

CONFIDENTIAL

(Downgraded on 25.2.2011)

**Minutes of 436th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held on 18.2.2011**

Hong Kong District

[Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), Mr. K.S. Ng, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), 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 Kennedy Town and Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H1/17

(MPC Paper No. 2/11)

1. The Secretary said that as the proposed amendments to the draft Kennedy Town and Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H1/17 involved various facilities of the University of Hong Kong (HKU), The Merton developed by the former Land Development Corporation, Mount Davis 33 developed by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA), Sai Wan Estate developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), Kwun Lung Lau developed by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) and a site on Smithfield, the following Members had declared their interests in this item :

- | | |
|---|--|
| Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung
as the Director of Planning | - being a non-executive director of the URA, a Member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Building Committee of the HKHA as well as a Member of the Supervisory Board of the HKHS; |
| 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
and Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan | - being a Member of the Home Purchase Allowance Appeals Committee; |
| Mr. K.Y. Leung
and Professor S.C. Wong | - being an employee of HKU; |
| Mr. Laurence L.J. Li | - owned a flat on Smithfield; |
| Mr. Andrew Tsang
as the Assistant Director of
the Home Affairs
Department | - being an assistant to the Director of Home Affairs who was a non-executive director of the URA as well as a Member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of the HKHA; and |
| Ms. Olga Lam
as the Assistant Director of
the Lands Department | - being an assistant to the Director of Lands who was a non-executive director of the URA, a Member of the HKHA and a Member of the Supervisory Board of the HKHS. |

2. Professor S.C. Wong also declared an interest in this item as he lived in the HKU staff quarters on Sha Wan Drive under the adjoining Pok Fu Lam OZP.

3. The Committee noted that Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee, Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan, Mr. Laurence L.J. Li and Mr. Andrew Tsang had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The interests declared by other Members were related to various completed URA/HKHA/HKHS projects and HKU sites, with no landed interest involved. As the item was related to the plan-making process, the Secretary said that these Members could be allowed to stay at the meeting in accordance with the Procedure and Practice of the Town Planning Board (TPB). However, if representations relating to the above sites were received upon gazetting of the proposed amendments to the OZP, the concerned Members would need to withdraw from the meeting. Members agreed.

[Professor C.M. Hui returned to join the meeting at this point.]

4. Mr. K.S. Ng, STP/HK, said that nine replacement pages for Plan D1a, Plan D1b, P.2, P.3, P.5 and P.7 of Attachment II as well as P.5, P.7 and P.8 of Attachment III of the Paper were tabled at the meeting for Members' information. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation and a fly-through animation, Mr. Ng then presented the proposed amendments to the draft Kennedy Town and Mount Davis OZP No. S/H1/17 as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

Background

- (a) the Kennedy Town and Mount Davis Planning Scheme Area (the Area) was subject to great development pressure as there were many old and low-rise buildings in the Area and the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) West Island Line (WIL) would be extended to the Area in 2014. There was thus an urgent need to review/incorporate building height (BH) restrictions on the OZP to provide proper guidance for developments in the Area;

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

Existing Profile of the Area

- (b) the Area was divided into seven sub-areas with different characteristics as described in paragraph 5 and shown on Plan 4 of the Paper. In brief, the Area was mainly residential in nature with concentration of residential developments in the Kennedy Town Residential Cluster and Foothill Residential Area. The residential developments on the waterfront and to the north of Catchick Street were generally below 90mPD, except The Merton (156.9mPD to 176.3mPD) and Manhattan Heights (171.2mPD) which were excessively tall and out-of-context with the surrounding developments at the waterfront setting. Other major residential developments in these two sub-areas included The Belcher's, Sai Wan Estate and Kwun Lung Lau. While Mount Davis and its foothill area formed the green mountain backdrop of the Area, there were some low to medium-rise residential developments along Mount Davis Road and scattered government, institution or community (GIC) uses such as service reservoir in this sub-area. Various HKU facilities were located within the Pok Fu Lam Road West GIC Cluster. An area generally bounded by the shoreline in the north, Cadogan Street in the east, foothill of Mount Davis in the south and the Island West Refuse Transfer Station in the west covered various sites such as the ex-Kennedy Town Incinerator and Abattoir site, the ex-Mount Davis Cottage Area and the ex-Police Married Officers Quarters site. This sub-area was thus subject to an ongoing land use review. The Island West Refuse Transfer Station, the Western

District Public Cargo Working Area, China Merchants Wharf, some open spaces and temporary uses were located along the shoreline in the Mount Davis Coastal Area, Belcher Bay Cluster and the Area under Ongoing Land Use Review;

Urban Design Principles

- (c) the formulation of BH restrictions had taken into account a list of urban design principles as detailed in paragraph 9 of the Paper. In particular, a stepped height concept with lower developments along the waterfront and gradation of height profile to echo the natural topographical profile should be adopted. The existing BH profile, except the excessively tall buildings on the waterfront, and the development character of the Area should be respected. The view to the Area and Victoria Harbour from local vantage points, existing green/view corridors and major air paths should be preserved. Open spaces and low-rise GIC sites should also be retained as visual relief and breathing space;

Proposed BH Concept

- (d) to maintain a generally low profile for the waterfront developments and taking into account various factors such as the topography, site levels, local character and predominant land uses, a stepped height profile with two height bands from the waterfront to the inland area was proposed for the Kennedy Town Residential Cluster. These height bands were generally comparable to the BH restrictions stipulated on the adjoining Sai Ying Pun and Sheung Wan OZP. Existing residential developments with BHs exceeding the proposed height bands would be allowed to redevelop to their existing heights, except The Merton and Manhattan Heights as explained below. As a continuation of the stepped height profile, the proposed BH restrictions for the Foothill Residential Cluster gradually increased uphill while maintaining the low-rise character of the developments in the area. A gradual increase in the BH profile from Pok Fu Lam Road to Pokfield Road was also proposed for the Pok Fu Lam Road West Cluster;

- (e) within the Pok Fu Lam Road West Cluster, HKU had plans to redevelop three sites including Yam Pak Building, Ricci Hall and Flora Ho Sports Centre for academic and hostel uses. As the redevelopment proposals were still at a preliminary stage, the BH restrictions proposed for these sites were mainly to reflect their existing BHs. Subject to availability of more detailed proposals and technical assessments, the BH restrictions for these sites would need to be reviewed in future. Moreover, a “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) site to the east of Chiu Yuen Cemetery was proposed for columbarium use which would also be subject to further study and public consultation. In this regard, a BH restriction of 8 storeys was proposed for this site, taking into account the site level and the uses always permitted in the “G/IC” zone such as school;

- (f) the developments along Mount Davis Road in the Green Mountain Backdrop area were mainly low-rise houses and medium-rise buildings. The area mainly fell within the “Landscape Protection Area” under the Metroplan Landscape Strategy. In view of the high landscape value and the local character, the existing BH profile of this sub-area would be maintained. To facilitate the sea breeze from the north, the low-rise character of the Belcher Bay Cluster which was a major recreation node in the Area would also be maintained;

- (g) within the Area under Ongoing Land Use Review, it was proposed to impose BH restrictions on the existing private developments and the GIC uses to be retained to ensure adequate planning control on these sites. However, the future land uses of some sites on government land in this sub-area were still under review. It was thus proposed to rezone these sites to “Undetermined” (“U”) and to incorporate BH restrictions upon completion of the land use review;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) Sites

- (h) a maximum BH restriction of 100mPD was proposed for the “R(A)” and “R(A)3” sites to the north of Queen’s Road West/Belcher’s Street/Victoria Road taking into account their location near the waterfront;

- (i) the existing height of Manhattan Heights at 171.2mPD (54 storeys) was out-of-context with the surrounding developments at the waterfront setting. The excessive BH was due to the low site coverage of about 20-23% for the domestic floors of the development, which were much lower than the maximum permissible site coverage of 40% for Class C site under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R). It was proposed to rezone this site from “R(A)” to “R(A)4” with stipulation of a maximum BH of 100mPD, which would allow redevelopment up to the maximum permissible plot ratio and site coverage for the site under the B(P)R. However, the provision for the claim of existing BH upon redevelopment would not be allowed taking into account the waterfront setting;

- (j) a maximum BH restriction of 120mPD was proposed for three groups of “R(A)” sites in the Area, namely, (i) the sites bounded by Queen’s Road West to the north, Hill Road to the east and south, and Belcher’s Street to the west; (ii) the sites bounded by Belcher’s Street to the north and Rock Hill Street/Forbes Street to the south; and (iii) the sites bounded by Forbes Street to the north, Pokfield Road to the east, Kwun Lung Lau (Blocks A to F) to the south and west. They acted as a transition between the low height band on the waterfront and the higher height bands in the uphill areas;

- (k) The Merton was an urban renewal scheme for residential development with public open spaces completed in 2005. Its existing heights of 156.9mPD to 176.3mPD (49 to 57 storeys) were also out-of-context and incompatible with the surrounding developments at the waterfront setting. According to the latest Master Layout Plan for this site under Application No. A/H1/72 which was approved by the then Chief Town Planner/Urban Renewal under the delegated authority of the TPB on 23.10.2002, the approved scheme had a BH of not more than 182mPD. Despite the above, it was considered that a lower BH would be more compatible with the waterfront setting. Under the Notes of the OZP, the subject “R(A)2” zone was subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 70,024m² and

provision of public open space of not less than 2,300m². Taking into account that about 40% of the site had been used for public open spaces which should be retained, it was proposed to impose a BH restriction of 120mPD on this site to cater for redevelopment up to the maximum permissible plot ratios under the B(P)R. However, the provision for the claim of existing BH was not allowed taking into consideration of the waterfront setting;

- (l) a maximum BH restriction of 140mPD was proposed for six “R(A)” sites at Pok Fu Lam Road, Smithfield, Lung Wah Street and Kai Wai Man Road, while a maximum BH restriction of 160mPD was proposed for a “R(A)” site at Pokfield Road and Kwun Lung Lau (Blocks 1 and 2);
- (m) maximum BH restrictions of 170mPD and 220mPD were proposed for the University Heights at Pokfield Road and The Belcher’s respectively to generally reflect their existing BHs;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) Sites

- (n) a maximum BH restriction of 60mPD was proposed for Hill View Garden at 72 Hill Road to generally reflect the existing BH in the midst of a cluster of low-rise GIC buildings;
- (o) the HKU Pokfield Road Residence had existing heights of 6 to 7 storeys (84.7mPD to 86.6mPD) and a plot ratio of about 3 (based on net site area excluding slopes and access road). Taking into account the pure residential nature of the development without commercial use and for more BH variations in the local area, it was proposed to rezone this site from “R(A)” and “G/IC” to “R(B)” with stipulation of a BH restriction of 120mPD. The HKU student hostel under construction at Lung Wah Street would be subject to maximum BH restrictions of 150mPD and 160mPD;
- (p) to generally reflect the as-built conditions, maximum BH restrictions of 140mPD and 160mPD were proposed for two sites at 52-62 Mount Davis Road and 2A-4 Mount Davis Road respectively which were proposed to be rezoned from “R(B)” to “R(B)1”;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) Sites

- (q) to reflect the as-built conditions, a maximum BH of 3 storeys was proposed for two sites at 2 and 6-10 Mount Davis Road which were proposed to be rezoned from “R(B)” to “R(C)2”;
- (r) to preserve the natural coastal and landscape value, a maximum BH restriction of 4 storeys was proposed for parts of the two “R(B)” sites to the west of Victoria Road which were proposed to be rezoned to “R(C)3”;
- (s) under the extant OZP, the “R(C)” zone was subject to a BH restriction of 10 storeys over one level of podium and two levels of car park, a maximum plot ratio of 1.2 and a maximum site coverage of 20%. Taking into account the Government’s latest policy to encourage the provision of car parks in basement, it was proposed to amend the BH restriction of the “R(C)” zone to 13 storeys including carports;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) Site

- (t) a maximum BH restriction of 100mPD was proposed for the “R(E)” site at 60-64 Victoria Road which was in line with the proposed BH restriction for the sites near the waterfront;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “G/IC” Sites

- (u) there were 24 “G/IC” sites in the Area. Three of them had been developed for non-G/IC uses including the HKU Pokfield Road Residence and two sitting-out areas along Mount Davis Path. It was thus proposed to rezone them to “R(B)” and “Open Space” (“O”) to reflect the as-built conditions. Another “G/IC” site covering a sloping area at Rock Hill Street was proposed for rezoning to “Green Belt” (“GB”) to preserve the natural slope. BH restrictions would be imposed on the “G/IC” sites to be rezoned to “U” within the Area under Ongoing Land Use Review upon finalization of the land use review;
- (v) for the other “G/IC” sites, maximum BH restrictions of 1 to 11 storeys were proposed for the low-rise developments e.g. ambulance depot, fire station,

schools, etc. mainly to reflect the existing/committed heights or to meet the general requirement for standard school development. To reflect the existing height of the Kennedy Town Community Complex, a maximum BH restriction of 15 storeys was proposed for this site. Besides, maximum BH restrictions of 135mPD and 140mPD were proposed for the high-rise developments of various HKU student hostels, including the Lee Shau Kee Hall, Shen Chi Sun Hall, Morrison Hall, Lady Ho Tung Hall and Starr Hall, to generally reflect their existing heights;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) Sites

(w) there were five “OU” sites in the Area. A maximum BH of 1 storey was proposed for the “OU(Petrol Filling Station)” and “OU(Pier)” zones. A maximum BH of 2 storeys was proposed for the “OU(Public Cargo Working Area)” and “OU(Cemetery)” zones. A maximum BH of 6 storeys was proposed for the “OU(Uses Related to Underground Refuse Transfer Station)” zone. The proposed BH restrictions were to generally reflect the BH of the existing developments and/or to cater for some possible low-rise buildings/structures;

Proposed BH Restriction for “Industrial” (“I”) Site

(x) maximum BH restrictions of 60mPD and 80mPD were proposed for the “I” site covering the China Merchants Wharf, taking into consideration the waterfront location and the existing BHs;

Appraisal of Visual Impact

(y) the Area did not fall within the “view fan” of all the seven strategic vantage points as identified in the Urban Design Guidelines of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. Taking into consideration the available view, accessibility and popularity to the public, two local vantage points were selected for assessing the visual impact of the proposed BH restrictions:

- the photomontages in Plan 15A of the Paper showed the view from the major ferry route in the western gateway to Victoria Harbour. From this local vantage point, the proposed BH restrictions of 100mPD and

120mPD were compatible with the existing built form and a stepped BH profile was enabled. The standout buildings included The Merton and Manhattan Heights on the waterfront, and The Belcher's in the eastern part of the Area. The ridgelines of Mount Davis and the Peak were also generally preserved;

- the photomontages in Plan 15B of the Paper showed the view to Sulphur Channel from a popular hiking trail of Harlech Road within the Lung Fu Shan Country Park. While a number of existing/committed developments such as The Belcher's, The Merton, Manhattan Heights, Cayman Rise and Mount Davis 33 had affected the harbour view, the proposed BH restrictions would not cause adverse visual impact on the view to the harbour; and
- for the Area as a whole, it was considered that the overall visual impact of developments/redevelopments at the proposed BH restrictions would not be significant;

Proposed Building Gaps

- (z) taking into account the findings and recommendations of the AVA, it was proposed to impose the following building gaps to improve the air ventilation of the Area:
 - to facilitate the north-east air movements to the inland area, a building gap of 10m wide above 20mPD (about 15m above ground level) to the west of Dragonfair Garden was proposed to link up Des Voeux Road West and Queen's Road West and to generally align with Woo Hop Street. As the air path was currently blocked by Kwan Yick Building Phase I, this building gap would be realized upon redevelopment of the site;
 - to facilitate the north-easterly wind to penetrate into Belcher's Street, a building gap of 10m wide above 20mPD (about 15m above ground level) between Hong Kong Industrial Building, King's Building, Wo

Fat Building, Shun Shing Mansion and Harbour One (under construction) was proposed to link up Des Voeux Road West and Queen's Road West and to align with Belcher's Street. For practical reason, this building gap would to a large extent make use of the existing gap above podia between buildings and was in a curved alignment as shown in Plan G1a of the Paper. As the air path was currently blocked by Hong Kong Industrial Building, this building gap would be realized upon redevelopment of the site; and

- to facilitate a continuous major air path of southward wind penetrating into the Area, two building gaps of 12m wide above 29mPD and 60mPD (both about 15m above ground level) were proposed to the west of Smithfield Terrace at 71-77 Smithfield and to the west of Smithfield Garden at 50 Smithfield respectively. As the air path was currently blocked by Block C of Smithfield Garden, the building gap to the west of Smithfield Garden would be realized upon redevelopment of the site;

Other Rezoning Proposals

- (aa) apart from the incorporation of BH restrictions and zoning amendments into the OZP as mentioned above, opportunity was also taken to incorporate the following zoning amendments to reflect the existing uses, to rationalize the zoning boundaries and/or for more appropriate zonings;

Rezoning two sites at Mount Davis Road from "R(B)" to "R(C)2"

- (bb) 2 and 6-10 Mount Davis Road were mainly occupied by 3-storey residential buildings with open car park. They fell within the "Landscape Protection Area" under the Metroplan Landscape Strategy. The immediate neighbourhood to the south of Mount Davis Road was predominately low-rise residential in nature and was zoned "R(C)3" subject to a maximum BH restriction of 3 storeys including carports on the Pok Fu Lam OZP. Given the high landscape value, the lease restrictions and the local character, it was proposed to rezone the two sites from "R(B)" to "R(C)2" subject to a maximum plot ratio of 0.75, site coverage of 25% and a

maximum BH of 3 storeys;

Rezoning two sites at Mount Davis Road from “R(B)” to “R(B)1”

- (cc) a site at the eastern end of Mount Davis Road covering Greenery Garden and Four Winds Apartments had been developed into two 17-storey (148.7mPD) (excluding one basement car park) and a 13-storey (135.9mPD) residential buildings respectively. Another site at the western end of Mount Davis Road covering Vista Mount Davis (129.7mPD) and Cape Mansions (139.1mPD) were occupied by three 20-storey buildings above carport/entrance lobby. It was proposed to rezone the two sites from “R(B)” to “R(B)1” subject to a maximum plot ratio of 3, and maximum BHs of 160mPD and 140mPD for the sites located at the eastern and western ends of Mount Davis Road respectively;

Rezoning sites at Victoria Road from “R(B)” to “R(C)3” and “GB”

- (dd) the vegetated slopes to the west of Victoria Road formed part of the green natural coastline and faced the western gateway to Victoria Harbour. There were two undeveloped “R(B)” sites in this area as shown in Plans C1a and D1a of the Paper. Part of the southern “R(B)” site was occupied by the Jubilee Battery which was a military site with historic interest, and the Victoria Road Detention Centre which included Grade 3 historic buildings. The remaining area was vacant and covered with dense vegetation. Part of the northern “R(B)” site had been handed over to the MTR Corporation Ltd. for use as a temporary underground magazine stores for the WIL project until 2014. The two sites fell within the “Landscape Protection Area” and/or “Development Area of High Landscape Value” under the Metroplan Landscape Strategy. Given the landscape significance and prominent location of the two sites, it was proposed to rezone them from “R(B)” to “R(C)3” and “GB”. The proposed “R(C)3” zone was delineated mainly based on the formed portion of the sites in order to minimise the adverse landscape impact and tree felling upon development. It would be subject to a plot ratio of 0.75, site coverage of 25% and a maximum BH of 4 storeys. For the remaining portion of the two sites which had steep topography and dense vegetation, it was

proposed to rezone them from “R(B)” to “GB” to preserve the natural landscape;

Rezoning 86 Victoria Road from “O” to “R(A)” and area shown as ‘Road’

- (ee) the “O” site at the western end of Sai Ning Street was the subject of two previously approved applications (No. A/H1/65 and A/H1/75) for residential and public open space development. The residential development (The Sail at Victoria) had been completed and all the approval conditions had been discharged. In this regard, it was proposed to rezone the residential site from “O” to “R(A)” to reflect the as-built condition. A strip of land to the east of The Sail at Victoria was occupied by a public staircase. It was proposed to rezone this strip of land from “O” to an area shown as ‘Road’ to reflect the existing use;

Rezoning two “G/IC” sites along Mount Davis Path from “G/IC” to “O”

- (ff) two sites along Mount Davis Path were currently used as sitting-out areas. It was proposed to rezone them from “G/IC” to “O” to reflect the existing open space use;

Rezoning a “G/IC” site at Rock Hill Street to “GB”

- (gg) the slopping area to the east of the future MTR Kennedy Town Station at Rock Hill Street was not suitable for development due to the steep topography and dense vegetation of the area. It was thus proposed to rezone this area from “G/IC” to “GB” to preserve the natural slope;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (hh) it was proposed to amend the Notes for the “R(A)”, “R(B)”, “R(C)”, “R(E)”, “I”, “G/IC” and “OU” zones to incorporate/amend the BH restrictions and to incorporate a minor relaxation clause on the BH restrictions. The Remarks in the Notes for the “R(B)” and “R(C)” zones would also be amended to incorporate the development restrictions for the “R(B)1”, “R(C)2” and “R(C)3” sub-areas;

Proposed Amendments to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP

- (ii) opportunity was taken to revise the Explanatory Statement of the OZP as detailed in Attachment III of the Paper to take account of the proposed amendments and to reflect the latest planning circumstances of the OZP; and

Departmental and Public Consultation

- (jj) the proposed BH restrictions had taken into account the comments from the relevant departments, where appropriate. Upon agreement of the Committee, the proposed amendments to the OZP would be published under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance for public representation. The Central and Western District Council would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition period of the draft Kennedy Town and Mount Davis OZP No. S/H1/17A (to be renumbered as S/H1/18 upon exhibition).

5. A Member questioned about the proposed BH restrictions for the sites directly fronting the waterfront. This Member noted that the area bounded by the shoreline in the north, Cadogan Street in the west, Catchick Street in the south and Smithfield in the east was subject to BH restrictions of 100mPD/120mPD, but the “I” site covering the China Merchants Wharf was subject to BH restrictions of 60mPD/80mPD only. This Member asked if the BH limit for the concerned area should be lowered given the waterfront location.

6. In response, Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK, said that Manhattan Heights and part of The Merton were located within the concerned area. The existing BHs of these two developments (156.9mPD to 176.3mPD for The Merton and 171.2mPD for Manhattan Heights) were incongruous with the surrounding developments and the waterfront setting. In order to respect the urban design principle of protecting the waterfront to avoid out-of-context and incompatible developments, it was considered that a lower BH should be adopted at these two sites. However, the proposed BH restrictions should be able to accommodate the maximum permissible plot ratio and/or site coverage under the B(P)R. The part of The Merton to the north of Catchick Street was classified as a Class C site subject to a maximum permissible domestic plot ratio of 10 under the B(P)R, while the other part of The Merton to the south of Catchick Street was a Class B site subject to a maximum permissible domestic plot ratio of 9 under the B(P)R. About 40% of the site area of The

Merton had been used for public open space purpose and should be retained. Taking into account that about 40% of the site had been used for public open space purpose, a BH restriction of 120mPD was proposed for this site to cater for redevelopment up to the maximum permissible plot ratios under the B(P)R. Manhattan Heights was a Class C site under the B(P)R. Similarly, a BH restriction of 100mPD was proposed which would allow redevelopment up to the maximum permissible plot ratio and site coverage under the B(P)R. Moreover, future redevelopment to the existing heights would not be allowed at both sites taking into consideration of the waterfront setting. For the other sites within the concerned area, a BH restriction of 100mPD was also proposed which had given due regard to their locations on the waterfront. Some waterfront sites along the northern shoreline of the Hong Kong Island were also subject to a BH restriction of 100mPD.

7. The Chairman said that the designation of building gaps on the OZP would not affect the existing developments as these building gaps would only be realised when the concerned sites were redeveloped in future. This should be conveyed to the owners/residents of the concerned developments, and a possible channel was through the consultation with the relevant District Council on the OZP amendments. Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au said that apart from consulting the relevant District Council, consultative sessions would also be held to solicit the views of the local residents and other stakeholders on the OZP amendments. During consultation, the consultees would be duly informed of the rationale/principles underlying the OZP amendments, including that the proposed building gaps would only be realised upon the future redevelopment of the concerned sites.

8. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the draft Kennedy Town and Mount Davis OZP No. S/H1/17 and that the draft Kennedy Town and Mount Davis OZP No. S/H1/17A (to be renumbered as S/H1/18 upon exhibition) at Attachment I of the Paper and its Notes at Attachment II were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (b) agree to adopt the revised Explanatory Statement at Attachment III of the Paper as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the TPB

for the various land use zonings of the OZP and that the revised Explanatory Statement was suitable for exhibition together with the OZP under the name of the TPB.

[The Chairman thanked Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK, Mr. K.S. Ng, STP/HK, and Mr. Calvin Chiu, AVA Consultant, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]