existing “G/IC” and “OU” (except “OU(Business)”) sites would broadly be kept to their existing heights. The BH restrictions would be expressed in terms of mPD for some relatively higher “G/IC” and “OU” sites. For the low-rise “G/IC” and low-rise “OU” developments with BHs not taller than 13 storeys, they would be subject to restrictions in terms of number of storeys to allow design flexibility to cater for specific functional requirements;

Designation of Non-Building Areas (NBAs), Building Gaps and Setbacks

- (f) based on the recommendations of the AVA Study, NBAs, building gaps

and setback were proposed in the following areas:

- (i) a 13m-wide NBA between two existing buildings aligned with Li Tak Street abutting Kok Cheung Street was proposed to create an additional east-west air path to allow more westerly wind to enter the Area;
- (ii) a building gap of 13m-wide at 20mPD aligned with Ka Shin Street abutting Kok Cheung Street was proposed to create an additional east-west air path to allow more westerly wind to enter the Area;
- (iii) a building setback of 3m at 15m above mean street level was proposed along the two sides of the section Maple Street between Tung Chau Street and Larch Street, except at Kowloon Funeral Parlour and Maple Street Substation, upon redevelopment to create an air path to channel the southerly wind at Tai Kok Tsui Road to join the open space at Willow Street so as to refresh the inner part of the Area;
- (iv) a building gap of 3m-wide at 20mPD was proposed at the junction of Sycamore Street/Tai Kok Tsui Road to maintain the existing building gap thereat;
- (v) a building setback of 3m at 15m above mean street level was proposed on the two sides of Portland Street and Sai Yeung Choi Street South upon redevelopment to enhance the north-south air flow in this inner part of the Kowloon Peninsula;
- (vi) to further improve the air ventilation, a southwest to northeast air path between Cherry Street and Boundary Street was proposed taking advantage of the existing building gap over the nullah/box culverts along Cheung Wong Road and Nullah Road. A BH restriction of 20mPD would have to be imposed on part of the “R(A)” and “G/IC” sites along the identified air path to facilitate

wind flow; and

- (vii) a building gap of 30m wide at 23mPD aligned with Mong Kok Road was proposed at the Mong Kok Government Offices and the Food Environment and Hygiene Department's Office at Sai Yee Street upon redevelopment to ease the downwash of easterly wind from Kadoorie Hill;

Other Rezoning Proposals

- (g) the following rezoning proposals were required to effect the BH restrictions or to reflect the existing status of the sites/completed comprehensive development projects:
  - (i) four "R(A)" sites were proposed to be rezoned from "R(A)" to "R(A)3" with maximum BHs of 60mPD and 80mPD under the 2-tier BH control;
  - (ii) the "R(E)" site abutting Kok Cheung Street was proposed to be rezoned from "R(E)" to "R(E)1" with maximum BHs of 60mPD and 80mPD under the 2-tier BH control;
  - (iii) the "OU(Business)" site abutting Kok Cheung Street was proposed to be rezoned from "OU(Business)" to "OU(Business) 1" with maximum BHs of 60mPD and 80mPD under the 2-tier BH control;
  - (iv) the residential sites sandwiched between Prince Edward Road West and Flower Market Road were proposed to be rezoned from "R(A)" to "R(A)3" with maximum BHs of 60mPD and 80mPD under the 2-tier BH control;
  - (v) part of the "G/IC" zone at 18 Ivy Street was proposed to be rezoned from "G/IC" to "R(A)" to reflect its existing predominant residential use;

- (vi) the waterworks reserve site at Sycamore Playground was proposed to be rezoned from “G/IC” to “O” to reflect its existing use;
- (vii) the pedestrian walkways at Pok Man Street and at the junction of Tung Chau Street and Tai Kok Tsui Road were to be rezoned to areas shown as ‘Road’;
- (viii) Langham Place was proposed to be rezoned from “CDA” on the Land Development Corporation Development Scheme Plan (LDC DSP) to “C(2)” and areas shown as ‘Road’ to reflect its existing commercial/office/hotel uses; and
- (ix) Florient Rise was proposed to be rezoned from “CDA” on the LDC DSP to “R(A)2” to reflect its existing commercial/residential uses;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (h) the Notes of the OZP would be revised to take into account the proposed amendments and to refine the development control of various zones. The major amendments were highlighted below:
  - (i) incorporation of BH restrictions including two-tier BH control and minor relaxation clauses in the Remarks of the Notes for the concerned development zones;
  - (ii) incorporation of the development restrictions for the proposed “C(2)” and “R(A)2” zones;
  - (iii) incorporation of the minor relaxation clause for the NBAs, building gaps/setbacks;
  - (iv) revision to the Remarks of the “OU” annotated “Historical Site Preserved for Commercial and Cultural uses” zone to reflect the Board’s intention to preserve the historic Lui Seng Chun building; and

- (v) inclusion of a set of Notes for “OU” annotated “Petrol Filing Station” zone and revision to the annotation of the “OU” zone from “For All Other Specified Uses Not Listed Above” to “Railway”;

Departmental Consultation and Public Consultation

- (i) the proposed BH restrictions and rezoning proposals had been circulated to relevant Government departments and they did not have adverse comment on or objection to the proposals. The proposed BH restrictions had taken into account the comments from relevant departments, where appropriate; and
- (j) upon agreement of the Committee, the proposed amendments to the OZP would be published under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance for public inspection. The Yau Tsim Mong District Council would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition period of the draft Mong Kok OZP No. S/K3/27A (to be renumbered to S/K3/28 upon exhibition).

18. A Member asked whether the proposed higher BHs of 100mPD and 120mPD for the sites along Nathan Road would cause urban canyon effect prohibiting wind flow to pedestrian areas, and whether the AVA study had taken into account the air quality aspect. Mr. Calvin Chiu, AVA Consultant, said that generally speaking, the ratio of BH to road width (i.e. H/W ratio) at 2:1 would facilitate better wind flow from the top of buildings to the pedestrian streets. Nathan Road was about 30m wide and the H/W ratio for the sites along Nathan Road was about 3:1, which was still considered acceptable given the presence of many high-rise commercial developments along the road. Mr. C.W. Tse of the Environmental Protection Department said that the district was a built up area already. The air quality in the area was mainly affected by vehicular emissions. As the AVA study had revealed that the proposed BH restrictions would not have significant air ventilation impacts in the Area, the imposition of BH restrictions would unlikely induce any changes to the air quality situation in the Area.

Deliberation

19. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to :
- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the draft Mong Kok OZP No. S/K3/27 and that the draft Mong Kok OZP No. S/K3/27A at Attachment I (to be renumbered to S/K3/28 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
  - (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement at Attachment III of the Paper for the draft Mong Kok OZP No. S/K3/27A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings on the OZP and agree that the revised Explanatory Statement was suitable for exhibition together with the OZP under the name of the Board.

[The Chairman thanked Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan, DPO/TWK, Mr. C.K. Soh, STP/TWK, Mr. Simon P.H. Chan, TP/TWK, and Mr. Calvin Chiu, AVA Consultant, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Roger K.H. Luk returned to join the meeting at this point.]

**Hong Kong District**

[Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), Mr. Louis K.H. Kau, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), Mr. T.C. Cheng, Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK), and Ms. Una Wang, Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Consultant, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 12**

[Closed Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H5/25  
(MPC Paper No. 17/10)

---

20. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared their interests in this item:

Mr. K.Y. Leung	his spouse owned a property on Lockhart Road;
Ms. Julia M.K. Lau	owned properties in Star Street; and
Mr. Laurence L.J. Li	owned a property in Wan Chai near St. Francis Street.

21. The Committee noted that Mr. Laurence L.J. Li had left the meeting. The Committee considered that other Members' interests were direct and they should leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Mr. K.Y. Leung and Ms. Julia M.K. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

22. With the aid of powerpoint presentation and a fly-through animation, Mr. Louis K.H. Kau, STP/HK, presented the proposed amendments to the approved Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H5/25 and covered the following main points as detailed in the Paper :

**Background to the Proposed Amendments**

- (a) the Wan Chai Planning Scheme Area (the Area) was a well-established mixed commercial and residential area. In general, while the area to the north of Hennessy Road was mainly commercial in nature and intermixed with some residential developments, the area to the south of Hennessy Road was mainly residential with commercial uses on lower floors, except a few major commercial developments. The Area was subject to great

redevelopment pressure. In the absence of building height (BH) control, there could be a proliferation of high-rise buildings, which were out of context with the surrounding environment. There was an urgent need to incorporate BH restrictions in the OZP to provide proper guidance for developments in the Area;

- (b) the current review covered the development zones which were not subject to BH restrictions, including the “Commercial” (“C”), “Commercial/Residential” (“C/R”), “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”), “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”), “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) zones. Opportunity had also been taken to review the “C/R” zone as recommended in the “Stage II Study on Review of Metroplan” completed in 2003;
- (c) five Urban Renewal Authority Development Scheme areas were covered by individual Development Scheme Plans outside the Area and were not covered by the current BH review. Moreover, under the current Wan Chai OZP, the “R(C)” zone was already subject to BH and plot ratio restrictions which would be retained and would not be covered by the current review;
- (d) the general urban design principles for formulating the BH restrictions were as follows :
  - (i) the existing BH profile and the development character of the Area should be respected;
  - (ii) the height profile should be sympathetic and compatible in scale and proportion with the surrounding developments;
  - (iii) the view to ridgelines and mountain backdrops from the vantage points at Cultural Complex in Tsim Sha Tsui and West Kowloon Cultural District as well as the view to harbour from the Peak and the Stubbs Road Lookout Point should be preserved; and



- (iv) the existing green/view corridors should be preserved. Low-rise GIC sites should also be retained to serve as visual and spatial relief;

#### Local Wind Environment

- (e) an air ventilation assessment (AVA) by expert evaluation (EE) for the Area had been undertaken. The major findings and recommendations of the AVA were detailed in paragraph 7 and Attachment VII of the Paper. After striking a balance between air ventilation and private development rights, the following measures were adopted to achieve planning purposes and address AVA issues:
  - (i) where there were already development restrictions (including site coverage, plot ratio and BH restrictions), they should be retained;
  - (ii) various height bands had been proposed taking the topography into consideration;
  - (iii) all open spaces/green areas had been maintained and heights of most GIC facilities are restricted to the existing heights;
  - (iv) buildings along the air paths above the GIC cluster at Morrison Hill had been kept as low as possible to maintain the open view and for better air ventilation;
  - (v) all east-west and north-south aligned public roads would not be extinguished nor built-over to maintain air ventilation. Some north-south running roads to the north and south of Queen's Road East would be widened to form through air paths to facilitate the southerly wind penetration; and
  - (vi) future developments were encouraged to adopt suitable design measures to minimize any possible adverse impacts. These included greater permeability of podium, wider gap between buildings, non-building area to create air paths, perforated building

towers and podium design, positioning of building towers to align with the prevailing winds, as appropriate;

- (f) to enhance the existing air path network for better air ventilation of the Area, a number of non-building areas (NBAs), building gaps and setbacks as shown in Plans 11A1 to 11B3 and R1 to R3C of the Paper were proposed;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “C” Sites

- (g) maximum BHs of 110mPD and 130mPD (i.e. about 106m to 126m/26 storeys to 31 storeys) were proposed for the proposed “C” sites (currently zoned “C/R”) to the north of Johnston Road/Hennessy Road, and east of Canal Road East to facilitate commercial redevelopment. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints Wan Chai Chapel (62mPD) at 118 Gloucester Road fell within this area. Whilst the site was being used for a religious institution, it was considered that the planning intention for the area along Gloucester Road was for commercial development. Hence, it was proposed to retain the “C” zoning for this site and subject to a maximum BH of 130mPD;
- (h) a maximum BH of 140mPD was proposed for the existing “Commercial (1)” (“C(1)”) zone for Wu Chung House at Queen’s Road East to reflect the existing BH;
- (i) a maximum BH of 200mPD was proposed for the existing “Commercial (2)” (“C(2)”) zone for Times Square to reflect the existing BH;
- (j) a maximum BH of 94mPD was proposed for the proposed “Commercial (3)” (“C(3)”) zone for QRE Plaza (to be rezoned from “O”) to reflect the as-built condition and the existing BH, as agreed by the Committee on 13.2.2009;
- (k) a maximum BH of 80mPD (i.e. about 76m/20 storeys) was proposed for the proposed “Commercial (4)” (“C(4)”) zone at the Wan Chai Police

Married Quarters (WCPMQ) site (to be rezoned from “G/IC”) at Lockhart Road. The proposed BH restriction had taken into account the recommendations of the AVA and the need to ensure compatibility with the preserved Wan Chai Police Station building to the north;

- (l) a maximum BH of 220mPD was proposed for the proposed “Commercial (5)” (“C(5)”) zone for Hopewell Centre (to be rezoned from “R(A)”) to reflect the existing BH;
- (m) a maximum BH of 180mPD was proposed for the proposed “Commercial (6)” (“C(6)”) zone for Three Pacific Place (to be rezoned from “R(A)”) to reflect the existing BH;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “R(A)” Sites

- (n) a maximum BH of 110mPD (i.e. about 103m to 106m/31 storeys to 32 storeys) was proposed for the proposed “R(A)” sites (currently zoned “C/R”) to the south of Wan Chai Road and to the west of Morrison Hill Road, as well as the “R(A)” and its sub-area located to the north of Queen’s Road East in the ‘Old’ Wan Chai Area;
- (o) a maximum BH of 100mPD (i.e. about 84m to 94m/25 storeys to 28 storeys) was proposed for the “R(A)” sites to the south of Queen’s Road East and to the north of Star Street in the ‘Old’ Wan Chai Area to maintain the generally medium-rise residential character of the area;
- (p) a maximum BH of 120mPD (i.e. about 80m to 104m/21 storeys to 31 storeys) was proposed for the “R(A)” sites to the south of Star Street and to the south of Hopewell Centre, and the “R(B)” sites to the south of Wu Chung House in the ‘Old’ Wan Chai area, where the existing site levels were at about 16mPD, 40mPD and 37mPD respectively;
- (q) a maximum BH of 140mPD (i.e. about 76m/24 storeys) was proposed for the “R(B)” sites to the north of Kennedy Road on the south-western side of the ‘Old’ Wan Chai Area where the existing site level was at about

64mPD;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “G/IC” Sites

- (r) the proposed BH restrictions for “G/IC” sites reflected mainly the existing BH and served as breathing space and visual relief. Buildings of 13 storeys or below were proposed to be restricted in number of storeys, while for those above 13 storeys the restrictions were expressed in mPD. School sites were generally proposed to be restricted to 8 storeys whereas a BH of 90mPD was proposed for the committed redevelopment of Tang Shiu Kin Building. Moreover, relaxation of the BH restrictions on individual GIC site could be considered on a case to case basis through the planning application or plan amendment procedures when specific redevelopment proposal was proposed;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “OU” Sites

- (s) the proposed BH restrictions for the “OU” sites were as follows:
- (i) a maximum BH of 1 storey was proposed for the “OU” annotated “Petrol Filling Station” site at Kennedy Road and the “OU” annotated “Historical Building Reserved for Cultural and Community Uses” site covering the Environmental Resource Centre at Queen’s Road East;
  - (ii) a maximum BH of 210mPD was proposed for the “OU” annotated “Comprehensive Redevelopment Area” site covering the proposed Hopewell Centre II at Queen’s Road East;
  - (iii) a maximum BH of 110mPD was proposed for the site bounded by Johnston Road/Hennessy Road, Canal Road West, Morrison Hill Road and Wan Chai Road, which was proposed to be rezoned from “C/R” to “OU” annotated “Mixed Use” (“OU(MU)”);
  - (iv) a maximum BH of 4 storeys was proposed for the Wan Chai Police Station which was proposed to be rezoned from “G/IC” to “OU”

annotated “Historical Building Preserved for Hotel, Commercial, Community and/or Cultural Uses” ;

- (v) a maximum BH of 130mPD was proposed for the office (Southorn Centre) and residential towers (Southorn Garden) and a maximum BH of 20mPD was proposed for the Southorn Stadium which was proposed to be rezoned from “G/IC” to “OU” annotated “Residential cum Commercial, Government Offices and Community Facilities” to reflect the as-built condition; and
- (vi) no BH restriction was proposed for the existing elevated walkway connecting QRE Plaza and Hopewell Centre which was proposed to be rezoned from an area shown as ‘Road’ to “OU” annotated “Elevated Walkway” ;

Designation of NBAs, Setbacks and Building Gaps

- (t) as it was intended to preserve the existing Wan Chai Police Station (WCPS) in situ, NBAs along the eastern and western-side boundaries up to the outer side walls of the existing buildings were proposed. As the Wan Chai Police Married Quarters (WCPMQ) site would be redeveloped, two 6m-wide NBAs along the eastern and western-side boundaries would be required to enhance the north-south air/wind path to improve air ventilation;
- (u) an NBA was proposed at the north-eastern corner of a “G/IC” site covering the Lady Trench Training Centre at the junction of Tak Yan Street/Oi Kwan Road to extend and improve the efficacy of the existing air path;
- (v) a minimum set back of 1m from the lot boundary fronting Wing Fung Street, Anton Street, the portion of St. Francis Street between St. Francis Yard and Queen’s Road East, Greeson Street, the portion of Spring Garden Lane between Johnston Road and Queen’s Road East, Tai Yuen Street, and 39 and 41 Kennedy Road as well as 213 Queen’s Road East fronting Yen Wah Steps were proposed to widen these identified air paths to facilitate

the north-south air ventilation in areas on both sides of Queen's Road East;

- (w) building gaps of 6m wide above 19mPD were proposed on the eastern and western-side boundaries of the Lockhart Road Municipal Services Building site and the eastern-side boundary of Hennessy Road Government Primary School site;
- (x) a minor relaxation clause was proposed to be incorporated in the Notes of the relevant zones to allow minor relaxation of the set back or NBA restrictions as shown on the OZP under exceptional circumstances;

#### Review of the "C/R" Zone

- (y) there were about 24.81ha of land zoned "C/R" on the Wan Chai OZP. A land use review had been undertaken to examine these "C/R" sites with a view to rezoning them to appropriate zonings so as to provide a clear planning intention;
- (z) the "C/R" sites to the north of Johnston Road/Hennessy Road and the area to the east of Percival Street were predominantly commercial in nature and had been developed as an extension of the Central Business District. As such, it was proposed to rezone this area to "C". There was provision for residential development under the proposed "C" zone through the planning permission system;
- (aa) the "C/R" sites to the south of Wan Chai Road and west of Morrison Hill Road were predominantly residential in nature, with retail shops on the lowest three floors or in the non-domestic portion, which were akin to the "R(A)" type development. It was proposed to rezone this area to "R(A)" to reflect the existing predominant residential nature. There was provision under the "R(A)" zone for commercial development through the planning permission system;
- (bb) the "C/R" sites bounded by Johnston Road/Hennessy Road, Canal Road West, Morrison Hill Road and Wan Chai Road were of mixed residential

and commercial uses under gradual transformation. To allow flexibility for redevelopment, this area was proposed to be rezoned to “OU(MU)” to provide maximum flexibility for development of a combination of compatible uses including commercial, residential, educational, cultural, recreational and entertainment uses either vertically within a building or horizontally over a spatial area to meet the changing market needs. The “OU(MU)” zone would provide a transition between the commercial belt in the north and the residential developments to the south. New developments within the proposed “OU(MU)” zone would have to conform with the respective schedules in the Notes for non-residential building/non-residential portion of a composite building or for residential building/residential portion of a composite building. Existing C/R buildings within the proposed “OU(MU)” zone was allowed to continue and development would be in accordance with the schedule governing existing composite buildings;

#### Other Rezoning Proposals

- (cc) the WCPS was proposed to be rezoned from “G/IC” to “OU” annotated “Historical Building Preserved for Hotel, Commercial, Community and/or Cultural Uses”, subject to a BH restriction of 4 storeys or the height of the existing building, whichever was the greater, for the preservation of the building;
- (dd) the WCPMQ site was proposed to be rezoned from “G/IC” to “C(4)”, subject to a BH restriction of maximum 80mPD and a maximum plot ratio restriction of 12;
- (ee) the QRE Plaza site at 196-206 Queen’s Road East was proposed to be rezoned from “O” to “C(3)” to reflect the completed development subject to a maximum BH of 94mPD to prevent excessively tall building upon redevelopment in future;
- (ff) the Hopewell Centre was proposed to be rezoned from “R(A)” to “C(5)” to reflect the existing office use;

- (gg) the Three Pacific Place at 1 Queen's Road East was proposed to be rezoned from "R(A)" to "C(6)" subject to a BH restriction of 180mPD to reflect the height of the existing development;
- (hh) the Harcourt House and a portion of Mass Mutual Tower at Gloucester Road was proposed to be rezoned from "G/IC" to "C" subject to a BH restriction of 130mPD to tally with the BH band proposed for the adjacent area;
- (ii) Li Chit Garden at 1 Li Chit Street, 'No. 1 Star Street' at 1 Star Street, 11-17 Kennedy Street, Oi Kwan Court at 28 Oi Kwan Road and Connaught Commercial Building at 185 Wan Chai Road were proposed to be rezoned from "G/IC" to "R(A)" or "R(A)" sub-area subject to BH restrictions from 90mPD, 100mPD, 110mPD and 120mPD respectively;
- (jj) the Hung Shing Temple at 129-131 Queen's Road East was proposed to be rezoned from "R(A)" to "G/IC" subject to a BH restriction of 2 storeys to reflect the existing BH;
- (kk) the Southorn Centre at 130 Hennessy Road, Southorn Garden at 2 O'Brien Road and Southorn Stadium at 111 Johnston Road was proposed to be rezoned from "G/IC" to "OU" annotated "Residential cum Commercial, Government Offices and Community Facilities" subject to a BH restriction of 130mPD to tally with the adjacent developments;
- (ll) an existing elevated walkway across Queen's Road East was proposed to be rezoned from 'Road' to "OU" annotated "Elevated Walkway";
- (mm) a portion of Wan Chai Park at Queen's Road East was proposed to be rezoned from "G/IC" to "O" and Tak Yan Street Children Playground at Tak Yan Street was proposed to be rezoned from "G/IC" and "C/R" to "O";



- (nn) Wing Ning Street Sitting Out Area was proposed to be rezoned from “C/R” to “O”;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

(oo) the proposed amendments to the Notes of the OZP included the followings:

- (i) the deletion of the set of Notes for the “C/R” zones;
- (ii) the Remarks of the “C”, “R(A)”, “R(B)” and “G/IC” zones had been revised to incorporate development restrictions for the “C”, “R(A)”, “R(B)” and “G/IC” zones and its sub-areas; and
- (iii) the inclusion of separate sets of Notes for the “OU” annotated “Elevated Walkway”, “OU” annotated “Historical Building Preserved for Cultural and Community Uses”, “OU” annotated “Petrol Filling Station”, “OU” annotated “Historical Building Preserved for Hotel, Commercial, Community and/or Cultural Uses”, “OU” annotated “Residential cum Commercial, Government Offices and Community Facilities” and “OU(MU)” zones ;

Departmental Consultation and Public Consultation

(pp) the proposed BH restrictions and rezoning proposals had been circulated for departmental comments. Most departments did not have adverse comment on or had no objection to the proposals. The proposed BH restrictions had taken into account the comments from relevant departments, where appropriate; and

(qq) upon agreement of the Committee, the proposed amendments to the OZP would be published under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance for public inspection. The Wan Chai District Council would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition period of the draft Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/25A (to be renumbered to S/H5/26 upon exhibition).

23. A Member noted that the proposed height band at Wan Chai north was much higher than that of the inner part of the Area. In response, Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK, said that apart from adopting the broad urban design principles as stated in paragraph 9 of the Paper, the topography, local character, existing BH profile, predominant land uses and compatibility in terms of BH with the surrounding area had also been taken into consideration in the current BH review exercise of the Wan Chai OZP. The northern part of Wan Chai area had already been developed as an extension of the Central Business District with high-rise office buildings blocking the ridgeline of Wan Chai Gap. On the other hand, residential developments with relatively lower development intensity and BH were located inland to the south of Johnston Road/Wan Chai Road. Given the existing high-rise developments in the Wan Chai North and the commercial developments to the north of Hennessey Road/Johnston Road, the stepped BH concept ascending from the harbour gradually rising towards inland would not be achievable. Moreover, the proposed height bands should in general, commensurate with the planning intention of the various land use zones and reflect the majority of the existing buildings/committed developments.

24. A Member said that the Central-Wan Chai Bypass would be open in the near future. This, together with the redevelopments taking place in the Wan Chai Area, would generate additional traffic and worsen the local traffic conditions in the area. This Member considered that a comprehensive transport study should be conducted, the findings of which could form a basis to devise the building density that could be allowed in Hong Kong Island.

25. In response to the same Member's enquiry, Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au responded that in general, existing buildings that had already exceeded the relevant BH restrictions were allowed to be redeveloped to the height of the existing buildings upon redevelopment. The existing BH limit for Hopewell Centre was already identified in the Study on Urban Design Guidelines for Hong Kong. Hopewell Centre, though affecting the 20% 'building-free zone', did not breach the ridgeline when viewed from the Cultural Complex at Tsim Sha Tsui. Besides, it also fell outside the 'view fan' of the vantage point at West Kowloon Cultural District. Having regard to these criteria, it was proposed that Hopewell Centre be subject to its existing BHs. However, new developments with excessive BHs breaching the ridgeline would not be encouraged.

26. In response to the same Member's question on the intention of rezoning some sites from "G/IC" to "R(A)", Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au said that some residential/commercial developments with the provision of GIC facilities were located in sites under the "G/IC" zone and were subject to planning applications approved by the Board in the 1980s and 1990s. In general, the current rezoning proposals were to reflect the as-built conditions of these developments. Moreover, the requirements on providing public open space/GIC facilities at the sites and the respective GFA calculation for these facilities would also be stipulated in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP in order to tally with the development schemes previously approved by the Board.

27. The Chairman 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.

#### Deliberation

28. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/25 and that the draft Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/25A at Attachment I (to be renumbered to S/H5/26 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement at Attachment III of the Paper for the draft Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/25A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zones on the Plan and agree that the revised Explanatory Statement was suitable for exhibition together with the OZP under the name of the Board.

[The Chairman thanked Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK, Mr. Louis K.H. Kau, STP/HK, Mr. T.C. Cheng, TP/HK, and Ms. Una Wang, AVA Consultant, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]