

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION
UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

APPLICATION NO. A/SK-CWBN/48

- Applicants** : Clear Water Bay Land Company Limited, Double One Limited and Coastline International Limited represented by Kenneth To and Associates Limited
- Site** : Lots No. 214 RP, 219, 220 s.A, 220 s.B, 220 RP, 224 and 226 and Adjoining Government Land in D.D. 229, Clear Water Bay, Sai Kung
- Site Area** : About 78,561m² (including about 4,647 m² Government Land)
- Lease** : (a) Expire on 30.6.2047
 (b) Lots No. 214RP, 220s.A, 220 S.B and 220RP in D.D. 229:
 restricted for film studio purpose with ancillary office and quarters
 (c) Lots No. 219 and 224 in D.D. 229:
 restricted for housing for staff and employees of the grantee
 (d) Lot 226 in D.D. 229:
 house lot restricted for private residential and viewing theatre purposes
- Plan** : Approved Clear Water Bay Peninsula North Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/SK-CWBN/6
- Zoning** : “Comprehensive Development Area(2)” (“CDA(2)”) with the following restrictions:

Sub-areas	Maximum Plot Ratio (PR)/Gross Floor Area (GFA)		Maximum Site Coverage	Maximum Building Height (BH) (excluding basement(s))	
	Domestic	Non-Domestic		No. of Storeys	BH (m)
Area(a)(i)	PR 1.5	-	35%	8	24
Area(a)(ii)				6	18
Area(a)(iii)				3	9
Area(b)	-	23,720m ² GFA		5	22
Area(c)	4,000m ² GFA			4	12

(Minor relaxation of the above development restrictions may be considered by the Town Planning Board (the Board) on application under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).)

- Application** : Proposed Comprehensive Development for Residential, Commercial (Hotel, Kindergarten, Eating Place and Shop and Services) and Residential Institution Uses with Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio (PR), Gross Floor Area (GFA) and Building Height (BH) restrictions

1. The Proposal

- 1.1 The applicants seek planning approval for a Master Layout Plan (MLP) for proposed comprehensive development with minor relaxation in PR, GFA and BH restrictions at the application site (the Site). The Site falls within an area zoned “CDA(2)” on the approved Clear Water Bay Peninsula North OZP (**Plan A-1**). Pursuant to section 4A(2) of the Ordinance, an applicant for permission for development on land designated “CDA” shall prepare a MLP for the approval of the Board and include the various information as stipulated in the Notes of the OZP for the “CDA” zone.
- 1.2 MLPs for comprehensive development at the Site were previously approved by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) under applications No. A/DPA/SK-CWBN/3 and A/SK-CWBN/33. The approval given under application No. A/DPA/SK-CWBN/3 and its subsequent applications for minor amendments to MLP lapsed on 20.10.2014. The approval under application No. A/SK-CWBN/33 (the 2014 approved scheme) was given by the Committee on 14.11.2014. Application for Extension of Time (EOT) for commencement of the approved development was approved by Director of Planning under the delegated authority of the Board on 6.11.2018, with the validity of the planning permission extended to 14.11.2022.
- 1.3 The current application is submitted by the same applicants of the 2014 approved scheme. As compared with the 2014 approved scheme, the MLP currently submitted involves changes in development layout, PR / GFA, BH and proposed uses. A comparison of the changes in development parameters between the 2014 approved scheme and the current scheme is at **Appendix II**. In the current application, some of the graded historic buildings or part of the buildings at the Site are proposed to be preserved for adaptive reuses. According to the applicants, the amendments to the MLP are made taken into account the gradings of the Shaw Studio Compound and the individual buildings therein, as confirmed by the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) in 2015 and 2016 (**Plan A-2c** and **Appendix III**). A “preservation-cum-development” approach has been adopted in the preparation of the revised MLP, with representative elements from the functional zones¹ of the Shaw Studio Compound preserved (**Plan A-2d**). Details of the proposed scheme under the current MLP (**Plan A-2e**) are as follows.

Area (a)

- 1.4 The applicants propose to develop 14 three to four-storey houses, 10 six-storey duplexes and 14 seven to eleven-storeys towers in Areas (a)(i) and (ii). The Shaw Villa (Grade 2) (photo on **Plan A-4i**) in Area (a)(iii) is proposed to be redeveloped, with part of the façade to be retained in-situ. The resultant domestic PR of the residential development within Area (a) is 1.56² (domestic GFA of 98,948.5m²), which exceeds the maximum domestic PR of 1.5 as stipulated in the OZP by 0.06 (or 4%). Some of the residential buildings are located on the man-made platform at the central part of the Site (**Plan A-2d**), which is a landscape feature proposed to be preserved by the applicants. As compared to the restrictions of the OZP, the

¹ According to the AAB’s Historic Building Appraisal for the Shaw Studio Compound (Appendix VI), the 3 functional zones consists of: (1) Commercial Group; (2) Industrial Centre; and (3) Accommodation Area.

² While the applicants indicate in the application that the proposed domestic PR of Area(a) is 1.64, the actual domestic PR for residential development within Area(a) is 1.56 based on a reduced site area of Area (a) by excluding the right-of-way of 2,703m²

maximum BH increases from 24m to 36.3m (+51.2%) and 8 storeys to 11 storeys (+37.5%) in Area (a)(i), and from 18m to 33m (+83%) and 6 storeys to 10 storeys (+66.7%) in Area (a)(ii). The applicants indicate that stepped BH profile having the tallest buildings in the central north and lower BHs towards the periphery has been proposed.

- 1.5 Part of the Administration Building and the entire Film Store & Dubbing Building (photo on Plans **A-4a** and **A-4b**), which are proposed to be preserved for adaptive reuse as shops, thematic restaurants, gallery/ heritage display area and kindergarten fall within Area (a). The applicants indicate that the non-domestic GFA proposed in Area (a) is about 2,435m².

Area (b)

- 1.6 In Area (b), the applicants propose to convert the existing Shaw House (Nil Grade) (photo on **Plan A-4o**), which is currently a 11-storey office building, into a hotel (with 183 guestrooms) cum retail development. Together with the remaining part of the Administration Building (Grade 1) falling within Area (b), this would result in a non-domestic GFA of about 17,540m². The total non-domestic GFA of 17,540m² proposed within Area (b) is less than the maximum GFA of 23,720m² as restricted on the OZP by 6,180m² (or -26%).

Area (c)

- 1.7 In Area (c), the applicants propose to preserve in-situ the existing Administrative Staff Quarters (Grade 3), Dormitory No. 4 (Grade 2), and Dormitory No. 3 (Grade 2), and reuse as hostel (134 units) for non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The existing Guard House (Grade 3) will also be preserved in-situ, and used as an amenity facility (photos on **Plans A-4c and A-4d**). The total GFA for the hostel development is 8,795m², which exceeds the maximum GFA of 4,000m² for Area (c) (+ 119.9%) on the current OZP.

- 1.8 A comparison table showing the differences in major development restrictions on the OZP and the current proposal is as follows:

	(a) Restrictions in the Approved Clear Water Bay Peninsula North OZP No. S/SK-CWBN/6	(b) Current Scheme No. A/SK-CWBN/48	Difference (b) – (a)
Total Site Area		78,561m²	
Area (a)	-	63,469 m ² (Domestic) - excluding right-of-way of 2,703m ²	-
Area (b)		6,374 m ² (Commercial)	
Area (c)		6,015m ² (Hostel)	
Total GFA		127,718.5m²	
Area (a)	-	98,948.5m ² (Domestic) 2,435m ² (Non-domestic)	-
Area (b)	23,720m ²	17,540m ²	-6,180m ² (-26%)
Area (c)	4,000m ²	8,795m ²	+4,795 (+219.9%)

	(a) Restrictions in the Approved Clear Water Bay Peninsula North OZP No. S/SK-CWBN/6	(b) Current Scheme No. A/SK-CWBN/48	Difference (b) – (a)
Plot Ratio			
Area (a)	1.5 (Domestic)	1.56 (Domestic) (based on reduced site area by excluding the right-of-way)	+0.06 (+4%)
		0.04 (Non-domestic) (based on a reduced site area of Area (a) by excluding the right-of-way of 2,703m ²)	
Area (b)	-	2.75	-
Area (c)	-	1.46	-
Site Coverage	Maximum 35%	Not more than 35%	0
No. of Units	-	Total: 1,066 749 flats 134 hostels 183 hotel guestrooms	-
Building Height	Area (a)(i): 24m	Area (a)(i): 21 to 36.3m	+12.3m (+51.2%)
	Area (a)(ii): 18m	Area(a)(ii): 11.5m to 33m as existing (Admin Building 13.9m, and Film Store & Dubbing 7.2m)	+ 15m (+83%)
	Area (a)(iii): 9m	Area(a)(iii): 9m (Shaw Villa)	0
	Area (b): 22m	Area(b): as existing (Shaw House 37.5m)	N/A
	Area (c): 12m	Area (c): as existing (Dormitory No.3 – 12.2m, No. 4 – 16.8m and Admin Staff Quarters – 16.4m)	N/A
No. of Storeys	Area (a)(i): 8	Area (a)(i): 6 to 11	+3 (+37.5%)
	Area (a)(ii): 6	Area (a)(ii): 3 to 10 as existing (Admin. Building:4, and Film Store & Dubbing: 2)	+4 (+66.7%)
	Area (a)(iii): 3	Area (a)(iii): 2 (Shaw Villa)	-1
	Area (b): 5	Area (b): as existing (Shaw House:11)	0

	(a) Restrictions in the Approved Clear Water Bay Peninsula North OZP No. S/SK-CWBN/6	(b) Current Scheme No. A/SK-CWBN/48	Difference (b) – (a)
	Area (c): 4	Area (c): as existing (Dormitory No. 3 – 4 storeys, No. 4 – 6 storeys, Admin Staff Quarters – 5 storeys)	N/A
No. of Blocks	-	Total: 46 40 (Domestic) 3 (Commercial) 3 (Hostel)	-
Kindergarten	-	3 bi-sessional classrooms	-
Parking Spaces and Loading/ Unloading Bays	-	Private car: 981 residential: 778 retail: 149 ³ hostel: 54 (as existing) Motorcycle : 23 residential: 8 retail: 15 hostel: 0 Loading/unloading Bay: 20 residential: 10 retail: 10 Single-deck tour bus parking space: 1 Lay-by for taxi & private car: 3 Lay-by for school bus: 2	-
Open Space	-	Not less than 10,500 m ² (including the 2,200m ² communal open space serving as a buffer between the proposed development and Silver Bay Garden)	-

1.9 The applicants have submitted a Heritage Assessment Report (**Appendices Ia, Ie and Ig**). Apart from the preservation of the historic buildings in parts of the Site and the central site platform as shown on **Plan A-2d**, the applicants have included in the submitted conservation proposal other preservation elements including providing heritage display and gallery in the preserve Administration Building and Film Store and Dubbing Building for the public to interpret the history of the Site, and organizing tours for visitors for selected units with display and interpretation use. In summary, the applicants propose to preserve 11 out of 18 graded historic buildings in full or in part. A potential heritage park at the area zoned “Open Space” (“O”) on the OZP (**Plan A-2a**) to the immediate southwest of the Site is also proposed. However, it does not form part of the planning application. A

³ Of the 149 private car parking spaces, 69 of them are for the hotel.

summary of the applicants' conservation proposal is at **Appendix IV**.

- 1.10 According to the submitted Tree Survey, there are a total of 887 trees within the Site. 239 trees are proposed to be retained and 23 trees are proposed to be transplanted. The remaining 625 trees are proposed to be felled whilst there will be 900 new trees in the compensatory planting proposal (replanting ratio between felled tree and compensatory tree at 1:1.44). The overall greening of the Site is 30%. The Landscape Master Plan and Tree Recommendation Plan submitted by the applicants are at **Drawings A-6** and **A-7**.
- 1.11 A total of not less than 10,500 m² communal open space is proposed for the exclusive use of future residents. It includes an open space of about 2,200m², serving as a buffer between the southern part of the proposed development and Silver Bay Garden (**Plan A-2a**). A 1.5m wide impeded access for the public is located within the buffer open space and along its boundary with Silver Bay Garden (**Drawing A-6**). The open space framework of the proposed development is at **Drawing A-8**.
- 1.12 To cater for the additional traffic generated by the proposed development, the applicants propose in the submitted Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) improvements works at the junction of Clear Water Bay Road/ Ngan Ying Road and Clear Water Bay Road / Hang Hau Road / Ying Yip Road (**Plan A-2f**). Plans submitted by the applicants showing the road improvement works are at **Drawings A-9** and **A-10**.
- 1.13 According to the Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) submitted by the applicants, on-site sewage pumping facility is proposed to cater for part of the sewage generated by the proposed development. It will be connected to a new rising main for discharge of sewage to the existing sewer at Hang Hau Road. Layout of the proposed sewerage arrangement is at **Drawing A-11**.
- 1.14 According to the applicants, the proposed development will be divided into 3 phases, and they are anticipated to be completed in 2023. The MLP, Section Plans, Landscape Master Plans, Tree Recommendation Plans, Open Space Framework, Junction Improvement Plans, Proposed Sewage Arrangement Layout, Phasing Plan, and photomontages submitted by the applicants are at **Drawings A-1 to A-22**.
- 1.15 In support of the application, the applicants have submitted the following documents:
- | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------|
| (a) | Application Form received on 11.5.2018 | (Appendix I) |
| (b) | Supporting Planning Statement – Volume 1 | (Appendix Ia) |
| (c) | Supporting Planning Statement – Volume 2 | (Appendix Ib) |
| (d) | Supporting Planning Statement – Volume 3 | (Appendix Ic) |
| (e) | Further Information (1) from the applicants received on 16.8.2018 and 20.8.2018 (not exempted from publication) | (Appendix Id) |
| (f) | Further Information (2) from the applicants received on 14.9.2018 (not exempted from publication) | (Appendix Ie) |
| (g) | Further Information (3) from the applicants received on 20.9.2018 (exempted from publication) | (Appendix If) |
| (h) | Further Information (4) from the applicants received on | (Appendix Ig) |

- 16.11.2018 (not exempted from publication)
- (i) Further Information (5) from the applicants received on 30.11.2018 (not exempted from publication) **(Appendix Ih)**
- (j) Further Information (6) from the applicants received on 21.1.2019 & 23.1.2019 (not exempted from publication) **(Appendix Ii)**
- (k) Further Information (7) from the applicants received on 8.3.2019 (exempted from publication) **(Appendix Ij)**
- (l) Further Information (8) from the applicants received on 15.3.2019 (exempted from publication) **(Appendix Ik)**

1.16 On 6.7.2018, 2.11.2018 and 18.1.2019, the Committee agreed to defer its consideration on the application as requested by the applicants for submission of FI. The applicants submitted FIs as indicated in paragraph 1.15 above. The application is scheduled for consideration at this meeting.

2. Justifications from the Applicants

The justifications put forward by the applicants in support of the application are detailed in **Appendices Ia to Ik**, and are summarised as follows:

Well-justified Conservation Proposal for the Shaw Studio

- (a) The historical significance of the Shaw Studio is attributed to its contribution to the success of the film industry in Hong Kong, resulting from its systematic and efficient film production. Members of the AAB opines that a balance should be struck between heritage conservation and development and buildings with higher heritage value in each of the zones of the former Shaw Studio, so as to preserve and demonstrate the workflow of the film production process. The conservation proposal under the current revised MLP covers representative elements from the commercial, industrial and accommodation zones of the former Shaw Studio.
- (b) All of the proposed preservation elements with conservation values have been reflected in the revised MLP, including the in-situ preservation of the selected historic buildings, conserving façade elements and retaining parts of buildings with conservation value. The historic man-made platform at the central part of the Site is also proposed to be preserved in whole in order to upkeep the integrity and authenticity of the Shaw Studio Compound.

Providing Incentives to Conserve Privately-owned Historic Buildings

- (c) In order to encourage private owners to conserve their historic buildings, the Government has adopted the policy on providing economic incentives to private owners to pursue “preservation-cum development” option to incorporate the buildings into future development instead of total demolition. MLPs for redevelopment of the Site without conservation elements have previously been approved by the Board. The current MLP is proposed by the applicants to integrate conservation elements into the current scheme with some development incentives including minor relaxation of development restrictions to facilitate implementation of the comprehensive development.

No Significant Increase in Development Quantum

- (d) The marginal increase in total GFA arises from the in-situ conservation and required works for adaptive reuse of the Accommodation zone. The requested minor relaxation of PR for Area (a) is technical in nature to maintain the approved residential GFA and the incorporation of commercial GFA due to in-situ conservation of Administration Building and Film Store & Dubbing.

Revised Development Strategy and Stepped BH Profile Commensurate to that of the OZP and PB Requirements

- (e) The detailed development requirements laid down in the Planning Brief (PB) were set out without considering the need for heritage conservation. Given the need to preserve the various graded historical buildings, as well as the existing platform levels (including the man-made platform in the centre of the compound), a new private residential development strategy is introduced to best comply with the design criteria of the PB.
- (f) A variety of built form and height is achieved in the proposed development. The 7 to 11-storey apartment blocks are situated at the central northern portion of the compound against buildings of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST)'s Lee Shau Kee Campus that are of a comparable height. The height of the 6-storey duplex blocks have been minimised, and together with the 3 to 4-storey villa / houses situated closest to Ah Kung Wan Road and Clear Water Bay Road to achieve a varied and descending height profile towards the periphery of the Site.

Commensurate to other PB Design Requirements

- (g) To further enhance visual compatibility with the surroundings, the vegetated slopes facing Ah Kung Wan will be reinstated with new trees and preserved trees in order to soften the development edge. Breezeways will also be incorporated to enhance the development's permeability (**Drawing A-1**).
- (h) Various proposed landscape areas are located between various building blocks through the Site, and a buffer open space between the proposed development and Silver Bay Garden has also been proposed.

Continuing to Meet the Prevailing Planning Intention

- (i) The Site has been zoned "CDA(2)" for over a decade for the redevelopment of the obsoleted TV and film studio into a comprehensive residential development. The revised MLP adopts a "preservation-cum development" approach and it is in nature an optimal future planning of the Site to meet planning intention of "CDA(2)" zone.

No Adverse Tree Impact

- (j) According to the revised Tree Survey Report, about 239 existing trees within the Site are to be retained while 23 trees are to be transplanted. A total of 625 trees would be removed, citing structural / health problems and conflict with the proposed development. About 900 new trees would form part of the compensatory planting proposal. The proposed development would accommodate 1,162 trees with a net

gain of 275 trees. There would not be any adverse tree impact at the Site.

No Adverse Traffic Impact

- (k) A TIA has been conducted based on the recent traffic data. Improvement works are proposed at the junctions of Clear Water Bay Road / Ngan Ying Road and the Clear Water Bay Road / Hang Hau Road / Ying Yip Road roundabout (**Drawings A-9 and A-10**). With the implementation of the proposed local junction improvement measures, the junctions will have adequate capacity to cater for the additional traffic flow generated by the proposed development.

No Adverse Visual Impact

- (l) The current scheme has adopted a sensitive BH profile that corresponds to the surrounding context, whilst striking a balance between new developments and the historic conservation strategy for the Site. It has strived to minimise the building mass by adopting a stepped height profile, which clusters taller building blocks in the centre north and with lower building blocks closer to the two peripheries of the Site. This breaks down and minimizes the building mass visible from outside the periphery of the Site. The periphery of the Site also has buffer planting to create a harmonious transition to the low-rise development context surrounding the Site, and tree planting in the core of the development will alleviate the visual impact upon full realization of the various planting proposals. The building gap along the east-west visual corridor has also been widened to further alleviate any adverse visual impact. The Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) concludes that the revised MLP is acceptable from visual perspective.

Deviations from BHR

- (m) Due to conservation of the historic buildings / elements, with some of them retained in-situ at the existing site level, it is not possible to excavate the existing platforms as the 2014 approved scheme. Variation of development platform is hence limited. For the 2014 approved scheme, the varying site platforms were created via extensive excavation, ranging from 5m to 14m in depth. It contradicts with the current conservation requirement. Also, the in-situ preserved historic buildings / feature elements have taken up about 1ha of land within the residential area and about 8 building blocks will be affected. GFA of the affected building blocks have to be reshuffled to the northern and central part of the residential area (i.e. Area (a)) in response to the PB's prescribed height profile.

No Insurmountable Environmental Impact

- (n) Noise mitigation measures in the form of architectural fins are recommended, and as such no road traffic noise exceedance is anticipated. There is an adequate buffer distance between the air sensitive uses within the Site and the surrounding road networks. The chimney identified at the roof of the Cheng Yu Tung Building within the HKUST is well over 200m away. As such, no adverse air quality impact is anticipated. There would be no loss of woodland habitat nearby and no adverse ecological impacts are anticipated during the operation phase. The Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) concludes that the risk from the nearby LPG filling station is acceptable and in compliance with the relevant standards. Construction site run-off and drainage can be suppressed with proper site practice and good site management.

During the operation phase, no adverse water quality impacts from sewage discharge are anticipated with the provision of proper drainage and sewerage systems.

No Insurmountable Drainage and Sewerage Impact

- (o) The stormwater drainage system would follow the existing drainage flow path, with the majority of the stormwater runoff discharging via the stormwater drain leading to Ah Kung Wan via an existing natural stream. As such, the proposed development would not cause any adverse drainage impact.
- (p) Part of the sewerage generated by the proposed development will be conveyed to the existing Ngan Ying Road Sewage Pumping Station and then to the public sewer system. A new pumping facility and rising main will be constructed and maintained by the applicants to convey the remaining sewage to the gravity sewer at the bottom of Hang Hau Road. Downstream sewers will also have adequate capacity for a single development, and the existing sewerage system will not be overloaded. As such, adverse sewerage impacts are not anticipated.

No Insurmountable Geotechnical Impact

- (q) The Geotechnical Impact Assessment (GIA) indicates that the proposed development is feasible in terms of potential geotechnical constraints and no further natural terrain hazard study is required, except for the large fill slopes on the south-eastern boundary that further assessment and upgrading to current slope engineering standard will be undertaken in detailed design stage as agreed during the land exchange.

No Adverse Air Ventilation Impact

- (r) The air ventilation performance of the current MLP is compared with that from the application approved in 2014. The Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) indicates that the current MLP would maintain a comparable wind performance to the scheme approved in 2014 at the pedestrian level and around its immediate vicinity.

3. Compliance with the “Owner’s Consent/Notification” Requirements

Private Land portion

- 3.1 The applicants are the sole “current land owners”. Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members’ inspection.

Government Land portion

- 3.2 For the Government land portion of the Site, the “owner’s consent/notification” requirements as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Satisfying the “Owner’s Consent/Notification” Requirements under Sections 12A and 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 31) is not applicable.

4. Background

- 4.1 The Site was originally zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Film Studio” (“OU(Film Studio)”) on the adopted Clear Water Bay Peninsula North Outline Development Plan (ODP) No. D/SK-CWBN/1. In 2000, the owners of the Site submitted proposals for redevelopment of the Site for residential and commercial uses. Upon consideration of the related proposal and technical assessments, the Site was rezoned to “CDA” on the ODP for comprehensive low-density, low-rise development to complement with the surrounding area. The “CDA” zoning on the ODP generally reflects the development parameters of the redevelopment proposal. Under the “CDA” zoning on the ODP, the is divided into 3 sub-areas, including Area (a) mainly for private residential use, Area (b) for commercial use and Area (c) for residential institution use.
- 4.2 The Site was subsequently zoned as “CDA(2)” on the draft Clear Water Bay Peninsula North Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan No. DPA/SK-CWBN/1, which was gazetted on 22.3.2002. The development restrictions for the “CDA(2)” zone are the same as those stipulated on the ODP. There has been no change to the “CDA” zoning of the Site since the first publication of the draft DPA plan. The zoning of the Site has remained unchanged on the OZP since then.
- 4.3 On 19.9.2003, a PB to facilitate the preparation of MLP for the Site was endorsed by the the Committee (**Appendix V**). According to the PB, in order to blend in with the surrounding areas and to avoid overtaxing the infrastructure provision, the “CDA(2)” zone is divided into three areas for different types of use and development intensities. In order to create an interesting roof-line with different finishing levels, and to avoid inducing adverse visual impact to the surrounding, a stepped height concept corresponding to the existing topography of the Site should be adopted. In this connection, Area (a) is further divided into three sub-areas with different BH restrictions. Other than the above restrictions which has been stipulated on the OZP, the following design criteria are included in the PB:
- (a) there should be variety in the built form and height of individual building blocks, which could be achieved, e.g. through varying the formation levels of individual houses within each sub-area;
 - (b) the number of building blocks attaining 8 storeys in height should not be more than 25% of the total number of residential blocks;
 - (c) housing blocks fronting Clear Water Bay Road should be low-rise and preferably 4 to 5 storeys high (excluding basements);
 - (d) careful consideration should be given to the building facades and disposition of housing blocks facing Ah Kung Wan Road;
 - (e) a strip of land, with a width of not less than 20m along the south-western boundary (about 2,200m² in area) of the Site, should be designated as an open space to serve as a buffer between the proposed development and the Silver Bay Garden; and
 - (f) building blocks should be planned around open space and amenity areas.
- 4.4 On 20.10.2006, the Committee approved the MLP with conditions under planning application No. A/DPA/SK-CWBN/3 for comprehensive residential, commercial and residential institution development at the Site. Amendments to the MLP were subsequently approved by the Committee on 14.11.2014 (application No.

A/SK-CWBN/33) (the 2014 approved scheme). During the publication of planning application No. A/SK-CWBN/33, public comments were received regarding the historic and architectural value of the buildings at the Site. In response, the Commissioner for Heritage's Office, Development Bureau (CHO, DEVB) and the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) advised that preliminary assessment of the heritage value of the buildings at the Site was being conducted before submitting the grading proposal to the AAB for consideration. The application was considered on the basis of the prevailing PB with no particular requirement on heritage conservation and the fact that the buildings at the Site were not graded/proposed graded historic buildings at that time.

- 4.5 Redevelopment of the Site has not yet commenced after the approval of the latest MLP in 2014. AMO subsequently completed assessments of the heritage value of the Shaw Studio Compound and grading was confirmed by AAB on 17.9.2015 and 3.3.2016. The AAB confirms that the whole site of the Shaw Studio Compound is accorded with a Grade 1 status, while the 23 individual buildings within the Shaw Studio Compound are accorded with their own gradings or with nil grading (**Appendix III**).
- 4.6 The development restrictions and design criteria in the PB were stipulated with reference to a redevelopment proposal submitted in 2000 with site level significantly modified and no building preserved for adaptive reuse. With the adoption of the "preservation-cum-development" approach, the existing man-made platform at the centre of the Site and some part of the historic buildings on the platform would be preserved under the current scheme, some of the design criteria set out in the PB, in particular the heights of the buildings, may not be achievable or applicable. Nevertheless, the key guiding design principles including stepped BH profile, variety in built form and height of individual building blocks, careful consideration for building facades and disposition of housing blocks facing Ah Kung Wan Road, low-rise housing blocks fronting Clear Water Bay Road and the provision of buffer open space between the proposed development and the adjacent Silver Bay Garden should be followed.

5. Previous Applications

- 5.1 The Site is the subject of two previous planning applications (No. A/DPA/SK-CWBN/3 and A/SK-CWBN/33) (**Plan A-1**).
- 5.2 Application No. A/DPA/SK-CWBN/3 for proposed comprehensive development for residential, commercial and residential institution at the Site was approved with conditions by the Committee on 20.10.2006. Subsequently, 3 applications (No. A/DPA/SK-CWBN/3-1, No. A/DPA/SK-CWBN/3-3 and No. A/DPA/SK-CWBN/3-4) for minor amendments to the approved MLP and extension of time for commencement of the approved development were approved by the Director of Planning under the delegated authority of the Board on 15.2.2008 (No. A/DPA/SK-CWBN/3-1) and 28.9.2010 (No. A/DPA/SK-CWBN/3-3 and No. A/DPA/SK-CWBN/3-4). The permission given lapsed on 20.10.2014.
- 5.3 Application No. A/SK-CWBN/33 for a revised MLP for Proposed Comprehensive Development with Residential, Commercial and Residential Institution Uses and Minor Relaxation of Development Restrictions at the Site was approved with

conditions by the Committee on 14.11.2014 (the 2014 approved scheme), and is valid until 14.11.2018. The application for the extension of time for commencement of the approved development was approved by the Director of Planning under the delegated authority of the Board on 6.11.2018, with the validity of the planning permission extended to 14.11.2022.

6. **Similar Application**

There is no similar application in the vicinity of the Site.

7. **The Site and Its Surrounding Areas** (Plans A-1 and A-2a, A-2b, aerial photo on Plan A-3 and photos on Plans A-4a to A-4m)

7.1 The Site:

- (a) comprises a number of platforms rising from the south to the east and overlooks Ah Kung Wan;
- (b) is accessible from Clear Water Bay Road via Ngan Ying Road; and
- (c) is mainly occupied by buildings and structures of the Shaw Studio Compound originally used for film studio and TV production. The Shaw Studio Compound has been accorded a Grade 1 status by AAB whilst individual buildings within the Shaw Studio Compound are accorded with gradings as set out in **Appendix III (Plan A-2c)**. At the southwestern part of the Site is the Administration Building (Grade 1), Film Store & Dubbing (Grade 2) and Colour Laboratory (Grade 2). At the eastern tip overlooking Ah Kung Wan is the Shaw Villa (Grade 2) which is a 2 storey house over 2 levels of basement. Located in the west fronting Ngan Ying Road is the 11 storey Shaw House (Nil grade) currently used as an office and for car parking. At the north-western fringe are three blocks of staff quarters (Grades 2 and 3) with building heights ranging from 4 to 6 storeys. The remaining area of the Site is mainly a historic man-made platform at the central part of the Site on which sound stages and other structures previously used for film production (Grades 2 and 3) are located.

7.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:

- (a) adjoining the Site to the north is the HKUST. The nearest building is the Lee Shau Kee Business Building which is 5 storeys with BH of 194.6 mPD;
- (b) to the east and south-east are mainly vegetated slopes within the “Conservation Area” “(CA)” zone, with some low-density residential developments along Ah Kung Wan Road;
- (c) to the immediate south-west is an area zoned “O” which is currently used as a temporary fee-paying public car park. Further to the south-west is a petrol filling station and two rows of low-rise residential developments (including Silver Bay Garden) abutting Clear Water Bay Road; and

- (d) to the west across Ngan Ying Road are low-rise residential developments and the Clear Water Bay School.

8. Planning Intention

- 8.1 The “CDA” zoning is intended for comprehensive development or redevelopment of the area for residential and/or commercial uses with the provision of open space and other supporting facilities. The zoning is to facilitate appropriate planning control over the development mix, scale, design and layout of development, taking account of various environmental, traffic, infrastructure and other constraints.
- 8.2 According to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, the “CDA(2)” site is for the redevelopment of the Shaw Brothers’ Studio (i.e. the Shaw Studio Compound). The Site is divided into 3 sub-areas for different land uses. Area (a) includes the Shaw Villa and the area intended for private residential development. Area (b) is intended for commercial use, and should include a kindergarten to serve the residents. Area (c) is for residential institution use, intended for hostel under central management. A stepped BH profile with the height decreasing from the central part of the Site towards the peripheries should be adopted. To provide flexibility for innovative design, minor relaxation of PR/GFA, SC and BH restrictions may be considered by the Board, with each proposal being considered on its individual planning merits.

9. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

- 9.1 The following government departments have been consulted and their comments are summarised as follows:

Land Administration

- 9.1.1 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Sai Kung, Lands Department (DLO/SK, LandsD):

- (a) the Site would involve/affect:
- (i) private lots including Lots 214 RP, 219, 220 s.A, 220 s.B, 220 RP, 224 and 226 in D.D. 229;
 - (ii) Short Term Tenancy (STT) No. SX4727 let for a public fee-paying carpark. The term of the tenancy is one year certain commencing on 25.6.2015 and thereafter quarterly;
 - (iii) Government Land Licence No.S6601 issued to Shaw Organization Ltd. For filtration tank, L.P. gas and cemented yard purpose;
 - (iv) Government Land Licence No.S11378 issued to Shaw Organization Ltd. For septic tank purpose;

- (v) Licence Agreement No.S/LA/4 replaced by STT granted to Coastline International Ltd. for laying or construction and subsequent maintenance of a foul water pipeline;
- (vi) a right-of-way serving Lots 214RP, 220 s.A, 219 and 224 in D.D. 229; and
- (vii) AM15-0005/B (1) to (18) are demarcated historic buildings. Advice from the AMO on the latest position should be sought.

Land Exchange/Lease Modification applications under processing (new lot nos. 241 and 242)

- (b) regarding the planning application submission of the applicants, it is noted that there are substantial changes in the development parameters (including some heritage items, hotel cum retail etc.) compared to those parameters adopted in the land exchange applications under processing. Thus, a fresh application for proposed land exchange of the concerned lots, with its revised phasing plan mentioned in para.5.6 of the supporting planning statement (**Appendix Ia**), is required. However, please note that there is no guarantee for the approval of the land exchange/lease modification, which may be, if approved, subject to the terms and conditions as the Government may consider appropriate including payment of premium and administrative fee;

Redevelopment in Lot Nos. 219 and 224 in D.D. 229

- (c) it is mentioned in p.14 of the supporting planning statement (**Appendix Ia**) that the dormitory situated within the lots will be conserved in-situ for adaptive reuse as residential institution (hostel or staff quarters). Please note that lots 219 and 224 are “Special Purpose Leases” granted for staff accommodation use subject to “Cessation of User clause”. In this regard, there is no guarantee that these two lots could be used by the applicants when the lots cease to be used for staff accommodation and this would need to be considered separately upon the application for lease modification/land exchange. The applicants should firstly obtain the policy support from the relevant bureau before proceeding with the application;

Right-of-way

- (d) it is noted in para. 4.2.1 of the supporting planning statement (**Appendix Ia**) that the concerned right-of-way area will not form part of the residential development under the revised MLP. Hence, there is no outstanding issue regarding the possible road closure or extinguishment of the ROW; and

Access Road to Shaw Villa

- (e) it is noted from the revised MLP in Figure 5.1 of the supporting planning statement (**Appendix Ia**) that portion of the road leading to Shaw Villa is within the proposed new lot under land exchange. If private agreements between the respective lot owners are involved, there is no assurance that the proposal will be acceptable under the terms and conditions of the proposed land exchange.

Heritage Conservation

9.1.2 Comments of the CHO and AMO, DEVB:

Grading Assessment

- (a) at the meeting on 17.9.2015 and 3.3.2016, the AAB⁴ accorded Grade 1 status to the Site of Shaw Studio Compound as a whole, and various grading for the 23 individual buildings on the Site (18 buildings therein accorded with Grade 1, 2 or 3 status and the remaining five accorded with Nil Grade);
- (b) the heritage value of historic buildings is assessed against six criteria, namely historical interest, architectural merit, group value, social value and local interest, authenticity and rarity;
- (c) in preserving the graded historic buildings, reference should be made to the definition of each grading adopted by the AAB⁴;
- (d) it should be noted that the dual grading status of Shaw Studio Compound (and the buildings therein) is meant to acknowledge the merit of the Site as an integral whole as well as the individual buildings. The relevant historic building appraisal is included in **Appendix VI**;

Heritage Conservation

- (e) as per the prevailing heritage conservation policy promulgated since 2007, the Government recognises the need for economic incentives in order to encourage and facilitate private owners to preserve historic buildings in their ownership. In implementing this policy, a proper balance between preservation of historic buildings and respect for private property rights should be struck;
- (f) taking the views of the AAB into consideration, the heritage value of the Shaw Studio Compound as a whole (mainly on the different functional elements) should be respected and conserved as far as possible. As for the individual buildings, their conservation treatment

⁴ (i) Grade 1 – buildings of outstanding merit, which every effort should be made to preserve if possible;
(ii) Grade 2 – buildings of special merit, efforts should be made to selectively preserve;
(iii) Grade 3 – buildings of some merit, preservation in some form would be desirable and alternative means should be considered if preservation is not practicable;

should be commensurate with their respective grading;

General Comments

- (g) the Shaw Studio Compound comprises three functional zones, i.e. commercial, industrial and accommodation zones. It is noted that in the 2014 approved scheme, there was no heritage element and the historic buildings were proposed to be demolished to make way for redevelopment. Under the revised MLP (October 2018) of the application, 11 out of 18 graded historic buildings are proposed to be preserved and adaptively re-used, in whole or in part, Shaw Studio Compound in order to best represent the heritage value of each of the functional zone within the Compound (i.e. the Commercial Area, Industrial Centre, and Accommodation Area);
- (h) the preservation-cum-development proposal recognises and is commensurate with the heritage value of the Studio and the individual graded historic buildings therein. In particular, the proposed preservation arrangement exemplifies the merits of each functionally distinct zone (i.e. commercial group, industrial centre and accommodation area) that constituted to the Studio Compound as a self-contained entity; demonstrates the organic growth and evolution of the Studio over the years; and honours the overall integrity of the Studio Compound with regard to its systematic and efficient studio operation, where the entire film production process could be done at one site;
- (i) it is noted that the application allows the opening up of the Studio which currently does not provide general public access. For instance, open days and guided tours will be arranged for two buildings, selected units at the dormitories (such as the one resided by the late director Chang Cheh (張徹導演)), and the exterior of the preserved dormitory blocks;
- (j) it is noted that the application seeks to relax some of the development restrictions which are summarized as follows:
 - (i) relaxation of plot ratio of Area (a);
 - (ii) relaxation of the number of storeys of residential blocks in Area (a)(i) and Area (a)(ii), and also the BH;
 - (iii) relaxation of maximum GFA in Area (c) to reflect the existing GFA (and necessary addition and alteration works) of the four preserved historic buildings therein (i.e. Dormitory No. 3, Dormitory No. 4, Administrative Staff Quarters and Guard House), without any proposed new building in sub-area (c);
- (k) under the prevailing heritage conservation policy, as an incentive, it is considered justifiable to support the relatively minor relaxation sought in the application in exchange for the preservation of over half of the graded historic buildings in the Studio Compound. Indeed,

most of the relaxation sought arises from the need to preserve the graded buildings. Therefore in-principle support to the application from the heritage conservation perspective is rendered;

- (l) to facilitate the in-situ preservation of the L-shaped façade of Sound Stage 1 (Grade 2) and portion of the Production Department (Grade 2), the preservation of the man-made platform, formed in 1950s at the centre of the Studio Compound, is also supported from the heritage conservation perspective. The significance of the platform is noted where most of the industrial buildings are situated and is a representative feature of the functional zone within the Studio Compound;
- (m) in anticipation of the extensive changes to the Shaw Studio Compound and those graded historic buildings therein under the development scheme, including alteration works for accommodating new uses and complying with prevailing statutory requirements, from the heritage conservation perspective, a Conservation Management Plan (“CMP”) should be devised and implemented by the owner for proper management of the graded buildings in transition from the Shaw Studio Compound to the new development site. The compilation of CMP should cover, but not limited to, the following aspects, to the satisfaction of AMO prior to commencement of any works:
 - (i) an outline of the conservation approach of the development project;
 - (ii) documentation of the proposed works to the Shaw Studio Compound and the graded historic buildings therein;
 - (iii) evaluation of the impacts of the proposed works on the Shaw Studio Compound and the graded historic buildings therein;
 - (iv) provision of protective measures for the Shaw Studio Compound and the graded historic buildings therein throughout the project period;
 - (v) recommendations of mitigation measures for the Shaw Studio Compound and the graded historic buildings therein for managing the changes arising from the development project;
- (n) from the heritage conservation perspective, the inclusion of a CMP as one of the approval conditions is suggested:
 - (i) the submission of a CMP for the conservation of the Shaw Studio Compound and the graded historic buildings therein prior to commencement of any works and implementation of the CMP to the satisfaction of the AMO or of the Board; and
 - (ii) the submission of a full set of photographic, cartographic, and / or 3D scanning records of the Shaw Studio Compound and

the graded historic buildings therein prior to commencement of works to the satisfaction of the AMO or of the Board.

Traffic

9.1.3 Comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T):

- (a) no objection to the application; and
- (b) the following approval condition is recommended should the application be approved:

the submission of a revised TIA and implementation of the road improvement works proposed therein, at the cost of the applicants to the satisfaction of the C for T or of the Town Planning Board.

Environment

9.1.4 Comments of the Director for Environmental Protection (DEP):

- (a) no objection to the application. It is agreed on the conclusion of the revised EA that no insurmountable environmental impact is anticipated from the proposed development ;
- (b) an approval condition is proposed to require the applicants to submit a Noise Impact Assessment and implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of DEP or of the Board at a later stage; and
- (c) an approval condition is proposed to require the applicants to submit a land contamination assessment and the implementation of the land contamination remediation measures proposed therein prior to the commencement of construction works to the satisfaction of DEP or of the Board at a later stage.

Urban Design and Visual

9.1.5 Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD):

Background

- (a) the Site is situated within a predominantly rural and low-rise low-density setting with residential buildings ranging from 2 to 7 storeys in height in the east, southeast, west and southwest. Adjoining the Site to the north is the HKUST. The Site is currently occupied by the graded Shaw Studio Compound comprises of 23 existing buildings, ranging from 1 to 11 storeys in height, sitting on various man-made platforms, rising from a level of about 134mPD in

the southwest to about 164mPD in the northeast, with a platform of about 154mPD at the centre of the Site ;

- (b) the applicants seek planning permission for proposed comprehensive development for residential commercial and residential institutional uses and minor relaxation of PR, GFA and BH restrictions at the Site which falls within an area zoned “CDA(2)”. The Site is the subject of a previous application No. A/SK-CWBN/33 for similar development approved on 14.11.2014 by the Committee;
- (c) development at the Site is guided by a PB endorsed by the Board on 19.9.2003. According to the PB and the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, the overall planning objective is to redevelop the Site in a comprehensive manner for low-density residential uses with the provision of a local service centre for the Clear Water Bay Peninsula North area. The key guiding design concepts include, inter alia, stepped BH profile with BH descending from the central part of the Site towards the coast and the peripheries, variety in built form and height of individual building blocks through varying the formation levels, careful consideration for building facades and disposition of housing blocks facing Ah Kung Wan Road, low-rise housing blocks fronting Clear Water Bay Road and the provision of buffer open space between the development and the adjacent Silver Bay Garden. It should be noted that the previously approved scheme has largely complied with the development restrictions stipulated under the OZP and was in line with the design concepts as laid down in the PB. At the AAB’s meeting on 17.9.2015, the Shaw Studio Compound as a whole was accorded Grade 1 status. The need to conserve historic buildings was not taken into account in the 2014 approved scheme and the PB. Having reviewed the submissions, observations / comments on the application from urban design and visual impact perspective are as follows:

Urban Design

- (d) the proposed development under the current application involves, inter alia, minor relaxation of PR and BH restrictions to facilitate comprehensive residential and commercial development and the conservation of historic buildings. In view of the Shaw Studio Compound’s historical significance, the existing man-made platforms at the centre and near the south-eastern boundary of the Site (at about 146mPD to 154mPD), which were proposed to be demolished in the approved scheme in response to the requirements of the PB to create a variety in built form and height of individual building blocks through varying the formation levels, have to be preserved. This has resulted in a raised site formation level by about 5m to 14m as compared to the previously approved scheme. As such, substantial changes in layout and disposition of building blocks are required. This would lead to a considerable increase in the overall building bulk of the proposed development. Whilst such layout would have potential visual impact implications and is not entirely in line with the planning and design concepts laid down in the PB, it is

noted that the applicants have provided justifications for this approach and adopted some good design measures including, inter alia, the provision of breezeways / view corridors (**Drawing A-1**), and the creation of stepped BH profile and provision of set back from the southern boundary with a view to create a development that is more compatible with the surrounding development context;

Visual Impact

- (e) the applicants have also proposed various measures with a view to minimising the adverse visual impact of the proposed development. These include, inter alia, preservation of green knoll and existing trees, vertical greening on retaining wall and platform edge, and tree planting at the periphery and in the centre of the proposed development. The applicants have also endeavored to propose the following further mitigation measures to bring about slight improvements to the visual compatibility when viewed from Clear Water Bay Road and Ah Kung Wan Road and address concerns on the proposed development with a view to creating a development that is more harmonious to its surroundings:
 - (i) reduction of the floor-to-floor heights of duplex blocks B1 to B10 from 4.0m to 3.5m, resulting in an overall reduction in BH from 24m to 21m; and
 - (ii) reduction in the number of storeys for T12 from 8 storeys to 7 storeys (or BH reduced by 3.3m) and the increase in the number of storeys for T14 from 9 to 10 storeys (or BH increased by 3.3m); and
- (f) the proposed development would bring about an overall “Moderate Adverse” visual impact (except when viewed from View Points (“VPs”) A and K which are considered “Insubstantial” and “Slight Adverse” respectively) as the development would intrude into the open sky views at various VPs and partially block views to sea and islands at VPs P and Q. However, it is noted that the applicants have proposed the aforementioned mitigation measures and reduced the BH of the various blocks in the current scheme to create a more discernible stepped BH profile that responds to the local topography and surrounding low rise developments. As compared with the approved scheme, the change in visual impact resulting from the current scheme is not substantially different and significant change to the overall visual character of the area is not anticipated.

Landscape

9.1.6 Comments of the CTP/UD&L, PlanD:

- (a) no objection to the application;
- (b) the applicants have clarified in the FI received on 16.11.2018 that

some existing trees along Blocks A1-A14 proposed to be removed are in poor form and health, and whip planting will be implemented to enhance the screening effect. As shown in the revised scheme, the huge platform structure near Block B6-B8 will be softened by proposed terraced planters to echo with the sloping topography;

- (c) should the Board approve the application, the following landscape conditions are recommended to be included in the permission:
 - (i) submission and implementation of the Landscape Master Plan, including the design, provision and maintenance of buffer open space at the south-western boundary of the Site, and provision of screen planting along the north-western and south-eastern boundaries of the Site, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Board; and
- (d) if there is any change in the tree preservation and removal proposal, the applicants should seek comment/advice from relevant government department(s), such as LandsD under lease, as appropriate.

Sewerage

9.1.7 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department (CE/MS, DSD):

- (a) no in-principle objection to the application; and
- (b) the SIA needs to meet the full satisfaction of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD), the planning authority of sewerage infrastructure. DSD's comments on the SIA are subject to views and agreement of EPD.

9.1.8 Comments of the DEP:

- (a) no objection to the application; and
- (b) based on the revised SIA, the applicants have proposed to construct and maintain a new sewage pumping facility within the Site, rising mains and gravity sewers along Clear Water Bay Road and Hang Hau Road. In case this proposal is found to be unviable, the applicants shall construct and operate / maintain an on-site sewage treatment facility which will be subject to licensing control under the Water Pollution Control Ordinance. Approval conditions are proposed to require the applicants to submit an updated SIA and the implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the EPD, DSD and the Board at a later stage;
 - (i) the submission of an updated SIA to the satisfaction of DEP or of the Board;

- (ii) the implementation of new sewage collection system and sewer connection works identified in the updated SIA to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Board.

Drainage

9.1.9 Comments of the CE/MS, DSD:

- (a) no major comment on the Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) submitted;
- (b) the following approval condition is proposed should the application be approved:

submission of a revised DIA and implementation of mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services; and

- (c) for the DIA, section 6.1.4 should be amended to be read as “The existing channel / drain at north west outside catchment A (as shown in Figure A) shall be maintained by the lot owner”. The amendment to section 6.1.4 and “Figure 6 – Green Coverage” should be incorporated into the revised DIA to replace the superseded pages.

Air Ventilation

9.1.10 Comments of the CTP/UD&L, PlanD:

- (a) an AVA Initial Study (“IS”) using computational fluid dynamic modelling has been carried out to support the application. Two scenarios, i.e. the Base Scheme (i.e. 2014 approved scheme) and the current proposed scheme, have been studied. As set out in the AVA IS report, mitigation measures including (i) further break down the building mass facing Ah Kung Wan; (ii) lower the BH of blocks facing Clear Water Bay Road; (iii) stepped BH profile descending from the central north portion towards the periphery; (vi) widen building separation in the central portion of the site to 15m; and (v) better building form and building disposition, have been incorporated in the proposed scheme with the aim to address the potential adverse air ventilation impact induced by the proposed development on the surroundings; and
- (b) according to the simulation results, the overall performances of the base and proposed schemes on pedestrian wind environment are comparable under both annual and summer conditions. It is considered that the proposed scheme would not result in significant adverse air ventilation impact when compared with the base scheme.

Building Matters

9.1.11 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong East & Heritage, Buildings Department (CBS/HKE&H, BD):

- (a) no objection to the application;
- (b) he has the following comments under the Buildings Ordinance (BO):
 - (i) no comment on the proposed development potential provided that the site abuts on a specific street complying with the requirements under Building (Planning) Regulation (B(P)R) 18A(3) and not less than 4.5m wide;
 - (ii) all forms of right-of-way (ROW) and/or internal street within the Site should be deducted from the site area for the purpose of PR and SC calculations under the BO;
 - (iii) emergency vehicular access (EVA) shall be provided in accordance with B(P)R 41D;
 - (iv) the hostels within the proposed development are for domestic use and should be included in domestic PR and SC calculations;
 - (v) under B(P)R 23A, a hotel building or the hotel part of a building may be treated as a non-domestic building for PR and SC calculations and certain supporting facilities may be disregarded from GFA calculation on the condition that the requirements as stipulated in the PNAP APP-40 are complied with;
 - (vi) applicants are reminded to observe the requirements for provision of open spaces for domestic buildings under B(P)R 25;
 - (vii) the existing buildings and historic buildings retained within the Site are accountable for GFA and SC calculations under the BO;
 - (viii) subject to satisfactory design of the car parks under PNAP APP-2 and PNAP APP-111 and no adverse comments from other concerned departments, application for 50% GFA concessions for the above ground private car parks will be favourably considered upon building plan submission stage;
 - (ix) as the Site comprises several lots, when these lots are divided from parent site for building development, these lots should be individually and independently assessed afresh under site clarification and computation of PR and SC;

- (x) if the applicants intend to apply for GFA exemptions for the green/amenity features and non-mandatory/non-essential plant room, compliance with prerequisites and the sustainable building design guidelines as stipulated in PNAP APP-151 and 152 are required;
 - (xi) the excessive high headroom of the proposed houses shall be justified. The CBS/HKE&H, BD hereby reserves his comments under B(P)R 23(3)(a);
 - (xii) detailed comments on the compliance with BO will be given in the building plan submission stage;
- (c) the Site is subject to a discussion of extinguishing the existing ROW over government land granted to Lots 219 and 224 in D.D. 229 and the said area to be included under new Lot 242 in D.D. 229 as site area. The extinguishment of such ROW may cause the existing buildings and future developments on these lots contravene the BO; and
 - (d) detailed substantiations on site constraints and environmental impacts for GFA exemption of the proposed car parks above mean street level but below the existing formation level shall be provided during building plan submission for consideration by the Building Authority. There is no conclusion in this respect at this stage. The applicants' attention is drawn to the requirements / guidelines given in PNAP APP-2.

Fire Safety

9.1.12 Comments of the Director of Fire Services (D of FS):

- (a) he has no in-principle objection to the application, subject to fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of his department;
- (b) EVA arrangement shall comply with Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 administered by Buildings Department; and
- (c) detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans.

Water Supply

9.1.13 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/Construction, WSD):

- (a) no comment on the application from water supply point of view;

- (b) existing water mains might be affected. The applicants are required to either divert or protect the water mains found on Site:
- (i) if diversion is required, existing water mains inside the Site are needed to be diverted outside the site boundary of the proposed development to lie on government land. A strip of land of minimum 1.5 metres in width should be provided for the diversion of the existing water mains. The cost of diversion of existing water mains upon request will have to be borne by the applicants, and the applicants shall submit all the relevant proposals to WSD for consideration and agreement before the works commence;
 - (ii) if diversion is not required, the following conditions shall apply:
 - a. existing water mains are affected and no development which requires resitting of water mains will be allowed;
 - b. details of site formation works shall be submitted to the Director of Water Supplies (DWS) for approval prior to commencement of works;
 - c. no structures shall be built or materials stored within 1.5 metres from the centre lines of water mains. Free access shall be made available at all times for staff of the DWS or their contractor to carry out construction, inspection, operation, maintenance and repair works;
 - d. no trees or shrubs with penetrating roots may be planted within the Waterworks Reserve or in the vicinity of the water mains. No change of existing site condition may be undertaken within the aforesaid area without the prior agreement of the DWS. Rigid root barriers may be required if the clear distance between the proposed tree and the pipe is 2.5 metres or less, and the barrier must extend below the invert level of the pipe;
 - e. no planting or obstruction of any kind except turfing shall be permitted within the space of 1.5 metres around the cover of any valve or within a distance of 1 metre from any hydrant outlet; and
 - f. tree planting may be prohibited in the event that DWS considers that there is any likelihood of damage being caused to water mains.

Public Hygiene

9.1.14 Comments of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH):

if any Food and Environmental Hygiene Department's (FEHD) facility is affected by the development, FEHD's prior consent must be obtained. Reprovisioning of the affected facilities by the project proponent up to the satisfaction of FEHD may be required. The project proponent should provide sufficient amount of additional recurrent cost for management and maintenance of the reprovisioned facilities to FEHD. Besides, if FEHD is requested to provide household refuse collection services for the future residential flats, design of the refuse collection point(s) provided should be acceptable to FEHD.

District Officer's Views

9.1.15 Comments of the District Officer/Sai Kung, Home Affairs Department (DO/SK, HAD):

- (a) no objection to the application; and
- (b) DC member of Hang Hau East Constituency (Q04) and Chairman of Hang Hau Rural Committee hold no objection but were concerned on the increased traffic demand.

9.2 The following government departments have no comment on/objection to the application:

- (a) Chief Highway Engineer/NT East, Highways Department (CHE/NTE, HyD);
- (b) Chief Engineer/Consultants Management, Drainage Services Department (CE/CM, DSD);
- (c) Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC);
- (d) Project Manager (East), Civil Engineering and Development Department (PM(E), CEDD);
- (e) Secretary for Education (S for E);
- (f) Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department (CE (Works), HAD);
- (g) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS);and
- (h) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (H(GEO), CEDD).

10. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period

10.1 On 18.5.2018, 28.8.2018, 21.9.2018, 27.11.2018, 11.12.2018 and 29.1.2019, the application and the FIs published for public inspection. During the statutory public inspection periods, a total of ten public comments were received (**Appendix VII**).

10.2 The Incorporated Owners (2) and residents of Silver Bay Garden (1) as well as individual members of the public (6 of which 4 were made by the same

commenter) object to / raise concern on the application on the following grounds:

- (a) the proposed development would overstrain traffic condition that roads and traffic infrastructures are not adequate to accommodate the development;
- (b) the proposed development must reserve a buffer area between Silver Bay Garden and the Site which also incorporates sufficient greening initiatives. The interface should be permeable, and the open space should be accessible by Silver Bay Garden residents. The proposed 1.5m wide access should be reflected on the MLP.
- (c) the proposed scheme is substantial in building bulk and height, and the increase in BH would cause adverse visual and air ventilation impacts;
- (d) the preservation of graded buildings does not show respect for the tangible and intangible culture of the Site;
- (e) the construction phase of the proposed development will render adverse traffic, air pollution and noise impacts;
- (f) the open space design is undesirable. The landscaping proposal is insufficient in preserving the existing trees, which should be protected and preserved;
- (g) Silver Bay Garden residents will no longer be able to use the temporary car park upon development of the southern corner of the Site and the “O” site for heritage park;
- (h) the proposed development should not adversely affect the maintenance access of Silver Bay Garden’s sewerage facilities nearby; and
- (i) emergency vehicular access to Silver Bay Garden may be adversely affected.

10.3 An individual member of the public comments that the proposed development should make reference to the Murray House and Tai Kwun projects. The Shaw Studio Compound should be developed as a cultural centre endowed with various uses such as shops, restaurants, hostels, and hotel.

11. Planning Considerations and Assessments

11.1 The application is for comprehensive redevelopment of the Site covering the Shaw Studio Compound zoned “CDA(2)” on the OZP. The applicants propose in the current application to amend the approved MLP (Application No. A/SK-CWBN/33) to facilitate the adoption of the “preservation-cum-development” approach so that representative elements of the Shaw Studio Compound can be preserved. The applicants also seek minor relaxation of development restrictions, including (i) minor relaxation of domestic PR restriction for Area (a) from 1.5 as stipulated in the Notes of the “CDA(2)” zone to 1.56 and inclusion of non-domestic GFA of 2,435m² in Area (a); (ii) minor relaxation of GFA restriction for Area (c) from 4,000m² as stipulated in the

Notes of the “CDA(2)” zone to 8,795m², and (iii) minor relaxation of BH restrictions for residential use in Area (a).

- 11.2 The planning intention of the “CDA(2)” zone is for comprehensive development / redevelopment of the area for residential and / or commercial uses with the provision of open space and other supporting facilities. The zoning is to facilitate appropriate planning control over the development mix, scale, design and layout of development, taking account of various environmental, traffic infrastructure and other constraints. Under this zoning, the Site is divided into 3 sub-areas for different land uses with different PR / GFA and BH restrictions. A PB has been prepared to facilitate preparation of MLP for the Site (**Appendix V**). MLPs for comprehensive redevelopment of the Site were previously approved by the Committee during 2006 to 2014. The latest MLP was approved on 14.11.2014 and the validity was extended to 14.11.2022 (i.e. 2014 approved scheme). The 2014 approved scheme largely follows the development restrictions and design design criteria as stipulated in the PB.
- 11.3 However, the PB was prepared before the grading of the Shaw Studio Compound and the individual buildings by AAB and as such, there was no consideration on any preservation elements in the PB. With the adoption of the “preservation-cum-development” approach in redeveloping the Site as claimed by the applicants, the existing man-made platform at the central part of the Site and some parts of the historic buildings on the platform would be preserved under the current scheme. Some of the design criteria, in particular the heights of the buildings as stipulated in the PB may not be achievable or applicable.
- 11.4 While the current MLP would result in some deviations in the design criteria as stipulated in the PB, the applicants have provided justifications that the changes are arising mainly from the initiative to preserve the historic buildings and to facilitate the adoption of the ‘preservation-cum-development’ approach. Efforts have been made to formulate a scheme with good design measures to commensurate with the surrounding environment. The key design criteria stipulated in the PB including the stepped BH profile, variety in built form and height of individual building blocks, careful consideration for building facades and disposition of housing blocks facing Ah Kung Wan Road, low-rise housing blocks fronting Clear Water Bay Road and the provision of buffer open space between the proposed development and the adjacent Silver Bay Garden have been followed. Besides, technical requirements under the PB have largely been met.

Heritage Conservation

- 11.5 The Shaw Studio Compound was accorded Grade 1 status and the individual buildings within the Site were accorded various grading as set out in **Appendix III** by the AAB on 17.9.2015 and 3.3.2016. CHO and AMO of DEVB advise that the dual grading status of Shaw Studio Compound and the buildings therein is meant to acknowledge the merit of the Site as an integral whole as well as the individual buildings. Taking the views of the AAB into consideration, the heritage value of the Shaw Studio Compound as a whole should be respected and conserved as far as possible. The current proposal is an initiative to adopt a ‘preservation-cum-development’ approach to develop the Site which is privately owned and put some of the historic buildings into active uses. In this proposal, more than half of the graded historic buildings (11 out of 18) would be

wholly/partly conserved, including Administration Building, Film Store and Dubbing, Dormitories No. 3 and No.4, Administration Staff Quarters and Guard House to be conserved in-situ and partial facades of Sound Stage I, Colour Laboratory, Costume Store and Production Department to be conserved and integrated with the development (**Plan A-2d**). The man-made platform located in the centre of the Site on which the industrial centre, where most of the film making process had taken place, of the Shaw Studio Compound is located is also to be preserved in whole. The application allows the opening up of the Shaw Studio Compound which currently does not provide general public access. Open days and guided tours will also be arranged for part of the buildings. CHO and AMO of DEVB appreciate the efforts made by the applicants to take into account the heritage value in adopting the ‘preservation-cum-development’ approach when developing the Site. They advise that the application recognises and is commensurate with the heritage value of the Shaw Studio Compound and individual graded historic buildings therein. In particular, the proposed preservation arrangement exemplifies the merits of each functionally distinct zones (i.e. commercial group, industrial centre and accommodation area) that constituted to the Shaw Studio Compound as a self-contained entity; demonstrates the organic growth and evolution of the Shaw Studio Compound over the years; and honours the overall integrity of the Shaw Studio Compound with regard to its systematic and efficient studio operation, where the entire film production process could be done at one site. The initiative is in line with the heritage conservation policy of the Government and in-principle support to the application from the heritage conservation perspective is rendered.

Minor Relaxation of PR Restriction for Area (a)

- 11.6 Under the current OZP, there is restriction on domestic PR within Area (a) of not exceeding 1.5 (equivalent to GFA of 99,258m²). The currently proposed domestic GFA of 98,948.5m² is in fact less than the permissible domestic GFA under the Notes of the “CDA(2)” zone and the 2014 approved scheme. The proposed relaxation of PR from 1.5 to 1.56 is in fact a result of the exclusion of the right-of-way (2,703m²) from site area calculation, and is considered technical in nature.

Inclusion of Non-domestic GFA in Area (a)

- 11.7 Under the revised MLP, a total non-domestic GFA of 19,975m² is proposed for commercial use through the conservation of the existing Shaw House (Nil Grade) for hotel-cum-retail use, and in-situ preservation of the Administration Building (Grade 1) and Film Store and Dubbing (Grade 2) for adaptive reuse for shops, thematic restaurants, gallery / heritage display area and a kindergarten. Of the total proposed non-domestic GFA of 19,975m², 17,540m² is to be provided within Area (b) (which is less than the permissible non-domestic GFA of 23,720m² within Area (b) under the Notes of the “CDA(2)” zone). The remaining non-domestic GFA of 2,435m² is to be provided within Area (a) as a result of the preservation of the Administration Building (Grade 1) and Film Store and Dubbing (Grade 2) for commercial uses.

Minor Relaxation of GFA Restriction for Area (c)

- 11.8 Under the current MLP, the Administrative Staff Quarters (Grade 3) and two Dormitory buildings (Grade 2) and the Guard House (Grade 3) are proposed to be preserved for hostel use of NGOs and amenity facility. As a result, the GFA to be provided in Area (c) will be increase from 4,000m² as stipulated in the Notes of the “CDA(2)” zone to 8,795m² (+ 4,795m² or about 220%).
- 11.9 The change in non-domestic GFA in Areas (a) and (b) and increase in GFA in Area (c) would allow the in-situ preservation of the historic buildings and hence allowing public access to them. CHO and AMO of DEVB point out that as per the prevailing heritage conservation policy promulgated since 2007, the Government recognizes the need for economic incentives in order to encourage and facilitate private owners to preserve historic buildings in their ownership with a view to striking a balance between preservation of historic buildings and respect for private property rights. In this regard, the effort undertaken by the applicants to preserve the graded historic buildings is appreciated.

Relaxation of BH Restrictions

- 11.10 The Site is located along Clearwater Bay Road. To the immediate north is the Lee Shau Kee Campus of HKUST. The Lee Shau Kee Business Building, HKUST Jockey Club Institute for Advanced Study Lo Ka Chung Building, and the Li Dak Sum Yip Yio Chin Kenneth Li Conference Lodge of HKUST are to the immediate northeast of the Site, with BH of about 194.63mPD, 194.6mPD and 187mPD respectively (**Plan A-2b**). To the south, east and west of the Site are low-rise residential developments of 3 storeys in height.
- 11.11 The current MLP involves minor relaxation of maximum BH restrictions from 24m to 36.3m (+51.2%) / 8 storeys to 11 storeys (+3 storeys/+37.5%) in Area (a)(i); and from 18m to 33m (+83%) / 6 to 10 storeys (+4 storeys/+66.7%) in Area (a)(ii). According to the current MLP, the BH descends from 11 storeys (191.1mPD) in the central north to the peripheral areas comprising mainly buildings not exceeding 6 storeys (158.05mPD to 167.55mPD). About 26 % of the building blocks attain 8 storeys or above. As illustrated in the photomontages of the submitted VIA, there will be moderate adverse visual impact at some public viewpoints with mitigation measures proposed (**Drawings A14, A15 and A17 to 22**).
- 11.12 According to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP for the “CDA(2)” zone, to provide flexibility for innovative design adapted to the characteristics of particular sites, minor relaxation of BH restrictions may be considered, and each proposal will be considered on its individual planning merits. The proposed minor relaxation of BH is mainly to allow design flexibility in the current scheme to preserve the historic buildings and the representative features within the Shaw Studio Compound.
- 11.13 The applicants claim in the application that in view of the Shaw Studio Compound’s historical significance, the existing man-made platform at the centre and near the south-eastern border of the Site (at about 146mPD to 154mPD) (**Plan A-2d**), which was proposed to be demolished in the 2014 approved scheme in response to the requirements of the PB to create a variety in built form and height

of individual building blocks through varying the formation levels, have to be preserved. This has resulted in a raised site formation level by about 5m to 14m as compared to the 2014 approved scheme. As such, substantial changes in layout and disposition of building blocks are required. This would also lead to a considerable increase in the overall building heights of the proposed development. CTP/UD&L advises that whilst such layout would have potential visual impact implications and is not entirely in line with the planning and design concepts laid down in the PB, the applicants have provided justifications for this approach and adopted some good design measures including, inter alia, the provision of breezeways / view corridors, and the creation of stepped BH profile and provision of set back from the southern boundary with a view to create a development that is more compatible with the surrounding development context (**Drawing A-1**).

- 11.14 The applicants have also proposed various measures to minimize adverse visual impact, to improve visual compatibility and to create a development that is more harmonious to its surroundings. These include preservation of green knoll and existing trees, vertical greening on retaining wall and platform edge, and tree planting at the periphery and in the centre of the proposed development. CTP/UD&L advises that when compared with the 2014 approved scheme, the change in visual impact resulting from the current scheme is not substantially different and significant change to the overall visual character of the area is not anticipated.
- 11.15 CHO and AMO of DEVB supports the preservation of the man-made platform noting the significance of the platform where most of the industrial buildings are situated and is a representative feature of the functional zone within the Shaw Studio Compound.

Landscape

- 11.16 The proposed development as shown on the MLP largely conforms with the landscape requirements in the PB in that buildings are planned around the central landscape area and an open space serving as a buffer between the southern part of the development and the Silver Bay Garden is provided. Of the total 887 trees within the Site, the applicants propose to retain 239 trees and transplant 23 trees. Planting of 900 new trees are proposed to compensate the loss of 625 trees (**Drawings A-5 to A-7**). The overall greening ratio is 30%. CTP/UD&L has no objection to the application and suggests approval conditions in relation to Landscape Master Plan, buffer open space and screen planting as detailed in paragraph 12 below.

Air Ventilation

- 11.17 Although the proposal will bring about increase in maximum BH, the site coverage of the proposed development remains at not exceeding 35%. Mitigation measures including breaking down of building mass facing Ah Kung Wan, lowering the BH of blocks facing Clear Water Bay Road, stepped BH profile and widening building separation in the central portion of the Site, and better building form and building disposition, have been incorporated. The AVA submitted by the applicants demonstrates that proposed scheme would not result in significant adverse air ventilation impact when compared with the 2014 approved scheme. CTP/UD&L has no adverse comment on the conclusion of the AVA report.

Other Technical Aspects

11.18 The applicants have in the previous application (No. A/SK-CWBN/33) demonstrated that there would be no insurmountable problems in terms of environment, traffic, water supply, drainage, sewerage and risk aspects for comprehensive development at the Site of similar scale. For the current application, updated technical assessments including EA, TIA, DIA, SIA and QRA have been submitted and they are acceptable by the relevant government departments. In particular, traffic improvement measures are proposed at two junctions along Clear Water Bay Road in view of the anticipated traffic growth and recent traffic conditions (**Drawings A-9** and **A-10**). Relevant approval conditions are suggested in paragraph 12 below.

Public Comments

11.19 Regarding public concerns on the traffic capacity, historic values of the buildings within the Site and possible adverse impacts arising from the proposed development, the planning assessments as detailed in paragraphs 11.4 to 11.18 above are relevant. For the concern of Silver Bay Garden Residents on access to the buffer area, a 1.5m wide access is proposed and shown on the LMP submitted by the applicants (**Drawing A-6**). For the concerns on provision of car park, the provision of public car park could be considered within the “O” site upon development of the planned open space.

12. Planning Department’s Views

12.1 Based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 above and having taken into account all public comments in paragraph 10 above, the Planning Department has no objection to the application.

12.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 22.3.2023, and after the said date, the permission shall cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted is commenced or the permission is renewed. Should the application be approved, the following approval conditions and advisory clauses are suggested for Members’ reference:

12.3 Approval Conditions

- (a) the submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan (MLP), taking into account approval conditions (b) to (l) below, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Board;
- (b) the submission and implementation of the Landscape Master Plan, including the design, provision and maintenance of buffer open space at the south-western boundary of the Site, and provision of screen planting along the north-western and south-eastern boundaries of the Site, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Board;
- (c) the submission and implementation of a development programme of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of

the Board;

- (d) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Board;
- (e) the submission of a revised Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) and implementation of the road improvement works proposed therein, at the cost of the applicants, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Board;
- (f) the submission of a land contamination assessment and the implementation of the land contamination remediation measures proposed therein prior to the commencement of construction works to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Board;
- (g) the submission of a Noise Impact Assessment and implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Board;
- (h) the submission of an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Board;
- (i) the implementation of new sewage collection system and sewer connection works identified in the updated SIA to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Board;
- (j) the submission of a revised Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) and implementation of mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Board;
- (k) the submission of a CMP for the conservation of the Shaw Studio Compound and the graded historic buildings therein prior to the commencement of any works and implementation of the CMP to the satisfaction of the AMO or of the Board; and
- (l) the submission of a full set of photographic, cartographic, and / or 3D scanning records of the Shaw Studio Compound and the graded historic buildings therein prior to commencement of works to the satisfaction of the AMO or of the Board.

12.4 Advisory Clauses

The advisory clauses at **Appendix VIII** are suggested for Members' reference.

12.5 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, Members are invited to consider the following reasons for rejection:

- (a) the proposed relaxations of plot ratio and building height restrictions are considered not minor in nature; and
- (b) the proposed building heights of the proposed development is not in keeping with the character of the surrounding developments and would result in

visual intrusion to the area.

13. Decision Sought

- 13.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to grant or refuse to grant permission.
- 13.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, Members are invited to consider the approval condition(s) and advisory clauses to be attached to the permission, and the date when the validity of the permission should expire.
- 13.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, Members are invited to advise what reasons for rejection should be given to the applicants.

14. Attachments

Appendix I	Application Form received on 11.5.2018
Appendix Ia	Supporting Planning Statement – Volume 1
Appendix Ib	Supporting Planning Statement – Volume 2
Appendix Ic	Supporting Planning Statement – Volume 3
Appendix Id	Further Information (1) from the applicants received on 16.8.2018 & 20.8.2018 (not exempted from publication)
Appendix Ie	Further Information (2) from the applicants received on 14.9.2018 (not exempted from publication)
Appendix If	Further Information (3) from the applicants received on 20.9.2018 (exempted from publication)
Appendix Ig	Further Information (4) from the applicants received on 16.11.2018 (not exempted from publication)
Appendix Ih	Further Information (5) from the applicants received on 30.11.2018 (not exempted from publication)
Appendix Ii	Further Information (6) from the applicants received on 21.1.2019 & 23.1.2019 (not exempted from publication)
Appendix Ij	Further Information (7) from the applicants received on 8.3.2019 (exempted from publication)
Appendix Ik	Further Information (8) from the applicants received on 15.3.2019 (exempted from publication)
Appendix II	Comparison between the parameters of planning application A/SK-CWBN/33 and A/SK-CWBN/48
Appendix III	Grading for individual buildings in Shaw Studio Compound
Appendix IV	Summary of the applicants' conservation proposals
Appendix V	Planning Brief for Redevelopment of the Shaw Brothers' Studio Site, Clear Water Bay, Sai Kung
Appendix VI	Historic building appraisal
Appendix VII	Public Comments
Appendix VIII	Advisory clauses
Drawing A-1	Previous and Current Master Layout Plan
Drawings A-2 to A4	Section plans
Drawing A-5	Comparison of approved and current Landscape Master Plan
Drawing A-6	Current Landscape Master Plans
Drawing A-7	Comparison of approved and current Tree Recommendation Plan

Drawing A-8	Open Space Framework
Drawing A-9	Proposed junction improvement works at Clear Water Bay Road / Ngan Ying Road
Drawing A-10	Proposed junction improvement works at Clear Water Bay Road / Hang Hau Road / Ying Yip Road roundabout
Drawing A-11	Sewerage arrangement layout plan
Drawing A-12	Phasing plan
Drawings A-13 to A-22	Photomontages
Plan A-1	Location Plan
Plan A-2a	Site Plan
Plan A-2b	Viewing point of Site Photos
Plan A-2c	Location of graded historic buildings
Plan A-2d	Preservation proposal of graded historic buildings
Plan A-2e	Proposed development on sub-areas
Plan A-2f	Location of junctions proposed for improvement works
Plan A-3	Aerial Photo
Plans A-4a to 4o	Site Photos

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
MARCH 2019**