

CONFIDENTIAL

(downgraded on 20.1.2012)

**Minutes of 458th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held on 6.1.2012**

Hong Kong District

[Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), Ms. Kitty S.T. Lam, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), Mr. Alfred C.Y. Lam, Senior Town Planner/Cross-Boundary Infrastructure and Development Section (STP/CID), and Dr. Justin Zhengjun He, Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Consultant, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 10

[Closed Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the
Draft Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H20/19
(MPC Paper No. 1/12)

1. The Secretary said that as the proposed amendments to the draft Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H20/19 involved a number of public rental and Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) housing estates developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), the following Members had declared their interests in this item :

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung
as the Director of Planning | - | being a Member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Building Committee of HKHA |
| Ms. Olga Lam
as the Assistant Director of
the Lands Department | - | being an assistant to the Director of Lands who was a Member of the HKHA |
| Mr. Eric Hui
as the Assistant Director of
the Home Affairs
Department | - | being an assistant to the Director of Home Affairs who was a Member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of |

HKHA

- Ms. Julia Lau - being a Member of the HKHA
- Mr. Raymond Chan - having business dealings with the HKHA

2. The interests declared were related to various completed HKHA projects 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. The Committee also noted that Ms. Julia Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

3. Ms. Kitty S.T. Lam, STP/HK, said that four replacement pages for P.4, P.6, P.18 and P.19 of the Paper were tabled at the meeting for Members' information. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation and a fly-through animation, Ms. Lam presented the proposed amendments to the draft Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H20/19 as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

Background

- (a) No building height (BH) and Plot Ratio (PR)/Gross Floor Area (GFA) restrictions were imposed under the current Chai Wan OZP other than the "Comprehensive Development Area (1)" ("CDA(1)") site at Chai Wan Road which was subject to a maximum GFA of 86,268m². In order to provide better planning control on BH and to meet public aspiration for better living condition, Planning Department (PlanD) reviewed the Chai Wan OZP with a view to incorporating appropriate BH restrictions for development zones. The review also covered recommendation of appropriate PR/GFA restrictions for the "Industrial" ("I"), "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" ("OU(Business)") and "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Mass Transit Railway Comprehensive Development Area" ("OU(MTRCDA)") zones. The exercise also covered the review of "Commercial/Residential" ("C/R") and "Open Space" ("O") sites.

Existing Profile of the Area

- (b) In general, the Chai Wan Area (the Area) could be divided into 8 sub-areas having regard to the physical features and land use pattern of the Area.

- (c) Heng Fa Chuen, located in the northern part of the Area, had been developed into a medium-rise commercial/residential neighbourhood. Owing to the previous airport height restrictions, residential blocks of Heng Fa Chuen were built to about 57mPD to 65mPD with relatively low floor-to-floor height of about 2.67m.
- (d) Basin Area on the waterfront involved mainly industrial and government, institution and community (GIC) uses. The Government Logistics Centre, an oil depot, two bus depots and some low-rise developments were on the waterfront north and west of the Basin. The eastern part of the area was mainly occupied by 3 warehouse/godown buildings. The southern part of the area was occupied by existing industrial and office buildings zoned “I” or “OU(Business)”. The south-western part of the area was occupied by the ex-China Motor Bus (CMB) depot zoned “CDA(1)” for comprehensive residential development.
- (e) Siu Sai Wan Reclamation Area was mainly occupied by residential and GIC uses. Residential developments included Island Resort (about 193mPD) on the waterfront and Private Sector Participation Scheme (PSPS) developments. GIC facilities included schools, Siu Sai Wan Government Complex and Siu Sai Wan Sports Ground. A continuous promenade and open space had been developed along the waterfront.
- (f) Southern Foothill Area was predominantly residential in nature with public rental housing (PRH) developments of Siu Sai Wan Estate, Chai Wan Estate and Wan Tsui Estate and PSPS/HOS developments (e.g. Lok Hin Terrace and Yan Tsui Court).
- (g) Central Core Area was predominantly residential in nature with its northern, eastern and southern parts occupied by PRH developments including Tsui Wan Estate, Yue Wan Estate and Tsui Lok Estate, HOS developments, PSPS developments and two private commercial/residential developments. Chai Wan Park served as a major visual and ventilation corridor.

- (h) Western Core Area was a mixed commercial/industrial/residential area with a cluster of old industrial developments to the west of the MTR Chai Wan Station zoned “OU(Business)”. The northern part and southern parts were predominantly residential in nature.
- (i) Northern Hill-slope Area was predominantly occupied by GIC developments including Eastern Hospital and Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education.
- (j) Western Hill-slope Area was mainly occupied by PRH developments such as Hing Man Estate, Hing Wah (II) Estate and Fung Wah Estate as well as some HOS developments.

Existing Building Height Profile

- (k) In general, the BHs of the existing developments in Chai Wan gradually increased from the waterfront and central part towards the hillside in the north, west and south. Except for Island Resort, low to medium-rise developments were commonly found near the waterfront, such as Heng Fa Chuen of 60mPD and industrial developments to the south of the Basin up to 94mPD. Island Resort consisted of eight excessively tall residential towers (up to 193mPD) located right on the waterfront. Further inland, there was a cluster of relatively new industrial and industrial-office buildings of 104-135mPD in the “OU(Business)” zone along On Yip Street/Chai Wan Road.

Existing Building Age Profile

- (l) A majority (about 70%) of the buildings in the Area were under 30 years in age. The newer developments (20 years or below) were mainly concentrated in the Siu Sai Wan area. The industrial buildings to the west of the MTR Chai Wan Station and those clustered around Fung Yip Street were older (over 30 years).

Historic Buildings and Declared Monument

- (m) There were one declared monument i.e. Law Uk and two Grade 3 buildings,

i.e. the Muslim Cemetery and Cape Collinson Lighthouse in the Area.

Air Ventilation Assessment

- (n) In general, the annual prevailing wind of the Area came from the north-east and east, whereas the summer prevailing wind was mainly coming from the southwest, south, southeast to east. Valley winds from the southerly quarters ran through the mountain passes of Mount Collinson and Pottinger Peak, and penetrated through the valleys into the Area. The AVA had identified three air paths. The major air path ran through the central part of the Area by connecting roads and Chai Wan Park. The other two air paths were the southwest-north air corridor along Hong Man Street to the south of Greenwood Terrace, Wing Tai Road Garden, Shing Tai Road and Heng Fa Chuen Playground, and the southwest-east air corridor along Fei Tsui Road, Wan Tsui Road, Chai Wan Road, Sheung On Street Playground and Fung Yip Street.

Recommendations and Measures for Better Air Ventilation

- (o) The recommendations of the AVA were adopted in the proposed amendments to the OZP. They included a 30m-wide non-building area (NBA) on the south of Hing Man Estate, NBAs along Hong Man Street by widening the street to 20m, a 20m-wide NBA at Tsui Wan Estate, 15m-wide gap above podium between Chai Wan Industrial Centre and Minico Building, and 20m-wide building gap along Chui Hang Street by 5m-wide setback along the Chai Wan Flatted Factory site.

Urban Design Principles

- (p) Urban design principles considered and adopted in formulating the BH restrictions for the Area included stepped height concept with lower developments along the waterfront, existing BH profile and development character, low-rise GIC clusters, compatibility in scale with surroundings developments and preservation of existing green / view corridors, and retaining low-rise “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) sites to serve as visual and spatial relief.

Proposed BH Restrictions

- (q) It was proposed to impose BH restrictions for the “CDA”, “R(A)”, “G/IC”, “I” and “OU” zones in the Area.
- (r) For Heng Fa Chuen Area, the intention was to adopt a BH restriction which could generally maintain the existing medium-rise character. BH restrictions of 70mPD and 90mPD were considered appropriate respectively for the eastern part near the waterfront and the western part above the MTR depot and Heng Fa Chuen Station.
- (s) For Basin Area, a BH restriction of 35mPD was proposed for the oil depot site and a height band of 70mPD was proposed for “G/IC” sites to the north/west of the Basin. To generally reflect the existing stepped height profile rising from the waterfront to the more inland area, it was proposed to adopt two height bands of 100mPD and 120mPD for the “I” zone to the east/south of the Basin and “OU(Business)” zone in this area respectively. A BH restriction of 140mPD was proposed for the “CDA(1)” zone at the ex-CMB depot.
- (t) For Siu Sai Wan and Southern Foothill Area, residential developments in this area should have a general stepped height profile with lower developments to the north of Siu Sai Wan Road and gradually increasing to the upper platform of Siu Sai Wan Estate. The adoption of BH height bands of 100mPD, 120mPD and 140mPD was considered appropriate to reflect the stepped height profile. Island Resort with the existing height of 193mPD and located at the waterfront was considered excessively tall comparing with the adjoining waterfront development. A maximum BH of 140mPD was thus proposed to be imposed on future redevelopment of this site and claim for the existing BH was not allowed.
- (u) For Central Core Area, it was recommended to adopt BH restrictions of 100mPD and 110mPD for the northern and southern parts of this area. The BH restriction of 110mPD for the southern part would allow some variations in the BH to achieve a stepped BH profile with the developments

in “R(A)” zone to the north and south.

- (v) For Western Core Area, it was considered appropriate to adopt BH restrictions of 120mPD to 140mPD for “R(A)” sites to take account of the sloping topography. BH restriction of 120mPD was proposed for both “OU(Business)” and “CDA” sites.
- (w) For Western and Northern Hill-slope Area which was located on higher ground levels (around 80mPD), with a general intention to maintain the existing BH profile, the adoption of stepped BH restrictions of 160mPD to 210mPD was considered appropriate for these hill-slope areas, where developments were sited at different ground levels.
- (x) The BH proposed for “G/IC” sites was to reflect their existing BH with the exception of 11 sites which were subject to a maximum BH of 70mPD (including roof-top structures) as they were under the helicopter flight path of the Eastern Hospital. The other exceptions included 5 undeveloped “G/IC” sites with specific BH restrictions proposed having regard to the requirements of their designated uses and 8 sites with BH restrictions proposed based on generalized BH of nearby developments.

Appraisal of Visual Impact

- (y) To assess the visual impacts of redevelopment and the proposed BH restrictions on the overall townscape of the Area, 4 local vantage points (VPs) were selected. 2 of the VPs were located at the high grounds of Chai Wan Au, which provided a panoramic view from a highland area over the major developments in the northern part of the Area. Another one at a popular tourist attraction, Lei Yue Mun in Kowloon, which provided a front view from the north to the Area. The last one from the Hong Kong Trail, a popular hiking trail, which provided a panoramic view over the southern part of the Area. The visual impact of proposed BH restrictions was demonstrated by photomontages as shown in the Paper and the Powerpoint presentation. For the Area as a whole, it was considered that the overall visual impact of development/redevelopment to the proposed

BH restrictions would not be significant.

Proposed PR/GFA Restrictions for Development Zones

- (z) It was considered necessary to impose appropriate PR/GFA restrictions to provide better planning control on the development intensity in the Area upon development/redevelopment. The current review on development intensity mainly focused on the “I”, “OU(Business)” and “OU(MTRCDA)” zones. In assessing the development intensity of all “I” and “OU(Business)” zones, thorough examination of the nature of the developments, existing building profile including PR, building age and BH, lease entitlements and redevelopment potential had been carried out. Under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), a maximum average PR of 9.5 was recommended for existing industrial/business areas in the Metro Area, and the PR of individual sites could range from 5 to 12. A maximum PR of 12 as recommended in the HKPSG would still provide sufficient incentives for redevelopment in “OU(Business)” and “I” zones. According to the Commissioner for Transport, the capacity of the road network in the “OU(Business)” area west of the MTR Chai Wan Station was very limited. To ascertain the traffic constraints on future redevelopments in both the “I” and “OU(Business)” zones, a traffic assessment was undertaken by PlanD. The assessment concluded that even under the PR 12 scenario, road improvement schemes and traffic management measures might be necessary to cater for the future redevelopments within the two zones. The additional traffic generated from the redevelopment of sites within the two zones to the maximum permissible PR of 15 for non-domestic uses would be substantial and might cause very severe traffic congestion. From traffic point of view, a maximum PR of 12 was recommended.
- (aa) The proposed PR restrictions for “I” and “OU(Business)” zones in the area were recommended taking into account the recommended maximum PR under the HKPSG, the findings of the traffic assessment and the lease restrictions for the various sites. For “I” zones which were located to the south and east of the Basin, a maximum PR of 12 together with the

proposed maximum BH of 100mPD, or the PR and BH of the existing developments, whichever were the greater, were recommended. For “OU(Business)” zones which were located to the west of MTR Chai Wan Station and around On Yip Street, a PR restriction of 12 together with the proposed BH restriction of 120mPD, or the PR and BH of the existing developments, whichever were the greater, were recommended. For the “OU(MTRCDA)” site occupied by Heng Fa Chuen, it was considered appropriate to impose a maximum domestic and non-domestic GFA of 425,000m² and 26,750m² respectively in accordance with the lease conditions.

Review of the “C/R” Zone

- (bb) Opportunity had been taken to review the “C/R” zone on the OZP which scattered in the Central and Western Core Areas. In view of the predominant residential nature of these existing developments and taking into consideration their locations in predominantly residential neighbourhoods, the “C/R” sites were considered suitable to be rezoned to “R(A)”.

Proposed Amendments to the OZP

- (cc) Major proposed amendments as shown on the draft Chai Wan OZP were highlighted, including stipulation of BH restrictions for “CDA”, “R(A)”, “I”, “G/IC” and “OU” zones (Item A); rezoning of the “C/R” sites at Chai Wan Road, Wan Tsui Road, Lin Shing Road and Fei Tsui Road to “R(A)” (Item B1); rezoning of New Jade Garden from “C/R” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “R(A)” to reflect the planning intention for residential development (Item B2); rezoning of the Island Resort site from “R(A)” to “R(A)1” for imposition of BH restriction without allowing the claim for the existing BH (Item C1); rezoning of the site occupied by a playground at Chai Wan Road from “R(A)” to “O” to reflect the planning intention for open space use (Item C2); rezoning of 4 sites in Hing Wah (II) Estate, Wan Tsui Estate, Tsui Wan Estate, the bus terminus in Siu Sai Wan Estate and Hing Wah Community Hall from “R(A)” to “G/IC” to reflect their planning intention (Item D); rezoning of the oil depot site in the Chai Wan East Area

from “I” to “OU(Oil Depot)” to reflect the planning intention (Item E); rezoning of an area at Chong Fu Road from “I” and “O” to “G/IC” to reflect the planning intention and the allocation boundary (Item F); rezoning of an area at the junction of Ning Foo Street and Lee Chung Street occupied by the existing open-air bus terminus from “CDA” to an area shown as ‘Road’ to reflect its planning intention for bus/minibus terminus use as well as provide visual relief and breathing space to the congested industrial area (Item G); designation of a 30m-wide NBA on the south of Hing Man Estate (Item U1); designation of a 20m-wide NBA at Tsui Wan Estate (Item U2); and designation of NBAs along Hong Man Street and on both sides of the pedestrian stairway to Tai Man Street (Item U3). It was also proposed to correspondingly amend the Notes and Explanatory Statement of the OZP.

Public Consultation

- (dd) Since the proposals involved BH control, it was considered not appropriate to carry out prior public consultation. The Eastern District Council would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition period of the draft Chai Wan OZP No. S/H20/19A (to be renumbered to S/H20/20 upon exhibition) for public inspection under section 7 of the Ordinance.

4. In response to Ms. Olga Lam’s enquiry on whether the proposed BH restriction had taken into account the BH permitted under the lease, Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK, explained that it was inevitable that the development right in terms of BH for some sites with unrestricted leases would be affected, and BH restrictions, if simply following lease entitlement might not be able to achieve the planning objectives/intention in many cases.

5. Besides, Ms. Lam asked if the proposed rezoning of “C/R” to “R(A)” had taken into account the right of some sites which permitted the development of commercial uses on the floors above the lowest three floors within the existing building under lease. Ms. Au explained that the “C/R” zones in Chai Wan was suitable for rezoning to “R(A)” given the predominant residential nature of Chai Wan, and any existing commercial uses above the lowest three floors of the buildings on these sites could continue. When these buildings were redeveloped, the owner could apply for section 16 application for commercial uses

above the lowest three floors.

6. In response to Mr. Eric Hui's enquiry on whether the proposed BH restriction for Hing Wah Community Hall had taken into account the need for redevelopment, Ms. Brenda Au clarified that the proposed BH restriction of 3 storeys had taken into account the known redevelopment plan of the community hall as shown in Plan C4 of the Paper.

[Mr. Felix Fong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

7. The Chairman and a few Members agreed that Island Resort was excessively tall given its waterfront location, and it would be reasonable to impose a BH restriction lower than the existing height for Island Resort without the claim for existing BH upon redevelopment. A Member commented that TPB's current practice was to impose BH restriction to achieve stepped height profile from the waterfront, and the BH restriction for Island Resort should be consistent with the current practice. Ms. Brenda Au supplemented that the same practice had been adopted for similar buildings along waterfront in other OZPs e.g. Grand Promenade near Lei King Wan and Les Saisons in Shau Kei Wan. The Secretary supplemented that similar discussion had been raised in formulating the BH restriction for Harbourfront Landmark in Hung Hom which was on the waterfront, and it was agreed to impose a BH restriction much lower than the existing height to reflect the long term planning intention. Such approach of imposing BH restriction for the exceptionally tall buildings on the waterfront without allowing them to redevelop up to existing height was indeed an established practice.

8. Noting that the proposed BH restriction for Island Resort of 140mPD was much lower than its existing height of 193mPD, the Chairman and a few Members asked if the maximum permissible GFA or existing PR of 10.5 could be achieved upon future redevelopment of Island Resort given the BH restriction of 140mPD currently stipulated on the OZP, while providing a reasonable floor-to-floor height and meeting the requirements under Sustainable Building Design (SBD) Guidelines. A Member commented that a BH of 140mPD with site coverage of about 40% would be able to accommodate the PR permissible for Island Resort site under the OZP. Ms. Brenda Au confirmed that based on PlanD's assessment, the BH restriction of 140mPD would be able to accommodate the permissible PR assuming that carpark would be provided at basement and a reasonable floor-to-floor height

of 3.15m was adopted.

9. The Secretary supplemented that measures under SBD Guidelines and OZP restrictions on BHRs and building gaps were under two different regimes. It was technically difficult to take into account the impact of SBD Guidelines in formulating and assessing BH restrictions at the planning stage in the absence of detailed development proposal. Nevertheless, the mechanism of minor relaxation of BH restriction had been proposed to provide flexibility in building design. SBD Guidelines would most likely meet the planning objectives for granting minor relaxation of BH restrictions.

10. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on the air ventilation performance of the existing development of Island Resort and its possible redevelopment with higher site coverage and lower BHs, Dr. Justin Zhengjun He, the AVA Consultant, advised that the air ventilation performance of both the existing development and possible redevelopment at the site was not good based on his initial evaluation, but this should be confirmed by detailed computer simulation to calculate their actual air ventilation performance. A few Members commented that air ventilation performance of Island Resort would unlikely be worsened substantially upon redevelopment with reduced BH since the current layout and disposition were already wall-like to maximize seaview. Ms. Brenda Au held the same view with these Members, and further said that future redevelopment was expected to comply with the SBD Guidelines due to the GFA concessions involved, and such compliance would achieve satisfactory air ventilation performance at the same time. Moreover, site coverage of the redevelopment would be controlled under the Building (Planning) Regulations. Nevertheless, a Member commented that building gap requirement could be proposed for the site of Island Resort if considered necessary by the AVA. Taking note of the above, the Committee agreed to adopt 140mPD as the proposed BH restriction for Island Resort.

11. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Secretary confirmed that the proposed BH restriction for Island Resort would not affect its development intensity as permitted on the OZP.

12. Noting that the proposed BH restriction of Heng Fa Chuen had allowed a higher floor-to-floor height (i.e. 3.15m) for its redevelopment, the Chairman suggested restricting Heng Fa Cheun to its existing BH so that the developer had to include planning merits in his

application for minor relaxation of the BH restriction in future. Ms. Brenda Au explained that the stepped height profile in the Area and the waterfront setting had been taken into account in formulating the BH restrictions for Heng Fa Chuen, and the same assumption of floor-to-floor height for redevelopment was adopted in formulating the BH restriction for Tai Koo Shing. The Secretary further said that the same practice of allowing reasonable floor-to-floor height for redevelopment which was higher than the existing one had been adopted in formulation of BH restrictions for other OZPs. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on whether Heng Fa Chuen with higher BH after redevelopment would create adverse air ventilation impact, Dr. Justin Zhengjun He advised that BH restriction should have little impact on air ventilation performance.

13. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Ms. Brenda Au confirmed that an assumption of floor-to-floor height of 4m was adopted for commercial development in "OU(B)" zone, and in stipulating the BH restriction, sufficient design flexibility was available for commercial development in "OU(B)" zone with the imposition of maximum PR of 12.

14. The Chairman noted that some developments had existing PR lower than the proposed restriction of 12 in "OU(B)" zone. Given the concern on traffic congestion in the "OU(B)" zones, he asked whether the aforesaid developments could be restricted to their existing PR so as not to increase the burden on the traffic capacity in the area. He said that for those sites with the existing PR higher than the PR restriction of 12, the existing PR would be allowed for the reason of fairness. He commented that by applying a blanket PR control of 12 for the entire "OU(B)" zone, there would be a net increase in total GFA in the "OU(B)" zones.

15. In response, Ms. Brenda Au explained the existing PR and the PR restrictions (if any) under lease in the "OU(B)" and "I" zones as stated in paragraphs 5.4.3 to 5.4.5 and 5.4.11 of the Paper, and confirmed that the existing PR which exceeded the OZP restriction of 12 would be respected upon redevelopment. While admitting that those sites which had not been developed up to PR of 12 could gain more GFA under the proposed PR restriction, she explained that PR restriction of sites under the same zoning within an area would be consistently applied under the current practice, and PR of 12 for "OU(B)" and "I" zones were considered appropriate taking into account HKPSG recommendation and the traffic

assessment results. As most of the lots within “OU(B)” zoning were held under industrial and godown lease, the “OU(B)” zoning was in effect an upzoning even with the imposition of PR 12, and it was required to pay premium for non-industrial developments at these lots. Amount of premium was based on the GFA to be built.

16. The Chairman further suggested the Committee to consider whether it was appropriate to impose PR restrictions taking into account the lease entitlement of individual sites. Landowners of those sites without PR restriction under lease might feel aggrieved as the proposed PR restriction of 12 would affect their development right under lease.

17. In response, Ms. Brenda Au explained that imposition of PR restrictions simply following the lease entitlements would result in planning control on the development intensity in the “OU(B)” and “I” zones with too many variations. Imposition of the same PR restriction of 12 for the same landuse zone in an area would be more consistent. The Secretary supplemented that while lease entitlement was one of the considerations for formulating PR restrictions, it could not be an overriding consideration clouding other important planning considerations such as urban design, infrastructural capacity, good urban townscape etc. The imposition of PR and BH restrictions would inevitably affect the development right under lease for some sites. If it was for a good planning justification and for the public good, the Town Planning Board (the Board) had every right to do so.

18. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Ms. Brenda Au reconfirmed that the plot ratio of an existing building would be respected and the Secretary clarified that existing building referred to a building physically in existence.

19. The Chairman concluded that lease entitlement was only one of the considerations in formulating the BH and PR restrictions on the OZP. The representation process under the Town Planning Ordinance could provide a channel for the public to present their views to the TPB. The TPB could then consider the grounds of each representation in the representation hearing process. The meeting agreed to the imposition of PR 12 on “OU(B)” and “I” zones.

20. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the draft Chai Wan OZP No. S/H20/19 and that the draft Chai Wan OZP No. S/H20/19A at Attachment I of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/H20/19 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 7 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment III of the Paper for the draft Chai Wan OZP No. S/H20/19A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zones on the Plan and the revised ES would be published together with the Plan.

[The Chairman thanked Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK, Ms. Kitty S.T. Lam, STP/HK, Mr. Alfred C.Y. Lam, STP/CID, and Dr. Justin Zhengjun He, AVA Consultant, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]