

**CONFIDENTIAL**

(Downgraded on 1.8.2008)

**Minutes of 377th Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 18.7.2008**

[Ms. Phoebe Y.M. Chan, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), Mr. Tom C.K. Yip, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK) of the Planning Department, as well as Ms. Alice Cheung, Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Consultant, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 11**

Proposed Amendments to the  
Draft Quarry Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H21/24  
(MPC Paper No. 24/08)

---

1. The Secretary reported that as a number of proposed amendments were related to the residential and commercial developments owned by the Swire Pacific Ltd. (SP) or its subsidiaries, Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan, having current business dealings with SP, had declared interests in this item. Since the item was related to the plan-making process and Mr. Chan had no landed interest, Members agreed that in accordance with the Town Planning Board (the Board)'s established practice, Mr. Chan could stay at the meeting.
2. Ms. Phoebe Y.M. Chan, DPO/HK, said that replacement pages 24 and 25 of the Paper had been tabled at the meeting. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms. Chan briefed Members on the item as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

**Background**

- (a) being a major residential area and coupled with the rapid expansion of the commercial node at Taikoo Place, the Quarry Bay Area (the Area) was subject to great development/redevelopment pressure in recent years. In the absence of building height control, excessively high-rise developments

such as One Island East (301mPD) at Westlands Road and Grand Promenade (219mPD) at Lei King Wan, which were incompatible and out-of-context in the locality, were appearing at various locations resulting in negative impacts on the visual quality of the Area. Apart from the above, some proposed developments with planning and/or building plan approvals obtained also involved excessively tall buildings such as the proposed office development at Taikoo Place (295mPD) first approved by the Board in 1999 and the proposed extension to Cityplaza One (191mPD) first approved by the Building Authority in 2000;

- (b) in order to avoid further proliferation of out-of-context tall buildings and to provide certainty and transparency, appropriate building height restrictions were recommended for all development zones (except for sub-areas 1 and 2 of the “Commercial” zone (i.e. “C(1)” and “C(2)”), and sub-areas 1 and 2 of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Cultural and/or Commercial. Leisure and Tourism Related Uses” (i.e. “OU(1)” and “OU”(2)”) zone which already had building height and plot ratio controls. Opportunity was taken to review the “Commercial/Residential” (“C/R”) zones and to rezone these sites to appropriate zonings so as to provide a clear planning intention;

#### Context of the Area

- (c) topographically, the Area follows a natural stepped height profile ascending gradually from the waterfront in the north to the foothill area to the south. The Area was largely residential in nature with a number of large scale residential developments. Commercial developments were found at Cityplaza and the secondary commercial node at Taikoo Place, and various Government, Institution or Community (GIC) uses and open spaces were scattered around serving as breathing space and providing visual relief to the Area with the green hillslopes as the backdrop. In general, the Area could be divided into the eight sub-areas of different characters as detailed in paragraph 6.2 of the Paper;

### Existing Building Profile

- (d) the existing building height profile of the Area was predominantly medium-rise in character with the majority of buildings below 30 storeys in the central and southern parts of the Area. Developments in the north-western part of the Area were rather mixed, with old developments of low to medium-rise mixed with relatively new high-rise developments;
- (e) the majority of the buildings in the central and southern parts of the Area and in Lei King Wan were of a building age of 30 years or below. Buildings over 30 years and many reaching 50 years were concentrated in the western and north-western parts of the Area;
- (f) there were two historic buildings (viz. the Grade II ‘Woodside’ building in the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone at Mount Parker and the Grade III ‘former Pui Chi Boy’s Home’ zoned “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) at the foothill on the western side of King’s Road opposite Sunway Gardens) in the Area;

### Local Wind Environment

- (g) an air ventilation assessment (AVA) by expert evaluation of the Area had been undertaken. The major prevailing annual wind came from the east and east-northeast directions, and the prevailing summer wind mainly came from the southwest and east-southeast directions. The well-vegetated north-facing hill slopes located to the south of the Area would generate downhill (katabatic) wind which provided a cooling effect. The major air/wind paths, the problematic areas, recommendations and measures for better air ventilation in the Area were highlighted in paragraphs 8.4 to 8.7 of the Paper. In brief, the AVA consultants had suggested the following specific measures:
  - (i) setback should be provided along the east-west corridor connecting Taikoo Wan Road to Tong Chong Street on the two sides of Westlands

Road (i.e. to the north of Oxford House and on Somerset House) to create an air path from the east along Taikoo Wan Road all the way through Tong Chong Street and exit at King's Road;

- (ii) a gap down to street level should be provided on the northern side of One Island East;
- (iii) for the north-south flow wind, it would be very useful to connect up the open space east of One Island East all the way to King's Road. Open area should be provided south of Taikoo Shing Road around the Shipyard Lane area. Failing that, gaps between buildings down to street level should be provided. Another existing north-south air/wind path along Tai Fung Avenue through the open area between Cityplaza Four and Marigold Mansion to the Quarry Bay Park should be retained as far as possible; and
- (iv) on the west-southerly flow wind, an air path should be created in the site located immediately north of the Mount Parker Lodge for better penetration of north-south wind/air flow to the King's Road/Westlands Road area;

#### Urban Design Principles

- (h) taking into account the existing topography, site formation level, the waterfront and foothill setting, the local character, existing building height profile, compatibility with the surrounding area and the building height restrictions imposed on the OZP for the North Point area; as well as the broad urban design principles set out in the Urban Design Guidelines of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, the following guiding principles had been considered and adopted in formulating the building height restrictions for the Area:
  - (i) the view from public vantage point at middle of ex-Kai Tak Airport Runway towards the ridgeline on Hong Kong side should be

respected to avoid breaching the 20% building-free zone of the ridgeline;

- (ii) the height profile should be sympathetic and compatible in scale and proportion with the surrounding developments, which had a general stepped height profile with lower developments along the waterfront and the Quarry Bay Park area, and taller developments in the inland and uphill areas;
- (iii) the height profile should respect and preserve the open view and the existing medium-rise character, and congruous with the general height of the existing developments. Any out-of-context developments must be avoided;
- (iv) the proposed building height bands would ensure that the urban design principles would not be negated while still accommodating the current development intensity on site; and
- (v) the lower building height of the existing “G/IC” and “OU” developments would be kept to serve as spatial and visual relief. Besides, “Open Space” (“O”) and “GB” sites would be retained to preserve the existing greenery and open area as breathing space;

#### Overall Building Height (BH) Concept

- (i) an overall BH concept had been prepared for the Area which generally followed and reinforced the existing stepped building height profile in the Area, and allowed a reasonable floor-to-floor height to meet the modern day standard. The general height bands were set at 15m interval for a major part of the Area;
- (j) to ensure a stepped height profile and for the protection of the ridgeline, the proposed BH restrictions for residential and commercial developments in the “C”, “C/R”, “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”),

“Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) and “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) zones as well as the “OU” zone covering Grand Promenade were in terms of mPD as high-rise buildings were involved. BH control for “G/IC” and “OU” facilities and other low-rise developments would be subject to restrictions in terms of number of storeys to allow some design flexibility and to cater for specific functional requirements;

- (k) to allow for design flexibility, minor relaxation of the BH restrictions through planning permission system could be considered on individual merits. However, minor relaxation of BH restrictions for existing buildings which had already exceeded the specific BH restrictions stipulated on the Plan were generally not supported unless under exceptional circumstances and with very strong justifications;

Proposed BH restrictions for “R(A)”, “R(B)”, “C/R”, “C”, “CDA” Sites and “OU” Site covering the Grand Promenade

*Lei King Wan Waterfront and Park Area*

- (l) taking into consideration the prominent waterfront location to prevent massive wall effect and allowed visual permeability for the inland area, a maximum BH restriction of 80mPD was proposed for the three “C/R” sites covering the Lei King Wan development at the waterfront;
- (m) to follow the stepped height profile, a maximum BH restriction of 100mPD was proposed for the “C/R” site covering the Lei King Wan development in the inner area and the “R(A)” site of Hong Tung Estate;
- (n) for the waterfront “OU (Residential cum Public Transport Terminus, Commercial and Community Facilities)” site covering the Grand Promenade development, taking into consideration its prominent location on the waterfront and to avoid out-of-context development within the waterfront setting, it was proposed to restrict the height of the building at 160mPD upon redevelopment and the claim of existing BH should not be

allowed. The proposed BH restriction was in line with that of the adjacent development (Les Saisons of 154-165mPD) to the immediate east falling within the Shau Kei Wan OZP;

*Taikoo Shing Residential and Commercial Cluster*

- (o) to preserve the open view to and from the Quarry Bay Park, a maximum BH restriction of 90mPD was proposed for the “C/R” and “C” sites covering Taikoo Shing and Cityplaza Three and Four to the immediate south of Quarry Bay Park;
- (p) a maximum BH restriction of 105mPD was proposed for the area zoned “C/R” and “C” covering Taikoo Shing and Cityplaza Two in between Taikoo Wan Road and Taikoo Shing Road following a stepped height profile;
- (q) for the area zoned “C/R” and “C” respectively to the south of Taikoo Shing Road, the existing height of 45mPD of the “C” zone covering the shopping mall would be retained to provide an open vista for the surrounding residential developments. For the western part of the “C” zone, a maximum BH restriction of 135mPD was proposed to cater for a proposed hotel development under construction. While the proposed extension of Cityplaza One of 191mPD in the eastern part of the “C” zone had already obtained building plan approval, a maximum BH of 135mPD would be appropriate making reference to the hotel development under construction. A maximum BH restriction of 120mPD was proposed for the “C/R” site covering the Taikoo Shing following a stepped height profile;

*King’s Road North Residential and Commercial Cluster*

- (r) to reflect the existing building height which provided a visual relief for the adjacent residential developments, the maximum BH for the “C” site covering the Kornhill Plaza North was retained at 85mPD;

- (s) for the areas zoned “C/R” west of King’s Road near the Quarry Bay MTR Station, and areas zoned “C/R” and “C” to the immediate north of King’s Road and Kornhill Road, a maximum BH restriction of 120mPD was proposed;

King’s Road South Residential and Commercial Cluster

- (t) a maximum BH restriction of 100mPD was proposed for the “C” site covering the Kornhill Plaza South in order to echo with the commercial development to the north to form a central vista as visual relief for the adjacent residential developments;
- (u) for areas zoned “C/R” (covering the Kornhill (Lower and Middle) development), “R(A)” and “R(B)” (covering the Floridian and Sai Wan Terrace) south of King’s Road and Kornhill Road, a maximum BH restriction of 120mPD was proposed to respect the existing building height and to achieve a stepped height profile with building height bands to its north at 105mPD and to its south and further south at 135mPD and 150mPD respectively;

Foothill Area

- (v) for area zoned “R(A)” for Kornville and “R(B)” to the south-western part of the Area including Mount Parker Lodge, Nam Fung Sun Chuen and Block H of the Kornhill (Upper) development, a maximum BH restriction of 135mPD was proposed which generally followed the existing building height and aimed to achieve the stepped height profile;
- (w) a maximum BH of 150mPD and 165mPD were respectively proposed for Blocks F and G, and Blocks A to E of the Kornhill (Upper) development located within the “R(B)” zone;

Taikoo Place Commercial Area

- (x) for the portion of the “CDA” site, the “C” site fronting Quarry Bay Park to the north of Tong Chong Street, and the “C” site bounded by Tong Chong Street, King’s Road and Pan Hoi Street, a maximum BH restriction of 130mPD was proposed;
- (y) to avoid breaching the 20% building-free zone of the ridgeline upon redevelopment, a maximum BH restriction of 140mPD for part of the “C” site covering Cambridge House (to be rezoned to “C(3)”) was proposed. Moreover, claim of existing building height (159mPD) which had intruded into the 20% building-free zone of the ridgeline should not be allowed;
- (z) taking into account the need to preserve the 20% building-free zone of the ridgeline when viewed from the public vantage point at the middle of the ex-Kai Tak airport runway, maximum BH restrictions of 160mPD, 170mPD and 200mPD for the areas zoned “CDA” and “C” to the south of Tong Chong Street were proposed. For the site zoned “CDA”, approval from the Board (Application No. A/H21/96) had been obtained in 1999 for the Phase 2 redevelopment of the three existing industrial buildings namely, Warwick House, Cornwall House and Somerset House into two office buildings (i.e. Building 2A of 295mPD and Building 2B of 160mPD). As the proposed Building 2A of 295mPD would breach the ridgeline, the BH restriction covering the site currently occupied by Somerset House and Cornwall House would be restricted to a maximum of 200mPD upon redevelopment to maintain the 20% building-free zone of the ridgeline. The BH of the committed office development approved by the Board would not be affected by the proposed building height restriction insofar as the planning permission was still valid;
- (aa) an existing commercial building (i.e. One Island East) of about 301mPD had breached the ridgeline and was incompatible with the surrounding environment. To maintain the 20% building-free zone on the mountain backdrop in the long run, the site was recommended to be subject to a maximum BH restriction of 220mPD upon redevelopment and claim of existing building height should not be allowed;

[Miss Sylvia S.F. Yau and Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim left the meeting at this point.]

Western Residential and Commercial Cluster

- (bb) the commercial developments zoned “C(1)” and “C(2)” in this area were already subject to a maximum building height of 100mPD and 130mPD respectively under OZP;
- (cc) taking into consideration their location, the stepped height concept and the development potential of the sites upon redevelopment in future, maximum BH restrictions of 105mPD and 120mPD were proposed for the areas zoned “C/R” to the east of King’s Road; and the area zoned “R(A)” and “C/R” to the west of King’s Road respectively;

Proposed BH Restrictions for Other “G/IC” Zones

- (dd) there were a total of 25 “G/IC” sites in the Area comprising 23 developments. The majority of these G/IC sites had been developed to their designated uses including eight for educational uses, seven for government uses, two for community uses, six for utility/other uses and two vacant sites;
- (ee) the BH restrictions ranged from 1 – 13 storeys, which were mainly to contain the development scale and/or reflect the existing BH so as to serve as breathing space and visual relief to the Area;
- (ff) for the undesignated “G/IC” site located adjacent to the Sai Wan Ho Health Centre, which might be used for community hall, a building height restriction of not exceeding 6 storeys was proposed. For the other undesignated “G/IC” site to the southeast of the Grade II historical building “Woodside”, encircled by the “GB” zone and the Tai Tam Country Park, a building height restriction of not exceeding 6 storeys was also proposed taken into consideration the character of the area and the existing condition

of the site including inadequate vehicular access. While there was proposal for using the site for the development of an international school, the actual use of the site had not been confirmed;

Proposed BH Restrictions For Other “OU” Zones

- (gg) there were 10 “OU” sites on the Quarry Bay OZP. The two “OU(1)” and “OU(2)” sites annotated “Cultural and/or Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses” were already subject to a maximum building height restriction of not exceeding 35mPD and 25mPD respectively;
- (hh) for the six developed “OU” sites, BH restrictions of 1 to 3 storeys were proposed to contain their building height to the existing level;
- (ii) for the “OU” site annotated “Elevated Walkway” which was to provide main pedestrian link connecting the waterfront development with existing development in the Quarry Bay hinterland, no building height restriction was proposed;
- (jj) for the “OU” site covering the Grand Promenade, a maximum building height of 160mPD upon redevelopment was proposed as detailed in paragraph 3(n) above;

Rezoning Proposals for “C/R” Sites

- (kk) opportunity had also been taken to review the zoning of the “C/R” sites, most of which were predominantly residential in nature with the lower two or three floors used for small-scale and local type retail/commercial activities and were akin to “R(A)” type development. The following rezoning proposals were made to mainly reflect the completed developments:
  - (i) rezoning of commercial/residential sites including residential developments along King’s Road, Sunway Gardens, Westlands

Gardens, Taikoo Shing, Kornhill Garden, Kornhill (Middle and Lower), and Lei King Wan from “C/R” to “R(A)”;

- (ii) rezoning of a site at Finnie Street from “C/R” to “O” and ‘Road’; and from ‘Road’ to “O” to reflect the existing use of pedestrian walkway and a sitting-out area; and
  - (iii) rezoning of a strip of land between Pan Hoi Street and Westlands Road fronting King’s Road, two strips of land along Hong On Street and Hong Yue Street, and a strip of land at Tai On Street from “C/R” to ‘Road’;
- (ll) two sites at Pan Hoi Street and Tong Chong Street, comprising a total of four small-scale developments were predominantly residential in nature with retail activities on the ground floor. They were considered suitable for rezoning to “C” taking into consideration which fell naturally within the commercial/office area of Taikoo Place;

Other Rezoning Proposals, Designation of Non-Building Areas and Demarcation of Building Gaps

(mm) to reflect the existing developments/latest proposals and to take on board the recommendations of the AVA for improving the air ventilation for the Area, the following proposals were also made:

- (i) rezoning of a small piece of land at Mansion Street from “G/IC” to “GB” and ‘Road’ to reflect the existing uses partly as Tsat Tsz Mun Road with meter-parking facilities on both sides and partly occupied by hillslopes with natural vegetation;
- (ii) designation of seven strips of land, with a width ranging from 7m to 15m, at Taikoo Shing and Taikoo Place as non-building areas to facilitate air ventilation of the area;

- (iii) demarcation of a 15m-wide strip of land covering the Westlands Gardens site at Shipyard Lane subject to a BH restriction of 17mPD to facilitate air ventilation of the area;
- (iv) demarcation of two 10m-wide strips of land covering the site bounded by Yau Man Street and King's Road and Kornville, and the Quarry Bay Municipal Services Building subject to a BH restriction of 29mPD to facilitate air ventilation of the area;
- (v) rezoning of Cambridge House at Taikoo Place from "C" to "C(3)" to restrict the BH at the site to a maximum of 140mPD upon redevelopment to avoid breaching the 20% building-free zone of the ridgeline;
- (vi) rezoning of One Island East at Westlands Road from "C" to "C(4)" to restrict the BH at the site to a maximum of 220mPD upon redevelopment in the long run to avoid breaching the 20% building-free zone of the ridgeline; and
- (vii) rezoning of a piece of land to the south of 'Woodside' from "G/IC" to "G/IC(1)" subject to a BH restriction of 6 storeys and the requirement for planning permission through the submission of layout plan for consideration of the Board to ensure a compatible development with the surrounding natural green environment and its adjacent Grade II historical building;

Photomontages Showing the Proposed BH Profile

- (nn) four photomontages presenting the possible BH profile of the Area with and without proposed BH restrictions as viewed from the middle of ex-Kai Tak Airport Runway, transmitting station at Tai Tam Country Park, Sir Cecil's Ride (near Mount Parker Road), and rooftop of Eastern Harbour Centre were shown;

Proposed Amendments to the OZP

- (oo) amendments to the OZP, its Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) as detailed in paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 of the Paper as well as Attachments I, II and III of the Paper respectively were proposed to reflect the above proposed amendments. Opportunity were also taken to incorporate some technical amendments and to reflect the latest planning circumstances on the Notes and ES of the OZP respectively. The proposed amendments might be further revised to take into account Members' views and discussions at the meeting where appropriate;

Departmental Comments

- (pp) the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban, Transport Department raised a concern on possible traffic impacts arising from rezoning of two "C/R" sites at Pan Hoi Street and Tong Chong Street to "C" with a permissible plot ratio of 15. In response, PlanD considered that the plot ratio of these sites might be subject to change in the overall review of plot ratio restrictions for the Area to be undertaken in future;
- (qq) the Secretary for Education (SED) commented that a BH restriction of eight storeys should be imposed for the "G/IC(1)" site to the south of 'Woodside' for standard school requirement while the Government Property Administrator commented that no height restriction should be imposed for this undesignated "G/IC(1)" site in order not to restrict its development potential. PlanD considered that the site was encircled by "GB" and Country Park. Given the tranquil environment with natural green vegetation and to ensure compatibility with the surrounding area, any development on this site would require the submission of layout plan to the Board for consideration; and

Public Consultation

- (rr) to avoid pre-mature release of the development control information, the

Eastern District Council and Harbourfront Enhancement Committee would be consulted during publication of the proposed amendments under section 7 of the pre-amended Town Planning Ordinance.

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

“G/IC” site at Mansion Street

3.1 In response to a Member’s question, Ms. Phoebe Y.M. Chan said that the “G/IC” site had an area of about 2,577m<sup>2</sup>. The eastern portion of the site was the existing Tsat Tsz Mui Road with meter-parking facilities on both sides of the road and the western portion was part of a hillslope covered with natural vegetation.

3.2 Noting that there was a lack of “G/IC” sites in the district, a Member considered that the existing “G/IC” zoning should be retained to cater for future demand of GIC facilities in the district.

3.3 Ms. Phoebe Y.M. Chan explained that the site was elongated in shape and was partly occupied by an existing road and a hillslope with natural vegetation. The site configuration might not be suitable for large-scale GIC developments and any development on the hillslope might require extensive slope work and tree felling which were undesirable. Therefore, it was proposed to rezone the site from “G/IC” to “Road” and “GB” merely to reflect the existing uses on the site.

3.4 The Chairperson remarked that the existing road might be serving as an emergency vehicular access for the adjoining residential building. On the other hand, the closure of this section of road to cater for future development might affect the site classification of the adjoining residential building upon redevelopment.

[Mr. Walter K.L. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

3.5 Another Member shared similar views that the retention of the “G/IC” zoning for the site would provide flexibility to meet the future demand of GIC uses (such as Electricity

Substation or other public utility installations) in the Eastern district. Two other Members opined that it would be more prudent to retain the site under “G/IC” zoning and to rezone part of the site to “GB” in this built-up area would not be too meaningful. They considered that a further study on the function of the existing road and the possible impact on the traffic flow and the adjoining residential developments upon its closure should be undertaken prior to determining the future use of the site.

3.6 After further deliberation, the meeting agreed that the existing “G/IC” zoning of the site should be retained.

#### Designation of Non-building Areas to improve air flow

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

3.7 A Member supported the creation of air paths through the designation of non-building area (NBA) in specific locations and made the following suggestions:

- (a) the residential blocks of Kornhill (Upper) development appeared to have blocked the katabatic wind from the hill. Consideration should be given to designate NBA in this area so that there would be gaps between buildings upon redevelopment to enhance air flow in the north-south direction;
- (b) to slightly re-align the proposed 10m wide strip of land, which was subject to BH of 29mPD, of the “R(A)” site bounded by Yau Man Street, King’s Road and Quarry Bay Street to facilitate penetration of south-westerly wind down to the King’s Road area;

[Mrs. Shirley Lee left the meeting temporarily whilst Mr. Felix W. Fong returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) to designate the south-western corner of One Island East, which was not built-over at the moment, as NBA to assist the air flow in the north-south direction.

3.8 Ms. Phoebe Y.M. Chan said that the proposed 10m wide strip of land mentioned in paragraph 3.7(b) was also included in the adjacent “G/IC” site of the Quarry Bay Municipal Services Building as shown on Plan 15 of the Paper. The two strips of land which were subject to a BH restriction of 29mPD would allow the penetration of south-westerly wind to the downstream King’s Road and Westland Road area. Therefore, the re-alignment of the strip of land was not necessary.

[Mrs. Shirley Lee returned to join the meeting at this point.]

3.9 Ms. Alice Cheung, the AVA Consultant responded that the gaps between the building blocks of the Kornhill (Upper) development would allow the passage of wind. Hence, it was not necessary to designate this area as NBA. Instead, it was more important to improve the permeability of the podium upon redevelopment in order to improve the air ventilation at the pedestrian level.

3.10 In response to the Chairperson’s enquiry, Ms. Phoebe Y.M. Chan said that a general statement had been incorporated into the ES of the OZP which stated that future developments were encouraged to adopt suitable design measures including greater permeability of podium, wider gaps between buildings, non-building area to create air path for better ventilation, etc., in order to minimise any possible adverse impacts on the air ventilation condition in the area.

3.11 In response to a Member’s suggestion in paragraph 3.7(c) above, Ms. Alice Cheung explained that the air flow in the north-south direction would mostly be channelled through Westlands Road. The designation of the south-western corner of the One Island East site as NBA would not have any significant impact on the air flow.

3.12 A Member enquired whether the south-western corner of the One Island East site, which was a suitable location for erecting sculptures or other ornamental features, could still be allowed to do so if the area was designated as NBA. In reply to the Chairperson’s enquiry on the normal practice under lease, Mr. James Merritt said that if the site was held under an unrestrictive lease, one could not rely on the lease to control the erection of structure within the site. On the more general term, Mr. Merritt said that the erection of sculptures within a NBA would normally be allowed.

3.13 Another Member said that as the designation of the south-western corner of the One Island East site as NBA would only marginally improve the air flow in the area, it might not be a sufficiently strong justification to impose such restriction. Instead, consideration should be given to use this part of the site for road widening purpose so as to improve the pedestrian and traffic flow in the area.

3.14 The Chairperson concluded that the south-western corner of the One Island East site would not be designated as NBA.

Two “C/R” sites to the north of Tong Chong Street and to the north of Pan Hoi Street

3.15 Mr. Anthony Loo reiterated TD’s concern on the possible adverse traffic impact on the area as a result of the proposed rezoning of these two sites from “C/R” to “C” which could be developed to a maximum plot ratio of 15. Although it was understood that PlanD would review the plot ratio restrictions of all sites including the two subject sites within the OZP in future, he wondered if the proposed rezoning to “C” with a plot ratio of 15 at this moment would pre-empt the result of the plot ratio review.

3.16 Ms. Phoebe Y.M. Chan clarified that under the current “C/R” zone, the site could be developed either into a residential or a commercial development. A commercial development would be allowed to be developed up to a maximum plot ratio of 15 under the Building (Planning) Regulations. The proposal to rezone the existing “C/R” sites to “R(A)” or “C” was to provide a clear planning intention for more effective infrastructural planning and better land use management. The subject two sites were located within the commercial/office area of Taikoo Place and thus were considered suitable for rezoning to “C” to encourage redevelopment to commercial uses.

3.17 The Chairperson said that under the existing “C/R” zoning, the two sites could still be redeveloped as of right to commercial developments with a plot ratio of 15. Any change in the plot ratio control would need to be supported by strong justifications and relevant technical assessments, in particular Traffic Impact Assessment.

3.18 In response to the Chairperson’s enquiry on the likelihood of redevelopment of the two sites, Ms. Phoebe Y.M. Chan replied that these two sites comprised a total of four

small-scale residential developments with building age of about 40 years. The two buildings within the site at Tong Chong Street were nine storeys in height and the other two buildings within the site at Pan Hoi Street were nine and 25 storeys. Hence, the potential of redevelopment for the site at Tong Chong Street would be relatively higher than the other one at Pan Hai Street.

“G/IC” Site to the south of ‘Woodside’

3.19 Noting SED’s comments that the maximum BH of the site should be eight storeys to cater for standard school design, a Member opined that the building height restriction of the site should not be more than 6 storeys in order to preserve the character of the area and to maintain an open view towards the mountain backdrop. Another Member considered that the proposed maximum BH restriction of 6 storeys was the limit as the development would affect the adjacent historic building ‘Woodside’ and the design of the proposed development should carefully blend in with the surrounding natural environment.

3.20 The Chairperson said that since the site was on three different platforms, the maximum BH restriction of 6 storeys for the site could still achieve a stepped height profile.

3.21 Ms. Phoebe Y.M. Chan said that the site, with an area of about 2.48 ha, was surrounded by luxuriant natural vegetation. Given the large area of the site, there was scope for adopting non-standard school design in future. A photomontage showing an indicative school development envelope of about 10 storeys was shown and Members generally agreed that any tall buildings would be visually intrusive. One Member asked PlanD to explain to SED the need to minimise visual impact on the surrounding area should the site be used for school development in future. The Chairperson said that PlanD had proposed to include a requirement under the Notes of the OZP so that any development on the site would require the submission of layout plan for consideration by the Board so as to ensure compatibility with the surrounding natural green environment and its adjacent Grade II historic building ‘Woodside’.

3.22 A Member enquired whether the site had been designated for school development. Ms. Phoebe Y.M. Chan replied that the site was a piece of Government land reserved for GIC uses to meet future demand and was not committed for a particular use at the moment.

4. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree that :
- (a) subject to paragraph 3.6 above, the amendment to the draft Quarry Bay OZP No. S/H21/24A and its Notes at Attachment I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for exhibition under section 7 of the pre-amended Ordinance, and
  - (b) the revised ES at Attachment III of the Paper should be adopted as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Town Planning Board for the various land use zonings on the Plan and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP under the name of the Town Planning Board.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Phoebe Y.M. Chan, DPO/HK, Mr. Tom C.K. Yip and Ms. Alice Cheung, the AVA Consultant, for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]