Similar s.16 Applications for Commercial Development within the "R(A)" zone on the Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP

Approved Applications

| Application | Location | Date of | Approval |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| No. | | Consideration | Conditions |
| | | (MPC/TPB) | |
| A/H3/153 | 32-36 Hollywood Road, 1-7 Shelley | 23.2.1990 | (1) |
| | Street & 4 Tsun Wing Lane, Central | | |
| A/H3/154 | 98-104A Hollywood Road, 15 Shing | 20.4.1990 | (2) to (4) |
| | Wong Street & 1-27 Bridges Street | | |
| A/H3/177 | 32-36 Hollywood Road, 1-7 Shelley | 21.2.1992 | (5) |
| | Street & 1-4 Tsun Wing Lane | | |
| A/H3/192 | 32-36 Hollywood Road, 1-7 Shelley | 17.11.1992 | (5) |
| | Street & 1-4 Tsun Wing Lane | | |
| A/H3/214 | 348-356 Queen's Road West, Sai Ying | 13.1.1995 | (6) |
| | Pun | | |
| A/H3/221 | 96-116 Hollywood Road, 1-27 Bridges | 24.11.1995 | (7) to (11) |
| | Street & 15 Shing Wong Street | (Review) | |
| A/H3247 | 348-356 Queen's Road West, | 6.9.1996 | (6) |
| A/H3/328 | 3/F to 7/F Kinwick Centre, 32-36 | 26.4.2002 | (12) |
| | Hollywood Road Central | | |
| A/H3/402 | 2-4 Shelley Street, Sheung Wan | 13.7.2012 | (9), (13) to (17) |
| A/H3/432 | 2-4 Shelley Street, Sheung Wan | 7.4.2017 | (13) to (17) |

Approval Conditions

- (1) the south-western boundary of 7 Shelley Street and 4 Tsun Wing Lane should be set back by 1.5m for widening the eastern end of Tsun Wing Lane
- (2) the provision, management, maintenance and dedication for public use of a plaza/open space/amenity area; and an escalator, staircase and a supplementary disabled person lift, as proposed in the application
- (3) the landscaping of the slope as proposed in the application

- (4) the 6 loading/unloading bays proposed to serve the development should be relocated and laid out
- (5) the designed, constructed, managed and maintained of the proposed open space
- (6) the provision of vehicular ingress/egress arrangement
- (7) the diversion of the underground drainage system within the site
- (8) the submission of a sewage disposal proposal
- (9) the submission and implementation of a landscape plan
- (10) the provision, management and maintenance of the pedestrian escalator, the adjacent staircases and the lift for the disabled, as proposed by the applicant
- (11) the provision of stabilisation measure to slopes affected by the proposed development
- (12) the provision of loading/unloading facilities
- (13) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment
- (14) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works
- (15) the implementation of the mitigation measures for loading/unloading activities
- (16) the provision of setback of not less than 1.75m at the lower portion of the building along Shelley Street
- (17) the provision of water supplies for fire-fighting and fire service installations

Rejected Applications

| Application | Location | Date of Consideration | Reasons for |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|
| No. | | (MPC/TPB) | Rejection |
| A/H3/190 | 106-116 Hollywood Road | 6.11.1992 | (1) to (4) |
| A/H3/207 | 348-356 Queen's Road West, Sheung Wan | 9.9.1994 | (1) & (5) |
| | | (Review) | |
| A/H3/211 | 96-116 Hollywood Road, 1-27 Bridges | 16.12.1994 | (1), (2), (4), (6) |
| | Street, 15 Shing Wong Street | | & (7) |
| A/H3/377 | 20-26 Staunton Street, Central 20-26 | 14.3.2008 | (4), (8) to (10) |

| Application | Location | Date of Consideration | Reasons for |
|-------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| No. | | (MPC/TPB) | Rejection |
| | Staunton Street, Central | (Review) | |

Reasons for Rejections:

- (1) the Proposed development would result in adverse traffic impacts
- (2) the proposed office development is not compatible with the predominantly residential character of the area
- (3) there are no strong justifications for nor significant public planning gains from the proposed development
- (4) approval of the proposed development will set an undesirable precedent for similar office developments in the area
- (5) no suitable alterative loading/unloading facilities is proposed in the submission
- (6) the site is not easily accessible by public transport and is far from existing Mass Transit Railway Stations. The location is considered not convenient for office development
- (7) the traffic impact assessment has not satisfactorily addressed the traffic impact generated by the proposed office development on the local road system
- (8) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the "Residential (Group A)" zone. There was no strong justification in the submission to merit a departure from the planning intention
- (9) the proposed development was considered not compatible with the residential nature of the surrounding area. A plot ratio of 15 was also not compatible with the adjoining residential developments in terms of building bulk and development intensity
- (10) the proposed run-in/out and turntable arrangements were unsatisfactory and were not acceptable from the traffic safety and operational points of view

Advisory Clauses

- (a) to note the comments of DLO/HKW&S, LandsD regarding the submission of survey on the site area to the District Survey Office/Hong Kong for verification at building plan submission stage and application for licence to remove the non-offensive trades;
- (b) to note the comments of CBS/HKW, BD regarding the site coverage (SC) of the proposed development, the need to comply with the requirements in PNAP APP-132 and the SBD guidelines stipulated in PNAP APP-151 & 152, and the means of escape arrangement should comply with the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011;
- (c) to note the comment of CE/HK&I, DSD regarding the hydraulic calculations in SIA and that the applicant should bear all costs and undertake improvement/ upgrading works to the existing public sewerage systems for handling additional discharge due to the proposed development;
- (d) to note the comments of D of FS regarding the requirements of EVA as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Building 2011;
- (e) to note the comments of CA/CMD2, ArchSD that the greening ratio of the proposed development should be provided in accordance with PNAP APP-152; and
- (f) to note the comments of CTP/UD&L, PlanD that the applicant should explore and maximise the provision of greening to improve the landscape and visual amenity as far as practical.