



圖例
NOTATION

ZONES		地帶
COMMERCIAL	C	商業
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	R(A)	住宅 (甲類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	R(B)	住宅 (乙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	R(C)	住宅 (丙類)
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	GIC	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	O	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	OU	其他指定用途
GREEN BELT	GB	綠化地帶
COMMUNICATIONS		交通
RAILWAY AND STATION (UNDERGROUND)	RAIL STATION	鐵路及車站 (地下)
MAJOR ROAD AND JUNCTION	MAJOR ROAD	主要道路及路口
ELEVATED ROAD	ELEVATED ROAD	高架道路
MISCELLANEOUS		其他
BOUNDARY OF PLANNING SCHEME	BOUNDARY OF PLANNING SCHEME	規劃範圍界線
BUILDING HEIGHT CONTROL ZONE BOUNDARY	BUILDING HEIGHT CONTROL ZONE BOUNDARY	建築物高度管制區界線
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN METRES ABOVE PRINCIPAL DATUM)	MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN METRES ABOVE PRINCIPAL DATUM)	最高建築物高度 (在主水平基準上若干米)
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN NUMBER OF STOREYS)	MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN NUMBER OF STOREYS)	最高建築物高度 (層數目)
PETROL FILLING STATION	P F S	加油站
NON-BUILDING AREA	NBA	非建築用地

土地用途及面積一覽表
SCHEDULE OF USES AND AREAS

USES	大約面積及百分比 APPROXIMATE AREA & %		用途
	公頃 HECTARES	% 百分比	
COMMERCIAL	2.84	2.06	商業
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	5.55	4.10	住宅 (甲類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	15.40	11.19	住宅 (乙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	17.83	12.95	住宅 (丙類)
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	13.48	9.79	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	9.34	6.78	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	34.74	25.23	其他指定用途
GREEN BELT	20.60	14.96	綠化地帶
MAJOR ROAD ETC.	17.80	12.94	主要道路等
TOTAL PLANNING SCHEME AREA	137.68	100.00	規劃範圍總面積

夾附的《註釋》屬這份圖則的一部分，
現經修訂並按照城市規劃條例第5條展示。
THE ATTACHED NOTES ALSO FORM PART OF THIS PLAN
AND HAVE BEEN AMENDED FOR EXHIBITION UNDER
SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

核准圖編號 S/H 7/19 的修訂
AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/H7/19

AMENDMENTS EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE	按照城市規劃條例第5條 展示的修訂
AMENDMENT ITEM A	修訂項目 A 項
AMENDMENT ITEM B	修訂項目 B 項

(參看附表)
(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

2019年5月24日 按照城市規劃條例第5條展示的
核准圖編號 S/H7/19 的修訂
AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/H7/19 EXHIBITED
UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE ON
24 MAY 2019

Fiona LUNG 龍小玉
SECRETARY 城市規劃委員會秘書
TOWN PLANNING BOARD

香港城市規劃委員會依據城市規劃條例擬備的黃泥涌 (港島規劃區第7區) 分區計劃大綱圖
TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE, HONG KONG TOWN PLANNING BOARD
HONG KONG PLANNING AREA No. 7 - WONG NAI CHUNG - OUTLINE ZONING PLAN



規劃署遵照城市規劃委員會指示擬備
PREPARED BY THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT UNDER
THE DIRECTION OF THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD

圖則編號
PLAN No. S/H7/20

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO
THE APPROVED WONG NAI CHUNG OUTLINE ZONING PLAN
NO. S/H7/19
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan

Item A – Rezoning of the northern and eastern part of the Caroline Hill Road (CHR) Site fronting Leighton Road from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sports and Recreation Club” (“OU (SRC)”) and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Commercial (2)” (“C (2)”) with revision to the maximum building height from 2 storeys and 3 storeys to 135mPD.

Item B – Rezoning of the southern part of the CHR Site from “G/IC” to “G/IC (2)” with revision to the maximum building height from 3 storeys to 135mPD.

II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (a) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the “C” zone to stipulate the restriction on gross floor area and the requirements regarding the provision of Government, institution or community facilities and a public open space for the “C(2)” sub-zone.
- (b) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the “G/IC” zone to stipulation the restriction on gross floor area for the “G/IC(2)” sub-zone.
- (c) Deletion of ‘Market’ from Column 1 of the Notes for the “Commercial” zone, and from Column 2 in the Notes for the “Residential (Group B)” zone, and revision of ‘Shop and Services’ to ‘Shop and Services (not elsewhere specified)’ in Column 2 in the Notes for the “Residential (Group A)” and “G/IC” zones.

Town Planning Board

24 May 2019

[The Vice-chairman thanked Ms Katy C.W. Fung, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[The Chairman returned to the meeting and resumed the chairmanship at this point.]

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon returned and Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H7/19

(MPC Paper No.1/19)

16. The Secretary reported that the rezoning site was located in Wong Nai Chung. The following Members had declared interests on the item :

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - his parents co-owning a flat at The Leighton Hill in Causeway Bay; |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law | - co-owning with spouse a flat on Ventris Road in Happy Valley; and ; |
| Mr. Martin W.C. Kwan | - close relative owning a flat in Causeway Bay. |

17. The Committee noted that Mr. Martin W.C. Kwan had not yet returned to the meeting. As the properties co-owned by Mr Alex T.H. Lai's parents and Ms Lilian S.K. Law and her spouse had no direct view of the rezoning site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

18. The following government representatives and consultants were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr Louis K.H. Kau	- District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), PlanD;
Mr Anthony K.O. Luk	- Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), PlanD;
Ms Fiona H.Y. Fong	- Senior Engineer/Wan Chai, Transport Department (SE/Wan Chai, TD) (Atg.);
Mr Wai Hong Chan	- Senior District Engineer/General(2), Highways Department (Sr Dist Engr/G(2), HyD);
Mr Chi Kin Wan	- Dist Engr/G(2)B, HyD;
Mr Charles So	- Executive Director/Traffic and Transport Planning, AECOM; and
Mr Charis Wong	- Senior Engineer/Traffic and Transport Planning, AECOM.

19. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, STP/HK, to brief Members on the Paper. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

Background

- (a) to make good use of government land in the core business district and to meet the long-term needs of District Court-level judicial facilities, a site at the junction of Caroline Hill Road (CHR) and Leighton Road (the CHR Site) was proposed for commercial development and a District Court comprising the District Courts, Family Courts and Lands Tribunal;

The Proposed Amendments to the OZP

- (b) Amendment Item A- it was proposed to rezone a site (about 1.60ha) bounded by Leighton Road to the north, CHR on the east and west and the ex-EMSD Headquarters to the south from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sports and Recreation Club” (“OU(SRC)”) and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) with a maximum building height (BH) of 2 and 3 storeys respectively to “Commercial (2)” (“C(2)”) with a maximum BH of 135mPD and maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 100,000m²;
- (c) Amendment Item B- it was proposed to rezone a site (about 1.06ha) located to the north of the South China Athletic Association and abutting CHR (West) from “G/IC” with a maximum BH of 3 storeys to “G/IC(2)” with a maximum BH of 135mPD and maximum GFA of 70,000m²;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP

- (d) corresponding revisions to the Notes were made in respect of “C” and “G/IC” zones to incorporate the respective development restriction, and to follow the revised set of Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans;

Technical Assessments

- (e) various technical assessments had been conducted which demonstrated that the proposed developments would not induce unacceptable impact to the local area in terms of traffic, environmental, visual, air ventilation and landscape aspects;
- (f) according to the Traffic Review, the proposed developments would not generate unacceptable traffic impact after implementation of the proposed road junction improvement works. Part of the CHR Site would be used for the proposed road junction improvement works and provision of a new access connecting CHR(East) and (West);
- (g) relevant government departments had no adverse comments on the proposed amendments;

Provision of Government, Institution or Community (G/IC) facilities and Open Space

- (h) based on a planned population of about 185,000 persons, there was no shortfall on major GIC facilities in the area. A public open space of not less than 6,000m² had been proposed within the “C(2)” site; and

Consultation with Wan Chai District Council (WCDC)

- (i) WCDC had been consulted on 8.5.2018 and 8.1.2019. Majority of the WCDC members objected to the proposed amendments primarily on the traffic ground. Some members considered that commercial development should not be provided in the CHR Site and some members considered that more Government, Institution or Community (GIC) facilities, e.g. civic centre and Residential Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE), should be provided. In response to WCDC’s suggestion and after consultation with relevant government departments, one District Health Centre (DHC) and one Child Care Centre (CCC) were proposed to be provided within the “C(2)” site .

[Dr Frankie Yeung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Commercial and District Court Use

20. Members in general agreed to the proposed uses of the CHR Site for commercial development and District Court noting that the Site was located at the fringe of the core commercial and business areas of Causeway Bay. A Member said that given some existing court facilities had been ageing over years, the District Court proposal comprising the District Courts, Family Courts and Lands Tribunal at the CHR Site should be supported.

Scale of Development

21. Regarding a Member’s observation on the proposed plot ratio (PR) of 6.6 for the “G/IC(2)” site which was comparatively low in the district, Mr Louis K.H. Kau explained that based on the Judiciary’s advice, a total GFA of 70,000m² and a site area of about

10,000m² would be required for the District Court, the resulting PR the proposed development was 6.6. Given the nature and operational requirement of the District Court, no other public facilities were proposed for co-location. Mr Kau further explained that the development intensity of the CHR Site as a whole was proposed with due regard to the carrying capacity of the local road network. Based on the findings of the Traffic Review, the maximum GFA of the whole CHR Site was capped at 170,000m². With 70,000m² GFA set aside for the District Court, a maximum GFA of 100,000m² would then be available for commercial development, which was equivalent to a PR of 11.17. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Kau clarified that the 100,000m² GFA also included the GFA of GIC and public transport facilities, while underground public car park could be exempted from GFA calculation under the relevant joint practice note of concerned government departments.

Traffic Impact

22. A Member raised concern on the possible traffic impact arising from the proposed CCC and asked if adequate lay-by spaces would be provided to avoid tailing back of traffic to Leighton Road or adjoining areas. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the Transport Department had required provision of a minimum of seven pick up/drop-off spaces in the commercial development. In response to a Member's question regarding the types of public transport facilities to be included in the project, Mr Kau said that public transport facilities, including 125 public car parking spaces and a potential minibus terminus, would be provided within the commercial development. Besides, improvement works for road junction, pedestrian footpath and crossing facilities were proposed to mitigate traffic impact induced by the proposed development as well as improving the existing traffic conditions.

23. Some Members asked if weaving movement had been taken into account in undertaking the Traffic Review. Mr Charles So, Executive Director/Traffic and Transport Planning of AECOM explained that congestions related to weaving movements had been observed at CHR westbound. In order to reduce lane-changing manoeuvres, provision of a dedicated left-turning traffic lane at the westbound of Leighton Road and Hoi Ping Road junction and modification of the existing priority junction at west of CHR Site into a roundabout-like circulation had been proposed. A Member queried if the proposed traffic improvement measures would be effective in alleviating traffic congestion on CHR westbound. Mr So further explained that in improving the existing traffic conditions on

CHR westbound, modification of the left-turn lane to “left-turn and right-turn” shared lane at the northbound of Leighton Road and Hoi Ping Road junction would reduce the need to change-lane for right-turn. In addition, by setting back into the CHR Site, an extra lane would be provided on CHR westbound. The traffic impact would be minimized after implementation of the proposed road junction improvement works.

Pedestrian Circulation

24. A Member pointed out that most of the proposed pedestrian improvement measures were concentrated on Leighton Road and questioned if the proposed commercial development would pose impacts on the pedestrian circulation on Hoi Ping Road which had a very high pedestrian flow currently. He asked if there would be other mitigation measures to facilitate pedestrian circulation. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that the feasibility of an underground pedestrian network extended from MTR Station to various sites in Causeway Bay, including CHR Site, was explored under a study conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). In this regard, the future developer of the commercial site would be required to reserve an underground opening for the possible pedestrian connection to MTR Station and this requirement would be incorporated into the land sale conditions. In response to a Member’s further enquiry about the estimated time of completing the study for the subject pedestrian connection, Mr Kau said that a feasibility study had commenced this year and was targeted to be completed by 2020.

Provision of GIC Facilities

25. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the services provided by a DHC, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that as announced in the Chief Executive’s Policy Address 2017, DHC would be set up in each district with a view to enhancing public awareness of disease prevention and their capability in self-management of health, to promote awareness of the importance of primary healthcare services, to improve service accessibility, to provide support for the chronically ill as well as relieve the pressure on specialist and hospital services. Key services of DHC included primary, secondary and tertiary prevention services which focused on provision of counselling services, health promotion and educational programmes as well as health assessment and screening and chronic diseases screening and management service. In this connection, reference could be drawn from the pilot DHC in Kwai Tsing.

26. A Member asked if future developer would have to meet any design and locational requirements in the provision of GIC facilities at the commercial site. Mr Louis K.H. Kau responded that the developer would have to fulfil the specifications in providing the DHC and CCC to the satisfaction of the concerned government departments and this requirement would be incorporated in the land sale conditions.

27. A Member further queried if leisure facilities for the elderly could be incorporated in association with the DHC to provide a more comprehensive service for the elderly. Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that DHC was under the policy purview of the Food and Health Bureau and the provision of facilities within the DHC was still under study. Detailed scope of services would be submitted to WCDC for consultation and Member's suggestion would be conveyed to concerned department accordingly. The same Member said that the provision of DHC and CCC within the commercial development in the CHR Site was supported but there should be more information on how to set priority in providing the various types of GIC facilities.

28. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether the existing sports facilities at the CHR site would be reprovided, Mr Kau said that the existing facilities at the ex-Post Office Recreation Club and the PCCW Recreation Club were not public facilities and their reprovisioning would not be required.

29. A Member observed that WCDC had expressed the need for a civic centre and would like to know if the CHR Site could accommodate a civic centre instead. Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that WCDC's proposal for Moreton Terrace Activities Centre would provide an additional performance and activity venue to serve local community. It had recently secured funding from the Legislative Council. Besides, according to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), civic centre was planned on a district-wide basis and the current provision of civic centres on the Hong Kong Island was considered sufficient.

Visual impacts and Air Ventilation

30. With reference to the photomontages from the view of Sharp Street East and Victoria Park (Plans F and H in Attachment VI of the Paper), a Member pointed out that the existing visual gaps would be blocked by the developments at the CHR Site. This Member

asked if it was possible to adjust the disposition of the buildings to minimize its impact on visual permeability, and the justifications for positioning the District Court building at the southern portion. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that the conceptual layout shown in Plan 5 of the paper had been drawn up to illustrate the feasibility of accommodating the planned uses and served as the basis for carrying out various technical assessments. The exact building disposition and the detailed layout would be subject to future design at the implementation stage. The proposed building gaps of 25m and 20m shown in the conceptual scheme, and the new access road together with the open space fronting Leighton Road were to retain visual permeability through the CHR Site, break up the building mass of the proposed developments and improve air ventilation. According to the visual impact assessment and the photomontages prepared for the conceptual scheme, the proposed development would not have any significant adverse visual effects in overall terms. Given the site constraints, impairment to visual permeability at some particular viewpoints was inevitable.

Landscape

31. Some Members appreciated the conservation of the two Old and Valuable Trees (OVTs) but found the OVT within the “G/IC(2)” site detached and isolated. They pointed out that the proposed arrangement would downgrade the value of the OVT and leaving it as a pure exhibit. Some Members asked if it was possible to make adjustment to the layout to integrate the proposed open space with this OVT. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that the building footprint, need for a new access road and security requirements of the District Court had imposed constraints on the use of space around the OVT.

32. Apart from the two OVTs being conserved in-situ, a Member considered the fruit trees within/along the north-western periphery of the CHR Site were worth preserving for education and sentimental values. Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that due to the proposed traffic improvement works on CHR, a number of existing trees would be unavoidably affected. In this connection, the project proponent and the developer were required to follow the corresponding Design Guidelines of the Development Bureau and the Practice Notes of the Lands Administration Office respectively to minimise the impact of the proposed developments on the existing trees as far as possible and provide appropriate landscape measures as well as feasible tree protection and compensatory planting proposals. The

future developer would be required to submit a Landscape Proposal and the requirement of which would be incorporated into the future land sale conditions.

33. A Member asked if flexibility would be allowed for future developer to adopt innovative ways to revitalize the stone retaining walls. By referring to Plan 5 in the Paper, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that while some sections of the stone retaining wall would be affected by proposed traffic improvement works, three sections of the stone retaining walls would be preserved. The future developer would be required to meet the technical requirements as advised by the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) during the course of conservation. Regarding a Member's enquiry on the historical value of the stone retaining walls, Mr Kau said the stone retaining walls were estimated to be constructed during the 1930s while their historical value was still subject to assessment by AMO in accordance with its priorities of work. The decision to conserve the selected sections of the stone retaining walls was a result from public consultation on the CHR site over the years, including WDCD in 2018 and 2019. Although the OVT located on Leighton Road did not grow on the stone retaining walls, it was in close proximity and as such, the associated section of stone retaining walls would be preserved to maintain its integrity. AMO had been engaged and consulted in the course of preparing the conceptual layout for the CHR Site.

Conceptual Layout

34. In response to a Member's question, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that the open space, as indicated under the conceptual layout plan, would be designed, implemented and managed by the future developer of the commercial site. In this connection, the future developer was required to follow the design and management requirements under the guidelines on "Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines" promulgated by the Development Bureau. Generally speaking, the public open space had to be opened to the general public at reasonable hours with easy access. If the future developer wished to carry out commercial activities on the public open space, they had to apply for a waiver and/or permission, as appropriate, from the Lands Department and/or the Buildings Department. A Member questioned whether the location of the public open space at the southeast corner of the CHR site was appropriate having regard to the location of the OVTs and the local open spaces in the vicinity. Another Member also suggested relocating the open space from southeast to southwest corner to enhance public accessibility. Mr Louis

K.H. Kau explained that the disposition of the District Court at the westbound of CHR was to meet the District Court's design requirement where a minimum site area of 10,000m² and two ingress/egress points were necessary for the operational needs of the Judiciary. The design requirement of the Judiciary might not be fulfilled if part of the District Court site had to be set aside for public open space. Moreover, land uses along eastbound of CHR were mainly residential and designating the open space at southeast corner of the site could benefit the local residents. Notwithstanding the above, Mr Kau pointed out that the building disposition and layout would be subject to detailed design at the implementation stage.

35. Some Members further suggested that consideration could be given to swap the proposed locations of the commercial development and the District Court. Mr Louis K.H. Kau explained that disposition of the District Court at the southeast portion was to meet the requirements of the Judiciary for two ingress/egress points were necessary for its operational needs. The current location of the District Court could allow for ingress/egress on the interval road directly connecting to the lower ground level, loading/unloading and parking area. In response to a Member's question, Mr Kau said the Correctional Services Department had been consulted and its requirement had been incorporated into the conceptual layout. The Chairman explained that Members were invited to agree on the proposed rezoning of the "C(2)" and "G/IC(2)" sites on the OZP. The conceptual development scheme was drawn up to illustrate the possible layout and served as the basis for carrying out various technical assessments only. The detailed layout on the individual sites would be subject to future design and users' requirements at the implementation stage.

36. Some members had reservation on the proposed boundary of the "C(2)" and "G/IC(2)" zones demarcated on the OZP, in particular, with regard to the location of the public open spaces within the commercial development. A member reiterated that consideration should be given to enhance the connection to the open space network within the district to facilitate pedestrian circulation and accessibility.

Conclusion

37. To sum up, the Chairman concluded that Members agreed to the proposed uses and development intensity of the CHR Site for commercial development and the District Court. However, Members required more information on justifications for the conceptual

layout and disposition of the building blocks, open space network and pedestrian connectivity within and outside the site before making a decision on the proposed rezoning of the “C(2)” and “G/IC(2)” sites on the OZP. Members also requested for additional information on the choice and government's priority of GIC facilities to be provided in the proposed “C(2)” site.

38. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to defer the consideration of the proposed amendments to the approved Wong Nai Chung OZP pending submission of further information set out in paragraph 37 above.

39. The Chairman thanked the government representatives and consultants for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan returned to the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 7

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Further Consideration of Proposed Amendments to the Approved Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H7/19

(MPC Paper No.5/19)

25. The Secretary reported that the rezoning site was located in Wong Nai Chung and AECOM Asia Company Ltd. (AECOM) was the consultant for the proposed amendments. The following Members had declared interests on the item :

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - his firm having current business dealings with AECOM and his parents co-owning a flat at The Leighton Hill in Causeway Bay; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - having current business dealings with AECOM; |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - having past business dealings with AECOM; |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law | - co-owning with spouse a flat on Ventris Road in Happy Valley; and |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan | - his close relative owning a flat in Causeway Bay. |

26. The Committee noted that Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan had not yet returned to join the meeting. As the properties co-owned by Ms Lilian S.K. Law and her spouse had no direct view of the rezoning site, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

27. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main

points :

Background

- (a) on 8.3.2019, the Committee considered the proposed amendments to the approved Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H/19, which were to facilitate the proposed District Court and commercial development at the site at the junction of Caroline Hill Road and Leighton Road (the CHR site);
- (b) at the meeting, the Committee generally agreed with land use zonings, development density, public facilities and provision of local open space, but decided to defer the consideration of the proposed amendments to the OZP and requested more information be provided regarding the justifications for the locations of District Court and commercial development, block disposition in connection with the locations of the public open space, pedestrian connectivity within and outside the CHR site and Government's priority of providing various social welfare facilities at the commercial site;

Further Information in Response to Members' Concerns

Justifications for the Locations of District Court and Commercial Development

- (c) locating the commercial development at the southern portion fronting Leighton Road was a natural extension of the "Commercial" zone from the commercial core of Causeway Bay; and as public facilities were proposed to be provided at the commercial site, a more central location was preferred. Moreover, swapping the District Court site with the commercial site would not fully meet the functional and operational requirements of the Judiciary and might hamper pedestrian connection between Causeway Bay commercial core area and the proposed commercial development;

Block Disposition

- (d) the disposition, layout and detailed design of the site would be worked out at the detailed design stage. A possible design option of swapping the

building blocks of the District Court had been explored to address Members' concern on providing a larger set back from CHR (West);

Pedestrian Connectivity

- (e) the pedestrians in the Caroline Hill area mainly relied on at-grade footpaths and pedestrian crossings to/from the core area of Causeway Bay, MTR Station and public transport facilities. The future developer of the commercial site would be required to reserve an underground opening within the development for possible pedestrian connection to MTR Station which was subject to further feasibility study;

Provision of Government, Institution or Community (GIC) Facilities

- (f) based on a planned population of about 185,000 persons, there was no shortfall on major GIC facilities in the area. A District Health Centre (DHC) and Child Care Centre (CCC), together with other public facilities, would be provided within the commercial site. For the Residential Care Home for the Elderly as suggested by the Wan Chai District Council (WCDC), there was a deficit in the district and multi-pronged approaches would be adopted to increase its provision. Given the location of the CHR site and the demand for health and child care service in the district, priority had been given to the development of DHC and CCC; and

Public Consultation

- (g) on 9.4.2019, the Development, Planning and Transport Committee (DPTC) of WCDC passed a motion demanding abandonment of the subject proposed amendment item until further consultation with WCDC and the public. WCDC was consulted twice in 2018 and 2019, and would be further consulted during the exhibition period of the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/20 for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Pedestrian Connectivity

28. In response to a Member's enquiry on the pedestrian connection between Yun Ping Road and the CHR site, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that although widening of pedestrian waiting zone at the junction of Leighton Road/Yun Ping Road/Pennington Street/CHR (East) was not feasible due to space constraints, improvement work for increasing the green traffic signal time for pedestrians crossing Leighton Road at that junction was proposed.

29. A Member asked whether the possible underground pedestrian connection would provide a direct connection between the CHR site and MTR Station. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the feasibility of an underground pedestrian subway connecting the MTR Station to CHR Site would be explored under a study conducted by the Highways Department. The two possible alignment options of the underground pedestrian subway, subject to further feasibility study, would run from the MTR Station, via Pennington Street or Sunning Road, to the CHR site. In this regard, the future developer of the commercial site would be required to reserve an underground opening within the proposed development for the possible pedestrian connection to MTR Station and such requirement would be incorporated into the land sale conditions.

30. Noting the pedestrian crossing outside Po Leung Kuk would be removed, a Member pointed out that residents from Happy Valley had been using the said pedestrian crossing to Causeway Bay for a long time. The Member was of a view that more considerations should be given to the pattern of pedestrian movement when contemplating any new measures for pedestrian crossing.

31. A Member further added that the pedestrian crossings at the junction of Leighton Road/Yun Ping Road/Pennington Street/CHR (East) and outside Po Leung Kuk were essential for linking the CHR site and the surrounding developments. The Member considered that upon implementation of the underground pedestrian subway from MTR Station, the pedestrian connectivity would be largely improved and the reliance on at-grade pedestrian facilities would also be reduced.

32. A Member suggested that an elevated pedestrian connection at the northern part

of the commercial site could be provided between the proposed open space in south-eastern part of the site and the commercial tower as there was a significant level difference between the proposed open space and the new access road. The Member also suggested that a requirement for submission of a Master Layout Plan could be incorporated in the lease so as to ensure the accessibility and connectivity for pedestrians.

Landscape

33. A Member sought clarification on whether the Old and Valuable Tree (OVT) would be isolated by the proposed buildings and a retaining structure at the District Court site as shown on Plans 8 and 9 of the Paper. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the Judiciary was further consulted and an alternative design option was explored to allow more open area around the OVT. Due to security reason and operational needs, the landscape area together with the OVT would not serve as public open space. Regarding the retaining structure, Mr Kau explained that as the existing OVT was at a higher level (about 15mPD) while the proposed new access road would be at a lower level, a retaining structure was therefore required. In response to the Member's further enquiry on the location of the OVT, Mr Kau explained that the tree shown on Plan 9 of the Paper was not the OVT. The plan was simply a conceptual illustration to show the visual impacts of the proposed development.

34. Noting that the fruit tree at the western periphery of the CHR site might be affected by the proposed road improvement works, a Member pointed out that the fruit tree was worth preserving for educational and sentimental value. The Chairman supplemented that the relevant government departments would consider the appropriate measures such as tree preservation or transplanting of the affected trees at the detailed design stage of the road improvement works.

Block Disposition

35. A Member asked whether the design of the proposed development would take into account the comments raised by Members or to be received from the public during the exhibition period of the draft OZP. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that design flexibility should be allowed for the layout of the proposed development, but if Members considered it appropriate, some requirements could further be incorporated in the Explanatory

Statement (ES) of the OZP or the conditions of lease.

36. Referring to the previous conceptual layout plan as shown on Plan FC-3 of the Paper, a Member suggested that District Court Block 1 could be rotated, say by 90 degrees, and set back from the new access road so as to allow more open areas between the proposed open space and the OVT. The Member also considered that more innovative building design should be adopted for the building blocks of the District Court. While appreciating the revised block disposition as shown in the conceptual layout, another Member shared the view that the disposition of the building blocks could be further enhanced to provide more open areas near the OVT, as well as improving air ventilation at the District Court site.

Visual Impacts and Air Ventilation

37. Noting the Visual Appraisal and Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) were prepared based on the conceptual scheme, a Member sought clarification on whether technical assessments would be prepared in the detailed design stage. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that some design elements incorporated in the conceptual scheme were recommended in the findings of the AVA. If the future developer of the commercial site and the project proponent of the District Court decided not to follow the recommended design elements, they would need to demonstrate with a quantitative AVA that the impacts of their latest schemes would not be worse-off than the conceptual scheme. Such requirement had been included in the ES of the OZP and would be incorporated in the relevant land documents.

Public Consultation

38. In response to a Member's enquiry about the motion passed by DPTC of WCDC demanding abandonment of the subject proposed amendment item, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the Development Bureau issued a letter to WCDC on 29.4.2019, to explain that comments from WCDC members were considered by the Planning Department and relevant government departments. On 8.1.2019, WCDC was further consulted on the revised development proposal. Majority of the WCDC members supported the provision of DHC and CCC but had a general concern on the traffic impacts of the proposed development at the CHR site. In addition, the findings of the relevant technical assessments were made

available to the WCDC members during the consultation and for public inspection after the last submission to the Committee on 8.3.2019. The Government had endeavoured to address local concern through the two DC consultations. Upon the Committee's agreement on the proposed amendments, WCDC would be further consulted during the exhibition period of the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/20 (draft OZP) for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance.

39. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, explained that DPTC of WCDC held a scheduled meeting on 9.4.2019. It was not a meeting held for consultation on the proposed amendments to the Wong Nai Chung OZP.

Others

40. In response to a Member's question on how to ensure a better coordination of the proposed developments at the CHR site, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the future developer would be required to design and construct a new access road within the CHR site connecting eastern and western sections of CHR to serve both the District Court and the commercial development. A close liaison between the relevant parties and government departments would be maintained with a view to devising and taking forward the proposed developments in this regard. Moreover, the design of the later phase of the developments at the CHR site should take into account the findings of the AVA in respect of early phase of the developments at the site. The Chairman supplemented that land uses and major development parameters were set out in the OZP while some detailed design requirements were included in the ES of the OZP to guide the future developments at the CHR site.

41. A Member expressed concern regarding the use of public open space in private development and queried whether there was any measure to improve the accessibility. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the future developer was required to follow the requirements under the guidelines on "Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines" promulgated by the Development Bureau.

42. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the Environment Bureau was mapping out the long-term strategy for waste recycling in urban area. There was no information on the waste recycling strategy for the CHR site at hand.

The Chairman suggested that Dr. Sunny C.W. Cheung, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment), Environmental Protection Department, might provide supplementary information in respect of the territorial waste recycling strategy for Members' information after the meeting.

Conclusion

43. To sum up, the Chairman concluded that Members generally agreed to the proposed uses and development intensity of the CHR site for commercial development and the District Court and noted that some good design concepts had been stipulated in the ES of the OZP to guide the future developments while allow flexibility at the detailed design stage. Some Members expressed concerns on the two pedestrian crossings at the junction of Leighton Road/Yun Ping Road/Pennington Street/CHR (East) and on Link Road and suggested the concerned government department should further explore other possible improvement works to enhance the pedestrian connectivity to the CHR site, while not adversely affecting the traffic condition in the area. Alternative design concepts should also be explored to provide more open areas surrounding the OVT at the proposed District Court site.

44. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Wong Nai Chung OZP and that the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/19A at Attachment II in F-Appendix I (to be renumbered to S/H7/20 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III in F-Appendix I were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment IV in F-Appendix I for the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/19A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP. ”

45. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if

appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revision would be submitted for the Board's consideration.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Brian C.L. Chau, TP/HK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan returned to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 8

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Further Consideration of Proposed Amendments to the Approved Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H15/33
(MPC Paper No.6/19)

46. The Secretary reported that the rezoning site was located in Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau and one of the consultants for the proposed amendments was AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM). The following Members had declared interests on this item:

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - his firm having current business dealings with AECOM; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - having current business dealings with AECOM; |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - having past business dealings with AECOM; and |
| Ms. Daisy Wong | - her spouse owning a flat and car parking space in Wong Chuk Hang. |

47. The Committee noted that Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr. Franklin Yu had no involvement in the amendment items and the properties owned by Ms. Daisy Wong's spouse had no direct view of the rezoning site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

(Translation)

**Minutes of the 16th Meeting of the 5th Wan Chai District Council
Hong Kong Special Administrative Region**

Date: 8 May 2018 (Tuesday)
Time: 2:30 p.m.
Venue: District Council Conference Room, Wan Chai District Office,
21/F Southorn Centre, 130 Hennessy Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong

Present

Chairperson

Mr NG Kam-chun, Stephen, BBS, MH, JP

Vice-chairperson

Dr CHOW Kit-bing, Jennifer, BBS, MH

Members

Ms NG Yuen-ting, Yolanda, MH
Mr LEE Man-lung, Joey
Ms LEE Kwun-yee, Kenny, MH
Ms LEE Pik-yee, Peggy
Mr LAM Wai-man, Wind, Anson
Mr WONG Wang-tai, Ivan, MH
Miss YEUNG Suet-ying, Clarisse
Mr CHENG Ki-kin
Dr TANG King-yung, Anna, BBS, MH
The Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Ms CHUNG Ka-man, Jacqueline

Representatives of Core Government Departments

Mr CHAN Tin-chu, Rick, JP	District Officer (Wan Chai), Home Affairs Department
Miss LAU Hei-yue, Hayley	Assistant District Officer (Wan Chai), Home Affairs Department
Ms CHAN Siu-ping, Daphne	Senior Liaison Officer (Community Affairs), Home Affairs Department
Mr TSE Kwok-wai	District Commander (Wan Chai District), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr CHAN Kit-fung	Police Community Relations Officer (Wan Chai)

	District), Hong Kong Police Force
Ms CHAN Sin-nga	Assistant Division Commander (Operations) (North Point), Hong Kong Police Force
Miss YIP Hau-yu, Hannah	District Social Welfare Officer (Eastern & Wan Chai), Social Welfare Department
Ms YUNG Chi-wai, Esther	Chief Engineer/South 4, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms WONG Wai-ching, Daisy	District Lands Officer/HKE (District Lands Office, Hong Kong East), Lands Department
Mr LUK Chi-kwong	Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong East), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms LEE Pui-ling, Becky	District Leisure Manager (Wan Chai), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr LAU Chi-keung	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Wan Chai), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Mr CHAN Chi-pong, Steven	Senior Transport Officer/Wan Chai, Transport Department

Representatives of Other Government Departments and Organisations

Dr CHEUNG Tin-cheung, JP	Director of Buildings	} for agenda item 1
Mr KWAN Sun-kau, Victor	Senior Building Surveyor, Buildings Department	
Ms WONG Fung-sang, Mandy	Administrative Assistant/Director of Buildings, Buildings Department	
Mr KAU Kin-hong, Louis	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department	} for agenda item 3
Mr LUK Kwok-on, Anthony	Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong 3, Planning Department	
Ms FONG Hau-yin, Fiona	Engineer/Wan Chai 1, Transport Department	
Mr CHAN Chak-wing	Acting District Engineer/Peak, Highways Department	
Mr CHAN Wai-hong	Senior District Engineer/General(2), Highways Department	
Mr WAN Chi-kin	District Engineer/General(2)B, Highways Department	} for agenda items 3 and 4
Mr WU Kin-kwok, Eddy	Senior Engineer/Wan Chai, Transport Department	
Mr LAU Ka-hei	Associate, AECOM Asia Company Limited	

Mr MA Hon-wing, Wilson	Chief Engineer/South 3, Civil Engineering and Development Department	}	for agenda item 4
Mr WONG Chi-leung	Senior Engineer/7 (South), Civil Engineering and Development Department		
Mr LEE Hon	Engineer/11 (South), Civil Engineering and Development Department		
Mr CHAN Tai-chi	Senior Engineer 1/Central Wanchai Bypass, Highways Department		
Ms LI Oi-yin, Yanny	Senior Engineer/Shatin to Central Link (6), Highways Department		
Mr Francis LEONG	Executive Director, AECOM Asia Company Limited		
Mr Jacob TSUI	Senior Resident Engineer, AECOM Asia Company Limited	}	for agenda item 5
Mr William CHAN	Liaison Engineer I, MTR Corporation Limited		
Ms LEUNG Chung-yan, Juan	Member, Women's Commission		
Mr CHAU Kwan-yat, Edwin	Assistant Secretary for Labour & Welfare (Welfare)		

Secretary

Ms WU Lai-shan, Alexandra	Senior Executive Officer (District Council)/ Wan Chai, Home Affairs Department
---------------------------	---

Action

Opening Remarks

1. The Chairperson welcomed Dr CHEUNG Tin-cheung, Director of Buildings (DB); Mr Victor KWAN, Senior Building Surveyor; and Ms Mandy WONG, Administrative Assistant to the DB of the Buildings Department (BD), to the 16th meeting of the Wan Chai District Council (WCDC) for exchanging views with its Members. The Chairperson also extended his welcome to Ms Esther YUNG, Chief Engineer/South 4 of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), who joined the meeting for the first time, and Mr Steven CHAN, Senior Transport Officer/Wan Chai of the Transport Department (TD) vice Mr LAU Kin-kwok.

2. The Chairperson asked Members to note the papers and agenda with suggested discussion time on the conference table. He reminded them that each Member would be allotted three minutes to speak in respect of each agenda item.

confirmed by means of a motion moved by a Member and seconded by another Member.

26. Members present did not propose any amendments, and the minutes of the 15th meeting of WCDC were confirmed by means of a motion moved by Ms Kenny LEE and seconded by Mr Anson LAM.

Discussion Items

Item 3: Rezoning of the Caroline Hill Road Site (WCDC Paper No. 35/2018)

27. The Chairperson welcomed the following representatives to the meeting:

Planning Department:	Mr KAU Kin-hong, Louis, District Planning Officer/HK Mr LUK Kwok-on, Anthony, Senior Town Planner/HK3
Transport Department:	Mr WU Kin-kwok, Eddy, Senior Engineer/Wan Chai Ms FONG Hau-yin, Fiona, Engineer/ Wan Chai 1
Highways Department:	Mr CHAN Chak-wing, Acting District Engineer/Peak Mr CHAN Wai-hong, Senior District Engineer/General(2) Mr WAN Chi-kin, District Engineer/General(2)B
AECOM Asia Co. Ltd.:	Mr LAU Ka-hei, Associate

28. The Chairperson invited the representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) to brief Members on the paper.

29. Mr Louis KAU briefed Members on the following key points:

- (i) Noting the grave concern expressed by the Council over the impact of the entire development project on the traffic of Causeway Bay, PlanD had made tremendous efforts during the planning process;

- (ii) The proposed gross floor area (GFA) was 170 000 square metres, the total area of the entire site was about 2.6 hectares and the overall plot ratio was about seven. For a site on Hong Kong Island, a plot ratio of seven was relatively low;
- (iii) Of the GFA of 170 000 square metres, 70 000 square metres would be used to build a Judicial Complex for District Court (JCDC). Since the operating hours of courts were different from the peak hours of ordinary offices, with the former opening at 9:30 a.m. and adjourning at 4:30 p.m., it was believed that lesser traffic impact would be caused;
- (iv) Improvement works were proposed for roads in the vicinity in order to alleviate the traffic at Caroline Hill Road;
- (v) According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, the overall open space in Wan Chai District was considered sufficient, yet the local open space was insufficient. In view of this, PlanD required the provision of open space of at least 6 000 square metres within the future commercial site for public enjoyment;
- (vi) The Transport Department (TD) required the provision of 100 public parking spaces for private cars and 25 public parking spaces for commercial vehicles within the site to ease the serious illegal parking problem in Causeway Bay; and
- (vii) It was proposed that some space would be reserved in the proposed development project for the reprovisioning of the existing green minibus stops at Lan Fong Road. TD would consult users, stakeholders and the district council when the development project was about to complete. After the consultation, a decision would be made on the number of minibus routes to be reprovisioned at the Caroline Hill Road site.

30. Mr Anthony LUK briefed Members on the paper with a PowerPoint

presentation, including the background and details of the proposed developments, the open space and transport facilities to be provided, tree conservation and landscape design, conservation of stone walls, the traffic impact assessment (TIA), the air ventilation assessment, community facilities and the proposed amendments to the Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H7/19.

31. The Chairperson said that it was a well-known fact that the Caroline Hill Road site was the only large prime site left in the district. While he understood that the development of the Caroline Hill Road site should be in line with the future development direction, such as meeting the needs for judicial facilities and commercial sites, it was a matter of public concern that if the Administration had taken into account local needs during the planning process. For example, many Members had raised concern over the lack of a civic centre in Wan Chai District. More often than not organisers had to hire venues in Sai Wan Ho Civil Centre or Sheung Wan Civic Centre for holding activities.

32. The Chairperson continued that Miss Clarisse YEUNG had informed the Secretary on 4 May 2018 of her wish to make an oral statement on this agenda item at this meeting. Under Section 29 of the Standing Orders of WCDC, “a member who wishes to make an oral statement shall notify the Secretary before the meeting, and the oral statement shall not last more than five minutes”.

33. Miss Clarisse YEUNG made the following oral statement:

“I hereby make an oral statement. Regarding the planning of the site on Caroline Hill Road where the ex-Electrical and Mechanical Services Department is located, the Development Bureau (DEVB) and PlanD have been dodging the issue and concealing the fact from WCDC and LegCo. At the meetings of WCDC and the Public Works Subcommittee of LegCo held over the past few months, the government representatives repeatedly dodged the questions on the future land use raised by Members by saying that the demolition of the buildings on Caroline Hill Road was nothing to do with the future land use. Yet the murder will out. After Members of WCDC and LegCo have repeatedly asked about and pursued the issue, the Government admits honestly today that the

demolition of the buildings is related to the future land use. In other words, the Government is preparing to put the land on sale for commercial development and to build a judicial complex. I am deeply disappointed. I know no matter WCDC endorses today's paper or not, the Administration will submit the demolition proposal to the Finance Committee (FC) of LegCo. In my opinion, the Administration should re-launch the consultation on the Caroline Hill Road site, which should be conducted with no preconditions or stance, before demolishing the existing buildings and applying for making amendments to the OZP. The Government should not push ahead with the issue without considering the views of the Council and the local residents."

34. The Chairperson invited Members to raise comments or enquiries.
35. Ms Peggy LEE raised the following comments and enquiries:
 - (i) She had asked PlanD at a meeting of the Development, Planning and Transport Committee (DPTC) whether there were any preconditions behind the funding application to LegCo for the demolition of the buildings at the Caroline Hill Road site. In response, Mr Anthony LUK said that the Government did not impose any preconditions. Yet, in less than two months' time, PlanD consulted the Council on a planning proposal with preconditions. She was astonished to note such a proposal.
 - (ii) In view of the heavily congested traffic in the vicinity of Causeway Bay, the Council had expressed at its last meeting that no more additional sites in the district should be used for commercial purpose. Though the Administration claimed that road improvement works would be carried out, she queried who should be held accountable if traffic congestion was resulted.
 - (iii) PlanD had mentioned very long ago that the site in question was planned to be used for building government and recreation facilities. In fact, the local residents had a strong demand for open space, performance venues and a civic

centre. The Caroline Hill Road site was an ideal site for meeting local needs.

- (iv) While she acknowledged that the Government had to ensure an adequate supply of commercial sites to maintain Hong Kong's status as a financial centre, she queried why Wan Chai was targeted and why another commercial area could not be developed in other districts.
- (v) Upon receipt of the planning proposal by the Town Planning Board (TPB), a two-month consultation would commence. However, it was a known fact that it was unlikely for a planning proposal to be turned down. She queried how the Administration would address the opposition from the local residents, and asked if the views of the Council would be taken into account.
- (vi) She asked the Administration to clearly explain why the document submitted to this meeting was completely different from what the Government had said one and a half months ago. At that time, the Government said there were no preconditions. This was an act to deceive the Council. Not only did the Administration turn a deaf ear to the public opinion, but it also paid no heed to the views of the Council.

36. Ms Yolanda NG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) PlanD had firmly told the Council not long ago that the demolition of the old buildings was for safety sake and there were no preconditions. But shortly afterward, a planning proposal with preconditions was submitted to the Council.
- (ii) If there were reasonable justifications, she would not be opposed to the construction of a judicial complex at a site for sports and recreation use. But the Administration should seek consent from the court first. She enquired when the Administration started communicating with the court and when it firmly told the Council that there were no preconditions. She was sure that there were contradictions

in terms of time of the above actions. She requested the Administration to give an honest account of the matter.

- (iii) Causeway Bay had been overloaded with commercial activities and traffic. She asked the Administration to clearly explain why the Caroline Hill Road site should be rezoned for commercial use.
- (iv) While the Administration claimed that the additional parking spaces would alleviate the illegal parking problem in Causeway Bay, she queried if such measure could produce results. She doubted if the additional pick-up/drop-off facilities for green minibuses could accommodate the minibus bus routes at Lan Fong Road. In fact, the minibus stops at Jardine's Bazaar, King Lung Street, Lockhart Road and Jaffe Road were all overloaded with traffic. She queried if the relocation of the minibus stops to Caroline Hill Road would resolve the existing traffic problem or cause an even bigger traffic problem. Moreover, she asked the Administration if it had considered the willingness of the public to use the proposed minibus interchange at Caroline Hill Road and if it had taken into account the provision of pleasant walking experience. She was of the view that the Administration had deceived the Council about the proposed planning.

37. Miss Clarisse YEUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) At the meeting of WCDC on 6 March 2018, PlanD had said that an assessment of the buildings in Causeway Bay which were likely to be redeveloped had been made. PlanD had also promised that it would provide the Council with the information about the floor area and uses of those buildings. However, she had only received a location plan so far. Without the floor area and related information, it was almost impossible to discuss the over-commercialisation of Causeway Bay.

- (ii) She asked if the Administration could assess the buildings in Wong Nai Chung OZP which were aged over 30 years and below seven storeys high since these buildings were likely to be redeveloped. She also asked if the Administration could provide the Council with a list of the buildings, a location plan and the site area.
- (iii) PlanD had requested the Judiciary to consider the sites at Tung Chung, Tin Shui Wai and Sai Ying Pun. She asked PlanD to explain why the Judiciary considered those three sites unsuitable.
- (iv) The height restriction for Silverwood which was close to the Caroline Hill Road site was 100 metres, while South China Athletic Association (SCAA) was seven storeys high. She enquired why the height restriction for the Caroline Hill Road site was set at 135 metres. Moreover, she hoped that the landscape plan could show the visual effect from more angles.
- (v) She enquired about the number of parking spaces to be provided by JCDC and the two commercial buildings, and asked if the Administration had assessed whether the 125 public parking spaces could meet the local needs.
- (vi) She asked the Administration to provide details of the pick-up/drop-off facilities for green minibuses, including the number of minibuses allowed to be parked at the pick-up/drop-off point and whether a minibus terminus could be provided. Besides, she asked whether PlanD had confirmed with TD to ensure minibus operators were willing to use the proposed minibus stop.
- (vii) Paragraph 5(g) of the paper stated that “to reserve an underground connection point at the proposed commercial development for connecting a possible underground pedestrian connection that may be constructed in the future”. She asked the Administration to provide a map showing the route of the connecting point to the underground pedestrian

connection to be built.

- (viii) As regards the technical assessments as mentioned in paragraph 6 of the paper, she requested the Administration to provide the full technical assessment reports for the Council's perusal. Besides, according to the technical assessments undertaken, the proposed developments would not induce unacceptable impact to the local area. She asked the Administration to explain what unacceptable impact meant.
- (ix) She enquired if the TIA had covered the main roads such as Gloucester Road, Hennessy Road, Yee Wo Street, Causeway Road and Canal Road. She also enquired about the crossing arrangements between Link Road and Caroline Hill Road. Besides, she asked if the Administration had assessed the impact of road closures on the developments when an event was being held in the Hong Kong Stadium.

38. Dr Jennifer CHOW raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She concurred with the views just raised by Members, and commented that the entire proposal lacked vision. The planning proposal focused only on the development of a very limited and small area. However, any development could either stimulate or hinder the development of the entire community, and in particular would have impact on the development of the local economy. She called for the Administration to take into account the overall development of Wan Chai District in the planning process.
- (ii) The planning proposal did not include local views. She enquired if there were any alternative options. She opined that the Administration should consider how to fulfil the local needs. The Caroline Hill Road site was the only site left in the busy area which was suitable for the construction of a civic centre. The provision of such facility could add value to the district.

- (iii) She was worried about the traffic impact of the proposed developments. The proposed developments would induce extra pressure on the traffic of Wan Chai District, thus aggravating the traffic congestion problem.
- (iv) Cohesiveness was an important function of a community. Yet, the proposed developments could neither enhance the cohesiveness of the community nor add value to Wan Chai District in terms of the provision of transport and community facilities. She called for the Administration to enhance its visionary planning efforts and listen more to the views of the Council.

39. Ms Jacqueline CHUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) At the meeting of DPTC on 10 April 2018, Mr Louis KAU clearly stated that the Government did not set any preconditions. However, in less than a month, PlanD submitted such a paper, and even held a pre-meeting to clearly state that what information had been provided to the Council. This was no different from setting a trap for the Council. It was despicable of the Administration to fool the Council in such a way.
- (ii) As mentioned in the paper, if the Council agreed with the proposal, the Administration would relay the views of the Council to the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) for consideration. Subject to the consent of MPC, the Administration would proceed to amend the draft OZP. The Administration was trying to achieve its aim by seeking consent from the Council when the Council was not informed of all the facts. This showed that the Government had grown increasingly cunning.
- (iii) The presentation given by the Administration today did not reveal the whole truth. The Administration only repeatedly emphasised that an additional 100 and 25 parking spaces for private cars and commercial vehicles respectively would be

provided, but it was tight-lipped about the fact that a total of 600 parking spaces would be provided by the commercial buildings and the judicial complex.

- (iv) After painstaking effort by different parties, the seven traffic relief measures could eventually be implemented in the vicinity of Causeway Bay. When the traffic condition in the vicinity of Leighton Road and Percival Street began to show signs of improvement, another project was proposed. Upon completion, the developments would bring in at least 600 vehicles. The commercial development in the retail sector and restaurants would certainly result in extra vehicular and pedestrian flows. The Administration claimed that the courts would only operate between 9:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. This was a specious argument used to cover up the truth.
- (v) The proposed development of Po Leung Kuk in Causeway Bay had obtained the approval from the Council and would commence in 2019. Given its old age, SCAA was likely to be redeveloped. The building height restriction for buildings at Haven Street would be increased from 110mPD to 135 mPD, which would stimulate private developments in the area. Moreover, whenever an event was held in the Hong Kong Stadium, the traffic in the vicinity of Causeway Bay would be brought to a standstill, and Leighton Road would be the only road left which could relieve the traffic at those major trunk roads such as Gloucester Road, Lockhart Road and Hennessy Road. Even Road P2 at Wan Chai North to be commissioned could only relieve the traffic in the coming five years. The planning proposed by PlanD today would bring in at least 600 vehicles, which would certainly add an extra burden to the local traffic.
- (vi) The reason behind the proposed relocation of the judicial building to Caroline Hill Road was that the Government intended to sell the sites where the three government buildings in Wan Chai were located at high prices. She accused the Government of repeatedly deceiving the

Council, and expressed her opposition to the rezoning proposal.

40. Ms Kenny LEE raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) It was stated in the paper that the “TIA assumes that the maximum floor area for retail purpose is 10 000 square metres. The Government will consider imposing a ceiling on the floor area of the shopping malls for retail purpose”. This showed that the Government would only consider imposing a floor area ceiling. Without any promises, all these assumptions were subject to change.
- (ii) She enquired if the Administration had considered the traffic condition after the commissioning of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) and the future growth in the vehicle population in estimating the reserve capacity (RC) in 2031. She queried why the Administration could make a long-term projection covering the future 13 years from 2018 to 2031 within such a short time. She was of the view that a projection covering the coming five or ten years should be provided.
- (iii) Members of the public were seen having their driving training on Leighton Road and Cotton Tree Path during different periods of time every day. Besides, Irving Street and the area outside Regal Hong Kong Hotel were packed with vehicles before and after school hours. She enquired if the Administration had considered these conditions in making the projection.
- (iv) Regarding the level of service of pedestrian crossings, it was stated that the green time for road sections B1, B3 and B5 would be extended in order to raise the level of service to Grade D. If the green time for pedestrians was to be extended, the waiting time for vehicles would increase. She enquired how the traffic light time would be adjusted to relieve the traffic congestion at Causeway Road.

- (v) SCAA would soon be redeveloped. Moreover, serious traffic congestion would arise whenever an event was held in the Hong Kong Stadium. The proposed planning would bring in a few hundred additional vehicles. She could not imagine how the future road design could absorb such massive vehicular flow.
- (vi) As regards the proposed road juncture improvement works, the lane outside Po Leung Kuk would be modified to a “left-turn and right-turn” shared lane. At present, there was one lane for eastbound Leighton Road and another lane for westbound Leighton Road. This junction could accommodate a few more vehicles, but not an additional lane could be created. Therefore, no significant improvement was expected.

41. Mr Ivan WONG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) Members were most concerned about the studies undertaken by the Administration, based on which the Caroline Hill Road site was considered the most suitable site for the construction of JCDC. He enquired if the Administration had considered using this site for other development purposes to meet the local needs.
- (ii) PlanD had not consulted the Council on the preliminary planning, and the relevant decision was made before collecting public views. In fact, the concrete planning had already been worked out long before consulting the Council. This showed that the Administration disrespected the Council. Such practice had been in place for years and no improvement had ever been made.
- (iii) PlanD should not work out the concrete design before considering other relevant factors. In view of the serious traffic congestion in Causeway Bay, the local residents had high hopes that the Caroline Hill Road site could be used to alleviate the traffic congestion and open space could be provided within the site.

- (iv) A large number of people would go in and out of the courts before and after the operating hours. Thus he did not agree with the argument that the courts would only operate from nine to four.

42. Mr Anson LAM raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) Instead of having no preconditions as claimed by the Administration, a prior decision had been made. He was surprised that the Administration dared to claim that the proposed developments would not generate unacceptable traffic impact. Such lies were downright insults to Members' intelligence.
- (ii) The vicinity of Caroline Hill Road had already been highly congested. He asked what actions would be taken by the Administration if the traffic congestion there did deteriorate after the implementation of the proposed planning. Since TD was not a law enforcement department, he queried if the Police had to be asked to deploy its manpower to monitor the traffic round the clock.

43. Mr CHENG Ki-kin raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) Wan Chai was an old district and many long-standing problems could not be resolved since the district had been fully developed. He opined that the long-standing problems in the district, such as the relocation of the methadone clinic at Southorn, should be resolved through the redevelopment of the Caroline Hill Road site and the relocation of the three government buildings.
- (ii) If the court had to be relocated, it should be relocated to an easily accessible area in the urban district for the convenience of the public.
- (iii) The illegal parking problem was resulted from insufficient parking spaces. Since the prices of Grade A offices had

continued to rise to a record level, he asked without the redevelopment of an old area, how job opportunities could be created and how opportunities for upward social mobility could be provided for the next generation.

44. The Chairperson asked the representatives of PlanD to respond to Members' first-round enquiries.

45. Mr Louis KAU responded as follows:

- (i) He said that PlanD had all along respected the Council. He stressed that the Government had proposed in the 2017 Policy Address to rezone the Caroline Hill Road site for the construction of JCDC and commercial development. PlanD had never had any intention to conceal the development direction of the Caroline Hill Road site. He also clarified that he had not attended the meeting of DPTC held on 10 April 2018.
- (ii) The Judiciary considered that the locations of the sites at Tung Chung and Tin Shui Wai could not meet the needs of the courts, while the area of the site at Sai Ying Pun could not meet the required area of 70 000 square metres estimated based on the existing needs. Having considered all the relevant factors, the Judiciary agreed in principle to construct JCDC at the Caroline Hill Road site. The Administration Wing sent a written reply to the Council on 10 April 2018, explaining the considerations for the site selection.
- (iii) As regards the number of parking spaces to be provided, there would be 135 parking spaces for private cars, 5 parking spaces for motorcycles and 14 loading/unloading facilities for use by the vehicles of the Correctional Services Department in JCDC. As required by the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, there would be 300 parking spaces for private cars, 30 parking spaces for motorcycles, 46 loading/unloading facilities for goods vehicles and 7 pick-up/drop-off facilities for taxis and

private cars within the commercial site.

- (iv) According to the Hong Kong 2030+ Planning Vision and Strategy, commercial sites were still in short supply up to 2031. Having considered the fact that the Caroline Hill Road site was located in a core business district in Causeway Bay and the compatibility of the site with the nearby developments, PlanD considered the Caroline Hill Road site suitable to be used for commercial purpose. The Administration would closely monitor the impact of the developments on the nearby traffic.
- (v) In response to the public aspiration for the use of the Caroline Hill Road site to meet local needs as relayed to PlanD by the Council, the provision of the relevant facilities was planned. As regards the provision of a civic centre, PlanD could relay this suggestion to the relevant policy bureau and departments for consideration. However, attention should be drawn to the fact that it was necessary to consider the traffic impact even if the site was to be used for building a civic centre.
- (vi) The proposed amendments to the Wong Nai Chung OZP mainly concerned the rezoning of the Caroline Hill Road site, while the Causeway Bay OZP introduced to the Council at its last meeting was to revise the building height restrictions for a number of zones in the OZP. To show the visual impact after the relaxation of the building height restrictions, PlanD assumed that buildings aged above 30 years and with less than seven storeys would be redeveloped, and based on this assumption, an analysis showing the simulated visual impact was made. Since the amendments to the Wong Nai Chung OZP did not concern the building height restrictions for the entire OZP, no such similar analysis would be made. Thus, PlanD could not provide the information as requested by Miss YEUNG.
- (vii) As required by the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, if any commercial sites on Hong Kong Island were to be

developed, the building height restriction should generally be set at 135 mPD in order to enable the sites to be developed to the permissible development intensity on one hand, and to meet the requirements of the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines on the other. Moreover, although the plot ratio for the Caroline Hill Road site was lower than that for general commercial sites, the provision of a new carriageway and open space of not less than 6 000 square metres was required. Therefore, adequate flexibility should be allowed in the building height in order to enable the building design could meet the necessary requirements.

- (viii) The developer would design and provide open space of no less than 6 000 square metres in accordance with Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines issued by DEVB.
- (ix) As regards reserving an underground connection point to connect a possible underground pedestrian connection that might be constructed in the future, as far as he knew, there were two possible routes for the underground connection, namely, along Sunning Road or along Pennington Street. Therefore, flexibility would be stipulated in the land lease of the Caroline Hill Road to require the developer to reserve underground connection points in those locations for connecting to the possible underground pedestrian connection that might be constructed in the future.
- (x) PlanD would advise TPB to set the retail floor area at 10 000 square metres, and would advise LandsD to incorporate such restriction into the future conditions of sale to prevent the retail land use from bringing in too many vehicles, which might generate the impact similar to that of Times Square on the nearby road network. Since the retail floor area of Times Square accounted for about 40% of the total floor area, a greater traffic impact was produced. In the planning proposal under discussion, only 10% floor area would be used for retail purpose. Therefore it was believed that the traffic impact could be minimised.

46. Mr LAU Ka-hei responded as follows:

- (i) The TIA of the Caroline Hill Road site covered the traffic condition in the next five years following the completion of the buildings. It was therefore a long-term projection covering up to 2031.
- (ii) The TIA had taken into account the traffic impact after the commissioning of CWB. Since CWB was mainly to divert the traffic of Gloucester Road, it was believed that no significant traffic impact would be caused to the local traffic (e.g. Leighton Road).
- (iii) While Leighton Road, Cotton Tree Path, Eastern Hospital Road were packed with school buses and private cars before and after school hours, such traffic congestion would not coincide with the rush-hour congestion in the morning since the former occurred earlier than the latter. Besides, since court hearings would start at 9:30 a.m., the staff and legal practitioners would arrive at around 9 a.m.
- (iv) Regarding the proposed road junction improvement works in the western section of Caroline Hill Road, during peak hours, vehicles would queue up on the fast lane of northbound Caroline Hill Road, waiting for turning right to eastbound Leighton Road. The traffic queue would extend to the junction of Link Road. Since northbound Link Road had only one lane, the above-mentioned traffic queue also blocked the right-turn traffic for westbound Leighton Road. In view of this, it was proposed to modify the slow lane of northbound Caroline Hill Road to a “left-turn and right-turn” shared lane in order to increase the right-turn traffic capacity and avoid traffic congestion on the fast lane.
- (v) The TIA showed that the RC of major signalised crossings was positive. A positive RC figure indicated that the road junction was operating with spare capacity. Besides, the design flow/capacity ratio was below 0.85, indicating that

the performance of the junctions was satisfactory.

47. Mr Louis KAU supplemented as follows:

- (i) PlanD had obtained the information from the Police about road closures due to special events in the Hong Kong Stadium in 2017. In 2017, 36 major events were held in the Hong Kong Stadium, resulting in 36 road closures. More than half of those events were held on Sundays or public holidays, indicating that at least half of the events had no significant impact on the developments on Caroline Hill Road. Most of the remaining events were held on Friday, only two of which were held during rush hours in the morning.
- (ii) The Police would inform the shop tenants and residential buildings close to Caroline Hill Road of the time of road closures before any major events in the Hong Kong Stadium to enable them to make preparation. The Police would do the same following the completion of the judicial complex and the commercial buildings. Therefore, the events in the Hong Kong Stadium would not cause any unacceptable impact on the developments on Caroline Hill Road in the foreseeable future.

48. The Chairperson thanked the representatives of PlanD for their detailed responses. He then asked Members if they had other comments.

49. Miss Clarisse YEUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She was shocked to note the comments by PlanD that Members had raised too many questions. It was the duty of Members to obtain a clear understanding of the issue under discussion by raising enquiries. Noting the numerous flaws contained in the paper submitted by PlanD, Members raised enquiries about various issues. However, she was very sorry to learn that PlanD was unable to answer their enquiries.

- (ii) RC and traffic congestion were two separate concepts. Since she was worried that the traffic in the vicinity of Caroline Hill Road would be brought to a standstill after the rezoning, she enquired of PlanD about what unacceptable impact meant. However, the representative of PlanD only cited the design flow/capacity ratio without answering her question at all.
- (iii) In its reply in April 2018 to an enquiry raised by DPTC, the Department of Justice (DoJ) said that the relocation of courts was not under its purview and they would only provide legal advice. She asked if DoJ had any knowledge at that time of the plan to relocate the courts to Caroline Hill Road.
- (iv) It was proposed that 70 000 square metres of the site would be used to construct a judicial complex. She had no intention to hinder employment, yet a judicial complex would lead to the provision of the relevant services in a centralised manner, which ran against the planning direction of decentralisation.
- (v) The population of the New Territories (NT), Kowloon and Hong Kong Island stood at 3.6 million, 2.1 million and 1.29 million respectively. Besides, the numbers of single-parent families in NT, Kowloon and Hong Kong Island were 45 000, 26 000 and 9 000 respectively. If the judicial complex was to be located on Hong Kong Island, more people would have to access the complex through cross-district travelling.
- (vi) It was a usual practice of the Government to deceive the Council by using some tricks. The passage of projects and papers did not mean that the public interest had been served. The Government neither conducted a public consultation in a sincere manner nor answered Members' enquiries. It only submitted a consultation paper with preconditions.
- (vii) Co-opted Member Dr CHEUNG Chalton of DPTC had once said that Causeway Bay needed a home for the elderly run

by the Government. The representative of PlanD said at the last meeting that the Social Welfare Department was consulted, which did not make any request for the provision of a home for the elderly within the Caroline Hill Road site. She found such reply unbelievable.

- (viii) Professor TANG Wing-shing of the Department of Geography of the Hong Kong Baptist University had been promoting the idea of urban logic, i.e. the application of logic in urban planning. She queried if the Government chose to blindly pursue the goal for the supply of Grade A offices at the expense of local needs.
- (ix) The greatest evil was that the Government had deceived the Council and put forward a demolition proposal with preconditions, which would soon be submitted to FC.

50. Ms Yolanda NG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) Since PlanD had not yet answered her question, she had to raise the question once again. She enquired when the Judiciary was asked to consider the sites at Tung Chung, Tin Shui Wai, Sai Ying Pun and Caroline Hill Road, and when the Judiciary gave a reply. She opined that they could confirm from the answers of these fundamental questions if PlanD had deceived the Council.
- (ii) She did want to render her support for the development of the Caroline Hill Road, provided that the Administration respected the Council and listened to Members' views.
- (iii) She did not think that the Caroline Hill Road site was suitable for commercial use. A site at Jardine's Bazaar had been changed from residential to commercial use; Lee Garden Three had opened; and some major residential buildings at King Lung Street and Jaffe Street had been converted to shopping centres and commercial buildings. In fact, Causeway Bay was over-commercialised, with the whole district being overloaded with commercial

developments. The original small, liveable district had become a commercial and tourist region, and the local residents were subjected to the pressure brought about by the commercial developments every day.

- (iv) She agreed that all the people of Hong Kong were entitled to the service provided by the Judiciary. Yet she queried if the Caroline Hill Road site was the only site suitable for the construction of JCDC. She recalled that Hong Kong Tramways had deceived the Council by saying that they were required to move out and the circular planting area in Causeway was the only suitable site for relocation of the tram power substation. However, the true story was uncovered by the Council after Members kept asking questions. If PlanD did not speak the truth today, it was impossible to obtain the support from the Council.

51. Mr Joey LEE concurred with other Members' views. He queried if PlanD had committed a procedural error by pursuing the issue in such a way. He found the arguments raised before and today by PlanD unacceptable. PlanD should conduct a review and devote its effort to longer term planning, so as to enable the public to have a better living. He was very disappointed and dissatisfied with the handling of the matter by PlanD.

52. The Chairperson invited representatives of PlanD to respond to Members' enquiries.

53. Mr Louis KAU responded that the Judiciary replied to the Government in mid-2017 that they agreed to reprovise JCDC at the Caroline Hill Road site and to build the judicial court complex for High Court at the site at 5 New Harbourfront in Central. Having reviewed its needs, the Judiciary proposed to the Government the construction of the judicial complexes at the above-mentioned sites to meet its long-term needs for judicial facilities.

(Post-meeting note: PlanD corrected the previous answer, saying that the Judiciary replied to the Government in mid-2016 that they agreed to reprovise JCDC at the Caroline Hill Road site.)

54. Ms Yolanda NG said that she had to ask the same question three times. PlanD only told the meeting when the Judiciary replied, but did not answer when the Judiciary was informed of the proposed sites for consideration. PlanD had told the meeting about a month ago that there were no preconditions, but now answered that the Judiciary had replied to the Government in mid-2017. She requested PlanD to give a thorough account of the whole matter.

55. Mr Louis KAU responded that the Judiciary had requested the Government in 2012 to provide a site for meeting its need for judicial facilities. In response to the Judiciary's request, PlanD later informed the Judiciary of the proposed sites for consideration.

56. Miss Clarisse YEUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She asked PlanD if the Judiciary had been asked whether they would accept the Caroline Hill Road site before PlanD visited the Council for the first time to discuss the demolition of the buildings at Caroline Hill Road.
- (ii) She enquired why the proposed open space of 6 000 square metres would be developed by a private developer. She asked if PlanD considered the Leisure and Cultural Services Department not capable of developing the open space.
- (iii) Since Members raised many enquiries and opposing views regarding the project, she suggested voting on the project by a show of hands in order to raise objection to the submission of the paper to TPB.

57. The Chairperson concluded that while community development was no cause for complaint, it was worthy of support only if the development could cater for the local needs. Members had grave concern over the development of the Caroline Hill Road site since they feared that the Administration would repeat the same mistake, leading to irreversible traffic impact as that caused by Times Square. The justifications given by the Administration were not convincing enough, and the majority of

Members were against the proposed developments. The Chairperson then invited views from Members on whether it was necessary to put the proposal on a vote.

58. Dr Anna TANG agreed with the Chairperson that community development was no cause for complaint. Yet the lack of communication between PlanD and Members had led to lots of worries raised by Members. Wan Chai was a busy district with a large population. At present, a large number of territory-wide facilities were located in Wan Chai. Therefore, it was imperative for the Government to ensure the land in the district was put to good use. She hoped that the Administration could enhance communication with Members, and expressed that she would abstain from voting at the moment if the proposal was put to a vote.

59. Mr Ivan WONG said that Members had clearly expressed their concerns. They were not against the construction of a judicial complex. Yet, the matter should be pursued in accordance with better procedures. He was of the view that the Administration should consolidate Members' views and relayed the consolidated views to TPB to enable Members' voices to be heard loud and clear.

60. Ms Yolanda NG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She stressed that she was not against any planning development, but against the paper. She could not agree with PlanD's handling of the matter including bypassing the Council and submitting a paper with preconditions.
- (ii) She did not agree with the suggestion about submitting the consolidated views of the Council to TPB for consideration. If the paper was submitted to TPB, TPB would proceed to consider the suitability of the proposed site. She was of the view that the Council should vote on the matter in order to show whether the paper was supported by the majority.
- (iii) The representative of PlanD claimed that even if the site was used to build recreation facilities, traffic impact would be caused. However, PlanD did not provide TIA in respect of

the provision of recreation facilities, making it impossible for the Council to assess which option would result in greater impact. PlanD only proposed in the paper to construct a judicial complex and commercial buildings. There were no other alternative options at all. This was very unfair.

61. Mr Anson LAM commented that it was necessary to conduct a vote in order to firmly express the Council's opposition to the submission of the paper to TPB.

62. Ms Jacqueline CHUNG said that the Council was not against the construction of a judicial complex, but could not agree with the content of the paper. She opined that it was necessary to conduct a vote in order to tell TPB loud and clear about the Council's stance. The Council should ensure no repeat of the same problems as those caused by Times Square; otherwise, the Council would owe the public an answer.

63. Mr Joey LEE stressed that he was not against community development, but against the paper. The Government should communicate with the Council before developing the district. The proposal should only be submitted to TPB after obtaining the support from the majority of Members.

64. Ms Kenny LEE said that being the Chairperson of DPTC, she was most concerned with the traffic impact of the proposal. Such information was not provided at the pre-meeting held two weeks ago. Instead, the information was hastily submitted to the Council today. In fact, all the traffic figures obtained before the commissioning of CWB were estimated figures. In addition, the consultant was unable to answer the enquiries about the growth in the number of vehicles and road management. For the above reasons, she expressed her opposition to the paper.

65. Miss Clarisse YEUNG agreed that the paper should not be endorsed. She opined that if the paper was submitted to TPB, TPB could keep bringing up issues with the residents by making use of the planning procedures, even if much controversy had been aroused in the community. The case of Hopewell Centre II could serve as a good

example of such practice. Therefore, the Council should state loud and clear its stance.

66. Dr Anna TANG said that Members had clarified that they were not opposed to the content of the paper, but the submission of the paper to TPB. The future handling of the matter should be left to TPB as Members had clearly expressed their stance.

67. The Chairperson concluded that Members were not against district development. Yet the consultation work which was conducted in a hasty manner could not promptly remove all the worries raised by Members. Therefore, Members expressed their opposition to the paper.

68. Dr Anna TANG supplemented that the departments concerned did not maintain sufficient communication with Members, and the consultation work was not up to standard.

69. Ms Yolanda NG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) Most of the Members who had spoken on the agenda item were not only opposed to the content of the planning paper about the construction of a judicial complex and the commercial developments, but also did not support the submission of the paper to TPB. If Members only expressed their views without passing any resolution, PlanD would proceed to submit the paper to TPB, and TPB would process the paper upon receipt of it. Therefore, she opined that the Council should vote on whether it agreed with the submission of the paper to TPB.
- (ii) PlanD had not answered the core questions at all. It contradicted itself by saying that it did not receive the reply from the Judiciary until mid-2017, that it only started considering the land use in 2012 and that there were no preconditions. All these claims were made to deceive the Council.
- (iii) The representative of PlanD claimed that even if the site was used to build recreation facilities, traffic impact would be

caused. However, PlanD did not provide TIA in respect of the provision of recreation facilities. In other words, no alternative options were available. In the past decade, the Government had not engaged the public in the planning process of the site concerned. The Council found it hard to support such a paper which was submitted to the Council in haste.

70. Ms Peggy LEE said that if the proposal was submitted to TPB, PlanD would convince it by presenting some estimated figures, and there would be no turning back once TPB was convinced. Therefore, she opposed the submission of the proposal to TPB and called for PlanD to thoroughly consult the Council.

71. Dr Anna TANG commented that the consultation work conducted by PlanD was not good enough, and queried why the paper had to be submitted to TPB within such a short notice. She stressed that she was absolutely not against the submission of the paper to TPB.

(Dr Anna TANG left the meeting at 5:55 p.m.)

72. Mr Ivan WONG said that even all Members raised objection, PlanD might still submit the paper to TPB. He asked if PlanD was willing to make a pledge at the meeting that the relevant paper would not be submitted to TPB before removing all the worries.

73. Ms Jacqueline CHUNG reckoned that since the paper was to “brief the Wan Chai District Council on the proposed developments at the Caroline Hill Road Site and the related proposed amendments to the approved Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H7/19, and solicit views of members of WCDC”, the Council should vote on whether the proposed amendments should be endorsed, with a view to enabling the Administration to note the stance of the Council. This could prevent TPB from making its own interpretation of Members’ views.

74. The Chairperson asked Members to vote on the proposed amendments by a show of hands. The voting result was as follows:

Yes: 1 vote (Mr CHENG Ki-kin)

No: 9 votes (Dr Jennifer CHOW Ms Yolanda NG Mr Joey LEE Ms Kenny LEE Ms Peggy LEE Mr Anson LAM Mr Ivan WONG Miss Clarisse YEUNG Ms Jacqueline CHUNG)

Abstain: 1 vote (Mr Stephen NG)

75. The Chairperson said the Council voted against the proposed amendments by a clear majority. He asked PlanD to launch a more in-depth consultation with the Council.

Item 4: Wan Chai Development Phase II – Commissioning of Road P2 at Wan Chai North
(WCDC Paper No. 36/2018)

76. The Vice-chairperson welcomed the following representatives to the meeting:

Civil Engineering and Development Department:	Mr Wilson MA, Chief Engineer/South 3 Mr WONG Chi-leung, Senior Engineer/7 (South) Mr LEE Hon, Engineer/11 (South)
Highways Department:	Mr CHAN Tai-chi, Senior Engineer 1/Central Wanchai Bypass Ms Yanny LI, Senior Engineer/Shatin to Central Link (6)
AECOM Asia Company Limited:	Mr Francis LEONG, Executive Director Mr LAU Ka-hei, Associate Mr Jacob TSUI, Senior Resident Engineer
MTR Corporation Limited:	Mr William CHAN, Liaison Engineer I

77. The Vice-person asked the representatives of CEDD to brief Members on the paper.

78. Mr Wilson MA said that one of the major items of Wan Chai Development Phase II was to construct a section of Road P2 in Wan Chai North to connect Lung Wo Road in Central with the existing roads in Wan Chai North. The section of Road P2 underneath the Hong Kong

2. The Chairperson asked Members to note the papers and agenda with suggested discussion time on the conference table. He reminded them that each Member would be allotted three minutes to speak in respect of each agenda item.

Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting

Item 1: Confirmation of Minutes of the 19th Meeting of WCDC

3. The Chairperson said that the Secretariat had received proposed amendments raised by Dr Jennifer CHOW, Miss Clarisse YEUNG and Ms Yolanda NG respectively to the minutes of the 19th meeting of WCDC. He asked Members to note the paper on the conference table

4. Since no other amendments were proposed by Members present, the amended minutes of the 19th meeting were confirmed by means of a motion moved by Mr Anson LAM and seconded by Dr Anna TANG.

Discussion Items

**Item 2: Rezoning of the Caroline Hill Road Site
(WCDC Paper No. 1/2019)**

**Item 3: Proposed Road Improvement Works at Caroline Hill Road, Link Road and Leighton Road, Causeway Bay
(WCDC Paper No. 2/2019)**

5. The Chairperson stated that since agenda item 3 was about the road improvement works associated with the proposed developments under the rezoning of Caroline Hill Road site (the CHR site); he suggested discussing agenda items 2 and 3 together. Representatives of the relevant government departments could first be invited to brief Members on the two papers to enable Members to have a good grasp of the whole matter, before giving time for Members to raise comments and enquiries. The Chairperson asked Members whether they agreed with the above arrangement.

6. Members present raised no objection, and the Chairperson announced that agenda items 2 and 3 would be discussed together.

7. The Chairperson welcomed the following representatives of government departments and organisations to the meeting:

Planning	Mr Louis KAU, District Planning Officer
Department	Mr Anthony LUK, Senior Town Planner/
(PlanD):	HK3

Highways Department (HyD):	Mr CHAN Wai-hong, Senior District Engineer/ General (2) Mr WAN Chi-kin, District Engineer/ General (2)B Mr LEE Wai-lik, District Engineer/ Peak
Lands Department:	Ms Michelle WONG, Estate Surveyor/ Causeway Bay
Transport Department:	Mr Eddy WU, Senior Engineer/ Wan Chai Ms Fiona FONG, Engineer/Wan Chai 1
Food and Health Bureau (FHB):	Ms Wendy AU, Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Health) 5 Mr Jimmy WU, Director (District Health Centre Team)
Social Welfare Department (SWD):	Ms POON Hau-yuk, Assistant Social Welfare Officer (Eastern/Wan Chai) 1
AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM):	Mr Charles SO, Executive Director (Transportation Planning) Ms WONG Wan-ting, Project Engineer (Transportation Planning)

8. The Chairperson asked representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the paper.

9. Mr Anthony LUK of PlanD briefed Members on the rezoning of the CHR site with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, including background information of the proposed developments, the originally proposed development parameters, the new community facilities, the transport facilities, the traffic impact assessment (TIA) and the proposed amendments to the Approved Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H7/19, etc.

10. Mr Louis KAU of PlanD supplemented as follows:

- (i) The demolition works at the CHR site were not necessarily related to the long-term development of the site. Regardless of the future land use of the CHR site, the existing superstructures were no longer suitable for use; therefore they should be demolished to release the development potential of the site as soon as possible.

- (ii) At the meeting of the Public Works Subcommittee under the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council (LegCo) held on 21 March 2018, the Permanent Secretary for Development had already expressed the above-mentioned Government's intention.
- (iii) It was also recorded in the minutes of meeting of the Development, Planning and Transport Committee (DPTC) of WCDC held on 12 April 2018 that the Council understood that supporting the demolition works did not mean that the Council would support the long-term uses of the CHR site. PlanD also promised at the meeting that the Council would be consulted on the future development proposal.
- (iv) It was mentioned in the 2014-15 Budget that the Government hoped to complete the land use study of the CHR site as soon as possible for the provision of additional commercial floor area. The Government also mentioned in the 2016 Policy Address that the CHR site would be developed for commercial use in the long term.
- (v) In mid-2016, the Judiciary agreed with the Government's direction of reprovisioning a district court complex at the CHR site. A series of studies were carried out afterwards in accordance with the intention of the Judiciary, such as considering the auxiliary facilities required for the reprovisioning of a district court complex.
- (vi) Furthermore, it was mentioned in the 2017 Policy Address that the CHR site would be used for commercial purpose and for the development of a district court complex. Following the completion of the preliminary technical study, PlanD consulted the Council on the development proposal of the CHR site in May 2018. Minor amendments had been made to the proposal having regard to Members' views. PlanD then returned to WCDC today to seek Members' views on the revised proposal.

11. Ms Michelle WONG of LandsD stated that the discussion paper of agenda item 3 aimed to brief Members on the road improvement works associated with the rezoning of the CHR site proposed by PlansD, and seek advice from Members on the matter. She invited the representatives of HyD to introduce the works.

12. Mr CHAN Wai-hong of HyD explained that the major role of HyD

in this project was to conduct a TIA and carry out road improvement works. There were two purposes for conducting the road improvement works, first, to improve road junctions and ensure smooth traffic flow; second, to accommodate the additional pedestrian flow brought by the commercial developments by enhancing pedestrian facilities. He then invited representatives of the consultant to introduce the road improvement works.

13. Mr Charles SO of AECOM briefly introduced the proposed road improvement works at Caroline Hill Road and Leighton Road in Causeway Bay with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, including the proposed junction improvement works and proposed pedestrian crossing facilities, etc.

14. The Chairperson thanked the representatives for their presentations, and he asked Members to express their views.

15. Mr CHENG Ki-kin enquired about the justifications for providing aided child care service at the CHR site. He pointed out that most children in the area were taken care by babysitters or domestic helpers; therefore he reckoned that the provision of aided child care service in the area might lead to a mismatch of public resources.

16. Dr Anna TANG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She was glad to note that community services were included in the planning, and she hoped that relevant departments would attend meetings of a number of dedicated committees under the Council to collect views from Members and other departments. She was of the view that the Administration should understand the demand for community services in the district by conducting extensive consultation.
- (ii) She pointed out that Wan Chai was a bustling district with heavy traffic and pedestrian flows. If a public car park was established in the heart of Causeway Bay, the additional parking spaces provided would only be a drop in the ocean. She was worried that this might attract even more vehicles to circulate the area to wait for parking spaces, causing traffic obstruction. Therefore, she had reservations about the proposed construction of a public car park at the CHR site, and she asked if the departments concerned had concrete figures to support the proposal.

(Mr Ivan WONG and the Hon Paul TSE joined the meeting at 2:55 p.m.)

17. Miss Clarisse YEUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She pointed out that PlanD consulted the Council on the demolition works at the CHR site on 12 April last year. Then in a span of only one month, Members' views were sought on a complete rezoning proposal, showing that the Government had already planned to rezone the CHR site for commercial development when lobbying for the implementation of the demolition works. She criticised that it was most ridiculous for the Government to claim that the demolition works were not necessarily related to the long-term development of the CHR site.
- (ii) When the draft OZPs of Wan Chai and Causeway Bay were being discussed, the Council had made it clear that no additional commercial zones should be established in the core area of Causeway Bay, yet such view was not mentioned in the presentation of PlanD. Obviously, the rezoning proposal was made without paying regard to the advice of the Council, and the direction proposed did go against the Council's views.
- (iii) The Council had requested the Development Bureau (DEVB) in writing to provide the full report of the TIA, including all detailed information. She commented that the assessment should not cover the impact of the developments on inner streets only. The vehicular flows at major junctions, such as Causeway Road, Hennessy Road and Canal Road, should be assessed as well.
- (iv) She asked why PlanD insisted on rezoning part of the CHR site for commercial use, instead of preserving the entire site for "Government, Institution or Community" (GIC) uses. She demanded an explanation from the Government. She reckoned that PlanD should not push ahead the proposal simply because it was mentioned in the Policy Address, but ignored its feasibility in the district.
- (v) She considered that relevant terms should be included in the land lease stipulating that the premises housing the district health centre (DHC) and child care centre (CCC) were owned by the Government, in order to avoid those premises being converted into a shopping mall or offices in the future.

- (vi) PlanD stated during previous consultations with the Council that certain minibuses at the minibus stands in Causeway Bay would be relocated to the minibus terminus at Caroline Hill Road in the future. She enquired about the future use of the original minibus stands in Causeway Bay.
- (vii) She asked whether the open space would be managed by the Government or a private developer. Besides, she asked the departments concerned if a footbridge or subway would be constructed after the vicinity of Haven Street was redeveloped, so that pedestrians could access the MTR station by crossing Leighton Road.

18. Ms Peggy LEE raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She enquired about the justifications and considerations based on which PlanD or LandsD proposed the establishment of a DHC and a CCC at the CHR site. She pointed out that the Council had been in the hope that a civic centre could be established at that location. She did not understand why the Government considered out of the blue that primary health care and child care services were needed in Wan Chai.
- (ii) According to the TIA, the DHC and CCC would bring in 22 and 8 vehicles respectively during rush hours. She asked the departments concerned how such precise estimated figures were obtained, and whether corresponding figures in other districts were applied in Causeway Bay.
- (iii) She called on the Government to study the changes and needs of Wan Chai District in considering the provision of community facilities. If the Government insisted on providing primary health care facilities at the CHR site, she suggested relocating the methadone clinic to those facilities to solve the practical district issue.

19. Mr Ivan WONG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) He opined that the current design had not fully utilised the CHR site to achieve the objective of alleviating traffic congestion in Causeway Bay. He suggested that the Government make reference to the design of Grand Promenade or Island Resort and arrange the district court complex to be built above the ground level with a transport

interchange underneath.

- (ii) He agreed that community facilities in Wan Chai were insufficient, yet he doubted whether a CCC was needed. He said that Hong Kong had the lowest birth rate in the world, and families in Wan Chai were generally well-off with sufficient financial means to take care of their children. Therefore, he was of the view that it would be more appropriate to establish a civic centre at the CHR site.

20. Dr Jennifer CHOW raised the following comments:

- (i) She pointed out that the basement of the ex-Electrical and Mechanical Services Department Headquarters could provide a large area for development purpose. However, the Government only proposed converting two basements to a minibus terminus, while the other two basements would be filled up. She opined that the proposal failed to fully utilise the land resources, resulting in significant wastage.
- (ii) The Council had been asking for the provision of a civic centre at the CHR site. Nevertheless, the Government not only ignored such community need, but also recovered the sites occupied by two recreation clubs to make way for commercial development. She urged the Government to consider how to compensate for the loss of the recreational and sports facilities due to commercial development.
- (iii) She reckoned that the overall planning of the CHR site should include the redevelopment plans of Hong Kong Stadium (HKS) and Po Leung Kuk (PLK), but such factors were not taken into account in preparing the figures.
- (iv) She commented that providing child care service was the social responsibility of commercial institutions. Therefore, she believed that it might not be necessary to provide a CCC at the CHR site. Instead, the Government should consider providing a civic centre, medical services, and women health services, etc., with a view to satisfying community needs.

21. Ms Yolanda NG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She could not agree with PlanD's claim that there was no proposal with preconditions when they consulted the Council on the demolition works in April. She said that she would

strongly doubt the sincerity of PlanD in communicating with the Council if PlanD still insisted that there was no proposal with preconditions despite the heated debate with the Council in May.

- (ii) She welcomed the proposed provision of a DHC and a CCC, but she wondered why such facilities with the public being the service target would be located within the commercial developments. She enquired about the role of FHB in such facilities in the future, and whether these centres would be operated as commercial entities after completion.
- (iii) She agreed that child care service was in short supply in Wan Chai. However, she did not think that health care and child care services should be provided at the expense of recreational facilities.

22. Ms Jacqueline CHUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) Today's proposal which included the provision of a green minibus stand, a DHC and a CCC seemed to paint a rosy picture. However, traffic concerns raised by the Council earlier, including the severe traffic congestion at Caroline Hill Road and Leighton Road, had not been resolved at all. She wondered how the estimated figures in the TIA were derived, and criticised that TD did not hold itself accountable for the TIA.
- (ii) She asked why the number of parking spaces was reduced from 600 to 125, and whether the 125 parking spaces were reserved for the use by commercial institutions. Besides, according to the paper, after the inclusion of a DHC and a CCC, the commercial floor area would be reduced correspondingly. She enquired about the exact reduction in the commercial floor area and the respective floor areas for commercial and retail purposes.

23. Ms Kenny LEE raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She pointed out that Wan Chai District had a larger elderly population among the 18 districts in Hong Kong. Therefore, she supported the establishment of a DHC as soon as possible to help the public detect chronic diseases at an

early stage, as well as meeting the public needs for rehabilitation services after being discharged from hospitals.

- (ii) She asked the departments concerned whether it had estimated the future vehicular flow based on the floor area of the car parks in the buildings in the surrounding area, such as Hysan Place, Lee Garden Four and Lee Garden Five, in assessing the traffic impact.
- (iii) She pointed out that with the increase in road surface, more people would go to the area concerned by driving their own cars, resulting in an increase in vehicular flow. She asked whether the departments concerned had considered establishing a minibus stand and a bus station in the underground space, with a view to encouraging the public to use public transportation and hence avoiding road saturation within a short period of time.
- (iv) Since the redevelopment of HKS was still under planning, she believed that TD did not have any traffic figures on the redevelopment for the moment. Therefore, she considered that the current TIA could not reflect the actual situation, and the relevant figures were subject to adjustment.

24. The Chairperson invited representatives of the government departments to respond.

25. Mr Louis KAU of PlanD responded as follows:

- (i) Regarding the opinion raised by Mr CHENG Ki-kin on child care service, representatives of SWD would introduce the demand for child care service in Wan Chai later.
- (ii) If a DHC or a CCC was to be established in the future, the departments concerned would consult the Council in due course. As for the comments raised by Dr Anna TANG concerning the public car park, representatives of TD and the consultant would give a response later.
- (iii) When PlanD submitted the rezoning proposal to the Town Planning Board (TPB), relevant technical reports would be submitted altogether. Those reports would then become open documents available for inspection by Members and the public at any time.

- (iv) Take Hopewell Centre and Wu Chung House as an example, some of their floor areas were for the use of government agencies, and such areas were owned by the Government. Therefore, under the existing mechanism, although the DHC and CCC would be located within the commercial site, the premises would be owned by the Government.
- (v) According to the latest design, the proposed open space would be located within the commercial site, and the developer would be responsible for its development. In designing, developing and managing the open space, the developer must make reference to the Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines issued by DEVB.
- (vi) With regard to the concern raised by Miss Clarisse YEUNG about the impact on pedestrian connectivity caused by the redevelopment of Haven Street, he asked representatives of TD to give a reply.
- (vii) Since a number of Members had expressed concerns about the demand for child care service in Wan Chai, he invited representatives of SWD to give a response.
- (viii) Following the last consultation with the Council, PlanD had consulted relevant bureaux and departments on the establishment of a civic centre at the CHR site as proposed by the Council. The bureau concerned replied that since a civic centre was a territory-wide facility, it had reviewed whether such facilities were sufficient on Hong Kong Island. In light of the usage of such facilities on Hong Kong Island, the bureau concerned had no plan to establish an additional civic centre on Hong Kong Island for the time being.
- (ix) With regard to the enquiries about the estimation of vehicular flow, he asked representatives of the consultant to respond.
- (x) While the detailed design of the judiciary complex was yet to be available, the overriding principle was to ensure the safe operation of the judiciary complex. Therefore, there was no plan to allocate part of the site for the judiciary complex for the use of other government agencies for the moment. Nevertheless, some space in the basement of the commercial site would be reserved for the establishment of minibuss pick-up and drop-off facilities, and TD could use such space

for the reprovisioning of the existing minibus stands at Lan Fong Road in the future. It was hoped that the prevailing traffic problem in the district could be alleviated through the development of the CHR site.

- (xi) Although the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) had filled up some spaces temporarily when demolishing the superstructures, those spaces would be utilised when the site was redeveloped in the future to avoid any wastage of land resources.
- (xii) The consultant had followed the established practice by including in the TIA all the redevelopment projects near the CHR site which were already known. Since the redevelopment of HKS was under preliminary planning, it was not included in the TIA. However, once the redevelopment of HKS was confirmed, its impact on the surrounding traffic would be assessed, and by then developments at the CHR site would be included in the assessment and the impact of all the relevant developments on the overall traffic conditions would be assessed.
- (xiii) He thanked Ms Yolanda NG for supporting the provision of a DHC and a CCC in the district. He stressed that although the DHC would be located within the commercial site, and the premises would be provided by the developer, its operation would be overseen by FHB. Therefore, the DHC would never become part of the commercial development.
- (xiv) He clarified that the 125 parking spaces mentioned earlier were public parking spaces, which had no direct relevance with the commercial and judiciary developments in the future. It was estimated by TD that 125 public parking spaces should be provided at the site having regard to the current demand in Causeway Bay. He further explained that the commercial and judiciary developments would have their own parking spaces, and together with the public parking spaces, about 600 parking spaces would be provided in total.
- (xv) According to the current estimation, the total floor area of the two social welfare facilities was about 3 700 square metres, but the exact total floor area would be subject to the actual detailed design.

26. Mr Charles SO of AECOM responded as follows:

- (i) In projecting the traffic flow generated by the DHC and CCC, the consultant had make reference to the trip rates of similar facilities, namely Central Kowloon Health Centre and SIA Shaukiwan Day Creche of Hong Kong Society for the Protection of Children.
- (ii) It was the general practice for the consultant to conduct a traffic survey and project the future traffic flow based on the area of the developments at the CHR site. At the early stage of the TIA, the consultant had enquired of relevant departments about other development projects in the surrounding area. Therefore, development projects with concrete schedules, such as the development of PLK, Lee Garden Three and Jardine's Crescent, were already included in the TIA.
- (iii) To alleviate the traffic burden, junction widening works would be carried out by reducing some of the area of the CHR site. Besides, in view of the frequent right-turning traffic congestion at the western section of Caroline Hill Road, it was proposed that the left-turn lane be modified to a left-turn and right-turn shared lane. Moreover, when the eastern and western sections of Caroline Hill Road were linked up, it was expected that the illegal parking problem at the eastern section would be improved due to additional vehicular flow.

27. The Chairperson invited representatives of TD and SWD to respond to Members' enquiries.

28. Ms Fiona FONG of TD responded as follows:

- (i) With regard to the enquiries about the public car park, as explained by PlanD earlier, TD suggested that 125 public parking spaces should be provided at the commercial site after considering the traffic condition in the district, including the daytime and night-time illegal parking figures.
- (ii) Regarding the enquiries about the TIA, as mentioned by the consultant of HyD earlier, they had submitted the TIA report to TD. TD had examined the assumptions in the report and noted that other development projects in the district which were already known had been included in the TIA. TD considered that such practice was reasonable.

29. Miss Hannah YIP of SWD stated that there was a keen demand in Wan Chai for places of CCCs, especially the places of aided standalone CCCs for children aged under two. In 2017/2018, the average utilisation rate of aided standalone CCCs reached 100%. Non-governmental organisations which operated aided CCCs in Wan Chai also said that their services fell short of the demand. Apart from local residents, people who worked in Wan Chai could also be the service users. Therefore, SWD suggested that an aided standalone CCC should be established at the CHR site.

30. The Chairperson asked Members to begin their second round of speeches.

31. The Hon Paul TSE raised the following comments:

- (i) The rezoning of the CHR site and redevelopment of HKS were both mega projects. If two projects were carried out simultaneously, the traffic problems arising from the projects would double, making the implementation of the projects even more challenging. Local residents had complained repeatedly about the frequent congestion from Broadwood Road to Caroline Hill Road, and areas which were relatively quieter at present, such as the vicinity of HKS would become busy as well after the rezoning of the CHR site. He opined that the proposal which included so many concepts in such a small area was idealistic but impracticable.
- (ii) He was disappointed with the replies given by the departments concerned regarding the TIA. He pointed out that the current figures showed that there were many saturation points, and this was a worrying situation. Take Junction J6 as an example, in 2031, the design flow/capacity ratios during morning and evening rush hours were 0.44 and 0.46 respectively. He requested the Administration to explain why such ratios were so low.
- (iii) HKS only held large-scale events occasionally at present, but more events would be held there after redevelopment. According to past experiences, when an event was being held at HKS, the entire Caroline Hill Road had to be closed. He queried whether frequent road closures had to be implemented in the future. He reckoned that since these problems would happen very soon, the Administration should not keep making an excuse that the proposal had yet to be

finalised or it would be subject to further revision. He urged the Administration to disclose the whole plan to the Council as soon as possible.

- (iv) He pointed out that not only 125 public parking spaces would be provided under the rezoning proposal. Together with the 600 parking spaces in the commercial buildings and judiciary complex, the vehicular flow of the entire area would be bound to increase significantly.
- (v) He supported the establishment of a DHC and a CCC in the district, but their locations must be selected after thorough consideration. He commented that it would be very challenging to place so many facilities within a single site. He opined that the idea was ambitious, but it might make things worse.
- (vi) He urged the Administration to provide additional traffic figures, so that the Council could better understand whether the rezoning was feasible. As the Member of Broadwood constituency, he believed that local residents would strongly oppose the proposal.

32. Miss Clarisse YEUNG raised the following comments:

- (i) She considered that the TIA report was closely related to the development proposal being discussed at the meeting. Therefore, it was unreasonable for the departments concerned to provide the TIA report to the Council only after it was submitted to TPB.
- (ii) With regard to the performance of the major junctions, the vehicular flow at Junction J17 (Cotton Path) would decrease. If an additional carriageway was constructed at Junction J18, the vehicular flow from Junction J6 to Junction J2 should reduce significantly. Nevertheless, the reduction was only 1% according to the assessment. She queried how the Council could judge whether the relevant figures were correct or not if the full report of the TIA was unavailable.
- (iii) The existing minibuses included minibuses routes for Lai Tak Tsuen, Jardine's Lookout, Tai Hang Drive and Happy Valley. She reckoned that it was no difference from asking the residents to walk uphill if they had to walk from Causeway Bay station to Caroline Hill Road to take minibuses

in the future. She opined that the Administration should carefully consider the feasibility of Ms Kenny LEE's suggestion of establishing an underground bus terminus.

- (iv) She pointed out that the TIA did not include the traffic impacts to be generated by the redevelopment of HKS and PLK, as well as the potential redevelopment of Haven Street.
- (v) She criticised that the Government often went after the GIC sites in Wan Chai, trying to rezone them for commercial purpose. Such examples abounded, such as the relocation of the water pumping station at Harcourt Road to Lockhart Road Playground, the redevelopment of HKS which included demolishing Wan Chai Sports Ground (WCSG) for the construction of the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre Phase Three, etc. She commented that the Government's plans for the public space in Wan Chai could not meet the needs of the public.
- (vi) Apart from a CCC, the Council had also expressed that facilities for the provision of elderly services were needed in the district. She opined that the current proposal did not respond to the public aspiration in this respect. Worse still, the property developer would be entrusted with the management of the park, which was a common hangout for elders. She wondered why the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) was not appointed to manage the GIC site which was originally owned by the Government.

33. Mr Joey LEE raised the following comments:

- (i) Junctions J1 and J3 were often heavily congested. There were four days in December on which traffic in entire Wan Chai was paralysed due to severe congestion at the above locations. Traffic congestion would no doubt aggravate if more vehicles were brought in before the existing problems were resolved.
- (ii) It was not elaborated in the paper that which minibus routes would be relocated to the minibus terminus at Caroline Hill Road. He said that since Caroline Hill Road was far away from the MTR station, it would be very inconvenient to the residents if minibus routes 21A and 21M were moved to Caroline Hill Road. He urged the authorities concerned to provide additional information, so that the Council could

know which minibus routes would be relocated to the minibus terminus at Caroline Hill Road.

34. Ms Kenny LEE raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) The traffic figures provided in the paper were based on various assumptions, yet the departments concerned withheld the details of such assumptions from the Council. She said that some assumptions could result in better traffic figures. For instance, if today's traffic condition was used as a reference scenario, she was highly sceptical about whether the reserve capacities of Pennington Street and Caroline Hill Road could be as good as 27% and 12% respectively.
- (ii) She asked whether the assumption of illegal parking was included in estimating the saturation flow of roads.
- (iii) She asked the departments concerned whether they had considered the vehicular flow to be generated by other developments in the vicinity in the future, such as the shopping mall of Lee Garden Five.
- (iv) She pointed out that the development of a transportation hub could enhance the effectiveness of the junction improvement works. The public could choose to use public transport, and they would realise that they could reach different shopping malls more quickly by using public transport.
- (v) She pointed out that the TIA did not include the traffic impact of the redevelopment of HKS. When sports events were held by schools in HKS in the future, it was very likely that more than 10 coaches would access the area.
- (vi) She said that illegal parking could obstruct the vehicular flow of a traffic lane, therefore when assessing the traffic impact, the factor of illegal parking must be incorporated in the formula for assessment.
- (vii) She asked that if the Government would consider using public transportation as an alternative proposal, with a view to alleviating traffic congestion.
- (viii) Given that the increase in roads in Hong Kong was far below the growth in vehicle population, she reckoned that railway should be used as the backbone of the passenger transport

system, which should be connected with underground walkways. Besides, she hoped that members of the public could access different locations in Causeway Bay more quickly by taking buses and minibuses.

35. Ms Yolanda NG raised the following comments:

- (i) She agreed that commercial sites were in short supply, but it did not mean that more commercial sites should be provided in Causeway Bay and Wan Chai. In fact, Causeway Bay had already been over-commercialised. She was against the use of the CHR site for commercial development, unless the Government planned to convert Causeway Bay to another Central in the long run, where only commercial buildings were left without any residences.
- (ii) She hoped that more gender factors could be incorporated in the design of the DHC and CCC, and relevant facilities should be enhanced to cater for the needs of different user groups.
- (iii) It appeared that the TIA only covered a number of roads in the vicinity of Caroline Hill Road, while public concerns about other inner streets and the surrounding area of Hennessey Road were not taken into account. Besides, she reckoned that if any additional public transport facilities would be provided, they should be included in the TIA as well.
- (iv) She pointed out that Caroline Hill Road was far away from the downtown of Causeway Bay. She commented that it was not a bad idea to encourage the public to walk. However, a pleasant walking experience should be provided to the public by ensuring easy accessibility and cleanliness of streets. In fact, making walking a pleasant experience was a key factor in today's city management. Since the CHR site was a newly developed area, she hoped that the authorities concerned would inject more innovative elements into the project.

36. Ms Jacqueline CHUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She agreed that the local residents were in need of community facilities such as DHC and CCC. She asked

SWD and LCSD whether the two centres together occupied 3 700 square metres in the commercial site of 100 000 square metres. If so, there would be 6 300 square metres left for commercial and retail purposes. The 600 parking spaces would be used by those who went there for work, school or shopping. Moreover, people visiting other commercial, retail and recreational facilities in the vicinity would also use the 600 parking spaces. Thus the pedestrian and vehicular flows would increase significantly. From the business point of view, such changes would be welcomed, but to local residents, it would cause great inconvenience.

- (ii) While Wan Chai had a resident population of only 180 000, its transient population was as large as 600 000. She criticised HyD for making reference to Shau Kei Wan and Sham Shui Po, which were largely different from Wan Chai. She also wondered why TD considered such assessment reasonable.
- (iii) Traffic in Wan Chai was heavily congested at present. Even after the commissioning of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass, she believed that Hennessey Road and Leighton Road would still be used by many motorists. Since the existing traffic problems had not been resolved yet, and the TIA did not include the impacts of the redevelopment of HKS, she raised opposition to the rezoning proposal and the proposed amendments to Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/19.

37. Dr Jennifer CHOW raised the following comments:

- (i) She opined that without any concrete figures from the departments concerned, the Council was not convinced that the proposed development would not bring any unacceptable impact to the district. She said that with the existing rampant illegal parking and traffic congestion problems in Wan Chai, coupling with the geographical constraints of Caroline Hill Road, traffic congestion problem would definitely continue unchecked if a large number of vehicles were brought in, but the roads were not widened to ease the traffic.
- (ii) She pointed out that the 600 parking spaces were owned by the property developer, and the Government had no control over their leasing or sale in the future. Moreover, vehicles might not access the location only during non-peak hours,

and the TIA did not provide any estimated figures in this respect.

- (iii) At present, the major traffic bottlenecks were found in the vicinity of Regal Hongkong Hotel at Yee Wo Street and St. Paul's Convent School. However, the TIA did not provide any figures which showed that such bottlenecks could be resolved. She added that if the Government planned to encourage the public to use public transportation, subways connecting with the MTR station must be constructed.
- (iv) If a DHC was established at the site in the future, a lot of wheelchairs and rehabilitation buses would access the area; and if a CCC was set up, many baby strollers would be expected. Since such changes were not taken into account in the assessment, she urged the departments concerned to provide more comprehensive and realistic figures to the Council for reference.
- (v) At the commercial site with an area of 100 000 square metres, there were originally two recreation clubs which occupied a total area of 50 000 square metres. She called on PlanD to utilise the land resources flexibly, and reconsider establishing a civic centre on the GIC site.

(The Hon Paul TSE left the meeting at 4:05 p.m.)

38. Mr Ivan WONG stated that the Council was gravely concerned about the traffic issue not only for the sake of local residents, but also users of the court complex. Since persons attending hearings must arrive at the court on time, the court complex should be located at a place accessible by public transportation. He opined that if the district court complex was situated at the CHR site, subways must be built to connect the MTR station with the court complex, so as to offset the disadvantages brought about by the site selection. He agreed that special security needs should be taken into account in designing the court complex, but this should not be used as an excuse for being unable to make good transportation planning.

39. Ms Yolanda NG stated that the consultant had mentioned earlier that future developments, including the development at Jardine's Crescent, had been considered in producing the estimated figures. She enquired about the future developments at Jardine's Crescent.

40. Dr Anna TANG reiterated that she had reservations about TD's

reply regarding the public car park. She commented that the supply of those parking spaces was only a drop in the ocean, and it would not help much in alleviating the traffic congestion. Worse still, with the establishment of the public car park, more vehicles would circulate the area to wait for parking spaces, thus further aggravating the traffic obstruction.

41. The Chairperson invited representatives of the government departments to respond.

42. Mr Louis KAU of PlanD responded as follows:

- (i) Space would be reserved at the CHR site, and after TD consulted the industry and relevant stakeholders, the reserved space would be used for the reprovisioning of the minibus stands. As for which minibus routes would be relocated to the CHR site, the proposal was yet to be finalised for the moment. To make it convenient for residents to take MTR, consideration could be given to setting up a pick-up and drop-off point at Lan Fong Road, while the minibus terminus could be established at Caroline Hill Road. The proposal would be finalised after TD consulted relevant stakeholders, including the Council.
- (ii) Since no concrete redevelopment proposal of HKS was available for the moment, such factor was not included in the TIA. After the concrete redevelopment proposal was available, relevant departments would assess the impacts of the redevelopment of HKS on the traffic in the vicinity of Caroline Hill Road, Link Road and Leighton Road in Causeway Bay, and the proposed developments at the CHR site would be considered altogether.
- (iii) The current idea was to provide public open space at the commercial site, therefore the developer would design and manage the open space in accordance with the guidelines issued by DEVB. Regarding the suggestion of appointing LCSD to manage the open space, he stated that he would discuss the suggestion with relevant departments.
- (iv) PlanD and the Civil Engineering and Development Department were studying the development of underground space in Causeway Bay, with a view to improving connectivity in the district. The study included exploring the feasibility of constructing a subway connecting the CHR

site with the MTR station. Therefore, the developer was required to reserve a connection point at an appropriate location for connecting the subway that might be constructed in the future.

43. Mr Charles SO of AECOM responded as follows:

- (i) The traffic condition of signalised junctions was indicated in Reserve Capacity (RC). The higher the RC, the better the performance of the junction. The traffic condition of priority junctions was indicated in Design Flow/Capacity Ratio. The closer the ratio to 1, the poorer the performance of the junction.
- (ii) After the CHR site was rezoned, the performance of Junction J2 would be slightly improved because of the road widening works and the provision of an additional southbound lane. The impact on other junctions would also be minimal, while the priority junctions would still have high RC.
- (iii) He stated that in compiling the relevant estimated figures, the trip rates of different kinds of developments in the surrounding area were taken into account, including Tai Ping Mansion, Pacific Place and hotels in Wan Chai and Causeway Bay.
- (iv) The existing TIA did not include the impacts of the redevelopment of HKS. If HKS was to be redeveloped in the future, another TIA would be carried out which would be overseen by TD. Besides, impacts of the redevelopment of PLK had been included in the current TIA.
- (v) If illegal parking near a junction had affected its operation, such factor would be considered when the capacity of the junction was assessed.
- (vi) They had communicated with TD beforehand regarding the scope of the TIA, and the assessment mainly covered areas to be affected by the trip rates of the developments at the CHR site.

44. The Chairperson asked if there was any development plan for Jardine's Crescent.

45. Mr Charles SO of AECOM clarified that minor private

redevelopment projects there were included in the TIA.

46. Ms Fiona FONG of TD acknowledged Members' concerns about the traffic impact. She said that there were junction improvement measures under the current proposal to minimise the traffic impact of the rezoning of the CHR site.

47. Mr Gary LAI of TD supplemented that if there were any changes in the minibus routes in the future, TD would gauge views from Members and the Council.

48. Miss Hannah YIP of SWD stated that when planning the social welfare facilities at the CHR site, SWD had considered various factors, including developments in the surrounding area, community needs, demand and supply of relevant services and floor area available for social welfare purpose at the selected location, etc. At present, there were four subvented and self-financing elderly homes in Wan Chai, providing a total of 770 places. If private elderly homes participated in the Enhanced Bought Place Scheme were included as well, the total number of places provided was 923. SWD would continue to adopt a multi-pronged approach to increase the number of residential care places in the district, with a view to meeting the needs of frail elders for residential care services.

49. The Chairperson asked whether the 923 places mentioned above were all places for the elderly.

50. Miss Hannah YIP of SWD answered that all of them were residential care places for the elderly.

51. The Chairperson asked Members if they had other comments.

52. Ms Yolanda NG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) The consultant mentioned earlier that they had made reference to the information of Tai Ping Mansion. However, Tai Ping Mansion was located at Hollywood Road, she asked the consultant whether they meant China Taiping Tower at Sun Wui Road.
- (ii) If the consultant had referred to the figures of the development project at Jardine's Crescent, she requested the consultant to provide relevant information to the Council. According to her information, there was no development project planned for Jardine's Crescent at present, yet there

were redevelopment works of private buildings at Jardine's Bazaar.

53. Mr Anson LAM raised the following comments:

- (i) At present, there were four green minibuses routes at Lan Fong Road, namely 21M, 14M, 21A and 30. All of these routes needed to pass through Leighton Road, therefore relocating the minibus stands to Caroline Hill Road would cause great inconvenience to the residents and passengers.
- (ii) He opined that the Government should not consider building the proposed structures at Caroline Hill Road before the feasibility of constructing the subway connecting Caroline Hill Road was confirmed, otherwise vehicle-pedestrian conflicts might occur in the future.

54. Miss Clarisse YEUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She said that the views of the Council and the Government were greatly diverse, yet the departments concerned were completely unable to address the worries and concerns raised by Members regarding the traffic and planning issues.
- (ii) She emphasised that she had told the departments concerned before about her hope that the park could be managed by the Government instead of the property developer since there were too many examples of failures in the past. If the open space was managed by the property developer, the public would have no say in the opening and operation of the park, hence the interactivity would weaken significantly.
- (iii) The CHR site was originally a GIC site which was reserved for the community. A large portion of the floor area would be rezoned for commercial development under the rezoning proposal, bringing disadvantages and disasters to the community. She queried whether the Government had considered the well-being of the residents in Wan Chai at all.
- (iv) She stressed that she did not hope that part of the commercial floor area would be used for retail purpose. She opined that the reserved commercial floor area should be used as Grade A offices instead of any shopping mall, since the latter would bring in even more vehicular flow.

- (v) She commented that the presentation on the DHC was rather unclear. As far as she knew, a pilot project had been implemented in Kwai Tsing District. She enquired of the PlanD about their idea of providing a DHC in Wan Chai. In addition, she asked whether residents in the district were in need of this kind of facilities, and whether the development of these facilities were mature enough to ensure that it was feasible to provide such facilities in Wan Chai.
- (vi) She pointed out that the relocation plan of the minibus stand had yet to be confirmed, but PlanD had already reserved space at the CHR site for the reprovisioning of a minibus stand. If it was expected that the traffic from Leighton Road to Caroline Hill Road would become even more congested, she queried why additional vehicular flow should be diverted to the area. She commented that it was the greatest hope of the public that direct and efficient minibus service could be provided, therefore altering the minibus routes was not a sensible idea.
- (vii) She enquired of SWD about the number of elderly waiting for residential care services and the required waiting time in Wan Chai, and whether the existing services could satisfy local demands. Besides, she stated that Haven Street might be redeveloped. A large number of residents living in that area were elders, and they hoped that they would be accorded local rehousing, such as being admitted into residential care homes nearby. She asked if there were sufficient residential care homes in the vicinity to meet their demand.

55. Mr Joey LEE raised the following comments:

- (i) According to the consultant, the scope of the TIA was determined in accordance with the requirements of TD. He asked whether TD still stuck to the established procedures in determining the scope of the TIA. He opined that the rezoning of the CHR site was a mega development project, yet TD did not expand the scope of the assessment or request the consultant to conduct a more comprehensive TIA. He queried if TD was incompetent in doing its job.
- (ii) He believed that PlanD reserved space at the CHR site for the reprovisioning of a minibus stand in response to the request of TD. He urged TD to further disclose the details of the

relocation of the minibus stand.

56. Ms Peggy LEE raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She reckoned that many fundamental issues were still left unresolved under the proposal submitted by the Government this time, particularly matters related to traffic.
- (ii) She criticised that PlanD raised a new proposal every time when it consulted the Council. For instance, it was proposed out of the blue to reserve space for the construction of a subway this time. She enquired of the Government about its next step. She also doubted whether the Government would ever be able to formulate a proposal which could serve the needs of the market.
- (iii) She opined that the rezoning of the CHR site was a large-scale development project, therefore she wonder why the relevant TIA did not cover other development projects and potential redevelopments in the surrounding area.

57. The Chairperson asked the representatives of TD, PlanD and the consultant to respond.

58. Mr Louis KAU of PlanD thanked Members for their views on the development proposal. He stated that the next step was to consolidate the comments of the Council for discussion with the bureau concerned. If the proposal did not require further revisions, PlanD would submit the proposal together with the comments of the Council to TPB as mentioned in the paper.

59. Mr Gary LAI of TD responded that the relocation of the minibus stand had yet to be finalised for the moment. He explained that TD had not yet decided whether all minibus routes at Lan Fong Road would be relocated to Caroline Hill Road, or whether a midway stop would be provided to accommodate the transport needs of the public. He emphasised that no matter which option was adopted, TD would first consult the Council and conduct in-depth discussions with Members, as well as considering the transport characteristics of passengers and public views.

60. Ms Wendy AU of FHB responded as follows:

- (i) The Chief Executive had mentioned the establishment of DMCs in both the 2017 and 2018 Policy Addresses.

Non-public organisations would be invited via tender to establish a private healthcare personnel network in the community under a non-profit-making mode, and the Government would provide subsidies to the public for using the services covered by the private healthcare personnel network.

- (ii) She clarified that primary care was the first level of care in the whole healthcare system, including the prevention of diseases and health promotion. Therefore, primary care did not refer to medical services for the grassroots.
- (iii) The major objective of the DHC in Kwai Tsing District was to facilitate the early detection of chronic diseases by the public, such as high blood pressure and diabetes. According to the statistics compiled by the Census and Statistics Department, there were over 700 000 chronic disease patients in Hong Kong at present. Furthermore, there were studies indicating that some members of the public were not aware of having chronic illnesses. Therefore, the Government implemented the district healthcare system to help the public detect health problems early, and hence receive prompt medical treatment through the DHC system.
- (iv) FHB was of the view that addressing chronic diseases was a territory-wide issue, therefore a DHC would also be established in Wan Chai. FHB would propose detailed services in accordance with the demographic statistics of Wan Chai, and would consult the Council on the proposal.
- (v) The tender exercise for the Kwai Tsing DHC commenced last September and was closed last November. Tenders received were being evaluated currently. The DHC was expected to commence operation in the third quarter of 2019, and its operation mode could serve as reference for Wan Chai.

61. Miss Hannah YIP of SWD responded as follows:

- (i) The waiting time for aided residential care services was subject to various factors, such as whether the applicant had only selected a certain district or residential care home, and the turnover rate of individual residential care homes.
- (ii) SWD did not keep statistics on the waiting time for residential care homes by district. However, according to a

survey dated 30 November 2018, the average waiting time for care and attention places and nursing home places was 22 months and 21 months respectively.

- (iii) SWD would continue to implement multi-pronged measures to increase the residential care places, including making better use of the existing aided residential care homes, and converting the non-subsidised residential care places of contract homes to subsidised places, with a view to increasing the overall supply of subsidised residential care places for the elderly.
- (iv) From 2017 to 2019, SWD would issue 3 000 Residential Care Service Vouchers in phases to provide an additional choice for elderly persons in need of residential care services.
- (v) If elders had any needs for social welfare services, district offices of SWD would be more than happy to provide assistance, and Members were welcomed to refer relevant cases to them.

62. Mr Charles SO of AECOM clarified that it should be China Taiping Tower at Yun Ping Road instead of Tai Ping Mansion as mentioned earlier. Besides, he clarified that private redevelopment projects at Jardine's Bazaar were included in the TIA.

63. Ms Jacqueline CHUNG reiterated that she was opposed to the revised proposal of the CHR site and the proposed amendments to Wong Nai Chung OZP. She urged the departments concerned to improve the proposal and seek comments from the Council again before submitting the revised proposal to TPB.

64. Ms Kenny LEE raised the following comments:

- (i) She considered that there was a pressing need to establish a DHC, since the existing healthcare system was heavily dependent on hospital service, while the work relating to preventive medicine only accounted for 10%. She pointed out that prevention was better than cure in long term, thus a DHC should be set up as soon as possible.
- (ii) She criticised that the scope of the TIA was so small that it only extended to Jardine's Bazaar, without including other developments. Moreover, only several junctions in the vicinity of Caroline Hill Road were included in the TIA,

therefore she opined that the assessment was not comprehensive enough to reflect the actual traffic condition.

- (iii) She pointed out that the reserve capacity was too low. To solve the traffic congestion problem in long term, additional time and energy must be spent by TD on planning a public transportation hub. She called on TD to promise residents in Wan Chai that better planning on the public transportation network would be conducted.

65. Mr Joey LEE stated that the representatives of TD had not responded to his questions. He asked whether the scope of the TIA was determined according to the general practice or whether the scope was expanded having regard to the scale of the development project. Besides, he hoped that the DHC would be established as early as possible.

66. Ms Fiona FONG of TD stated that the PowerPoint presentation only showed some of the junctions covered by the TIA. In fact, junctions at Yee Wo Street and Percival Street were also included in the assessment. According to the figures provided by the consultant, the development of the CHR site would have greater impacts on the vehicular flow at the junctions in the surrounding area, while the impact on the junctions in further areas, such as those at Pennington Street, Hennessey Road and Gloucester Road, would be insignificant.

67. The Chairperson stated that Members had expressed their views thoroughly, and he asked the government departments to note their views.

68. Miss Clarisse YEUNG expressed dissatisfaction with TD's reply. She said that it was necessary for TD to submit the full report of the TIA in the next consultation with the Council on the revised proposal. Otherwise, she considered that TD was trying to make a fool of the Council.

69. The Chairperson asked the government departments to note the opinions raised by Members, and he thanked the representatives for attending the meeting.

**Item 2: Proposed Coverage of the Redevelopment of Hong Kong Stadium
(WCDC Paper No. 3/2019)**

70. The Chairperson welcomed Mr YUEN Hing-keung, Chief Leisure Manager (Recreation & Sport)² of the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB); Ms Rosa AU, Senior Executive Officer (Planning)⁴ and Ms Wandy LEE,

二〇一九年七月四日

書 面 動 議

規劃署、建築署、路政署及
運輸署的合併書面回覆
灣仔區議會文件第 43/2019 號

1. 為何建議興建的新區域法院將會是 135 米高？是否預留日後再作其他用途？

根據《黃泥涌分區計劃大綱圖》的擬議修訂，加路連山道的「政府、機構或社區(2)」用地將預留作興建區域法院及其附屬設施之用。有關發展項目的最大總樓面面積限為 70,000 平方米。高度限制與鄰近商業地帶的相關限制一致。

2. 現時政府的交通評估報告是否已包括賽馬日、假日及大球場活動日，以及出入醫院的車流量？

加路連山道一帶的交通高峰時段主要集中在工作日的上下午繁忙時間。所以現時的交通評估報告選擇以工作日進行交通評估。出入醫院的駕駛者為現有道路使用者的一部分，已包括於交通評估之中。

另外，當香港大球場或賽馬會舉辦大型項目時，警方會因應實際的交通及人潮情況實施特別交通及運輸安排，所以上述的情況未有納入交通評估。

3. 現時繁忙時段的時代廣場及渣甸坊的地鐵人流量已近飽和，銅鑼灣的行人路根本無法負荷，請問有否就加路連山道發展後的人流量作評估？有否有考慮到人車爭路的問題？

交通評估內容同時包括車輛及行人流量的評估。行人流量的主要評估包括加路連山道、禮頓道、開平道、新寧道、邊寧頓街及恩平道的行人路及過路處。行人流量評估結果顯示，在實行人過路設施的改善措施後，附近行人路及過路處整體仍能達致可接受的水平。

因應上述結果，交通評估建議作出以下行人過路設施的改善措施，包

括 (i) 擴闊加路連山道 (西段) 的東面行人路至 3.5 米；(ii) 擴闊加路連山道 (西段) 以東，橫過禮頓道的交通燈控制過路處至 4 米；(iii) 移除位於加路連山道 (西段) 保良局外的行人過路處，以配合未來的道路設計；(iv) 於加路連山道 (東段)，有關用地的東面出入口外增設一個新的行人過路處，以便禮頓道與有關用地之間的行人能使用加路連山道 (東段) 以東的較寬闊行人路；及 (v) 於禮頓道／恩平道／邊寧頓街／加路連山道 (東段) 路口延長橫過禮頓道的行人綠燈時間，以改善行人路服務水平。

4. 根據規劃署的建議，新建的商業大樓完全遮擋了加路連山道一帶民居的景觀、通風及採光，嚴重影響居民現有的生活環境，請問部門如何確保發展不會影響居民原有的生活素質？

政府已經就用地改劃作商業及新區域法院的建議進行相關技術評估，包括空氣流通評估及視覺影響評估。我們建議擬議發展的建築物高度該與毗鄰的商業發展相若。此外，我們亦根據空氣流通評估結果，建議在擬議發展內提供通風廊，並於商業發展內提供休憩空間，以促進空氣流通及視覺通透度。

5. 現時禮頓道、樂活道、連路、加路連山道及附近主要幹道的交通情況及執法數字為何？據我們了解，現時上述道路已十分擠塞，一旦將此用地發展成 135 米高的商業樓宇，勢必對附近一帶交通造成嚴重的負荷，請問部門有何解決方案？

政府已經就加路連山用地改劃作商業及新區域法院的建議進行交通評估。而各項技術評估報告的詳細內容已經上載於城規會網站 (https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/tc/meetings/mpc_meeting.html) 供公眾參考。

在此，相關交通評估已包括評估範圍內已規劃的重建計劃及發展（包括商業、住宅及政府、機構或社區設施），以估計日後交通情況並建議相應的改善工程。根據交通評估，用地的發展項目落成後雖然會增加禮頓道和加路連山道的車流量，但相應的路口改善工程有助減少車輛穿插情況，使行車更暢順。此外，在路口改善工程實施後，禮頓道及加路連山道(西段)路口會增加一段左轉入加路連山道(西段)的行車，加路連山道(西段)亦會增加一條南行的行車線。交通評估結果顯示，在實施路口改善工程後，加路連山道用地附近主要路口的剩餘容車量仍然在可接受水平。其他建議的路口改善工程包括 (i) 將加路連山道 (西段) /連道的優先通行路口改為類似迴旋處的交通運行模

式；(ii) 在有關用地的東面出入口外（即加路連山道（東段）的東行線）增設一條右轉車道；及 (iii) 在禮頓道/加路連山道（西段）/開平道路口北行的左轉行車道將改為「左轉和右轉共用」行車道。

6. 規劃署表示香港未來對於商業用地有很大的需求。但據了解，一些甲級商業大廈如利園三期及置地廣場均有不少空置單位，請問有關說法是根據甚麼數據作推算？

灣仔/銅鑼灣區甲級寫字樓空置率一向偏低，而現時區內並無新增商業用地供應。根據差餉物業估價署所製訂《香港物業報告 2019》，灣仔/銅鑼灣區的甲級寫字樓空置率在 2018 年年底約為 4.8%，較全港(8.7%)為低；平均月租由 2008 年的 526 元/平方米上升至 2018 年的 799 元/平方米，明確反映該區甲級寫字樓供應短缺及市場對核心商業區寫字樓有殷切需求。

在《香港 2030+：跨越 2030 年的規劃遠景與策略》的研究過程中，規劃署在 2017 年完成了一項名為《檢討甲級寫字樓、商貿及工業用地的需求》的顧問研究，該研究推算全港的商業核心區甲級寫字樓（包括位處灣仔/銅鑼灣區的甲級寫字樓）在短中長期均會出現供不應求的短缺情況。以總樓面面積計算，至 2023 年的短期短缺約有 48 萬平方米；至 2033 年中期短缺約有 31 萬平方米；至 2041 年長期短缺約有 106 萬平方米。

Action

amendments to the minutes of the 22nd meeting of WCDC from Miss Clarisse YEUNG, and referred Members to the paper tabled.

54. As Members present had not raised further amendments, the amended minutes of the 22nd meeting were duly confirmed by means of a motion moved by Mr Joey LEE and seconded by Mr Ivan Wong.

Action

Discussion Items

Item 3: Amendment Items Incorporated into the Draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H7/20
(WCDC Paper No. 41/2019)

Item 4: Written Motion on the Proposed Planning of ex-Electrical and Mechanical Services Department Headquarters Site at Caroline Hill Road
(WCDC Paper No. 43/2019)

55. The Chairperson said that since both agenda items 3 and 4 were subject matters relating to the proposed developments at the Caroline Hill Road Site (the CHR Site), he suggested discussing these two agenda items together. The Chairperson asked Members whether they agreed with the above arrangement.

56. There being no objection from Members present, the Chairperson announced that agenda items 3 and 4 would be discussed together.

57. The Chairperson welcomed representatives of the following government departments and institution to the meeting:

Planning Department (PlanD):	Mr Louis KAU, District Planning Officer/ Hong Kong Mr Anthony LUK, Senior Town Planner/ Hong Kong 3
------------------------------	--

Transport Department (TD):	Ms Fiona FONG, Engineer/Wan Chai 1
----------------------------	------------------------------------

Highways	Mr CHAN Wai-hong, Senior District
----------	-----------------------------------

Department Engineer/General (2)
(HyD): Mr WAN Chi-kin, District Engineer/General
(2)B
Mr LEE Wai-lik, District Engineer/Peak

AECOM Asia Co. Ms WONG Wang-ting, Senior Engineer
Ltd. (AECOM): (Transportation Planning)

58. The Chairperson invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on WCDC Paper No. 41/2019.

59. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Anthony LUK of PlanD briefed Members on WCDC Paper No. 41/2019, including background of the amendments to the draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H7/20, a summary of the proposed amendments, the conceptual development with key development parameters, the conservation of old trees and masonry walls, the proposed junction improvement works and the proposed pedestrian crossing facilities, etc.

60. Dr Jennifer CHOW asked Members to raise comments and enquiries.

61. The Hon Paul TSE said that now that the Council would discuss both agenda items together. He suggested explaining the background of his written motion to Members before Members had the floor.

62. Dr Jennifer CHOW said that Members should be allowed to speak first.

63. Mr Anson LAM said that PlanD and a number of departments had previously consulted the Council on the rezoning of the CHR site but still he had serious doubts on the suitability of rezoning the subject site to commercial uses.

64. Mr Joey LEE questioned, considering the rules of procedure, how this could be considered a combined discussion if Members simply proceeded to give views on the paper for agenda item 3 right now.

65. In response to Members' views, Dr Jennifer CHOW asked the Hon Paul TSE to brief Members on the paper for agenda item 4 first.

66. The Hon Paul TSE briefly introduced WDC Paper No. 43/2019 as follows:

- (i) The paper had focused on traffic issues, with questions 2, 3 and 5 pertaining to traffic assessment, pedestrian flow and road congestion respectively while questions 1, 4 and 6 pertaining to the planned building height of the new District Court, the impacts of the new commercial developments on landscape, ventilation and daylight provision as well as the territory's future demand for commercial sites respectively. He invited the relevant departments to respond to the above questions accordingly.
- (ii) Given the huge controversies over transport support facilities, environmental and landscape impacts as well as the maximum permissible gross floor area (GFA) under the current planning proposal, his motion had proposed that this Council strongly objected to the current proposal, as well as request the Government to review the matter and submit a new proposal befitting the needs of residents to the Council for further deliberation and endorsement before submission to the Town Planning Board (TPB).
- (iii) He expressed doubts over the traffic impact assessment (TIA) conducted by the Government. According to some architects and professionals who belonged to his constituency, the reserve capacity (RC) of Leighton Road was still below 15%, the minimum acceptable level stipulated by TD, whereas the level of service (LOS) of the footpaths along Leighton Road was also below LOS C, the prevailing minimum acceptable level by TD. Besides, the TIA did not cover the vehicular flows during peak hours and special occasions such as race days and events to be taken place at the Hong Kong Stadium (HKS), nor did it carry out data analysis on pedestrian flows

or tailbacks on Leighton Road and Broadwood Road. In his opinion, given that the TIA had been riddled with flaws, the Council and the majority of Members would find the formulation of a planning proposal based on this TIA report hardly acceptable.

67. Dr Jennifer CHOW asked the seconders of the motion whether they had anything to add.

68. Ms Peggy LEE asked whether Members could raise enquiries on the consolidated reply from the government departments now.

69. Dr Jennifer CHOW said that Members had the floor now.

70. Ms Peggy LEE made the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She pointed out that the development of individual constituencies would certainly impact on the overall traffic conditions in Wan Chai. All along, residents who belonged to her constituency were not only very worried about the traffic impact of Hopewell Centre Phase II development on Kennedy Road and Queen's Road East, but also had grave concern over new development projects in the district, in particular the development of the CHR Site, because such developments would have a significant impact on the overall traffic conditions in Wan Chai.
- (ii) She enquired about the building height and site area of the existing Wanchai Law Courts as well as how they compared with the new court premises. Noticing that the proposed court premises would occupy a sizeable site, she asked if it was due to emerging uses or an anticipated increase in the number of court cases in the future.
- (iii) She pointed out that the TIA conducted by the Government had omitted vehicular flows during race days, holidays and HKS events. In her opinion, precisely these high-frequency

occasions would lead to an increase in vehicular flow. Therefore, given omission of vehicular flows on these occasions, she questioned how this could be hailed as a comprehensive TIA. Besides, she enquired about the planning horizon of the TIA concerned.

- (iv) The departments concerned had indicated in the consolidated reply that the overall LOS of existing footpaths and pedestrian crossings had still been acceptable. However, she enquired whether the LOS would remain acceptable five years later and asked about the data modelling approach to forecast the number of years for which the LOS of such footpaths and pedestrian crossings would remain acceptable.
- (v) According to the consolidated reply from the departments concerned, the vacancy rate of Grade A Offices in Wan Chai/Causeway Bay areas was 4.8% as at the end of 2008, lower than the territory-wide average. Yet, this indicated that vacant office spaces were still available. She enquired of PlanD about the reasons for increasing the supply of commercial sites in such a circumstance.
- (vi) She pointed out that the Government's planning for concurrent commercial developments of such a sizeable scale would have implications on the traffic conditions and the quality of life of residents in the neighbourhood. In the absence of strong justification, indeed it would be difficult to convince and enlist the support of residents.

71. Mr Anson LAM made the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) He pointed out that traffic congestions at Broadwood Road and Leighton Road were serious. Traffic jams had not only been spotted during the morning and afternoon peaks, occasionally the tailback had also extended uphill between 1:00 p.m. and 2:00 p.m. Similarly, heavy traffic in the periphery of Leighton Road had been observed, in which the

tailback had stretched all the way from Leighton Road to Jardine's Lookout on the hill. He pointed out that none of the chairpersons, members and representatives of the owners' corporations of buildings in Jardine's Lookout and at Broadwood Road in the meeting supported the development proposal concerned. He questioned the approach taken by the Government in conducting consultation and planning, and suggested that PlanD should carry out site visits to assess local traffic conditions.

- (ii) He queried the PlanD's claim that there was an undersupply of commercial sites. He pointed out that there were still a lot of vacant shops in Lee Garden Three. Besides, the redevelopment of The Excelsior, Radiant Centre at Cannon Street and 40-42 Yiu Wa Street had been confirmed, whereas there were plans to redevelop Crowne Plaza Hong Kong Causeway Bay into a commercial building as well. The GFA of the confirmed commercial developments had amounted to 1 372 031 square feet (sq. ft.), excluding a total floor area of about 1 800 000 sq. ft. of the CHR Site after being rezoned for commercial uses. There had long been numerous commercial developments in the vicinity of Causeway Bay. While some shops in existing buildings were still vacant, some of these buildings were under construction. He opined that PlanD had utterly failed to take into account the traffic burden arising from the demolition and redevelopment activities, and criticised it for shamelessly ignoring public opinions.

72. Mr Joey LEE said that given the precious land resources in Hong Kong, he did not object to the development of land by the Government provided that residents and local traffic conditions would remain unaffected. Several Members had held a residents' meeting on 14 June 2019, with an attendance of over 100 residents. Besides, the representatives of the Government had sat in the meeting. On that day, residents had put forward different proposals for the consideration of relevant departments. However, the reference materials tabled today failed to include any such

residents' views. He criticised TD for constantly cutting corners, leaving the traffic problems uneradicated. He opined that the construction of new commercial buildings and court premises at the CHR Site might give rise to a gridlock at the location concerned. He queried that TD had never carried out site visits to assess local traffic conditions but only worked behind closed doors.

73. The Chairperson said that the government departments would be invited to respond in one go after all Members had expressed their views.

74. Miss Clarisse YEUNG made the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She pointed out that a part of the CHR Site designated for the provision of court premises had a site area of 10 600 square metres (m²) while the floor space requirement of the new District Court was 70 000 m² only. In theory, the construction of a seven-storey building should be sufficient to meet its floor space requirement. Therefore, she questioned why it was necessary to provide a 13-storey building under the current proposal as the result of multiplying 13 floors by 10 600 m² would far exceed 70 000 m². She enquired about the intended uses of the surplus floor area.
- (ii) According to the previous concept plan from PlanD, the proposed court premises had a floor area of 5 600 m². She enquired whether the Government intended to put the surplus floor area up for sale for commercial uses in the future.
- (iii) The departments concerned claimed in the consolidated reply that traffic was typically the heaviest during the morning and afternoon peaks on working days. She asked whether the departments concerned had any reasonable grounds for making this judgment. She believed that the residents present would agree that actually traffic was the busiest on weekend mornings. In fact, she had repeatedly made the same point during previous discussions. Given that the Council had repeatedly questioned the TIA report submitted

by PlanD, she did not understand why PlanD still made reference to the report concerned to reply to Members' enquiries.

- (iv) Regarding the assessment of future pedestrian flows upon completion of the developments at the CHR Site, she pointed out that one of the road junctions had been rated LOS E, the lowest ranking. She questioned why the departments concerned still indicated in the consolidated reply that the future pedestrian flows could still achieve acceptable levels.
- (v) It had been stated in the consolidated reply that the proposed developments and the adjacent commercial developments were of similar height. She pointed out that the so-called "buildings of similar height" referred to Hysan Place and Times Square, etc. but not the nearby residential buildings, which in fact the proposed developments were in close proximity to. She illustrated her point with a number of sun path diagrams, saying that the proposed developments would definitely have a profound impact on daylight provision in residential buildings.
- (vi) PlanD had repeatedly come to the Council to conduct consultation on the development plan, during which the Council had expressed its strong objection. However, despite the Council's objection, PlanD still proceeded with submission of the development plan to TPB, and TPB went ahead with public consultation accordingly. She doubted the purpose of the PlanD's consultation with the Council. She urged PlanD to request TPB to withdraw the current development plan which had neglected the interests of the public after listening to Members' views at today's meeting.

75. Ms Jacqueline CHUNG made the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) Although this was the third time PlanD had come to the Council for conducting consultation on the CHR Site, the

paper tabled had shown no signs of improvement. Notwithstanding the considerable comments made by Members during each consultation, PlanD had never addressed the Council's major concern.

- (ii) As set out in paragraph 6.1 of the paper, the provision of a DHC, a CCC and an underground public transport facility for minibuses had been covered by Amendment Item A. It appeared to be a valuable gift to residents but actually it was a hidden trap because the Amendment Item concerned had also included the provision of an underground public car park with not less than 100 private car and 25 commercial vehicle parking spaces. The so-called "provision of not less than 100 parking spaces" actually referred to 600 parking spaces, a figure that had never been revised by PlanD. Given the severe traffic congestion during rush hours in the vicinity of the location concerned, if 600 parking spaces were added in the future, the situation would be even more unimaginable.
- (iii) While the proposed developments would give rise to traffic congestion upon their completion, the existing traffic congestion problem had in fact remained unaddressed so far. At present, Leighton Road was fully parked whenever St. Paul's Convent School finished at 3:00 p.m. or meals were delivered at noon. As a result, two traffic lanes were narrowed into one. This problem had remained unsolved so far. In anticipation of the successive redevelopment of Po Leung Kuk (PLK), South China Athletic Association (SCAA), Haven Street, 8 Leighton Road and HKS, the traffic congestion problem would be further aggravated in the future. She criticised TD for failing to guarantee a smooth traffic flow so far. Under such circumstances, she wondered why Members should support the development proposal concerned.
- (iv) Apart from the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP, under the draft Causeway Bay OZP, the entire Percival Street and

the vicinity of Times Square would be completely transformed into a commercial zone in the future. Nevertheless, PlanD still considered that the confirmed commercial developments with a total GFA of over 1 300 000 sq. ft. were simply not enough to cope with future demand. As such, she queried whether PlanD ever had a forward-looking vision.

- (v) Motions had been moved whenever the Council held discussions on this subject but PlanD had failed to listen to its views. Since TPB was the approving authority, PlanD would act accordingly when TPB had given its support. She condemned PlanD for taking the Council lightly and expressed strong objection to development proposal as set out in the paper.

76. Ms Yolanda NG made the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She was delighted to see that the provision of a DHC, a CCC and public open space had been included in the Amendment Item concerned. Yet, “hotel” had been included as a use always permitted in the commercial zone.
- (ii) She agreed that it was necessary to identify an alternative site for reprovisioning of the existing courts with insufficient space. Nonetheless, the proposed court premises would have a GFA exceeding the floor space required for the new District Court (i.e. 70 000 m²). As such, she enquired about the actual floor space requirement of the courts.
- (iii) Noting that the Lands Tribunal would also be relocated to Caroline Hill Road, she asked why all of a sudden the Lands Tribunal would be moved into the new District Court if the original intent of rezoning the subject site was to address the issue of insufficient space in the existing

courts.

- (iv) She opined that the TIA had failed to include all vehicular flow figures. As a WCDC Member of the Causeway Bay constituency, she was sure that it was not the case that traffic was heaviest only during the morning and evening peaks on working days; instead, vehicular flows on weekends should also be counted. Besides, given the existence of HKS and SCAA in the periphery of the subject site, the additional vehicular flows generated by events staging at these facilities should also be included in the TIA.
- (v) She pointed out that the provision of court facilities at the subject site would generate prisoner transportation traffic in the future. She enquired about the traffic and security arrangements to be put in place if it so happened that major events were taken place nearby.
- (vi) She always stressed that the transport interchange should be located within a very short walking distance. However, given the provision of green minibus (GMB) stands at the CHR Site under the current proposal, she doubted how many residents would be willing to go there on foot to interchange for GMBs, which might in turn unduly overburden the road network. She expressed grave disappointment at the paper tabled today.

77. Mr Ivan WONG made the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) He opined that the Government should consider prioritising its tasks. After all, the overly rapid development of Wan Chai district with incessant construction and demolition activities had allowed no breathing space for residents.
- (ii) He pointed out that the proposed construction of a new

District Court at Caroline Hill Road could be traced back to the Policy Address. At that time, it had been stated by the Government in the Policy Address that there was insufficient space in the existing courts. However, the Judiciary had never come to the Council for giving an account of relevant data. He suspected that the backlog of cases was due to insufficient hardware or inadequacies in software, e.g. a shortage of lawyers or poor administrative efficiency within the Judiciary, etc. He was of the view that the Judiciary should send representatives to the Council to give an account in this regard.

- (iii) He had also doubts about the claim that there was an undersupply of commercial/office premises. He considered that with the emergence of the Internet and the growing popularity of working from home, the demand for commercial/office premises should decrease correspondingly.
- (iv) He commented that as Causeway Bay had been experiencing severe traffic congestion, the Government should grasp this opportunity to designate the subject site as a traffic calming area through proper planning. He reminded the Government that haste did not necessarily bring success, thus, any attempt to speed up the community development process should be by all means avoided.

78. The Chairperson invited the departmental representatives to respond to the concerns and comments raised by Members just now.

79. Mr Louis KAU of PlanD gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) As far as the floor space requirement of the courts was concerned, the Judiciary had proposed a GFA requirement of 70 000 m² in order to accommodate the District Court,

the Family Court and the Lands Tribunal. When calculating the GFA required, the existing GFA had been multiplied by 1.5, that is, apart from meeting the current demand, the Judiciary had set aside extra floor space for future development. Besides, it was necessary to provide an ancillary car park and loading/unloading facilities within the court premises; nevertheless, such ancillary facilities had been exempted from GFA calculation. Therefore, the provision of a seven-storey building was simply not enough. Moreover, under the Buildings Ordinance (BO), the whole building might not be subject to a uniform permitted percentage site coverage of 100%. For a non-residential development with a height of 60 metres (m) or above, the permitted percentage site coverage was 65%. In other words, if the building height had exceeded a certain limit, the site coverage had to be reduced. Therefore, it was not the case that a seven-storey building could provide 70 000 m² in GFA.

- (ii) In view of the independent operation of the District Court and security considerations, court facilities would not co-exist with other uses. In other words, the GFA of 70 000 m² would be for the exclusive use of the District Court and its ancillary facilities.
- (iii) As for the demand for commercial sites, the Government had engaged a consultant to conduct study on the future demand for Grade A Offices, commercial and industrial sites in Hong Kong under the research project on the “Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030” (Hong Kong 2030+). An Econometric Model had been adopted in the study concerned to assess the floor space demand of different land uses based on the assumption that the growth rate of Hong Kong’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) ranged from 3% to 5%. Its findings revealed that in terms of

floor space in GFA, there would be a shortfall of about 480 000 m² of Grade A Offices by 2023, which would decrease to about 310 000 m² by 2033, and then increase to about 1 060 000 m² by 2041. The estimated floor space requirements had rested on different assumptions which would be adjusted accordingly over time.

- (iv) When determining the uses of the CHR Site, a holistic approach would be adopted in land use planning, which included consideration being given to land uses of the neighbouring areas in addition to the demand for commercial sites; only then would the land uses be proposed. After conducting comprehensive assessment, PlanD considered that the CHR Site would be more suitable for commercial uses.
- (v) In fact, the provision of 125 public parking spaces at the CHR Site was made at the request of TD in response to the overall demand for parking spaces in Causeway Bay, thereby solving the problem of shortage of local parking spaces. As for the 600 parking spaces mentioned by Ms Jacqueline CHUNG, after deducting the 125 public parking spaces, the remaining ones were ancillary facilities of the commercial developments and the court premises. The impact of these parking spaces on the surrounding road network had been covered by the TIA.
- (vi) As for the impact of the developments at Caroline Hill Road on daylight provision in the surrounding buildings, he stressed that future developments at the subject site were subject to the requirements under the BO regardless of their architectural designs. As a matter of fact, daylight provision in all existing residential buildings had to comply with relevant BO requirements.
- (vii) PlanD would accordingly relay the views received, including those from members of the public and

Members, to TPB for consideration. TPB might make further amendments to the PlanD's proposal having regard to the sufficiency of grounds of various views.

80. Mr CHAN Wai-hong of HyD said that Members' enquiries on the TIA could be categorised into five areas: first, in which year the TIA had been conducted; second, whether the TIA had covered other future developments in Causeway Bay; third, whether the TIA had taken into account the vehicular flows on special occasions; fourth, whether it was impossible to ease the tailbacks at key junctions; and fifth, the impact of the developments at Caroline Hill Road on people flow in Causeway Bay upon their completion. Mr CHAN said that the design year 2031 (i.e. five years after the anticipated completion of the proposed developments in 2026) had been adopted in the TIA assignment for projecting future traffic and pedestrian flows. Since the remaining four areas involved quite many details, he invited the traffic consultant to elaborate on these matters.

81. Ms WONG Wang-ting of AECOM responded as follows:

- (i) According to the previous TIA concerning the CHR Site, as the performances of the junctions near Caroline Hill Road were better on Saturdays than during the morning and afternoon peaks on working days, the Consultant had chosen to conduct the TIA during the morning and afternoon peaks on working days. Besides, the TD's Annual Traffic Census had revealed that the vehicular flow in Causeway Bay was lower at weekends than on working days. As such, the TIA report had included the data collected during the morning and afternoon peaks on working days in accordance with the established practice.
- (ii) According to the Consultant's assessment of tailbacks, as typically tailbacks would not stretch from the neighbourhood of Caroline Hill Road to the junction on the hill, this level was deemed acceptable.

- (iii) The results of the TIA indicated that even in the absence of the proposed developments at Caroline Hill Road, certain junctions would not be able to achieve an RC of 15% in 2031. Therefore, an RC lower than 15% upon completion of the proposed developments at Caroline Hill Road would still be considered an acceptable level.
- (iv) The results of the TIA indicated that attaining at least LOS D would also be considered an acceptable level.

82. The Chairman asked the representative of TD whether they had anything to add.

83. Ms Fiona FONG of TD responded as follows:

- (i) According to the TIA report, the RC of all junctions near the CHR Site was positive number, implying that the junctions concerned had not been overburdened. TD was aware that the RC of individual junctions was below 15%, which had yet to attain the optimal standard frequently adopted in the planning of new districts. Despite this, in view of the considerable development constraints currently faced by urban areas, as long as the RC was a positive number, this level would still be deemed acceptable.
- (ii) According to the TIA report, the majority of footpaths had attained LOS C or above, a desirable level. Even though individual road sections had been rated as acceptable, i.e. LOS D, due to geographical constraints, still the overall LOS of footpaths was generally satisfactory.
- (iii) According to the information available to TD, vehicular flow at weekends was slightly lower than that on weekdays. Actually, TD had conducted traffic count surveys at individual junctions, and the figures obtained therefrom were similar to the results of the consultancy

report.

84. The Chairperson said that as the departmental representatives had responded to the first round of enquiries from Members, the second round of speaking could start now.

85. Mr Joey LEE enquired how low a level be deemed unacceptable if an RC of 15% and LOS D were deemed acceptable. He believed that not many present at the meeting would consider the reply from the departments concerned acceptable. Besides, he doubted whether the Council's views had been truthfully reflected to TPB. He suggested that the Council should issue a letter in its name to TPB to inform it of today's motion.

86. Ms Yolanda NG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She considered that Hong Kong was not only plagued by an inadequate supply of commercial sites but also the acute housing problem. She asked why the Government did not consider the possibility of designating the CHR Site for residential uses.
- (ii) Given that a lot of new commercial buildings in Causeway Bay were due for completion and many existing commercial premises were still vacant, she considered that over-development of commercial sites should no longer be pursued.
- (iii) In response to TD's comment that the vehicular flow was lower at weekends than on weekdays, she asked how this conclusion had been arrived at, e.g. at what time of the day the survey had been conducted. Her ward office had invited town planners and urban designers to attend a residents' meeting on 10 June 2019, to which PlanD had also sent staff to gauge public views. At that time, PlanD had nothing to say about the vehicular flow being lower at weekends than on weekdays. She asked TD to furnish

the full set of TIA report for the Council's reference.

- (iv) She considered that the two improperly-designed building blocks of the new District Court would not only have impact on daylight provision but also create a wall effect. She enquired about the possibility of refining the design of these two building blocks to reduce the impacts on the surrounding buildings.

87. Miss Clarisse YEUNG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She had a sneaking suspicion that the Council's views had been taken out of context when PlanD conveyed such views to TPB, in that the Council's support for the DHC had been twisted to create the impression that it had supported the entire development project. As PlanD had failed to effectively convey the Council's views, she considered that writing to TPB direct or attendance at public hearing sessions in person should be given priority.
- (ii) Regarding the building height of the court premises, she pointed out that given a permitted percentage site coverage of 60%, the product of 10 600 m² and 60% was 6 360 m²; and the quotient of 70 000 m² and 6 360 m² was equivalent to the height of an 11-storey building. Therefore, she was of the view that the construction of a 11-storey building with a maximum height of 60 metres would be able to meet the Judiciary's GFA requirement of 70 000 m², and that there was simply no need to construct a building with a height up to 135 metres above Principle Datum (mPD).
- (iii) She reiterated that some places would be permanently kept away from sunlight upon completion of the new District Court. She pointed out that when she asked whether PlanD was certain that such developments would

not block sunlight in the community at all, PlanD had only responded that their impact would meet the relevant standards. She opined that PlanD had the responsibility to ensure that the proposal concerned would be submitted to TPB only if it represented the best option for the community from the social, economic and environmental perspectives. It made no sense at all for PlanD to have knowingly submitted the development proposal to TPB even if the community had to make great sacrifices.

- (iv) Consideration might be given by PlanD to the community's proposal on swapping the land uses of the two sites intended for provision of court premises and open space. She did not understand why PlanD had failed to come up with the best option for the community before its submission. She further pointed out that the subject site had been left vacant for more than a decade before commencement of demolition works but the Government had never engaged residents for formulating a comprehensive proposal. What was more, there had been no direct consultation with the residents even before submission of the proposal to TPB. She opined that PlanD should suspend the developments concerned and discuss with the residents on how to refine the proposal before proposing the best option to TPB.
- (v) She reiterated that traffic in the vicinity of Caroline Hill Road was the heaviest during weekends, and suggested that PlanD should conduct site visits accordingly.

88. Ms Jacqueline CHUNG raised the following comments:

- (i) Mr KAU of PlanD had just admitted that the developments concerned would provide 600 parking spaces, implying that 600 vehicles would travel in the area concerned during rush hours, resulting in serious congestion at Leighton Road, Caroline Hill Road and

Eastern Hospital Road in the future. At present, motorists could still turn onto Leighton Road when there was traffic congestion at Gloucester Road or Hennessy Road. However, Leighton Road would not be spared the congestion either upon completion of the developments concerned.

- (ii) She pointed out that since the existing traffic congestion problem had remained unsolved so far, the local road network would be paralysed if over 1 000 parking spaces were additionally provided in the future commercial developments. She urged the departments concerned to deploy staff to conduct site visits in the district, listen to residents' views and consider the data provided by the Council.
- (iii) She expressed disappointment at the responses from PlanD, HyD and TD, and considered that PlanD had incompletely and inaccurately conveyed the Council's views to TPB. As such, she resolutely objected to the proposed amendments.

89. Ms Peggy LEE raised the following comments:

- (i) She urged the traffic consultant to disclose the assessment method, including the assessment dates and time slots as well as the number of vehicles involved, etc. She criticised that the PlanD's mere mention of the word "acceptable" was unable to convince the Council. She believed that none of the residents present would accept the assessment results.
- (ii) Given that Members who had spoken had not expressed support for the proposal concerned, she asked PlanD to clearly explain the next steps for this planning application. She wished to know whether PlanD would proceed with submission of the proposal to TPB for discussion and

approval, or alternatively, whether it would withdraw the current proposal after the third consultation and submit the modified proposal based on residents' views to the Council for consultation with residents before tabling it to TPB.

- (iii) She condemned the PlanD's practice of taking the Council's views out of context when conveying such views to TPB. It had merely been mentioned in WCDC Paper No. 41/2019 that a DHC and a CCC would be provided in response to Members' request, but no mention had been made of the Council's objection against the designation of the subject site for commercial uses and its concern on the problem of traffic congestion in the vicinity. She considered that instead of reporting only the good news but not the bad, PlanD should truthfully reflect each and every comment made by the Council, lest TPB would be misled.

90. Ms Kenny LEE raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She was of the view that in assessing local traffic conditions, the Government should view them holistically and even in the context of territory-wide policy instead of merely focusing on a small area. At present, there were more than 800 000 vehicles across the territory but the motor vehicle first registration tax had not been increased over the past decade or so. After all, such policy issues would have implications for local traffic conditions.
- (ii) She pointed out that the peak hour vehicular flow between Causeway Road and Leighton Road had decreased over the last year or so. She asked TD to provide such basic data as the congestion periods and the number of days in a year when congestion occurred, as well as the definition of congestion, etc. Besides, TD had indicated that there would still be an RC of 15% by 2031. As such, she

asked how this figure had been arrived at and whether traffic slowdowns had also been counted because from the perspective of transport studies, there was a clear distinction between congestion and slowdown. She believed that even slowdowns might be unacceptable to many residents present at the meeting. Nevertheless, it was unlikely to have uninterrupted traffic flows in prosperous cities, except on highways. As a matter of fact, cities such as Sydney and New York had taken a substantial number of alternative measures to mitigate traffic congestion.

91. The Chairperson reminded Ms Kenny LEE that her speaking time was up.

92. Ms Kenny LEE said that fellow Members had fully utilised the three-minute speaking slot.

93. The Chairperson advised Ms Kenny LEE that she had already spoken for over three minutes.

94. Ms Kenny LEE said that she still wished to raise enquiries on public transport services and transport support facilities.

95. The Chairperson asked Ms Kenny LEE to wait for the next round of speaking.

96. Mr Anson LAM raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) He requested TD to provide the full set of TIA report, so that Members could know the dates and duration of the assessment.
- (ii) In response to TD's comment that the traffic impact was acceptable, he enquired about what exactly the acceptable level was. Besides, TD had stated that the vehicular flow had not peaked at weekends. In this connection, he

enquired of the Police about the number of complaints about traffic congestion and illegal parking received during weekends. In fact, he had often called 999 to report such problems. He believed that the existing traffic problems would definitely not be acceptable to local residents.

- (iii) He criticised PlanD for its attempt to disguise the true nature of the space for provision of a GMB terminal under the misnomer of “GMB lay-by”. He enquired about which GMB routes would be relocated to the new GMB terminal and believed that the routes plying between the neighbouring areas such as Jardine’s Lookout, Lai Tak Tsuen and Tai Hang would be relocated to the GMB terminal concerned. He enquired of PlanD whether consideration had been given to the fact that residents would in the future need to walk a long distance to the GMB terminal in the absence of any ancillary facilities along the way. As a matter of fact, the subway previously mentioned by PlanD had yet to be seen.

97. The Hon Paul TSE raised the following comments:

- (i) He understood that the Hong Kong 2030+ had been based on objective data. However, judging from the recent social disputes and riots, he questioned whether 3.5% GDP growth was a realistic forecast.
- (ii) He pointed out that so far, Caroline Hill Road was a rather secluded area in the district. The Government’s current proposal on the transformation of Caroline Hill Road into the most prosperous area in Causeway Bay would of course be unacceptable to local residents. Furthermore, the traffic problems in the district had all along attracted much criticism. Even in the absence of any new developments, there had been numerous complaints from the residents.

- (iii) He pointed out that many members of the public admitted to this meeting were just local residents who would not behave impulsively. Absolutely they would neither storm the LegCo nor participate in vandalism, yet, they would still be angry. He called on the Government to refrain from turning a deaf ear to their voices of anger because the opposition efforts of the middle class people or apologists of the establishment would spark off a massive social crisis. He considered that it was high time the Government should stop before it was too late, and that it should not continue to act in a “you don’t know what I know” manner. Left unchecked, such an attitude would spread from politics to livelihood, traffic and planning matters, then Hong Kong would be game over for sure.
- (iv) He criticised the claim that traffic was busier on weekdays than Sundays as a deviation from reality. As such, he urged the Government to provide detailed data, enabling Members and residents to understand how the finding of the analysis had been arrived at. He said that a concern group named “Happybay” had been formed recently and hoped that PlanD would put forward practical options for the Council’s consideration after making reference to the alternative proposals from the concern group and fellow Members.

98. The Chairperson invited the departmental representatives to respond to Members’ enquiries.

99. Mr Louis KAU of PlanD gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) After considering the proposed amendments to the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP, TPB had agreed to gazette the amendments on 24 May 2019. In other words, such OZP amendments were legally binding. Under the Town

Planning Ordinance (TPO), any person might make representation in respect of the OZP amendments to the TPB Secretariat during the period between 24 May and 24 July 2019. Subject to the relevant provision under the TPO, the representations received would be published for three weeks in due course, during which other members of the public might comment on the representations. TPB would subsequently conduct a hearing with all persons who had made the representations or comments, enabling them to express their views on the amendments. After hearing such views, if TPB decided to make further amendments to the OZP, such amendments would be published for three weeks for the public to make further representations. Normally, the whole process would be completed within nine months after the plan exhibition period. Members might express their views on the OZP amendments to TPB.

- (ii) PlanD had already submitted the TIA report together with the proposed amendments to TPB. The TIA report concerned and the results of other associated technical assessments, including air ventilation, landscape and visual impact, etc., had been uploaded to TPB's website for public inspection.
- (iii) As for a Member's enquiry on the possibility of further refining the design, actually, the site plan currently tabled was a conceptual layout rather than a detailed design. The current OZP provided a development framework, viz. project scope, building heights, GFA, provision of essential government and ancillary facilities, etc., under which developers and the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) would draw up the detailed design in the future.
- (iv) In response to Miss Clarisse YEUNG's enquiry on the building height of the court premises, he said that

reference might be made to the design of the West Kowloon Magistrates' Court, and that the new District Court would adopt a modern architectural design with a relatively high ceiling. Although he did not have the exact details at hand, as far as he knew, the floor-to-floor height of the ground floor of the premises alone had exceeded 7 m. As such, given that 135 mPD was merely the permitted maximum building height, it might not be necessary to build the court premises up to this level. However, design flexibility should be taken into account when determining the building height restriction as the floor-to-floor height of court premises was generally greater than that of ordinary office premises.

- (v) As for the possibility of swapping the land uses of the two sites intended for provision of the court premises and open space, consideration might be given by ArchSD at the detailed design stage. In fact, TPB had also made similar comments when considering the proposed OZP amendments. Accordingly, other design-related comments made by Members would be forwarded to the relevant departments for following up.
- (vi) Members' representations and the minutes of this WCDC meeting would definitely be attached to the papers to be submitted to TPB in the future. In addition, it had been stated in paragraph 4 of the paper tabled at this meeting that "WCDC was still concerned about the traffic impacts of the proposed developments at the CHR Site", evidencing that the WCDC's concerns had been put on record.

100. The Chairperson invited the representatives of HyD to respond.

101. Mr CHAN Wai-hong of HyD supplemented that as the colleague of PlanD had said, the TIA report had already been uploaded to the TPB's website for public inspection, which had introduced the proposed

junction improvement works, explained the modelling approach to forecasting traffic volume in 2031 and set out the RC of junctions generated by transport computer model. He continued that instead of all computer-generated data, those of the priority areas had been set out in the report, e.g. future traffic flow generated from the operation of hotels, offices and retail spaces.

102. The Chairperson invited the representative of the Consultant to respond.

103. Ms WONG Wang-ting of AECOM supplemented that the traffic count survey concerned had taken place on 9 and 10 March 2017.

104. The Chairperson commented that in other words, the survey had been conducted more than two years ago. The Chairperson continued to ask whether the representative of TD had any comments.

105. Mr Gary LAI of TD responded that the proposed relocation of GMB stands had yet to be finalised at this stage. TD would explore the possibility of either relocating the GMB stands from Lan Fong Road to Caroline Hill Road or providing en route stops to cope with community needs. He guaranteed that WCDC would definitely be consulted before the adoption of any proposals, and that the travel pattern of commuters and public views would be taken into account.

106. The Chairperson asked the Police if they had any comments, e.g. whether the implementation of certain measures during HKS events would have an even greater impact.

107. Mr TSE Kwok-wai of HKPF responded that road closure measures would be implemented in accordance with an attendance classification scale (namely A, B, C, D or E) developed by the Police for HKS events. As a case in point, in view of the large attendance during the Hong Kong Sevens, the entire East Hospital Road and Caroline Hill Road would be re-routed one-way and even completely closed to traffic after the event to facilitate the departure of spectators.

108. The Chairperson said that the departmental representatives had responded to Members' enquiries and comments just now. Despite that there were supposed to be two rounds of speaking on this subject, in view of a multitude of concerns involved, he decided to allow more time for Members to speak. However, as the length of the deliberation on this subject had far exceeded the allotted time, he asked Members to speak as concise as possible.

109. Miss Clarisse YEUNG raised the following enquiries:

- (i) She pointed out that it was widely known that TPB had invited representations from the public. Yet, she wished to know the significance of the PlanD's attendance at WCDC meetings. During the PlanD's previous consultations with the Council, Members had urged for a complete withdrawal of the proposal in view of many possible problems arising therefrom, instead of submitting it to TPB. But in the end, PlanD had still submitted the proposal to TPB, which had been gazetted subsequently. Despite the PlanD's claim that it would listen to the Council's views, it had clung obstinately to its course after leaving the meeting. As the proposal had been gazetted, it was not possible to make further amendments even if the Council raised comments at this stage. She wondered what the agenda of PlanD as the perpetrator was when attending this meeting. After all, PlanD could in practice bypass the Council and proceed with the entire approval process without paying heed to the views of the public and Members.
- (ii) Of course, she was aware of the relatively high ceiling of the lobby of the West Kowloon Magistrates' Courts but opined that it was not possible to require a uniform floor-to-floor height of more than 10 metres for the whole building. If there was really such a need, she invited PlanD to convince the Council with relevant data. If it was necessary to require a uniform floor-to-floor height of

more than 10 metres for the whole building block of the new District Court, residents in the surrounding area had to endure the adverse impact of sunlight and ventilation.

- (iii) She was aware that TPB had a tendency to take the line, while the Council had no authority to request TPB to veto the proposal. Therefore, she suggested that the motion should aim to strongly request PlanD as the perpetrator to thoroughly consider whether the Government really needed to adopt such an approach in developing the subject site even if TPB had approved the proposal. She would welcome the PlanD's decision to withdraw the proposal, thus obviating the need to submit it to TPB again; otherwise, she considered it imperative for PlanD to provide good reasons to convince so many Members who were against the development proposal concerned.

110. Ms Kenny LEE raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She enquired of the TD whether there was a decrease in vehicular flows at Leighton Road and Causeway Road recently. She pointed out that given the ever-changing vehicular flows, TD had indeed spent too few days on the traffic count survey which had actually taken place on 9 and 10 March 2017, thus inevitably undermining data integrity. She said that she used to conduct traffic count surveys at road junctions in her own constituency for three to four days before submitting the data collected to TD for consideration.
- (ii) She enquired of the Consultant what exactly an acceptable level was, how the RC of 15% had been arrived at and how relevant parameters had been set. She pointed out that slowdown, congestion and standstill were different scenarios. As such, she asked to what extent a slowdown should be considered unacceptable.

- (iii) Regarding ancillary public transport services, she was of the view that there had been inadequacies in the TD's information system in terms of data warehousing. She pointed out that some mobile applications could inform motorists about congested locations so that they could plan ahead to take alternative routes, thereby shortening their journey time.
- (iv) Regarding public transport services, she enquired about the public transport routes available in the future in response to the overall traffic conditions in the district.

111. Dr Jennifer CHOW raised the following comments:

- (i) She pointed out that the PlanD was supposed to conduct comprehensive planning for the CHR Site, the only large-scale development in the district, but this had been done too hastily. What was more, the proposed planning would drastically transform the area concerned.
- (ii) She pointed out that as the CHR Site was only site available in the district, it was imperative for the Government to thoroughly study whether the focus should be put on commercial developments, or whether it should uphold its commitment to the well-being of the community with the provision of community facilities which had been unavailable in the district so far, e.g. civic centre or facilities for the elderly, etc.
- (iii) She criticised that the TIA conducted in 2017 was of course unable to reflect the current situation. Given that at present, long tailback opposite to the Hong Kong Central Library was a daily occurrence, the development of the CHR Site of such a sizeable scale would lead to gridlock in the surrounding area. Therefore, PlanD had to exercise due care in conducting the TIA to ensure data accuracy.

112. Mr Joey LEE raised the following comments:

- (i) Given that the documents had been published in the Gazette and given statutory effect, he wondered about the PlanD's intention of tabling the paper to the Council today. He was baffled by the PlanD's arrangement.
- (ii) He criticised TD for having actually accepted the TIA report prepared by the Consultant two years ago, which was really ridiculous. He said that at present, tailback had stretched all the way from Wan Chai to the rear of True Light Middle School of Hong Kong. He questioned whether the Consultant had conducted site visits to assess local traffic conditions, and criticised the Government for having paid consultancy fee indiscriminately.

113. Ms Yolanda NG raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) She considered it unwise for PlanD to be so eager for quick results. The recent social disputes had stemmed from the fact that the Government had implemented relative initiatives in an overly hasty manner. She pointed out that PlanD had time and repeatedly consulted the Council in March, May and July 2019 but had never given an account of the proposed development in the past decade.
- (ii) She was shocked to hear that actually the TIA concerned had been taken place in 2017. She pointed out that in 2017, Lee Garden Three was still under construction; there were at least three tenement buildings at Jardine's Bazaar; there were not as many private vehicles as today; and residents had yet to move in the two new buildings at the other end of Pennington Street. The traffic demand in the vicinity of Caroline Hill Road had undergone drastic changes since then.

- (iii) She considered that despite that PlanD had not distorted the Council's views when relaying such views to TPB, it had failed to convey all the views expressed by the Council. It had been mentioned in the paper that PlanD had proposed to provide a DHC and a CCC in response to the WCDC's comments. Yet, it had failed to mention anything about Members' worries and objections. She pointed out that some Members had organised consultation sessions in the district before the deadline for submission of representations on 24 July 2019, so as to reflect views to TPB direct. This was because PlanD had neither engaged in proactive and candid communication with the Council nor effectively relayed the Council's views.
- (iv) In view of the future provision of court premises on the CHR Site, it was imperative for PlanD to further assess traffic and security needs. For instance, there was a need for the courts to sit on holidays and grant access to prisoner transport vehicles from time to time. Such situations would affect the traffic arrangements in the vicinity. She enquired about the traffic arrangements to be implemented by PlanD if it so happened that the staging of a major event in the surrounding area coincided with the above special needs of the courts.

114. Mr Anson LAM raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) He pointed out that it was unimaginable that the TIA relating to the project of such a sizeable scale had lasted two days only. It was really ridiculous and perfunctory to have conducted a two-day assessment to prove that the project would not bring about traffic congestion.
- (ii) PlanD had included commercial developments under the existing design framework. However, precisely what residents had objected to was commercial developments.

He wondered who would like to have their own buildings being blocked by two commercial buildings on the opposite side of the street. Thus, PlanD was requested not to submit the proposal concerned to TPB, or else it was meaningless no matter how many consultations would be undertaken.

115. Ms Jacqueline CHUNG said that despite the development project of such a sizeable scale, PlanD had only conducted a two-day traffic count survey in March 2017 when redevelopment projects such as PLK, Haven Street, 8 Leighton Road and HKS had yet to be emerged. She condemned the PlanD's attempt to deceive the Council with fake and obsolete data, and requested PlanD to re-start a more formal, comprehensive and extensive TIA in order to obtain the latest data.

116. The Hon Paul TSE raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (i) He pointed out the two years had lapsed since the conduct of the TIA concerned, during which there might be substantial changes in circumstances. Besides, as the assessment exercise had lasted two days only, there were simply not sufficient data for benchmarking.
- (ii) He said that all along, importance had been attached to balancing the overall needs of the community and Hong Kong, and that he had never advocated the “not in my backyard” mentality. However, traffic problems in Wan Chai district had long been an insolvable issue, and would only fester if not properly addressed. He was of the view that PlanD could still go ahead in accordance with the established procedures, and that withdrawal of the proposal might not be absolutely necessary. Yet, he asked whether there was still room for amendments to the proposal (e.g. constructing one commercial building instead of two to release more space for provision of public park facilities) even if the proposal was approved in the future, amid objections expressed by numerous

residents and the Council, so as to ensure that the district would not undergo rapid transformation. In the face of social conflicts and controversies at present, he urged PlanD to strike a right balance between addressing the concerns of the community and propelling the development of Hong Kong from a professional perspective.

117. The Chairperson asked the departmental representatives whether they had any response.

118. Mr Louis KAU of PlanD responded as follows:

- (i) TPB was now accepting representations on the OZP amendments from the public. After considering all representations received, TPB would further amend the OZP. In other words, as far as TPB was concerned, OZP amendments could still be made provided that there were strong grounds.
- (ii) He said that PlanD, as a government department, had all along endeavoured to closely co-operate with WCDC, and that PlanD needed to consult WCDC in accordance with the established mechanism when dealing with proposed amendments to OZP. He explained that PlanD had come to WCDC the last two times with the aim to brief Members on the proposed OZP amendments and development of the CHR Site. Thereafter, PlanD had included a CHC and a CCC in the development plan of the CHR Site in response to the WCDC's comments. TPB had subsequently agreed to gazette the OZP. Therefore, PlanD had come today to brief Members on the proposed OZP amendments and invite them to give views. Thereafter, PlanD would convey the WCDC's comments to TPB for consideration.

119. Mr CHAN Wai-hong of HyD explained that the Consultant had

conducted a traffic count survey at key junctions on 9 and 10 March 2017 but the traffic model was based on the design year 2031, i.e. five years after the anticipated completion of the developments concerned in 2026, with the assumption of an annual growth rate of 0.1% between 2017 and 2031. Besides, the traffic flow to be generated from known development plans such as PLK and Jardine's Bazaar had already been included.

120. Miss Clarisse YEUNG pointed out that the estimated floor area used in traffic assessment was inaccurate. Given that the 2017 proposal was different from the one eventually submitted to TPB, the TIA conducted based on the 2017 proposal was not valid.

121. Mr CHAN Wai-hong of HyD clarified that the TIA had been conducted based on the latest information on floor area from PlanD instead of the floor area estimated in 2017. After all, the Consultant had been engaged to conduct traffic count survey at key junctions in 2017 only.

122. The Chairperson said that as it had been two years since 2017, vehicular flows should change correspondingly with the completion of many new buildings during this period.

123. As the meeting had nothing further to add, the Chairperson asked the Hon Paul TSE to read the written motion.

124. The Hon Paul TSE said that his motion had been seconded by Ms Peggy LEE, Mr Joey LEE and Mr Anson LAM, and that the content of the motion read as, "That this Council strongly objects to the road improvement works for Causeway Bay and the planning proposal on the rezoning of the former site of the Mechanical and Electrical Services Department Headquarters to commercial uses currently proposed by the Government. As there is much controversy over the current proposal in terms of provision of transport support facilities, environmental and visual implications, as well as GFA, which were likely to have serious repercussions for local residents, this Council requests that the Government should introduce such elements as community facilities,

civic centre and green public space, as well as draw up a new proposal that could better suit the needs of local residents. It is imperative to secure this Council's endorsement of any such proposals tabled for discussion before submission to PlanD and TPB."

125. Mr CHENG Ki-kin said that he had no comments on the second paragraph of the motion but reservations about the expression of "objects to...the planning proposal on the rezoning of the former site... to commercial uses" in the first paragraph. He pointed out that at present, Hong Kong was well known for the shortages of parking spaces, residential flats and office spaces. It was not possible to solve these undersupply problems without increasing the supply. What was more, given the many age-old issues in Wan Chai, failing to rezone some sites would leave these issues uneradicated. As a case in point, the three government buildings in Wan Chai would remain in the same locations if the courts were not relocated to Caroline Hill Road, and as a consequence, the plans for construction of footbridges and relocation of the methadone clinic would never materialise. He opined that after weighing up the pros and cons, the construction of office premises was after all better than the construction of residential premises. Therefore, Mr CHENG objected to the motion concerned.

126. The Hon Paul TSE clarified that what they opposed was the current proposal rather than the introduction of commercial elements in the proposal.

127. Mr CHENG Ki-kin opined that the wording of the motion was likely to cause misunderstanding that the Council objected to the designation of the subject site for commercial uses. As such, he suggested rephrasing the relevant paragraph of the motion.

128. The Hon Paul TSE reiterated that the motion had been moved to object the current proposal rather than the designation of the subject site for commercial or court uses. He asked Mr CHENG Ki-kin to read the motion carefully so that he would not cast his vote mistakenly.

129. Miss Clarisse YEUNG said that it had been learnt from the views

collected during a questionnaire survey that residents' position was consistent with the content of the motion. Besides, she considered that the deliberation of this proposal had been a bitter experience. As early as 2016, the Council had expressed concerns on the future development of the CHR Site, and had requested PlanD to completely withdraw the proposal concerned before its gazettal. Unfortunately, at that time such a request had failed to receive the unanimous support of the Council. Nevertheless, PlanD had still clung obstinately to its course and proceeded with submission of the proposal to TPB in the absence of public consultation. Therefore, she wished to take the opportunity of voting on the motion to bring this matter to the attention of the TPB and PlanD, with a view to urging PlanD to review the whole process and explore why the Council could only express objection to the gazetted proposal through a non-binding vote on the motion.

130. The Chairperson asked Members to vote on the motion by a show of hands. The voting results were as follows:

For: 12 votes (Mr Stephen NG, Dr Jennifer CHOW, Ms Yolanda NG, Mr Joey LEE, Ms Kenny LEE, Ms Peggy LEE, Mr Anson LAM, Mr Ivan WONG, Miss Clarisse YEUNG, Dr Anna TANG, Ms Jacqueline CHUNG and the Hon Paul TSE)

Against: 1 vote (Mr CHENG Ki-kin)

131. The Chairperson declared that the motion had been passed.

132. The Chairperson invited the representatives of various government departments and the institution concerned to note Members' views and thanked them for attending the meeting.

(Mr Anson LAM and Mr CHENG Ki-kin left the meeting at 6:15 p.m.
Dr Jennifer CHOW left the meeting at 6:19 p.m.)

Item 5: Rodent Elimination and Prevention in Wan Chai

**List of Representers in respect of
Draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H7/20**

Representation No.	Name of ‘Representer’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-1	Lai Wing Sze
TPB/R/S/H7/20-2	Dora Chan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-3	Mr. Lau Chun Kit
TPB/R/S/H7/20-4	Lai Wing Sze
TPB/R/S/H7/20-5	Chan Lai Fan Dora
TPB/R/S/H7/20-6	Hysan Development Projects Limited
TPB/R/S/H7/20-7	藺文芸
TPB/R/S/H7/20-8	Chan Sze Hung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-9	黎明基
TPB/R/S/H7/20-10	黎錫洪
TPB/R/S/H7/20-11	伍婉婷 Ng Yuen Tin, Yolanda
TPB/R/S/H7/20-12	謝偉俊
TPB/R/S/H7/20-13	楊雪盈 Clarisse Yeung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-14	香港希雲街十三號至十五號 A 業主立案法團 The Incorporated Owners of 13-15A, Haven Street, Hong Kong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-15	香港希雲街十七號至十九號 A 業主立案法團 The Incorporated Owners of 17-19A, Haven Street, Hong Kong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-16	禮信大廈業主立案法團 The Incorporated Owners of Lei Shun Court
TPB/R/S/H7/20-17	Caroline Hill Planning Concern Group
TPB/R/S/H7/20-18	香港加路連山道 13, 13A, 15 及 15A 號業主立案法團 The Incorporated Owners of No. 13, 13A, 15 & 15A Caroline Hill Road, Hong Kong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-19	The Owners Corporation Committee of Tai Hang Terrace
TPB/R/S/H7/20-20	The Owners Corporation

Representation No.	Name of ‘Representer’
	Committee of Park Garden, Tai Hang Drive
TPB/R/S/H7/20-21	The Owners Corporation Committee of Wing On Towers
TPB/R/S/H7/20-22	The Owners Corporation Committee of Butler Towers
TPB/R/S/H7/20-23	The Owners Corporation Committee of Cavendish Heights (Blocks 1-7)
TPB/R/S/H7/20-24	Jardine's Lookout Concern Group
TPB/R/S/H7/20-25	The Owners Corporation Committee of Cavendish Heights (Block 8)
TPB/R/S/H7/20-26	Hui Ming Chun Cindy
TPB/R/S/H7/20-27	加路連花園業主委員會委員 Caroline Garden OC Committees
TPB/R/S/H7/20-28	Residents of Jardine's Lookout
TPB/R/S/H7/20-29	The Owners Corporation Committee of Linden Height
TPB/R/S/H7/20-30	The Owners Corporation Committee of Flora Garden
TPB/R/S/H7/20-31	比華利山業主立案法團 The Incorporated Owners of Beverly Hill
TPB/R/S/H7/20-32	大坑關注社 (夾附 570 個簽名) Tai Hang Concern Association (with 570 signatures enclosed)
TPB/R/S/H7/20-33	Best Epoch Holdings Limited
TPB/R/S/H7/20-34	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/H7/20-35	博匯 Doctoral Exchange
TPB/R/S/H7/20-36	余淑芬
TPB/R/S/H7/20-37	陳漪蕾
TPB/R/S/H7/20-38	鍾朗豐

Representation No.	Name of ‘Representer’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-39	李凱雯
TPB/R/S/H7/20-40	林穎
TPB/R/S/H7/20-41	黃毓翔
TPB/R/S/H7/20-42	龍麗斯
TPB/R/S/H7/20-43	馮詩嘉
TPB/R/S/H7/20-44	Christie Chong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-45	Chan Yat Sun
TPB/R/S/H7/20-46	Leung Shuk Han, Daisy
TPB/R/S/H7/20-47	Cheng Yin Tai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-48	Lee Tsz Kiu
TPB/R/S/H7/20-49	Sukie Lau
TPB/R/S/H7/20-50	唐淦郴
TPB/R/S/H7/20-51	黃嘉倫
TPB/R/S/H7/20-52	黃文威
TPB/R/S/H7/20-53	陳文蔡
TPB/R/S/H7/20-54	周稷
TPB/R/S/H7/20-55	鄭志明
TPB/R/S/H7/20-56	鍾長玲
TPB/R/S/H7/20-57	蔡發
TPB/R/S/H7/20-58	李紅
TPB/R/S/H7/20-59	馮海蓮
TPB/R/S/H7/20-60	何兆佳
TPB/R/S/H7/20-61	何伊詠
TPB/R/S/H7/20-62	何雄偉
TPB/R/S/H7/20-63	葛子祥
TPB/R/S/H7/20-64	郭建合
TPB/R/S/H7/20-65	郭麗娥
TPB/R/S/H7/20-66	林家杰
TPB/R/S/H7/20-67	梁仲子
TPB/R/S/H7/20-68	梁錦泉
TPB/R/S/H7/20-69	梁堯燦
TPB/R/S/H7/20-70	梁興寧
TPB/R/S/H7/20-71	龍小燕
TPB/R/S/H7/20-72	王國泰
TPB/R/S/H7/20-73	黃鳳清
TPB/R/S/H7/20-74	楊來琮
TPB/R/S/H7/20-75	余家烈
TPB/R/S/H7/20-76	姚惠良
TPB/R/S/H7/20-77	秦樹雲
TPB/R/S/H7/20-78	薛標英
TPB/R/S/H7/20-79	Cheung Tik Sang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-80	Chu Kin San

Representation No.	Name of ‘Representer’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-81	Kong Chi Fung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-82	Kwok Chiu Ming
TPB/R/S/H7/20-83	L. Y. Weng
TPB/R/S/H7/20-84	Tang Wing Yin
TPB/R/S/H7/20-85	鄭佩珣
TPB/R/S/H7/20-86	Lee Chi Yan, Conrad
TPB/R/S/H7/20-87	Aliana Leung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-88	Alice Poon
TPB/R/S/H7/20-89	朱國懷
TPB/R/S/H7/20-90	Lui Hiu Hung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-91	Chu Kam Yiu
TPB/R/S/H7/20-92	高瑞芳
TPB/R/S/H7/20-93	Tam Yiu Cho
TPB/R/S/H7/20-94	陳慶豐
TPB/R/S/H7/20-95	王佩嫻
TPB/R/S/H7/20-96	Ho Pui Sin
TPB/R/S/H7/20-97	Paul Yuen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-98	Tam Wai Man Iris
TPB/R/S/H7/20-99	Tsui Wai Ming
TPB/R/S/H7/20-100	Mariposa A. Gonyon
TPB/R/S/H7/20-101	Chan Kin Yip Louis
TPB/R/S/H7/20-102	Jeremy Robert Kuo
TPB/R/S/H7/20-103	Sit Wei Bing
TPB/R/S/H7/20-104	張瑞芬
TPB/R/S/H7/20-105	劉陳淑華
TPB/R/S/H7/20-106	唐海通
TPB/R/S/H7/20-107	黃子軍
TPB/R/S/H7/20-108	李國強
TPB/R/S/H7/20-109	Sheila Wong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-110	Charles Lee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-111	Eunice Lee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-112	Leung So Ching
TPB/R/S/H7/20-113	Janet Ma
TPB/R/S/H7/20-114	Chan MY Annie
TPB/R/S/H7/20-115	Ho Liu Kit Fan, Anna V.
TPB/R/S/H7/20-116	林燕嫻
TPB/R/S/H7/20-117	Cheung Chak Man
TPB/R/S/H7/20-118	Chu Sue Fun
TPB/R/S/H7/20-119	Fu Yuk King
TPB/R/S/H7/20-120	Lam Chung Lun
TPB/R/S/H7/20-121	Ma Chan Chi
TPB/R/S/H7/20-122	Ma Pui Ying
TPB/R/S/H7/20-123	Tang Kwok Wah

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H7/20-124	Woo Lui Lui Christine
TPB/R/S/H7/20-125	陳柏林
TPB/R/S/H7/20-126	陳秀欣
TPB/R/S/H7/20-127	蔡炳權
TPB/R/S/H7/20-128	何偉雄
TPB/R/S/H7/20-129	何盛慕嫦
TPB/R/S/H7/20-130	蒲沛亮
TPB/R/S/H7/20-131	黃詠棠
TPB/R/S/H7/20-132	Cheng Kit Yee Eleanor
TPB/R/S/H7/20-133	Lung Justin
TPB/R/S/H7/20-134	Ramon Lo
TPB/R/S/H7/20-135	Chau So Wah
TPB/R/S/H7/20-136	Lee Kin Man
TPB/R/S/H7/20-137	Ng Ngar Lee Julia
TPB/R/S/H7/20-138	Wong Man Wai Ester
TPB/R/S/H7/20-139	關兆權
TPB/R/S/H7/20-140	萬玉鳴
TPB/R/S/H7/20-141	Lin Poon Yui Fong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-142	杜明
TPB/R/S/H7/20-143	翁芳玲
TPB/R/S/H7/20-144	Pang Sui Sun Connie
TPB/R/S/H7/20-145	陳嘉佑
TPB/R/S/H7/20-146	陳昌榮
TPB/R/S/H7/20-147	Siaw Kee Hock
TPB/R/S/H7/20-148	譚國樑
TPB/R/S/H7/20-149	Poon Kwok Cheung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-150	Lam Peggy Yuet Ying
TPB/R/S/H7/20-151	何瑪英
TPB/R/S/H7/20-152	Chan Chui Kwan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-153	Tai Lok Ho
TPB/R/S/H7/20-154	Tai Tat Keung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-155	Tam Ching Ting
TPB/R/S/H7/20-156	Tam Chi Yin Simon
TPB/R/S/H7/20-157	Henry Shek
TPB/R/S/H7/20-158	Wong Wai Mei
TPB/R/S/H7/20-159	Tam Wing Yu
TPB/R/S/H7/20-160	Li Kin Kay Thomas
TPB/R/S/H7/20-161	Ma Hoi Yee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-162	陳栢熙
TPB/R/S/H7/20-163	陳惠中
TPB/R/S/H7/20-164	趙民娟
TPB/R/S/H7/20-165	劉梅芳
TPB/R/S/H7/20-166	吳冠豪

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H7/20-167	彭文卿
TPB/R/S/H7/20-168	談慧敏
TPB/R/S/H7/20-169	Angel Lee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-170	Lai Bo Cheong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-171	Danny Tsang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-172	陳嘉倫
TPB/R/S/H7/20-173	張心蕙
TPB/R/S/H7/20-174	熊余煒華
TPB/R/S/H7/20-175	熊宏良
TPB/R/S/H7/20-176	羅少沾
TPB/R/S/H7/20-177	薛樹仁
TPB/R/S/H7/20-178	Chan Chun Kit
TPB/R/S/H7/20-179	Dennis Fung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-180	Ho Kit Ling 何潔玲
TPB/R/S/H7/20-181	Lam Pik Ha Eliza
TPB/R/S/H7/20-182	Shirley Cheng
TPB/R/S/H7/20-183	Chan Natalie Ellen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-184	陳文光 Chan Man Kwong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-185	陳湛彬
TPB/R/S/H7/20-186	黃林美麗
TPB/R/S/H7/20-187	Tam Chak Chi
TPB/R/S/H7/20-188	Annie Mimi Kam
TPB/R/S/H7/20-189	Lam Sum Chee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-190	Leung Chun Fung, Albert
TPB/R/S/H7/20-191	Au Kin On
TPB/R/S/H7/20-192	Andrew Tang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-193	Chan Yat Ping, Shirley
TPB/R/S/H7/20-194	Cheng Pwee Ling
TPB/R/S/H7/20-195	Cheng Kam Yick
TPB/R/S/H7/20-196	Dorothy Tang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-197	Jocelyn Grace Chan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-198	Ko Lan Fun Betty
TPB/R/S/H7/20-199	Lam Su Yin Joseph
TPB/R/S/H7/20-200	Lee Katie
TPB/R/S/H7/20-201	Ngai Chun Ngor Irene
TPB/R/S/H7/20-202	Dr. Simon Oay, LY 李偉
TPB/R/S/H7/20-203	Wong Pui Yee, Peggy
TPB/R/S/H7/20-204	Yip C. N.
TPB/R/S/H7/20-205	陳偉賢
TPB/R/S/H7/20-206	張家肇
TPB/R/S/H7/20-207	李張小華
TPB/R/S/H7/20-208	李松玲
TPB/R/S/H7/20-209	聞秀鑾

Representation No.	Name of ‘Representer’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-210	辛樹林
TPB/R/S/H7/20-211	黃金順
TPB/R/S/H7/20-212	Leung Shing Tai and Tang Fung Yee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-213	Stella Tse Wai Lan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-214	Chong Yuen Sum
TPB/R/S/H7/20-215	馮愛廉
TPB/R/S/H7/20-216	唐偉邦
TPB/R/S/H7/20-217	Au Man To
TPB/R/S/H7/20-218	Lai Sze Shun
TPB/R/S/H7/20-219	Leung Chun Yee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-220	Leung Chi Ping
TPB/R/S/H7/20-221	Leung Chun Lam
TPB/R/S/H7/20-222	Chan Shing Kai Henry
TPB/R/S/H7/20-223	Lam Ching Yee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-224	Lay Ester
TPB/R/S/H7/20-225	Wong Mo Sze
TPB/R/S/H7/20-226	任少儀
TPB/R/S/H7/20-227	Wu Tin Yuk
TPB/R/S/H7/20-228	Chan Sheung Yan Andrew
TPB/R/S/H7/20-229	Cheng Mei Hang Amelia
TPB/R/S/H7/20-230	Mak Man Yuk Patty
TPB/R/S/H7/20-231	Mak Frederick Kam Wing
TPB/R/S/H7/20-232	Mercedes M. Hidalgo
TPB/R/S/H7/20-233	Daisy Ho
TPB/R/S/H7/20-234	Sherwin Ho
TPB/R/S/H7/20-235	Wong Kit Ying
TPB/R/S/H7/20-236	朱俊傑
TPB/R/S/H7/20-237	朱諾熙
TPB/R/S/H7/20-238	高嫻玲
TPB/R/S/H7/20-239	關偉良
TPB/R/S/H7/20-240	黃蕙卿
TPB/R/S/H7/20-241	Chan Suet Mui
TPB/R/S/H7/20-242	Cheung Yuk Hing Rowena
TPB/R/S/H7/20-243	Michelle Chu
TPB/R/S/H7/20-244	Chun Ping Fai Patrick
TPB/R/S/H7/20-245	Vicky Fok
TPB/R/S/H7/20-246	Ho Chi Ling
TPB/R/S/H7/20-247	Kwan Yee Ching Natalie
TPB/R/S/H7/20-248	Minna Lai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-249	Leung Shu Wah
TPB/R/S/H7/20-250	P. K. Li
TPB/R/S/H7/20-251	Li Foo Chun Jean
TPB/R/S/H7/20-252	See Loi Chun

Representation No.	Name of ‘Representer’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-253	Maria Sit
TPB/R/S/H7/20-254	Hui Long Kiu Lester
TPB/R/S/H7/20-255	Hui Long Man Leslie
TPB/R/S/H7/20-256	Amanda Hui
TPB/R/S/H7/20-257	Eddie Hui
TPB/R/S/H7/20-258	Andrea Yu
TPB/R/S/H7/20-259	Ho Wai Ming, Ellie
TPB/R/S/H7/20-260	Lam Ming Chung, Stephie
TPB/R/S/H7/20-261	Lam Shu Fung, Clayton
TPB/R/S/H7/20-262	Lam Yue Fung, Marcus
TPB/R/S/H7/20-263	Lam Kei Chiu
TPB/R/S/H7/20-264	Tam Ho Chi
TPB/R/S/H7/20-265	Yung Kam Yim
TPB/R/S/H7/20-266	Yee-Tak Chow
TPB/R/S/H7/20-267	陳根源
TPB/R/S/H7/20-268	唐智謙
TPB/R/S/H7/20-269	Chan Wai Yee Cecilia
TPB/R/S/H7/20-270	Tong Wai Man Zarino
TPB/R/S/H7/20-271	Chan Kum Yuen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-272	任碧燕
TPB/R/S/H7/20-273	陳弼鑑
TPB/R/S/H7/20-274	張細妹
TPB/R/S/H7/20-275	梁鳳開
TPB/R/S/H7/20-276	余順禮
TPB/R/S/H7/20-277	Tsang Sui Cheong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-278	Chan Man Fai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-279	Lau Yee Lam
TPB/R/S/H7/20-280	Ngan Hon Ching
TPB/R/S/H7/20-281	Albert Shu
TPB/R/S/H7/20-282	Liza Lee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-283	何耀垣
TPB/R/S/H7/20-284	李浩輝
TPB/R/S/H7/20-285	Chan Chi Tong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-286	Ho Shing Yan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-287	Po Wing Kay Winky
TPB/R/S/H7/20-288	Roger So
TPB/R/S/H7/20-289	Wong Wing
TPB/R/S/H7/20-290	張鳳娥
TPB/R/S/H7/20-291	黃一鳴
TPB/R/S/H7/20-292	黃博傑
TPB/R/S/H7/20-293	余德惠
TPB/R/S/H7/20-294	Yee Jia Qiao Julian
TPB/R/S/H7/20-295	Chow Yuen

Representation No.	Name of ‘Representer’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-296	Subiatun
TPB/R/S/H7/20-297	Wong William
TPB/R/S/H7/20-298	Yao Pin Fang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-299	Leung King Wai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-300	梁雪盈
TPB/R/S/H7/20-301	Ling Suk Fan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-302	Lai Yiu Fai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-303	周仲文
TPB/R/S/H7/20-304	Kwok Shiu Ling
TPB/R/S/H7/20-305	Mary Lee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-306	Chan Chi Hung Wesley
TPB/R/S/H7/20-307	Chan Yuk Ching
TPB/R/S/H7/20-308	Chan Ling Hoi
TPB/R/S/H7/20-309	Sharene Mak
TPB/R/S/H7/20-310	Chan Chiu Wing
TPB/R/S/H7/20-311	Chan Ching Yee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-312	彭郁榮
TPB/R/S/H7/20-313	Chan Man Tuen Irene
TPB/R/S/H7/20-314	Christina Chan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-315	L W Ting
TPB/R/S/H7/20-316	Cheng Beatrice
TPB/R/S/H7/20-317	林漢銘
TPB/R/S/H7/20-318	陳嘉信
TPB/R/S/H7/20-319	鄭雪兒
TPB/R/S/H7/20-320	譚達榮
TPB/R/S/H7/20-321	宋若蘊
TPB/R/S/H7/20-322	何碧珊
TPB/R/S/H7/20-323	Chan King Chi
TPB/R/S/H7/20-324	Anna Cheung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-325	Johnny Wei
TPB/R/S/H7/20-326	黃惠娜
TPB/R/S/H7/20-327	霍新基
TPB/R/S/H7/20-328	雷綺雯
TPB/R/S/H7/20-329	江碟珍
TPB/R/S/H7/20-330	王皓昕
TPB/R/S/H7/20-331	王志龍
TPB/R/S/H7/20-332	Cheung Lai Kuen Hermia
TPB/R/S/H7/20-333	Wong Ho Ching Alex
TPB/R/S/H7/20-334	Chen Yeung Michelle
TPB/R/S/H7/20-335	Flora Fan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-336	Annie Wong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-337	區月姬
TPB/R/S/H7/20-338	朱慶

Representation No.	Name of ‘Representer’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-339	Mr Ho Hok Fai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-340	Albert Wong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-341	馬佩貞
TPB/R/S/H7/20-342	Amanda Li King Sze
TPB/R/S/H7/20-343	Tiffany Wei
TPB/R/S/H7/20-344	Lai Kam Cheung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-345	Pow Siu Chuen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-346	何穗祺
TPB/R/S/H7/20-347	鄭珊德
TPB/R/S/H7/20-348	Eddy Lau
TPB/R/S/H7/20-349	羅明德
TPB/R/S/H7/20-350	Siu Chin Pang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-351	Wong Yuet May Yumi
TPB/R/S/H7/20-352	Cheung Kam To
TPB/R/S/H7/20-353	Yuen Fung Ping
TPB/R/S/H7/20-354	Cheng Chi Huen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-355	鄭秀梅
TPB/R/S/H7/20-356	Wong Lai Fong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-357	Chow Wing Sun
TPB/R/S/H7/20-358	黃嘉麗
TPB/R/S/H7/20-359	張倩欣
TPB/R/S/H7/20-360	梁東海
TPB/R/S/H7/20-361	Lo Suet Ying
TPB/R/S/H7/20-362	Au Man To
TPB/R/S/H7/20-363	Chan Kit Wang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-364	Chan Chi Wai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-365	Lui Chun Chun
TPB/R/S/H7/20-366	范偉
TPB/R/S/H7/20-367	Fung Ho San
TPB/R/S/H7/20-368	Fung Ping Hung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-369	Fu Kam Wing Raymond
TPB/R/S/H7/20-370	張惠賢
TPB/R/S/H7/20-371	魏承思
TPB/R/S/H7/20-372	郭明珠
TPB/R/S/H7/20-373	Wong Lai Sze
TPB/R/S/H7/20-374	Chan Yuk Lam
TPB/R/S/H7/20-375	Mossip Mark S
TPB/R/S/H7/20-376	You Lingqin
TPB/R/S/H7/20-377	Yau Man Shan Cathy
TPB/R/S/H7/20-378	Chen Ruohong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-379	Greaves William David
TPB/R/S/H7/20-380	Tam Sin Yee Diana
TPB/R/S/H7/20-381	Wang Hoi

Representation No.	Name of ‘Representer’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-382	陳正豪
TPB/R/S/H7/20-383	陳正斌
TPB/R/S/H7/20-384	黃諾希
TPB/R/S/H7/20-385	Divya Vaze
TPB/R/S/H7/20-386	Chan Yuen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-387	Chan Yin Wan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-388	Chan Ka Pang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-389	Labasan Eden Bino
TPB/R/S/H7/20-390	Tai Fai Kee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-391	Tang Hay Tung Genevieve
TPB/R/S/H7/20-392	Wong Mo Sze
TPB/R/S/H7/20-393	Cheng Wai Yee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-394	Leung Su Wing Connie
TPB/R/S/H7/20-395	LEE SHEK YAN TERESA
TPB/R/S/H7/20-396	Chan Wai Wing Helen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-397	Tang Lai Mui
TPB/R/S/H7/20-398	NG SUI WONG
TPB/R/S/H7/20-399	Chan Hiu Yin Yvonne
TPB/R/S/H7/20-400	KWAN KING HONG ALBERT
TPB/R/S/H7/20-401	Steven William Gordon
TPB/R/S/H7/20-403	Chan Kin Man
TPB/R/S/H7/20-404	Ho Man Man Lucretia
TPB/R/S/H7/20-405	Fong Ting Nikita
TPB/R/S/H7/20-406	Vivian Lau
TPB/R/S/H7/20-408	Leung Chi Man
TPB/R/S/H7/20-409	LAU CHUN YAT JOSEPH
TPB/R/S/H7/20-410	LI WAI MAN
TPB/R/S/H7/20-411	Ko, Tinny
TPB/R/S/H7/20-412	Kwong Pong Woon
TPB/R/S/H7/20-413	CHIU WAI KIN KEN
TPB/R/S/H7/20-414	Lau Hon Wai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-415	CHENG Wan Yuk Margaret
TPB/R/S/H7/20-416	Tang Sung Hin
TPB/R/S/H7/20-417	WONG CHI HO
TPB/R/S/H7/20-418	Lau Elizabeth Yuen Shan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-419	Yuen Paul
TPB/R/S/H7/20-420	Lucy Chen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-421	HOLLAND, Trevor Alan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-422	So Wai Yeung Eric
TPB/R/S/H7/20-423	FUNG KA KEUNG DANIEL
TPB/R/S/H7/20-424	Fung Kwok Chung Raymond

Representation No.	Name of ‘Representer’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-427	SO TIN WAI KYNA
TPB/R/S/H7/20-428	Clementine Lee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-429	Sy Miu Kuen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-430	LI SHAU YIN
TPB/R/S/H7/20-431	Chan Wai Yee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-432	Kwan Ho Ching Christy
TPB/R/S/H7/20-433	Mary Ostrover
TPB/R/S/H7/20-434	Chen Sung Kai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-435	Tse Wing Han
TPB/R/S/H7/20-436	Davies Donald Robert
TPB/R/S/H7/20-437	Siu Wan Chi
TPB/R/S/H7/20-438	LAU PAK SHING
TPB/R/S/H7/20-439	鄭惠儀
TPB/R/S/H7/20-440	繆少琴
TPB/R/S/H7/20-441	Florence Sophia Huibonhoa
TPB/R/S/H7/20-442	Kan Wai Him Vincent
TPB/R/S/H7/20-443	Chung Timothy Che Ya
TPB/R/S/H7/20-444	Chau Yuk Chi
TPB/R/S/H7/20-445	Wong Wai Leung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-446	Wong Hin Chit
TPB/R/S/H7/20-447	Yeung Leung Yim Kin Jacqueline
TPB/R/S/H7/20-448	Kwok Pak Yu Steven
TPB/R/S/H7/20-449	Chan Mei Sang Pauline
TPB/R/S/H7/20-450	Au Chi Lap
TPB/R/S/H7/20-451	Karen Yeung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-452	Ko Laam
TPB/R/S/H7/20-453	Tin Ying Kit Allen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-454	Tsang Yiu Keung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-455	Lam Lok Yee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-456	Lam On Yee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-457	Lam Lap Fung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-458	Lam Kit Ling
TPB/R/S/H7/20-459	Wong Kieu Cleo
TPB/R/S/H7/20-460	NG MAU YUEN ERIC
TPB/R/S/H7/20-461	Chan Chun Hung Vincent
TPB/R/S/H7/20-462	Yip William John
TPB/R/S/H7/20-463	Tam Yin Ki Sharon
TPB/R/S/H7/20-464	Ranee Jhamatmal Khubchandani
TPB/R/S/H7/20-465	Yu Prima
TPB/R/S/H7/20-466	Chan Mun Ling Jennifer
TPB/R/S/H7/20-467	Chan Tsz Ying
TPB/R/S/H7/20-468	Li Chun Yin

Representation No.	Name of ‘Representer’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-469	Carrie Yeung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-470	Stather Ruth Meiling
TPB/R/S/H7/20-471	NG KAI MAN CARMEN
TPB/R/S/H7/20-472	Cheung Sin Ying
TPB/R/S/H7/20-473	鄧建達
TPB/R/S/H7/20-474	Cheuk, Athena
TPB/R/S/H7/20-475	Chan Ho Mo
TPB/R/S/H7/20-476	Chan Chan Yuen Ha
TPB/R/S/H7/20-477	Law Chi Yin Cynthia
TPB/R/S/H7/20-478	Ma Wing Yin Janice
TPB/R/S/H7/20-479	Ng Yee Fong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-480	盧耀華
TPB/R/S/H7/20-481	Duangmala Boontham
TPB/R/S/H7/20-483	Yeung Wing Kwong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-484	Roger Wai Kit Lau
TPB/R/S/H7/20-485	Lam Tat Wing
TPB/R/S/H7/20-486	Siu Vincent Hin Wai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-487	Wong Ying Yee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-488	Shek Wai Ting
TPB/R/S/H7/20-489	Chan Bik Ying
TPB/R/S/H7/20-490	Lam Pik Kwan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-491	Petula Susan Kincaid
TPB/R/S/H7/20-492	Wong Chi Hang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-493	鍾小明
TPB/R/S/H7/20-494	Au Siu Pong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-495	Chan Cham Bun
TPB/R/S/H7/20-496	Chan Choi Tsoi Wan Betty
TPB/R/S/H7/20-497	Chen Chu Lan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-498	Cheng Kim Ching
TPB/R/S/H7/20-499	Cheung Chi Hung, David
TPB/R/S/H7/20-500	Chiang Man Sze
TPB/R/S/H7/20-501	Hong Hiu Wing
TPB/R/S/H7/20-502	Josje Yee Sum Yeung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-503	Law Yin Ying Priscilla
TPB/R/S/H7/20-504	Lee Yan Yan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-505	Ng Sau Ching
TPB/R/S/H7/20-506	Richard Martin Payne
TPB/R/S/H7/20-507	Shek Wai Ting
TPB/R/S/H7/20-508	Tsui Ching Yee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-509	Wong Wing Sze Karen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-510	Wong Ka Lai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-511	Yuen Yu Hung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-512	Wu Wai Ling
TPB/R/S/H7/20-513	Yu Yeuk Wing
TPB/R/S/H7/20-514	陳惠香
TPB/R/S/H7/20-515	關棠武

Representation No.	Name of ‘Representer’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-516	何煒恒
TPB/R/S/H7/20-517	Lung Wing Kei Danny
TPB/R/S/H7/20-518	David Owen Pegg
TPB/R/S/H7/20-519	Wendy MC Tavish
TPB/R/S/H7/20-520	Behrens Chee Sau Chun Bella
TPB/R/S/H7/20-521	Taylor Evelyn Elborn
TPB/R/S/H7/20-522	Thomas Albert Carl
TPB/R/S/H7/20-523	Inger Tong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-524	Chan Mang Lung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-525	Chi Sau Lin
TPB/R/S/H7/20-526	Cheung Wing Hing
TPB/R/S/H7/20-527	Cheung Wai Yu
TPB/R/S/H7/20-528	Cheung Ching Kwok Aslan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-529	Leung Wai Po Rosanna
TPB/R/S/H7/20-530	Natalie Yim Lok Yan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-531	Tnevoh Yim Che Ming
TPB/R/S/H7/20-532	Yim Hong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-533	陳惠美
TPB/R/S/H7/20-534	黎樂怡中
TPB/R/S/H7/20-535	彭銘楷
TPB/R/S/H7/20-536	錢海穎
TPB/R/S/H7/20-537	錢嘉駿
TPB/R/S/H7/20-538	張學佳
TPB/R/S/H7/20-539	Chan Tsz Kin
TPB/R/S/H7/20-540	Chan Carson
TPB/R/S/H7/20-541	Cheung Man Yuk, Jennifer
TPB/R/S/H7/20-542	Ko Vanessa
TPB/R/S/H7/20-543	Lee Yuk Kuen Joecy
TPB/R/S/H7/20-544	Liu Kit Ling Bella
TPB/R/S/H7/20-545	Pun Chi In
TPB/R/S/H7/20-546	Wong Pui Shun Bonnie
TPB/R/S/H7/20-547	Wang Mei Mun
TPB/R/S/H7/20-548	Yau Chun Wang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-549	Yau Chi Ming Benson
TPB/R/S/H7/20-550	Chan Shun Hung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-551	Chang Po Yiu
TPB/R/S/H7/20-552	Fu Kwan Lin Kristy
TPB/R/S/H7/20-553	Leung Yuk Shan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-554	Leung Yuet Tong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-555	Li Wai Ling Sofia
TPB/R/S/H7/20-556	Lok Yee Hing Elaine
TPB/R/S/H7/20-557	Tam Helen Ka Yan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-558	Yan Lin Fu
TPB/R/S/H7/20-559	Ivanov, Anton
TPB/R/S/H7/20-560	Hedley Paul
TPB/R/S/H7/20-561	Cheung Suk Hing

Representation No.	Name of ‘Representer’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-562	Lee Tsz Chun
TPB/R/S/H7/20-563	Ng Wing Yee Amy
TPB/R/S/H7/20-564	高婉玲
TPB/R/S/H7/20-565	張秀珍
TPB/R/S/H7/20-566	Ho Ying Lung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-567	Carson, Luc A. R.
TPB/R/S/H7/20-568	While, Sharon Joy
TPB/R/S/H7/20-569	Au Pui Yue
TPB/R/S/H7/20-570	Allen Chun Lung Chan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-571	Cheung Mee Sheung Maisie
TPB/R/S/H7/20-572	Cheung Sin Yan Cindy
TPB/R/S/H7/20-573	Cheung Siu Ling
TPB/R/S/H7/20-574	Ching Pui Yee Phoebe
TPB/R/S/H7/20-575	Ho Sherwin Shiu Wang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-576	Ko Chung Ling Ophelia
TPB/R/S/H7/20-577	Lam Kwok Fai Ragence
TPB/R/S/H7/20-578	Lau Cho Yuen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-579	Lau Tat Wai David
TPB/R/S/H7/20-580	Lee Hoi Yee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-581	Ng Bing Chiu Raymond
TPB/R/S/H7/20-582	Pau Yuk Man Sharon
TPB/R/S/H7/20-583	Tai Yvonne
TPB/R/S/H7/20-584	To Chak Yan William
TPB/R/S/H7/20-585	Frances Tong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-586	童毓思 Tung Yuk Zse
TPB/R/S/H7/20-587	Wong Yuek Chee Fiona
TPB/R/S/H7/20-588	Yeung Lai Yi
TPB/R/S/H7/20-589	Pritchard Thomthy Hugh
TPB/R/S/H7/20-590	雷卓光
TPB/R/S/H7/20-591	黃慧蘭
TPB/R/S/H7/20-592	Ng Tsz Chun Shunichi
TPB/R/S/H7/20-593	Pang Lo Mei
TPB/R/S/H7/20-594	廖潔玲
TPB/R/S/H7/20-595	Bonnie Wong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-596	Carson Chan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-597	陳垂泮
TPB/R/S/H7/20-598	Chris Kwok
TPB/R/S/H7/20-599	Fiona Hung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-600	許宗熾
TPB/R/S/H7/20-601	Hui Sze Chung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-602	Alice Yung Woon Cheung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-603	Dr. Ferdinand Chu
TPB/R/S/H7/20-604	Paul Kam Kong Mak
TPB/R/S/H7/20-605	Ms. Genevieve Yang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-606	Mr. Leung Wai On
TPB/R/S/H7/20-607	Arthur Leung

Representation No.	Name of ‘Representer’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-608	Ms. Ng Kai Man Carmen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-609	楊女士
TPB/R/S/H7/20-610	陳敏灝
TPB/R/S/H7/20-611	蔡家輝
TPB/R/S/H7/20-612	Cho Clement
TPB/R/S/H7/20-613	岑亨緯
TPB/R/S/H7/20-614	Chow King Chee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-615	Hung Man Ping
TPB/R/S/H7/20-616	Hung Ho Chak
TPB/R/S/H7/20-617	Hung Ho Ching
TPB/R/S/H7/20-618	Hung Kwok Yiu Duncan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-619	Hung Kwok Hei Lyndon
TPB/R/S/H7/20-620	Hung Kwok Kit Gordon
TPB/R/S/H7/20-621	Hung Yuen Yu
TPB/R/S/H7/20-622	Kwok Chiu
TPB/R/S/H7/20-623	Kwok Tsun
TPB/R/S/H7/20-624	Lo Kai Yuen Harrison
TPB/R/S/H7/20-625	Tai Fai Kee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-626	Ting Lup Wong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-627	Yu Tak Wai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-628	Wong Tai Sang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-629	陳蔓蕾
TPB/R/S/H7/20-630	陳國瑛
TPB/R/S/H7/20-631	Wong Ying Esther
TPB/R/S/H7/20-632	Yeung Ka Man
TPB/R/S/H7/20-633	Fan Lai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-634	Chan Ka Kong Edward

List of Commenters in respect of
Draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H7/20

Comment No.	Name of ‘Commenter’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C1 (R13)	楊雪盈 Clarisse Yeung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C2	楊子雋 Arthur Yeung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C3	灣仔起步 Kickstart Wan Chai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C4 (R454)	Tsang Yiu Keung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C5 (R479)	Ng Yee Fong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C6 (R367)	Fung Ho San
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C7	Chung Siu Ming
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C8	Wong Yick Wan Judy
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C9	Lau Hak Heung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C10 (R373)	Wong Lai Sze
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C11 (R364)	Chan Chi Wai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C12 (R405)	Fong Ting Nikita
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C13	Chu Wan Kam
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C14 (R501)	Hong Hiu Wing
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C15	Cheung Siu Fun Sylvia
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C16 (R605)	Genevieve Yang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C17	Ng Law Bik Kwan Danny
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C18 (R421)	Holland, Trevor Alan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C19 (R344)	Lai Kam Cheung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C20	Tang Ka Lam Alan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C21 (R468)	Li Chun Yin

Comment No.	Name of ‘Commenter’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C22	Lai Kwan Wai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C23	Grayson Cheung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C24	Wong Tsz Wan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C25	Cynthia Cheng
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C26 (R435)	Tse Wing Han
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C27	Tse Sun Lung Alan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C28	Lee Ching Lam Donna
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C29	Debbie Sin Yee Lai
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C30	林衍庭
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C31 (R490)	Lam Pik Kwan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C32	Tse Wai Yue
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C33	Mok Ka Man
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C34	Leung Hau Hong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C35	Chu Ka Kin Kenneth
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C36	Gigi Wong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C37	Lam Cheuk Tat
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C38	Wan, Chun Yau
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C39	Chan Wai Ying
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C40	Yiu Ho Wa
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C41	Ng Yeuk Nam
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C42	Yip Ho Leung Laurence
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C43	Yuen Yee Man Angie
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C44	Yuen Po Yu Grace
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C45	Lam Kwan Yee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C46	Kenny Chun Kuen Ma
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C47	Fung Tsz Ying Karina
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C48	Elizabeth Yuen Shan Lau
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C49	Ho Sui Wa
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C50	Tsoi Kin Wan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C51	Kong Chun Lam Leslie
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C52	Fung Yuen Shan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C53	Chan Yee Lok

Comment No.	Name of ‘Commenter’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C54 (R606)	Leung Wai On
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C55	Vivian Lau
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C56	翁振傑
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C57	But Wai Mei
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C58 (R385)	Divya Vaze
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C59	陳建榮
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C60	Ng K.L.
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C61	Lo Yat Kai Stanley
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C62 (R394)	Leung Su Wing Connie
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C63 (R397)	Tang Lai Mui Rosemarie
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C64	Wu Man Leung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C65 (R387)	Chan Yin Wan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C66	Chen Ka Pang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C67	Benson Zhenghao Chen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C68	Eric Zhengbin Chen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C69 (R393)	Cheng Wai Yee
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C70	Lava can Eden bino
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C71	Tang Mong Ying Moni
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C72	Paul Leslie Mallia
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C73	Kai Ming Po
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C74 (R396)	Chan Wai Wing Helen
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C75	Lam Yun Leung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C76	Lam Kit Ying
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C77	Lam Ka Ki
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C78	盧楓楊
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C79	Ma Chi Hang
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C80	Lam Wing Suet
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C81	Ng Moon Tong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C82	Kwok Oi Yin Maggie
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C83	Chan Yuk Ching Ellan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C84 (R593)	Pang Lo Mei
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C85 (R26)	Hui Ming Chun Cindy
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C86 (R532)	Yim Hong
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C87 (R520)	Behrens Chee Sau Chun Bella

Comment No.	Name of ‘Commenter’
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C88	吳偉昌
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C89	Connie Cheung
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C90	呂孟慧子
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C91	Wong Pui Shan
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C92	Chan Ming Sing
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C93	Watt Ka Wah
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C94 (R17)	Caroline Hill Planning Concern Group
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C95 (R24)	Jardine's Lookout Concern Group
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C96 (R29)	The Owners Corporation Committee of Linden Height
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C97 (R30)	The Owners Corporation Committee of Flora Garden
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C98 (R25)	The Owners Corporation Committee of Cavendish Heights (Block 8)
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C99 (R23)	The Owners Corporation Committee of Cavendish Heights (Blocks 1-7)
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C100 (R21)	The Owners Corporation Committee of Wing On Towers
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C101 (R20)	The Owners Corporation Committee of Park Garden, Tai Hang Drive
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C102 (R19)	The Owners Corporation Committee of Tai Hang Terrace
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C103 (R22)	The Owners Corporation Committee of Butler Towers
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C104 (R28)	Residents of Jardine's Lookout
TPB/R/S/H7/20-C105 (R34)	Mary Mulvihill

**Summary of Representations and Comments and the Planning Department's Responses
in respect of the draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H7/20**

(1) The grounds and proposals of the representers (TPB/R/S/H7/20-1 to 634) as well as responses are summarized below:

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
Supporting All Amendment Items		
R1 to R5 (Individuals)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Amendment Items A and B. It provides more commercial land conducive to effective use of government land triggering overall development to the area (R3 only). 	Noted.
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current plan is not the most beneficial design for the neighbourhood. Need to be more focus on providing benefits for the neighbourhood (R1, R4 	(i) To meet the long-term needs of District Court-level judicial facilities and to make good use of the government land in the core business district, the CHR Site is proposed for District Court and commercial development. Given the local context, the CHR Site is considered suitable for the commercial development. The areas to the north across Leighton Road are zoned "Commercial" ("C") which are the core commercial and business areas of Causeway Bay and the CHR Site is located at the fringe of this commercial core. Hence, locating the commercial

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	and R5).	<p>development at the northern portion of the CHR Site fronting Leighton Road is a natural extension of the “C” zone from the commercial core of Causeway Bay.</p> <p>(ii) A range of public facilities including public open space, public transport facility for minibuses, District Health Centre, Child Care Centre and public car park are proposed in the commercial site which are beneficial to the neighbourhood.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public space in the conceptual plan is too fragmented. (R2 only) 	<p>(iii) The conceptual scheme only shows one of the possible designs. It was prepared for the purpose of illustrating the feasibility of development. Hence, the disposition, layout and detailed design are subject to the consideration of the future developer (for commercial site) and the project proponent (for District Court). In other words, the specific block disposition and layout will be subject to detailed design at the implementation stage. Integration of the open spaces and commercial development in a visually coherent manner is still feasible with suitable decking over the proposed access road within the “Commercial(2)” (“C(2)”) zone.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a need for good public pedestrian circulation through and around the development (R2 only). 	<p>(iv) Provision of internal traffic and pedestrian facilities to serve the proposed developments within the CHR Site would be determined during the detailed design stage. Apart from the existing at-grade pedestrian access around the Site, the future developer is required to reserve an underground connection point within the commercial site for possible pedestrian subway to MTR Station which is subject to further feasibility study.</p>
Supporting Selected Amendment Items		
R6 (Hysan Development Projects Limited)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports in principle Amendment Items A and B but objects to the Notes for 	Noted.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	the “Commercial(2)” (“C(2)”) zone.	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new road and ventilation gaps split the site into small dimension and fragmented open space, which are not efficient and effective. Most comprehensive outcome would be achieved if the court development could be included in the same Master Layout Plan (MLP) for comprehensive development. 	(i) The conceptual scheme only shows one of the possible design. It was prepared for the purpose of illustrating the feasibility of development. Hence, the disposition, layout and detailed design are subject to the consideration of the future developer (for commercial site) and the project proponent (for District Court). In other words, the specific block disposition and layout will be subject to detailed design at the implementation stage.
	<u>Representer’s proposal:</u>	
	(a) An alternative scheme was submitted proposing comprehensive development of the site. The whole site should be rezoned to	(ii) No technical justifications for the schemes were provided. Without the necessary details, the technical feasibility of these proposals cannot be ascertained. Apart from (i) above, it should be noted that the District Court will need to be fully fenced off with visitors subject to security check at single entrance point. Unrestricted integration at the deck level or integrated design is not possible given the security requirement of the District Court. Having said that,

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<p>“Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) for integrated design/ development for the building and open space. Alternatively, an MLP submission should be required for the commercial site excluding the court.</p>	<p>integration of the open spaces and commercial development in a visually coherent manner is still feasible with suitable decking over the access road within the “C(2)” zone without compromising the security of the District Court. Hence, rezoning the whole CHR site or commercial part to “CDA” to ensure physical and design integration may not be necessary.</p> <p>(iii) The developer is required to provide public open space within the commercial development to ensure that an integrated design will be adopted. To ensure proper location and disposition of the open space thereby facilitating easy accessibility by the public, the future developer is required under the lease to submit a Landscape Master Plan (LMP). Besides, the future developer is required to follow DEVB’s “Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines” in designing and managing the public open space. The commercial development in the subject “C(2)” zone will resemble other ordinary commercial developments governed under “C” zone. Moreover, other important attributes that are situated on the CHR Site, such as OVT and masonry wall, can be protected via established mechanism. Hence, it is considered that submission of MLP is not required.</p>
	<p>(b) Incorporate a wider range of community facilities to include a District Elderly Centre, Community Hall and study rooms.</p>	<p>(iv) Regarding the provision of G/IC facilities, based on a planned population of about 185,200 persons, there is no shortfall of major G/IC facilities in Wan Chai area, except day care centres for the elderly and residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) where the population-based standards were reinstated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) in end-2018. While there are no population based HKPSG standards for district elderly centre, study room and community hall, there are currently two District Elderly Community Centres, six study rooms, one existing community hall and a new multi-purpose Moreton Terrace Activities Centre (now under construction and scheduled for completion in 2021) in Wan Chai district.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
Opposing Selected Amendment Item		
R7 to R10 (Individuals)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Item A 	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relocation of minibus terminus to the CHR Site is inconvenient to the residents (R7, R9 and R10). 	(i) Regarding the relocation of the minibus terminus from Lan Fong Rad and nearby areas, while there is a provision for such facilities under the current zoning, the final arrangement, including whether to relocate such facilities to the CHR Site or providing en-route stops for green minibus routes, is subject to TD's further deliberation and local consultation with the stakeholders.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed commercial development is incompatible with the predominantly residential neighbourhood or recreational uses in So Kon Po area and causes traffic congestion (R8). 	<p>(ii) Response (i) to R1 to R5 is relevant.</p> <p>(iii) A Traffic Review was conducted to assess the traffic impact arising from the proposed development at the CHR Site on the surrounding road network, to review the provision of public transport facilities and to assess the adequacy of the pedestrian facilities.</p> <p>(iv) According to the Traffic Review, the proposed developments will not generate unacceptable traffic impact after implementation of the proposed road junction improvement works.</p> <p>(v) Through the road improvement works, especially the additional left-turn lane at Leighton Road and round about at CHR(West)/ Link Road, it is expected that the traffic conflict of vehicles currently observed in the local accesses around CHR Site will be lessened. The new access road within the CHR Site will provide an additional connection with Link Road bypassing a section of Leighton Road. It is assessed that the average queue length of the north bound traffic at CHR(West)/ Leighton Road will be reduced to the acceptable level.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
Opposing All Amendment Items		
R11 (Ms. NG Yuen-ting, Yolanda , Wan Chai District Council (WCDC) Member)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A and B. 	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site should be developed in a comprehensive manner rather than two separate developments. 	(i) Responses (i) and (ii) to R6 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is already excessive commercialisation in Causeway Bay area. Further commercial development would bring about traffic, ventilation and landscape impacts. 	<p>(ii) The 2017-18 Budget indicated that to maintain Hong Kong's status as an international financial centre, it is necessary to ensure a continual supply of office space, especially Grade A office space. In this regard, according to the "Review of Land Requirement for Grade A Offices, Business and Industrial Uses" conducted under the Hong Kong 2030+ Study, there is a long-term shortage of Grade A office of 1.06 million m² GFA in Hong Kong. The vacancy rate of the Grade A office in Wan Chai/ Causeway Bay (4.5% in end-2018) has always been relatively low compared with the territorial total (8.7% in end-2018). Regarding the suitability of the CHR Site for commercial development, response (i) to R1 to R5 is relevant.</p> <p>(iii) Various technical assessments have been conducted which demonstrate that the proposed developments will not induce unacceptable impact to the local area in terms of traffic, environmental, visual, air ventilation and landscape aspects. Details of technical assessments, including the road junction improvement works are set out in the submission to the Board back in March and May 2019 and are available for public inspection.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It also fails to address WDC's comments such as provision of more community facilities like civic centre and inadequacies in the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) due to the flawed assumptions. 	<p>(iv) The proposed development at the CHR Site and the current amendments incorporated into the OZP were presented to WDC on 8.5.2018, 8.1.2019 and 4.7.2019. On 8.5.2018, individual members considered that G/IC facilities that would benefit the Wan Chai District should be provided. In response to the suggestion of providing community facilities on the CHR Site, after consultation with related government departments, one District Health Centre (DHC) and one Child Care Centre (CCC) were proposed to be provided in the commercial development. On 8.1.2019, PlanD further consulted WDC on the revised development proposals and majority of the WDC members supported the provision of DHC and CCC but some considered that more G/IC facilities should be provided. WDC still had concern on the traffic impacts of the proposed developments at the CHR Site.</p> <p>(v) According to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), civic centre is planned on a district-wide basis and the current provision of which on Hong Kong Island is considered sufficient. Regarding the provision of GIC facilities, response (iv) to R6 is relevant. Regarding the adequacy of TIA, responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 are relevant.</p> <p>(vi) As for the assumptions and methodology, the Traffic Review was conducted by following the normal engineering practice and standard procedures which have been used in many previous projects in Hong Kong. In this regard, trip generation and attraction rates are generally adopted from the Transport Planning and Design Manual published by the Transport Department (TD). For special uses, including the District Court, DHC, CCC, public car park and Green Motor Bus facilities, trip rates are derived from similar existing facilities through trip generation surveys or by estimations.</p> <p>(vii) Based on the traffic data from Annual Traffic Census 2015 to 2018, the average peak hour</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation																																													
		<p>traffic flow in weekday AM peak was higher than that in weekend AM peak, while the weekday PM peak was of same order with that of weekend PM peak, which justify the use of typical weekday traffic in the model. In addition, based on the previous traffic data, it is noted that the critical junctions in the vicinity of the CHR Site would perform better in weekend PM peak than in weekday PM peak. A comparison of weekday and weekend traffic flow at Causeway Bay is attached in the table below. Furthermore, development traffic generated by the CHR Site is considered to be heavier in weekday peak hours as offices and court uses were expected to have little traffic generation/attraction during weekends. Therefore, traffic models for a typical weekday are adopted in the Traffic Review.</p> <table><tr><th></th><th colspan="2">2015</th><th colspan="2">2016</th><th colspan="2">2017</th><th colspan="2">2018</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>AM</th><th>PM</th><th>AM</th><th>PM</th><th>AM</th><th>PM</th><th>AM</th><th>PM</th></tr><tr><td>Weekday</td><td>14,190</td><td>13,430</td><td>14,120</td><td>13,140</td><td>13,760</td><td>13,300</td><td>13,740</td><td>13,260</td></tr><tr><td>Saturday</td><td>13,230</td><td>13,070</td><td>13,200</td><td>13,110</td><td>12,890</td><td>13,410</td><td>12,440</td><td>13,840</td></tr><tr><td>Sunday</td><td>9,230</td><td>11,450</td><td>9,320</td><td>11,140</td><td>9,210</td><td>11,410</td><td>9,280</td><td>12,320</td></tr></table> <p>Note 1: Based on screenline G-G including stations 1002, 1107, 2204 and 2214 Note 2: Figures are the traffic flow of east bound and west bound traffic</p>		2015		2016		2017		2018			AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	Weekday	14,190	13,430	14,120	13,140	13,760	13,300	13,740	13,260	Saturday	13,230	13,070	13,200	13,110	12,890	13,410	12,440	13,840	Sunday	9,230	11,450	9,320	11,140	9,210	11,410	9,280	12,320
	2015		2016		2017		2018																																								
	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM																																							
Weekday	14,190	13,430	14,120	13,140	13,760	13,300	13,740	13,260																																							
Saturday	13,230	13,070	13,200	13,110	12,890	13,410	12,440	13,840																																							
Sunday	9,230	11,450	9,320	11,140	9,210	11,410	9,280	12,320																																							
	<u>Representer’s proposal:</u>																																														
	(a) An alternative scheme was submitted proposing comprehensive development of the site.	(viii) No technical justifications for the schemes were provided. Without the necessary details, the technical feasibility of these proposals cannot be ascertained. Regarding the ground on comprehensive development, responses (i) and (ii) to R6 are relevant.																																													

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<p>The scale of commercial development should be reduced by at least one third with number of towers from two to one.</p>	<p>(ix) In respect of the development scale, given the scarcity of land resources, especially in the prime urban locations in Hong Kong, development intensity should be optimized wherever possible as long as it will not generate unacceptable impacts on the surrounding developments. It should be noted that not the whole CHR Site (area of 2.66ha) are utilised for development. About 17% of which will have to be set aside for road improvement and the construction of the new access road serving both the commercial development and the District Court. Regarding the GFA requirement, as advised by the Judiciary, a total GFA of 70,000m² is required (equivalent to PR of about 6.6). According to the conceptual scheme, the commercial development will have a total GFA of 100,000m² which is equivalent to a PR of about 11 based on a development site area of about 8,953m² and the proposed BH is 135mPD. The PR is about 25% lower than the general development intensity of high-rise commercial buildings under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) (i.e. a PR of 15). The scale of the proposed commercial development is therefore considered not incompatible with the surrounding area, which are primarily high-rise commercial/residential developments.</p> <p>(x) Moreover, the proposed development intensity of the CHR Site is formulated with due regard to the carrying capacity of the local road network and the proposed GFA of the whole CHR Site is based on the findings of the Traffic Review. As reflected in the Traffic Review, retail uses would generally generate comparatively more traffic than other commercial uses like office and hotel. In this regard, to minimise the traffic impact of the future commercial development, the maximum retail GFA of 10,000m² (i.e. about 10% of the total GFA for the commercial development) is stipulated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP.</p>
	<p>(b) The GFA of GIC facilities should be increased from</p>	<p>(xi) Regarding the provision of G/IC facilities, based on a planned population of about 185,200 persons, there is no shortfall of major G/IC facilities in Wan Chai area, except day care centres</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	3,000m ² to 8,000m ² to incorporate elderly care centre, communal health centre, youth activity centre, civic centre and elderly activity centre.	for the elderly and RCHE where the population-based standards were reinstated in the HKPSG in end-2018. While there are no population based HKPSG standards for district elderly centre, study room, elderly/youth activity centre and community hall, there are currently two District Elderly Community Centres, three Neighbourhood Elderly Centres, two Integrated Children and Youth Services Centres, one existing community hall and a new multi-purpose Moreton Terrace Activities Centre (now under construction and scheduled for completion in 2021) in Wan Chai district. HAD advises that they will continue to monitor the supply and demand situation of community hall facilities in Wan Chai. Regarding the proposal of locating a civic centre at the CHR Site, according to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), civic centre is planned on a district-wide basis and the current provision of which on Hong Kong Island is considered sufficient. The provision of RCHE is generally determined by a list of factors including the characteristics of the population, geographic concerns and the need of such facility. As the CHR Site is mainly used for commercial and district court purposes, after taking into account different factors (including development intensity and the appropriateness of locating social welfare facilities), it is considered that priority should be given to the provision of DHC and CCC. Nevertheless, SWD has indicated that multi-pronged approaches would be adopted to increase supply of such elderly care facilities in Wan Chai district.
	(c) Increasing the provision of open space from 6,000m ² to 12,000m ² .	(xii) For the provision of open space at the District Council level, there will be an overall surplus of about 19.2 ha in Wan Chai with the planned provision of 56.23 ha open space (including 15.97 ha local open space and 40.26 ha district open space), despite there will be a deficit of local open space of about 2.55 ha. As per Wong Nai Chung OZP, there will be an overall surplus of 4.07 ha of open space with the planned provision of 11.05 ha open space (including 2.83 local open space and 8.22 ha district open space), despite there will be a deficit of local open

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
		space of about 0.66 ha. In response to the local needs and WCDC's previous request, a public open space of not less than 6,000m ² will be provided within the CHR Site. The provision level is to strike a balance between the need of local open space and the feasibility of accommodating the commercial development and District Court within the CHR Site.
	(d) Providing underground and/or overhead pedestrian linkages to enhance connectivity with the neighbouring area.	(xiii) Response (iv) to R1 to R5 is relevant.
R12 (Hon. Paul TSE Wai-chun, WCDC Member)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A and B. 	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development will aggravate existing congestion problem. Surrounding roads like CHR and Cotton Path should be expanded and a proper round-about at Link Road/CHR/Leighton Road junction should be provided to ease downhill traffic 	(i) Responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 are relevant. The CHR(West) is already proposed to be widened to provide a round-about to lessen the traffic conflict of vehicles currently observed in the local accesses around CHR Site. To mitigate for traffic impacts induced at the existing road network outside the CHR Site, junction improvement works were proposed to smoothen traffic movement and provide additional turning lanes.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	flow.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing the plot ratio by at least 30% with the number of commercial and law court buildings both reduced from two to one to release area for open space. 	(ii) Responses (xi) and (xii) to R11 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing sports grounds to compensate the loss in Moreton Terrace. Besides, more GIC facilities should be provided to serve local residents. 	(iii) Regarding the loss of volley ball court in Moreton Terrace, it is noted that the volleyball courts have been combined with the handball court in the Victoria Park as the handball-cum-volleyball courts. In this regard, LCSD confirmed at a WCDC meeting on 7.5.2019 that the usage rate of the handball-cum-volleyball courts in Victoria Park which included a handball court and two volleyball courts had yet to reach the saturation level at present. Therefore, after the closure of the volleyball courts at Moreton Terrace, the handball-cum-volleyball courts in Victoria Park would still have capacity to absorb some of the demand from users of the volleyball courts at Moreton Terrace. Nonetheless, LCSD will contact the organisations who are the usual hirers of the volleyball courts and coordinate their usual bookings, in order to minimise the inconvenience caused to them. Regarding the provision of G/IC facilities, response (iv) to R6 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of ingress/egress to the site should be increased from two to three. Besides, 	(iv) The additional ingress/egress through Leighton Road which is a major district distributor is technically infeasible as it may cause vehicular conflict with Leighton Road and the OVT is likely to be affected by the new access arrangement. Response (iv) to R1 to R5 is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	underground pedestrian tunnel connecting the proposed development and MTR Station should be provided.	
R13 (Miss YEUNG Suet-ying, Clarisse, WCDC Member)	• Oppose Amendment Items A and B.	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	• The consultation document including the TIA submitted to WCDC were not comprehensive.	<p>(i) WCDC was consulted on 8.5.2018, 8.1.2019 and 4.7.2019 on the proposed developments at the CHR Site and the related proposed amendments to the OZP. Key TIA findings including junction performances were submitted to WCDC over the consultation on 8.1.2019.</p> <p>(ii) The final report of the TIA was submitted as part of the proposed amendments to the OZP for the Board's consideration in March 2019. The TIA report together with all the technical assessments have since then been made available for public inspection. WCDC was further consulted during the exhibition period of the draft OZP and was informed that the findings of the assessments were available for public inspection.</p> <p>(iii) Regarding the TIA, responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 and responses (vi) to (vii) to R11 are relevant.</p>
	• The development especially retail facilities will generate more traffic	(iv) To minimise the traffic impact of the future commercial development, the maximum retail GFA of 10,000m ² (i.e. about 10% of the total GFA for the commercial development) is stipulated in the ES of the OZP.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	and aggravate existing congestion problem.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocating the minibus station to the CHR Site will cause inconvenience to the residents. 	(v) Response (i) to R7 to R10 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area reserved for the District Court exceeds the requested need (i.e. 70,000m²) of the Judiciary. 	(vi) As for the District Court, as advised by the Judiciary, a total GFA of 70,000m ² is required (equivalent to PR of about 6.6), which is roughly equivalent to 1.5 times of the existing floor area occupied by the three courts combined in order to cater for the long term needs of the Judiciary. The area reserved for the District Court is necessary to achieve the above development intensity given the BHR of 135mPD.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The four buildings will adversely affect visual, light penetration and air ventilation of the area. 	(vii) Response (iii) to R11 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing the private developer to manage the open space will result in having the open space being used as a profit making tools for the 	(viii) Response (iii) to R6 is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	developer.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing the scale of commercial development and taking away retail component to minimise impact on traffic. 	<p>(ix) Response (ix) to R11 is relevant. Regarding the provision of retail facilities, as reflected in the Traffic Review, retail uses would generally generate comparatively more traffic than other commercial uses like office and hotel. In this regard, to minimise the traffic impact, the future commercial development will be restricted to a maximum retail GFA of 10,000m² (i.e. about 10% of the total GFA for the commercial development) as stated in the ES of the OZP.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowering the building height (BH) restriction of the Government, Institution and Community (GIC) site to minimize visual and air ventilation impact on the area. 	<p>(x) In relation to the proposed BH, the proposed maximum BH of 135mPD is considered in line with the BHR of “C” zone in Causeway Bay across Leighton Road. In deriving the BH for the District Court, reference has been made to the West Kowloon Law Courts Building which has a higher floor-to-floor height (5.5m to 6m) when compared with that of general office building. The same BHR of 135mPD as the “C(2)” zone is imposed on the “G/IC” zone to allow for design flexibility. In this regard, the project proponent of the District Court considers that any reduction of the BH restriction for the District Court will limit flexibility in disposition and design of the building mass while achieving the permissible development intensity of the proposed development. According to the project proponent of the District Court, stepped BH profile will be adopted in the two court buildings to allow height variation.</p> <p>(xi) The requirements for provision of at-grade open space of not less than 6,000m² and building gaps of a minimum of 20m and 25m would help alleviate the visual impact and enhance visual openness of the CHR Site as well as improve visual permeability by breaking up the perceivable building mass. The open space would also positively connect the site with the neighbourhood with direct frontage onto Leighton Road. A visual appraisal has also been conducted based on a conceptual scheme and concluded that the proposal in overall terms would not result in</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
		<p>unacceptable visual impact.</p> <p>(xii) On the potential blockage of views, with reference to the Town Planning Board Guideline No. 41 on “Submission of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board” (TPB PG-No. 41), private views from residential or commercial towers are not considered as it is not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations in the highly developed context of Hong Kong. In the interest of the public, it is far more important to protect public views from key strategic and important public viewing points. Based on the conceptual scheme, a visual appraisal has also been conducted in accordance to TPB PG-No.41 and it has concluded that the proposed development in overall terms would not result in unacceptable visual impact.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning the proposed open space from “C” to “Open Space” (“O”) and manage by the government. Besides, the open space should be relocated to the south of the site to allow separation with residents. 	<p>(xiii) Response (iii) to R6 are relevant. Besides, the project proponent of the District Court has indicated a separation of at least 20m between the building block (at west) and the residential blocks across CHR(West) will be maintained. The current disposition of the District Court will allow similar separation with the existing residential development across CHR(East). The development of the District Court will also need to comply with the greening ratio and tree preservation requirements as stipulated in the Sustainable Building and Design Guidelines (APP-152). As part of the development process of any government project, the project proponent will consult WCDC on the development of the District Court at appropriate stage of the project. In addition, the proposed designation of the open space as “O” zone will render the commercial development to be accommodated in a cramped site not conducive to an integrated design.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Old and Valuable Trees 	<p>(xiv) Under the ES of the draft OZP, the two OVTs (OVT No. HKPWCH/1) and (OVT No. EMSD</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	(OVTs) and masonry wall should be preserved and incorporated into the future development.	WCH/1) shall be preserved. In this regard, the two OVTs will be preserved in-situ in accordance with Environment, Transport and Works Bureau Technical Circular (Works) No. 29/2004 'Registration of Old and Valuable Trees, and Guidelines for their Preservation'. The masonry wall has been graded as Grade III Historical Building. In this regard, the ES stipulated that the stone retaining walls along the northern and eastern peripheries of the "C(2)" site (except the portions being altered by the road improvement works) and those along the southern periphery of the "G/IC(2)" site shall be preserved.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shelving the minibus station relocation proposal. 	(xv) Response (i) to R7 to R10 is relevant.
R14 to R30 (Various owners corporation committees/ residents groups, local concern group and individuals)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A and B in the form of two standard letters. 	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conclusion of the TIA is questionable due to the flawed assumptions (R14 to R18 and R27 only). 	(i) Responses (vi) to (vii) to R11 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The permissible BH and disposition of the District Court building will have impacts in respect of 	(ii) Responses (x) to (xii) to R13 and response (iii) to R11 are relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	sunlight penetration, air ventilation and visual permeability to the adjacent residential areas.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The District Court block fronting CHR West only have 20m gap with residential building across. 	(iii) Response (xiii) to R13 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is strong objection to allow hotel development as of right as it will generate a large amount of pedestrian and traffic flow. (R14 to R30) Individual representers also added that the new road cannot help divert traffic but create tailing back to CHR. (R19 to R30 except R27) 	(iv) Responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 are relevant. Given the surrounding area is predominantly used for commercial purposes, hotel is considered to be compatible with these commercial uses and would not result in unacceptable impact. It is considered appropriate to retain hotel as always permitted use in the “C(2)” zone. Nonetheless, whether the CHR Site will be used for office or hotel or mix of the two is subject to market condition.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TIA was outdated failing to reflect the latest situation (R24, R26 and 	(v) Under the Traffic Review, the design year is assumed to be five years after the completion of the proposed developments at the CHR Site, i.e. year 2031. In assessing the traffic impact, the 2017 observed traffic data was only the baseline condition and were forecasted to the design

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation																																													
	R28 only)	<p>year at 2031 with an assumed annual traffic growth rate of 0.1%. In the course of the assessment, major committed/planned developments in the vicinity of the CHR Site have been taken into consideration, including the redevelopment of Po Leung Kuk Headquarters at 66 Leighton Road and other planned redevelopment projects known at the time of review. In the actual circumstances, a general decrease in traffic flow of 1% to 0.42% per annum of 2015 to 2018 was observed in the Causeway Bay area. As a result, an annual increase of 0.1% in traffic flow in the Traffic Review is considered to be a conservative assumption tallying the actual situation.</p> <p>A comparison of weekday and weekend traffic flow at Causeway Bay is attached in the table below.</p> <table><tr><th></th><th colspan="2">2015</th><th colspan="2">2016</th><th colspan="2">2017</th><th colspan="2">2018</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>AM</th><th>PM</th><th>AM</th><th>PM</th><th>AM</th><th>PM</th><th>AM</th><th>PM</th></tr><tr><td>Weekday</td><td>14,190</td><td>13,430</td><td>14,120</td><td>13,140</td><td>13,760</td><td>13,300</td><td>13,740</td><td>13,260</td></tr><tr><td>Saturday</td><td>13,230</td><td>13,070</td><td>13,200</td><td>13,110</td><td>12,890</td><td>13,410</td><td>12,440</td><td>13,840</td></tr><tr><td>Sunday</td><td>9,230</td><td>11,450</td><td>9,320</td><td>11,140</td><td>9,210</td><td>11,410</td><td>9,280</td><td>12,320</td></tr></table> <p>Note 1: Based on screenline G-G including stations 1002, 1107, 2204 and 2214 Note 2: Figures are the traffic flow of east bound and west bound traffic</p>		2015		2016		2017		2018			AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	Weekday	14,190	13,430	14,120	13,140	13,760	13,300	13,740	13,260	Saturday	13,230	13,070	13,200	13,110	12,890	13,410	12,440	13,840	Sunday	9,230	11,450	9,320	11,140	9,210	11,410	9,280	12,320
	2015		2016		2017		2018																																								
	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM																																							
Weekday	14,190	13,430	14,120	13,140	13,760	13,300	13,740	13,260																																							
Saturday	13,230	13,070	13,200	13,110	12,890	13,410	12,440	13,840																																							
Sunday	9,230	11,450	9,320	11,140	9,210	11,410	9,280	12,320																																							
	<u>Representer’s proposal:</u>																																														
	(a) Alternative scheme A (R14 to R18 and R27 only), B and	(vi) No technical justifications for the schemes were provided. Without the necessary details, the technical feasibility of these proposals cannot be ascertained. The alternative Scheme A that																																													

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<p>C (R19 to R26, R29 and R30) were submitted proposing different disposition of the District Court blocks. Hotel should be put under Column 2 of the “C(2)” zone. (R14 to R27, R29 and R30 only) The BHR of the District Court should be restricted to 13 storeys. (R14 to R30) Under Scheme A, a building hup of 50m from Caroline Garden is proposed. (R14 to R18)</p>	<p>proposes relocation of the District Court blocks eastward fronting CHR(East) may affect the provision of three ingress/egress (at least two separate vehicular accesses and one separate emergency vehicular exit) serving the District Court as required by the project proponent. Regarding the BHR of the District Court, responses (x) to (xii) to R13 are relevant. Given the surrounding area is predominantly used for commercial purposes, hotel is considered to be compatible with these commercial uses and would not result in unacceptable impact. It is considered appropriate to retain hotel as always permitted use in the “C(2)” zone. Nonetheless, whether the CHR Site will be used for office or hotel or mix of the two is subject to market condition. In respect of the issue of building gap, the project proponent of the District Court has indicated a separation of at least 20m between the building block (at west) and the residential blocks across CHR(West) will be maintained. The current disposition of the District Court will allow similar separation with the existing residential development across CHR(East). The development of the District Court will also need to comply with the greening ratio and tree preservation requirements as stipulated in the Sustainable Building and Design Guidelines (APP-152). As part of the development process of any government project, the project proponent will consult WDC on the development of the District Court at appropriate stage of the project. Also, the adjustments in the zoning boundaries may affect the provision of three ingress/egress (at least two separate vehicular accesses and one separate emergency vehicular exit) serving the District Court site as required by the project proponent. Besides, the existing masonry walls are likely to be affected by the developments proposed under Scheme B and Scheme C.</p>
	(b) Undertaking TIA again and lowering the GFA of the commercial site based on the	(vii) Regarding the scale of commercial development, responses (ix) and (x) to R11 are relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	revised TIA findings.(R14 to R16, R18, R27)	
	(c) Two other alternative schemes (Schemes B and C) were submitted proposing adjustments to the zoning boundaries to relocate the public open space to face the residential building across CHR West. (R19 to R30 except R27) Under Scheme B, one commercial tower and access road should be removed for open space. 30% of the total site area (i.e. 8,000m ²) should be used as public open space. A minimum set back of 40m needs to be provided at the open space at the southern portion. Under Scheme C, all retail space should be removed while the number of commercial block should be	(viii) Apart from the responses given in respect of Scheme A above, the alternative Schemes B and C propose that the relocation of the District Court blocks eastward fronting CHR(East) may necessitate the demolition of part of the masonry walls which are graded as Grade III historical building. In addition, the proposed designation of the open space as “O” zone under Scheme C will render the commercial development to be accommodated in a cramped site not conducive to an integrated design.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	reduced to one. The open space should be managed by LCSD.	
R31 (The Incorporated Owners of Beverly Hill)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A and B. 	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development will aggravate the traffic congestion problem which will hinder emergency vehicular access and cause threat to safety and well-being of residents. 	<p>(i) Responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 are relevant.</p> <p>(ii) Regarding the concern on emergency vehicular access, the future road network with the proposed improvement scheme would be able to cope with the additional traffic generated by the proposed development. The predicted traffic conditions at critical junctions in the vicinity of the CHR Site would be similar before and after the commission of proposed development, the traffic situation to be encountered by the emergency vehicles during emergency operation are also expected to be similar. In any case, for situation which the ambulance is obstructed by traffic congestion, Emergency Medical Assistance Motorcycle (EMAMC) would be deployed by the Fire Services Department, which is equipped with paramedic equipment for rapid provision of pre-hospital paramedical care and treatment for the public.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TIA was outdated. 	(iii) Responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 and response (v) to R14 to R30 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local have not been adequately consulted. 	(iv) Apart from consultations with WCDC as detailed in the responses (i) and (ii) to R13 , representatives of concerned government departments also attended two residents' forums on

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
		10.6.2019 and 13.6.2019 which were attended altogether by about 80 participants. The draft OZP was gazetted for public inspection, during which public can submit representations/comments on the proposed development.
R32 and R356 to R361 (Tai Hang Concern Association and individuals)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A and B in the form of a standard letter. 	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	There is no justified need for further commercial development in the area.	(i) Response (ii) to R11 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development will aggravate the existing traffic condition and affect sunlight penetration and air ventilation of the area. Also, the TIA is not showing the actual traffic situation. 	(ii) Responses (iii), and (vi) to (vii) to R11 , responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 , and response (v) to R14 to R30 are relevant.
R33 (Best Epoch Holdings Limited)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A and B. 	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a lack of justification for commercial development which is incompatible with the surrounding area. 	(i) Response (ii) to R11 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development, including the development intensity and building height, are unsuitable and will aggravate the existing traffic congestion problem and bring about adverse visual/air ventilation impacts. 	(ii) Regarding the traffic impact, response (iii) to R11 is relevant. Regarding the development intensity and BH, response (x) to R11 and responses (x) to (xii) to R13 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It fails to address pressing community needs for G/IC facilities e.g. elderly facilities. 	(iii) Responses (iv) to R6 and (xi) to R11 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed open space is insufficient to address the existing deficit and may 	(iv) Regarding the management of the open space, response (iii) to R6 is relevant. Regarding the provision of open space, response (xiii) to R11 is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	likely be closed off to public.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TIA was outdated and did not reflect traffic conditions under major events. There was also no sensitivity test undertaken. The proposed measures cannot resolve existing traffic issues such as illegal parking. The technical feasibility of underground connection to MTR station was doubtful. 	<p>(v) Responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 and response (v) to R14 to R30 are relevant.</p> <p>(vi) When there is an event at Hong Kong Stadium, special traffic and transport arrangement (including road closure and traffic diversion) would be implemented by the Hong Kong Police Force for crowd control and road safety. The corresponding traffic advice would be published by TD to inform the public about the traffic arrangement in advance.</p> <p>(vii) While the underground connection to MTR Station is subject to further feasibility study, the future developer is required under the lease to reserve an underground connection point within the commercial site for possible pedestrian subway.</p> <p>(viii) While it is noted that stacking vehicles and illegal parking are the factors contributing to the existing traffic congestion, yet it is related to drivers' behaviours and enforcement issues which is regardless of the presence of the development. Besides, public car park would be provided within the CHR Site in addition to the ancillary parking provision of the development to cater for the parking demand in the vicinity. Nonetheless, appropriate site factors had been applied in the calculation to discount the junction capacity in order to take into account the effect caused by the stacking vehicles and illegal parking. These factors were derived based on site observation.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to conduct a Land Use Planning, Design and 	(ix) Various technical assessments have been conducted to demonstrate that the proposed developments will not induce unacceptable impact on the local area in terms of traffic,

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	Technical Feasibility Study with public engagement to assess and propose a zoning amendment.	environmental, visual, air ventilation and landscape aspects. The Planning Department (PlanD) together with concerned government departments consulted WCDC three times for the proposed developments at the CHR Site. WCDC was consulted on 8.5.2018, 8.1.2019 and 4.7.2019 on the proposed developments at the CHR Site and the related proposed amendments to the OZP with the WCDC members' concerns on the provision of G/IC facilities properly responded. WCDC was further consulted during the exhibition period of the draft OZP in July 2019. All the key assessment findings were presented to the WCDC in the above consultations. Apart from consultations with WCDC, representatives of concerned government departments also attended two residents' forum on 10.6.2019 and 13.6.2019 to explain the land use proposals and respond to residents' concerns. The two forums together were attended by about 80 participants.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining the site for community facilities serving the neighbourhood. 	(x) Response (ii) to R11 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopting substantial setback along both sides of the CHR Site abutting CHR should be provided. 	(xi) Response (ii) to R6 and response (xiii) to R13 are relevant.
R34 (Individual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A and B. 	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development will cause negative impacts on visual and air ventilation, and there is no spare traffic capacity to accommodate the development. 	(i) Response (iii) to R11 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed arrangement of the open space is not desirable and will be nothing more than circulating area/ landscape rooftop. Open space being managed by private company is also not desirable. 	(ii) Response (iii) to R1 to R5 and response (iii) to R6 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While there is still a shortfall of other community facilities, such as Residential Care and Home for Elderly (RCHE), the commercial site is not appropriate to 	<p>(iii) Response (iv) to R6 is relevant.</p> <p>(iv) The provision of RCHE is generally determined by a list of factors including the characteristics of the population, geographic concerns and the need of such facility. As the CHR Site is mainly used for commercial and district court purposes, after taking into account different factors (including development intensity and the appropriateness of locating social welfare facilities), it is considered that the CHR Site is not suitable to accommodate RCHE. The</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	accommodate child care and elderly care facilities and these facilities should not be situated in buildings with non-openable windows.	project proponent of CCC has no objection for the facility to be located in the premises of commercial building.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land tribunal should be located in or close to the New Territories. 	(v) The District Court and the Land Tribunal are the same level of court. In this regard, the Land Tribunal has jurisdiction to hear and adjudicate cases which are not district bound. By co-locating the District Court and the Land Tribunal in the CHR Site, the Chief District Judge would be able to holistically and flexibly deploy manpower resources including the Judges and Judicial Officers and their supporting staff as well as courtrooms and associated facilities. As such, it is considered appropriate to locate Land Tribunal at the CHR Site.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The BHR of Item B should be reduced to regular G/IC dimension. 	(vi) Response (x) to R13 is relevant.
R35 (Doctoral Exchange)	Oppose Amendment Items A and B.	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no objection to the District Court development on condition that there is no 	(i) Noted and regarding the impact of the District Court development, response (iii) to R11 is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	adverse impact.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed conceptual layout is undesirable as (i) the building massing is bulky with narrow building gap; (ii) there is a lack of void to allow air ventilation; (iii) the proposed green area and landscaping area segregated and divided by roads; (iv) the site is difficult to navigate; and (v) the GIC facilities are scattered. 	(ii) Regarding the conceptual layout in general, response (iii) to R1 to R5 and responses (ii) and (iii) to R6 are relevant. Regarding the issue of building gap, a building gap of not less than 25m in width across the northern portion of the CHR Site generally aligning with the OVT (No. HKP WCH/1) abutting Leighton Road and a building gap of not less than 20m across the southern portion generally aligning with the OVT (No. EMSD WCH/1) were assumed within the CHR Site to facilitate air ventilation as indicated in the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) conducted for the Conceptual Layout. Nonetheless, to provide design flexibility, quantitative AVA will be conducted at the detailed design stage under lease to identify the exact alignment of the building gap and/or other enhancement measures. Similar requirements will be incorporated into the land allocation for the District Court where applicable.
	<u>Representer's proposal:</u>	
	(a) An alternative scheme was submitted proposing different disposition. An elongated single block design of the DC is adopted with urban plaza and low-rise wings on both sides.	(iii) No technical justifications for the schemes were provided. Without the necessary details, the technical feasibility of these proposals cannot be ascertained.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	Large and connected open space and outdoor amphitheatre are proposed.	
	(b) Reducing the total GFA for commercial development by 30-50%.	(iv) Responses (ix) and (x) to R11 are relevant.
	(c) Rezoning the CHR Site to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “G/IC cum Commercial” with building height restriction of 135mPD and 115mPD for the southern and northern part respectively.	(v) It should be noted that in view of its security needs, the District Court will need to be fenced off with a single public entrance point for conducting security screening before entering the court facilities. Unrestricted integration at the deck level or integrated design between the commercial development and the District Court as proposed by some representers are considered not feasible based on the limited available information. Having said that, integration of the open spaces and commercial development in a visually coherent manner is still possible with appropriate decking over design within the “C(2)” zone, provided that the security of the District Court is not compromised. Hence, maintaining separate zonings for the commercial development and District Court as “C(2)” and “G/IC(2)” is considered appropriate. Regarding the BH, response (x) to R13 is relevant.
	(d) Increasing the total GFA for G/IC facilities to 8,000m ² by providing additional communal facilities including youth activities centre, elderly activities	(vi) Response (ix) to R6 is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	centre and civic centre.	
	(e) Increasing the total provision of open space to 12,000m ² .	(vii) Response (xii) to R11 is relevant
	(f) Providing new access road at the rear of the CHR Site and widen CHR to provide a new slip road.	(viii) The new access road currently proposed will provide access to the commercial site and District Court on both sides while connecting with the roundabout under the road improvement works. Providing the new access road at the rear of the CHR Site fails to serve such purpose. The CHR(West) is already proposed to be widened to provide a roundabout to lessen the traffic conflict of vehicles currently observed in the local accesses around CHR Site.
R36 to R46 and R629 to R630 (Individuals)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A and B in the form of a standard letter. 	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no need to provide additional commercial land. 	(i) Response (ii) to R11 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development will aggravate the local traffic condition while the proposed traffic 	(ii) Responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 are relevant. (iii) With the proposed junction improvement schemes, all the critical junctions would be operating within capacities after the completion of the proposed development. In general, most vehicles

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	management measures including new round-about and road widening cannot solve the traffic problem.	are able to clear the junctions without waiting for more than one traffic signal cycle during peak hours and queues would not accumulate persistently to prohibit the traffic between the main roads and inner streets. In addition, it is anticipated that the traffic impact caused by the proposed development to the inner streets and areas is not significant as the traffic to/from the CHR Site would mainly travel on major roads/streets.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TIA is not comprehensive and queried whether emergency situations have been taken into account. 	(iv) Responses (vi) to (vii) to R11 and response (ii) to R31 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed building height is significantly different from the neighbouring area and will cause negative impacts to the surrounding. (R45 and R46 only) 	(v) Responses (x) to (xii) to R13 and response (iii) to R11 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changing the public car park into monthly car park (R36 to R44 and R629 to R630 only). 	(vi) Provision of public car park is to address the current short-term parking needs of Causeway Bay.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing the plot ratio for 	(vii) Responses (ix) and (x) to R11 are relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	commercial site and incorporate more community facilities (R36 to R44 and R629 to R630 only).	
R47 to R355 and R607 (Individuals)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A and B in the form of a standard letter. 	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed commercial development and the provision of the public car parking will aggravate the local traffic condition (R47 to R355 only). 	(i) Responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 are relevant. The Traffic Review has already taken into account the trip generation from the public car parking spaces.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic congestion will hinder the access of emergency vehicles. 	(ii) Response (ii) to R31 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TIA is not comprehensive. Need to update TIA to reflect the 	(iii) Responses (vi) to (vii) to R11 and response (v) to R14 to R30 are relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	2019 situation (R346 only).	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local residents have not been adequately consulted. Need to undertaking thorough public consultation (R344 and R346 only) 	(iv) Response (iv) to R31 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No sustainability assessment has been undertaken (R344 only). Engaging professionals to undertake further assessments (R347 only). 	(v) Response (iii) to R11 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Queried whether the OVT can be preserved. (R355 only) 	(vi) Response (xiv) to R13 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need of 600 parking spaces and whether the CHR Site can accommodate such facility together with four new 	(vii) The total number of parking spaces include the car parking spaces that are derived based on the provision of office, hotel and retail uses at the CHR Site by making reference to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (subject to refinement upon adjustment in the mix at detailed design stage upon land disposal) as well as additional parking spaces for private cars (100) and commercial vehicles (25) to serve the local needs. The overall parking space

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	building blocks are doubtful. (R355 only)	provisions have been taken into account in the Traffic Review which demonstrates that there will not be unacceptable traffic impact from the proposed development after implementation of road improvement works.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether it is safe to locate District Court at CHR Site given the special security requirements of District Court is questionable (R355 only) 	(viii) After a comprehensively review of other sites on Hong Kong Island for District Court development, the Judiciary accepted that the CHR Site, being located at the prime business district on Hong Kong Island that is convenient to legal professionals and users, is the suitable to meet the requirements of the Judiciary.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing the CHR Site into a park. (R355 only) 	(ix) It is necessary to provide land to ensure a continual supply of office space and to improve court facilities. Besides, to address the deficit of local open space in the area, the future developer of the proposed commercial development will be required to provide 6,000m ² public open space within the site. Response (i) to R1 to R5 is relevant.
R362 to R593 (Individuals)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A and B in the form of a standard questionnaire with objection grounds generally the same as R13 though individual representers' choice of the stated objection reasons may be different. 	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Consultation is not sufficient and comprehensive (R363, R364, R366, R367, R370 to R373, R375 to R391, R393 to R398, R400 to R404, R406, R410 to R427, R429, R431, R432, R434 to R448, R451 to R453, R455 to R469, R471 to R484, R486, R487, R490 to R493, R495 to R499, R501, R504 to R506, R508 to R513, R517 to R519, R521 to R523, R525 to R540, R542 to R544, R546 to R559, R562, R564, R566 to R568, R570 to R573, R575 to R579, R581, R582 and R584 to R593 only) 	(i) Response (iv) to R31 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TIA is crude and biased which cannot reflect the 	(ii) Responses (vi) to (vii) to R11 and response (v) to R14 to R30 are relevant

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<p>existing situation (R362 to R373, R375 to R378, R380 to R429, R431 to R435, R437 to R453, R455 to R488, R490 to R514, R516 to R518, R520 to R523, R527, R529 to R556, R558, R561 to R573, R575 to R579 and R581 to R593 only)</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are sufficient retail facilities in the area and adding more will aggravate impacts on traffic and pedestrian. (R362 to R378, R380 to R447, R449 to R488, R490 to R513, R516, R517, R519 to R538, R540 to R565, R567 to R573, R577 to R579 and R581 to R593 only) 	<p>(iii) Response (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 and response (i) to R1 to R5 are relevant.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area reserved for the development of the District 	<p>(iv) Response (vi) to R13 is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<p>Court exceeds the requested need (i.e. 70,000m²) of the Judiciary. (R362 to R367, R369 to R373, R375 to R378, R380 to R394, R396 to R406, R408 to R427, R429 to R435, R437 to R447, R451 to R453, R455 to R469, R471 to R482, R484, R487, R490 to R501, R504 to R506, R508 to R513, R517 to R519, R521 to R523, R525 to R538, R540, R542 to R544, R546 to R556, R558 to R564, R567 to R573, R576 to R579 and R581 to R593 only)</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The location of the proposed District Court is in close proximity to the neighbouring residential developments and will 	<p>(v) Response (iii) to R11 and response (xiii) to R13 are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<p>affect sunlight penetration. (R362 to R367, R369 to R373, R375 to R378, R380 to R398, R400 to R422, R424 to R427, R429, R431 to R435, R437, R439 to R447, R450 to R476, R478 to R484, R487, R488, R490 to R502, R504 to R512, R516 to R518, R520 to R524, R527, R529, R530, R532 to R542, R544 to R549, R551 to R562, R564, R565, R567-R573, R575 to R579 and R581 to R593 only)</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocating the minibus station to the CHR Site will affect the commute routes of residents causing inconvenience to the residents. (R362 to R369, R371 to R373, R376 to R378, R380 to R395, R397 	<p>(vi) Response (i) to R7 to R10 is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<p>to R404, R406, R407, R410 to R422, R424 to R429, R431 to R435, R437, R439 to R449, R451 to R461, R463 to R485, R487, R490 to R495, R499 to R506, R508 to R513, R517 to R519, R521, R522, R527, R529 to R540, R542 to R544, R546 to R556, R558 to R560, R562 to R564, R567 to R579 and R581 to R593 only)</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing the private developer to manage the open space will result in having the open space to be used as a profit making tools for the developer (R362 to R364, R366, R367, R369 to R373, R375 to R389, R391 to R398, R400 to R406, R410 to 	<p>(vii) Response (iii) to R6 is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<p>R420, R422 to R427, R429 to R435, R437 to R447, R451 to R453, R455 to R461, R463 to R477, R479 to R484, R486, R487, R490 to R492, R494, R495, R497 to R506, R508 to R513, R517, R519, R521, R522, R527 to R538, R540, R542, R544 to R560, R562 to R564, R567 to R573, R575 to R579 and R582 to R593 only)</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The four tall buildings will adversely affect visual, light penetration and air ventilation of the area (R362 to R367, R369 to R373, R375 to R378, R380 to R404, R406, R407, R409 to R427, R429, R431 to R435, R437 to R447, R450 to R484, R486 to 	<p>(viii) Response (iii) to R11 is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<p>R488, R490 to R495, R497 to R513, R517 to R522, R524, R527, R529 to R538, R540, R542 to R547, R549 to R558, R560, R563, R564, R567 to R573, R575 to R579 and R582 to R593 only)</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development, especially the District Court, may not be compatible with other existing uses such as regular public events to be held at the Hong Kong Stadium. (R377 only) 	<p>(ix) Response (i) to R1 to R5 and response (vi) to R33 are relevant.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the scale of commercial development to minimise impact on traffic. (R362 to R373, R375 to R378, R380 to R394, R396 to R404, R406 to R429, R431 to R447, 	<p>(x) Responses (ix) and (x) to R11 are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<p>R449 to R464, R466 to R469, R471 to R477, R479 to R487, R490 to R493, R495, R498, R499, R501 to R504, R506, R508 to R513, R516, R517, R521 to R523, R527 to R540, R542 to R544, R546 to R553, R555, R557 to R568 and R570 to R593 only)</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower the BHR of the G/IC site to minimize visual and air ventilation impacts on the area. (R362 to R367, R369 to R373, R375 to R378, R380 to R407, R410 to R435, R437 to R447, R449 to R464, R466 to R477, R479 to R484, R486 to R488, R490 to R493, R495, R497 to R499, R501, R502, R504 to R513, R516 to R518, R520 to R523, R527 to R538, 	<p>(xi) Response (iii) to R11 and responses (x) to (xii) to R13 are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	R540, R542, R544, R546 to R553, R555, R558 to R560, R562 to R565, R567, R568, R570 to R586 and R588 to R593 only)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezone the planned open area from “Commercial” to “Open Space” and manage by the Government. (R362 to R364, R366 to R378, R380 to R398, R400 to R407, R409 to R435, R437 to R447, R449 to R484, R486 to R488, R490 to R493, R495, R498, R499, R501, R502, R504 to R513, R517, R518, R520 to R524, R527 to R538, R540, R542 to R544, R546 to R549, R551 to R564, R566 to R568, R570 to R580 and R582 to R593 only) 	<p>(xii) Response (xiii) to R13 is relevant. In addition, the proposed designation of the open space as “O” zone under Scheme C will render the commercial development to be accommodated in a cramped site not conducive to an integrated design.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocate the proposed open space to the south of the site. (R362 to R367, R370 to R373, R376 to R394, R397, R398, R400 to R404, R407, R409 to R422, R424 to R427, R429, R431 to R435, R437 to R447, R450 to R469, R471 to R477, R479 to R484, R486, R487, R490 to R493, R495, R497 to R499, R501, R502, R504 to R506, R508 to R513, R517, R518, R520 to R523, R527, R529 to R540, R542, R544, R546, R547, R549 to R553, R555, R557 to R565, R567, R568, R570, R572 to R580 and R582 to R593 only) 	(xiii) Response (xiii) to R13 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the two OVTs, one important tree and the 	(xiv) Response (xiv) to R13 is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<p>masonry wall. (R362 to R373, R375 to R407, R409 to R422, R424 to R435, R437 to R447, R449 to R477, R479 to R484, R486 to R488, R490 to R492, R495, R497 to R499, R501, R502, R504 to R513, R516 to R518, R520 to R524, R527, R529 to R538, R540, R542 to R544, R546 to R553, R555, R557 to R564, R566 to R568, R570 to R580 and R582 to R593 only)</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shelf the minibus station relocation proposal. (R362 to R369, R371 to R373, R375 to R378, R380 to R395, R397 to R404, R406, R407, R410 to R422, R424 to R429, R431 to R435, R437, R439 to R447, R449 to R456, R458 	<p>(xv) Response (i) to R7 to R10 is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	to R464, R466 to R477, R479 to R485, R487, R490 to R493, R495, R499, R501 to R506, R508 to R514, R516, R517, R520 to R523, R527, R529 to R540, R542 to R544, R546 to R553, R555, R558 to R564, R567, R568 and R570 to R593 only)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide active open spaces, including playground and basketball court. (R386, R513 and R588 only) 	(xvi) Response (iii) to R12 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should be constructed by phases. (R509 only) 	(xvii) The implementation programme will be subject to the project proponent and future developer
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carry our more comprehensive technical assessments to minimize impact brought to the local residents. (R379 only) 	(xviii) Response (iii) to R11 is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase the provision of elderly facilities in the area. (R374 only) 	(xix) Response (iv) to R6 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocate minibus routes 21A, 21M and 14M to the CHR Site may be feasible. (R377 only) 	(xx) Response (i) to R7 to R10 is relevant.
R594 to R602 (Individuals)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A and B in the form of a standard letter with objection grounds generally the same as R12. 	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development will attract people and traffic and hence aggravate traffic condition. (R595 to R599 only) 	(i) Responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 are relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TIA also lack survey data and queue analysis. (R595 to R599 only) The TIA is outdated and assumptions are sub-standard to TD's minimal acceptance level (R597 to R599 only). 	<p>(ii) Responses (vi) to (vii) to R11 and response (v) to R14 to R30 are relevant. Regarding the queue analysis, with the junction improvement schemes, all the critical junctions would be operating within capacities after completion of the proposed development. In general, most vehicles are able to clear the junctions without waiting for more than one traffic signal cycle during peak hours and queues would not accumulate persistently to prohibit the traffic between the main roads and inner streets.</p> <p>(iii) A reserve capacity of 15% is the most preferable scenario for planning new development areas but not an absolute cut-off and any positive figures already implied spare capacity and figure below such level does not necessarily represent unacceptable traffic condition. Essentially, a positive figure already indicates that there is spare capacity. Based on the Traffic Review, with the proposed development and junction improvement schemes, the reserve capacity (RC) and design flow/capacity ratio (DFC) of the critical junctions in the vicinity of the CHR Site would be positive and lower than 0.85 respectively. In addition, the anticipated traffic queue at all junctions would not extend to the next junction in the upstream, which is considered acceptable.</p> <p>(iv) Regarding the level of service (LOS) at the pedestrian crossing at Pennington Road/ Leighton Road, LOS D means "the LOS provides reasonable fluid flow; however, considerable friction and interaction between pedestrian are likely to occur". As the LOS of most footpaths and pedestrian crossings in the vicinity of the proposed development is C or above (i.e. desirable level), operation of this pedestrian crossing at this particular junction is still considered acceptable.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development will hinder air ventilation 	<p>(v) Response (iii) to R11 are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	and sunlight penetration. (R597 to R599)	
	<u>Representer's proposal:</u>	
	(a) An alternative scheme was submitted proposing a revised layout with one commercial block instead of two.	(vi) No technical justifications for the scheme has been provided. Without the necessary details, the technical feasibility of the proposal cannot be ascertained. Given the scarcity of land resources, especially in the prime urban locations in Hong Kong, development intensity should be optimized wherever possible as long as it will not generate unacceptable impacts on the surrounding area. Hence, the current GFA of 100,000m ² for the commercial development is considered appropriate. The proposed BH of 150mPD is considered excessive when compared to the BHR of the "C" zone in the vicinity.
	(b) Under the scheme, transport facilities are relocated underground with increase in the number of entry/exit points from two to three, decent size round about and underground pedestrian walkway to connect MTR.	(vii) The transport facilities are already assumed to be located underground in the conceptual scheme. Providing an additional ingress/egress through Leighton Road which is a major district distributor is technically infeasible as it may cause vehicular conflict with Leighton Road and it would also affect the OVT. Response (iv) to R1 to R5 is relevant.
	(c) Reducing the PR by at least 30%.	(viii) Responses (ix) and (x) to R11 are relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	(d) Providing sports ground to compensate loss of Victoria Park and Moreton Terrace and more community facilities to serve local residents.	(ix) Response (iii) to R12 is relevant.
R603 (Individual)	• Oppose Amendment Items A and B.	
	<u>Grounds of Representation:</u>	
	• The proposed development will aggravate traffic congestion problem and additional traffic will impede access of emergency vehicles.	(i) Responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 and response (ii) to R31 are relevant.
	• To create a recreational park with open space available to residents' use seven days a week.	(ii) Response (ix) to R47 to R355 and R607 is relevant. The open hours of the public open space to be provided in the commercial site has to take account of DEVB's "Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines".
R604 (Individual)	• Oppose Amendment Items A and B.	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is already very congested and the proposed development may generate pollution. 	(i) Response (iii) to R11 is relevant
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowering the proposed BH. 	(ii) Responses (x) to (xii) to R13 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed relocation of minibus to CHR Site is too far away from MTR Station and hence not convenient to residents. Identifying other sites to relocate the minibus terminus. 	(iii) Response (i) to R7 to R10 is relevant.
R605 (Individual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A & B. 	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is already very congested. The proposed development will aggravate 	(i) Responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 and response (iii) to R11 are relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	traffic and obstruct landscape and sunlight penetration.	
R606 (Individual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A & B. 	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development will aggravate traffic condition and the proposed building height will create shielding effect, as well as blocking air ventilation and sunlight penetration. 	(i) Responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 and response (iii) to R11 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In particular, the proposed commercial site will result in a loss of community area and trees. 	(ii) Response (iv) to R6 is relevant.
R608 to R617, R627 and R632 (Individuals)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A & B. 	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development will aggravate the traffic conditions. (R608 to R617, R627 and R632) It will impose threat to the safety of the children (R608 only). 	(i) Responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 are relevant. The road improvement works will be built up safety standards.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also, the proposed development is not compatible with the neighbourhood (R615 only). 	(ii) Response (i) to R1 to R5 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development will affect light catchment (R613 only). 	(iii) Response (iii) to R11 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing the plot ratio by at least 30% and reduce the number of commercial block to one instead of two. (R616 and R617 only). Adopting a low-rise (about 	(iv) Responses (ix) to (x) and (xii) to R11 are relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	10-storey) building height profile for the commercial building with special design features such as roof top gardens. (R609 and R632 only) Dedicating not less than one third of the land for outdoor area/ park/ exercise area. (R609 and R632 only)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shelving the car park and public transport interchange proposal (R609 and R632 only). 	(v) Response (i) to R7 to R10 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocating the transport facilities underground (R616 and R617 only). 	(vi) The transport facilities are already assumed to be located underground in the Conceptual Layout.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing entry/ exit points from two to three for direct access to Leighton Road (eastbound), Link Road and Cotton Path. Expanding vehicle lanes at CHR and 	(vii) The additional ingress/egress through Leighton Road which is a major district distributor is technically infeasible as it may cause vehicular conflict with Leighton Road and it would also affect the OVT. The CHR(West) is already proposed to be widened to provide a round-about to lessen the traffic conflict of vehicles currently observed in the local accesses around CHR Site. For underground connection with MTR Station, response (iv) to R1 to R5 is relevant. Response (iii) to R12 is also relevant for provision of sports grounds.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	Cotton Path. Providing proper round about at junction of Link Road, CHR and Leighton Road to expedite traffic outflow. Providing underground pedestrian walkway to connect to MTR. Providing sports ground to compensate loss of Victoria Park and Moreton Terrace and more community facilities to serve local residents (R617 only).	
R618 to R623, R625 and R628 (Individuals)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A and B. 	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development including the District Court should not be placed in Causeway Bay as it is already too congested (R619 only). 	(i) Response (i) to R1 to R5 is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development will paralyse the traffic in Causeway Bay (R618 only). 	(ii) Response (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development will destroy the neighbourhood/ bad for the district/ do not match with the neighbourhood (R621, R622, R623 and R625 only) 	(iii) Response (i) to R1-R5 and response (iii) to R11 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The disposition of the building is undesirable (R628 only). 	(iv) Response (i) to R6 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing the PR by at least 30%. Reducing the number of blocks for commercial development from two to one. 	(v) Responses (ix) and (x) to R11 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocating the transport facilities underground. 	(vi) The transport facilities are already assumed to be put underground in the Conceptual Layout.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing the number of entry and exit points for direct access to Leighton Road (eastbound), Link Road and Cotton Path (R618 to R621 only). 	(vii) Response (iv) to R12 is relevant.
R624 (Individual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A and B. 	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development will attract people and traffic flow while the proposed traffic measures cannot resolve the existing traffic problem. 	(i) Responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TIA cannot reflect the existing situation. 	(ii) Responses (vi) to (viii) to R11 and response (v) to R14 to R30 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocating other minibuses such as nos. 28 & 36X to the CHR Site. 	(iii) Response (i) to R7 to R10 is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing no stop zone for car outside Radio City at Hennessey Road and area near Iving Street. 	(iv) According to the Traffic Review, the proposed developments will not generate unacceptable traffic impact after implementation of the proposed road junction improvement works. No traffic management measure is required along Hennessey Road and Ivy Street.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing the development scale of commercial development by deleting retail and office to minimise traffic impact. 	(v) Responses (ix) and (x) to R11 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing public transport interchange to accommodate 2-3 bus lanes; loading/ unloading area; 15 minutes free drop off area; coach parking spaces; and school bus parking spaces. 	(vi) Green Mini-bus lay-bys of 105m will be reserved in the commercial development. A total of 125 public car parking spaces including 5 coach parking spaces will also be provided.
R626 (Individual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose to Amendment Items A and B. 	
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u>	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development does not take into account the actual need of the immediate area and will have adverse impact on the surrounding areas in terms of transport, commercial and livelihood. 	(i) Response (i) to R1 to R5 and response (iii) to R11 are relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development will only benefit the developer and against the principle of proper use of public land. 	(ii) Response (ii) to R1 to R5 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designating the CHR site for GIC uses such as clinics, kindergartens, nurseries, elderly centres, open space and vehicular access or open space. 	(iii) Response (iii) R6 is relevant.
R631 (Individual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose to Amendment Items A and B. 	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	<u>Grounds of representation:</u> The proposed development will paralyse the traffic in Causeway Bay and the TIA is not comprehensive as it lacks survey data on pedestrian routing and traffic queuing analysis.	(i) Responses (iii) and (iv) to R7 to R10 , responses (vi) to (viii) to R11 , response (v) to R14 to R30 are relevant. Pedestrian assessment is conducted as part of the Traffic Review.
Providing Comments		
R633 (Individual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing pedestrian crossing above or below Leighton Road to connect the CHR Site with the MTR Station. Adopting innovative design to provide an environmentally, socially and economically sustainable development. 	(i) Apart from the at-grade pedestrian access around the CHR Site, the future developer is required to reserve an underground connection point within the commercial site for possible pedestrian subway to MTR Station which is subject to further feasibility study. (ii) The future developer of the commercial development and the project proponent of the District Court will comply with the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (APP-152) will have general control on the building separation, building setback and site coverage to ensure better air ventilation, enhance environmental quality of living space, and more greenery particularly at pedestrian level.
R634 (Individual)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserving as many OVTs as possible and provide as much green/ outdoor 	(i) Response (xiv) to R13 is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
	recreational space as possible.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including public services facilities such as sports ground. 	(ii) Response (vii) to R11 is relevant.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimising traffic congestion on Leighton Road, CHR and Link Road. 	(iii) According to the Traffic Review, the proposed developments will not generate unacceptable traffic impact after implementation of the proposed road junction improvement works.

(2) The 105 valid comments on representations were submitted by some of the representers themselves (**R13, R17, R19, R20, R21, R22, R23, R24, R25, R26, R28, R29, R30, R34, R344&R402, R364&R426, R367, R373&426, R385, R387, R393, R394, R396, R397&R482, R405, R407&R605, R421, R426, R435, R454, R468, R479, R490, R501, R520, R532, R593 & R606**), one District Council Member (**C1**), 8 owners corporation committees/residents groups (**C96-C103**), 3 local concern groups (**C3, C94 & C95**) and individuals.

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Related Representation	Gist of Comments	Response to Comment
C1- C93	Oppose R6 & R11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose to the representation regarding the commercial development as it is inappropriate to include commercial development at the Caroline Hill Road (CHR) Site due to saturation of existing road capacity in Causeway Bay area and possible noise pollution on the surrounding neighbourhood. (C1-C22, C24-C45 and C47-C93 only) 	(i) Response (i) to R1 to R5 and response (iii) to R11 are relevant.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose to the representation on the restriction of gross floor area (GFA) for community facilities as more community facilities should be provided. (C1-C4, C6, C7, C9-C12, C14, C16-C19, C21-C23, C25-C28, C30-C49, C51-C54, C56-C70 and C72-C93 only) 	(ii) Response (iv) to R6 is relevant.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose to the representation on the public open space and large-scale and easily accessible open spaces that are managed by the Government should be built. (C1-C7, C10, C11, C13-C19, 	(iii) Response (iii) to R6 is relevant.

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Related Representation	Gist of Comments	Response to Comment
		C21, C22, C24-C28, C32-C45, C47-C49, C51, C53, C54, C56-C70, C72-C74 and C78-C93 only)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose to the representation on the relocation of the minibus station to the CHR Site as it will break the connection to the MTR station. (C1-C12, C14-C28, C30-C45, C47-C63 and C65-C93) 	(iv) Response (i) to R7 to R10 is relevant.
C94-C103	Oppose R6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to impose restriction on GFA and other requirements on the OZP to ensure that future development would not exacerbate the carry capacity of the local district. 	(i) The “C(2)” and “G/IC(2)” zones are restricted to a maximum GFA of 100,000m ² and 70,000m ² respectively under the OZP.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constraints within the CHR Site and surrounding areas have to be incorporated into the OZP to ensure special characters of the site can be maintained and form part of the future development. 	(ii) The future developer and project proponent are required to preserve the OVTs and protect the masonry walls as specified in the ES and under the lease/land document.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional community facilities proposed would generate additional pedestrian and traffic flow and should account for total GFA of the commercial zone. 	(iii) Response (iv) to R6 is relevant.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creating the CHR Site into a community focal 	(iv) The local open space is intended to serve

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Related Representation	Gist of Comments	Response to Comment
		point would worsen the existing traffic and environmental condition which cause harm to the local residents.	the neighbourhood. Response (iii) to R11 is also relevant.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the District Court has special operational requirements, it is undesirable to integrate the District Court with commercial and community uses and hence no need to rezone the whole CHR Site to “Comprehensive Development Area”. 	(v) Response (ii) to R6 is relevant.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the MLP submission is required under s16, a comprehensive and updated traffic impact assessment, master landscape plan, location of pedestrian circulation facilities, locations of vehicle access points and parking, loading/unloading facilities and a market research on demand and supply on commercial floor area should also be submitted. 	(vi) Responses (ii) and (iii) to R6 are relevant.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The disposition of commercial towers and the District Court will create wall effect and affect sunlight, wind penetration and visual openness of adjacent residential developments. 	(vii) Responses (x) to (xii) to R13 are relevant.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A minimum setback requirement of 40m at the open space shall be incorporated in the OZP. 	(viii) Response (xiii) to R13 is relevant.

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Related Representation	Gist of Comments	Response to Comment
	Oppose R11 & R35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given District Court has special operational requirements, it is undesirable to integrate the DC with commercial and community uses. 	(ix) Response (ii) to R6 is relevant.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Entrusting a private developer to design and construct Government facilities is impractical and vulnerable. 	(x) The District Court will be implemented by the Government.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raised concern on the management of the public open space in private development. 	(xi) Response (iii) to R6 is relevant.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed amphitheatre will create noise impacts. 	(xii)The future developer has to demonstrate the technical feasibility of providing an amphitheatre in the open space. Response (iii) to R6 is also relevant.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The “super block” design of the District Court is incompatible with the surrounding context which will cause adverse environmental, visual and air ventilation impacts. 	(xiii)Noted.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed road design with only one one-way vehicle access and drop-off area at the junction of CHR and Link Road is inappropriate. 	(xiv)Noted.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose to the incorporation of hotel use in the 	(xv)Response (i) to R1 to R5 is relevant.

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Related Representation	Gist of Comments	Response to Comment
		CHR Site as there is sufficient hotel development in the area.	Given the surrounding area is predominantly used for commercial purposes, hotel is considered to be compatible with these commercial uses and would not result in unacceptable impact. It is considered appropriate to retain hotel as always permitted use in the “C(2)” zone. Nonetheless, whether the site will be used for office or hotel or mix of the two will be subject to market condition.
C104	Oppose R6, R11 & R35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See C94 to C103 above. 	(i) Responses (i) to (xv) to C94 to C103 are relevant.
	Oppose R6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose the removal of Old and Valuable Trees and wall trees. 	(ii) Response (xiv) to R13 is relevant.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose to increase of building height of the proposed commercial development from 135mPD to 150mPD. 	(iii) Noted.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose the provision of an additional large-scale vehicular access at Leighton Road. 	(iv) Noted.
C105	Oppose R34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are bias in complying with government 	It should be noted all relevant information on

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H7/20-)	Related Representation	Gist of Comments	Response to Comment
		policy which has led the Town Planning Board members to ignore the duty to examine the long term effect of the development proposal.	the proposed amendments together with views of representers/commenters are submitted to the Board for consideration to allow Members to make an informed decision.

Responses to Grounds related to Concern on Specific Details of TIA

Regarding the concern on the specific details of the TIA, the consolidated government responses are as follows:

(a) Traffic modelling assumption - peak hour consideration

Some representers comment that traffic in weekends is heavier than that in weekdays and should be used to assess the traffic impact of the development. Based on the traffic data from Annual Traffic Census 2015 to 2018, the average peak hour traffic flow in weekday AM peak was higher than that in weekend AM peak while the weekday PM peak was of same order with that of weekend PM peak. In addition, based on the previous traffic data, it is noted that the critical junctions in the vicinity of the CHR Site would perform better in weekend PM peak than in weekday PM peak. Furthermore, development traffic generated by the CHR Site is considered to be heavier in weekday peak hours as offices and court uses are expected to have little traffic generation/attraction during weekends. Therefore, traffic models for a typical weekday are adopted in the Traffic Review.

(b) Observed year and design year adopted

Some representers consider that the TIA is outdated as the traffic survey was conducted in 2017. Under the Traffic Review, the design year is assumed to be five years after the completion of the proposed developments at the CHR Site, i.e. year 2031. In assessing the traffic impact, the 2017 observed traffic data was only the baseline condition and were forecasted to the design year with an assumed annual traffic growth rate of 0.1%. In the course of the assessment, major committed/planned developments in the vicinity of the CHR Site have been taken into consideration, including the redevelopment of Po Leung Kuk Headquarters at 66 Leighton Road and other planned redevelopment projects known at the time of review. In the actual circumstances, a general decrease in traffic flow of 1% to 0.42% per annum of 2015 to 2018 was observed in the Causeway Bay area. As a result, an annual increase of 0.1% in traffic flow in the Traffic Review is considered to be a conservative assumption tallying the actual situation.

(c) Reserve capacity and LOS level

Some representers comment that with the proposed development, individual junctions' reserve capacity has been reduced or maintained at a level below 15% which is not the usual level accepted by TD (i.e. 15%). The calculation of reserve capacity, based on the forecast traffic flows, was carried out in accordance with the guidelines set out in the Transport Planning and Design Manual. A reserve capacity of 15% is the most preferable scenario for planning new development areas but not an absolute cut-off and any positive figures below such does not necessarily represent unacceptable traffic condition. Essentially, a positive figure already indicates that there is spare capacity. Based on the assessment results, with the proposed development and junction improvement schemes, the reserve capacity and design flow/capacity ratio of the critical junctions in the vicinity of the CHR Site would be positive and lower than 0.85

respectively. In addition, the anticipated traffic queue at all junctions would not extend to the next junction in the upstream, which is considered acceptable.

Regarding the level of service (LOS) at the pedestrian crossing at Pennington Road/Leighton Road, LOS D means “the LOS provides reasonable fluid flow; however, considerable friction and interaction between pedestrian are likely to occur”. As the LOS of most footpaths and pedestrian crossings in the vicinity of the proposed development is C or above (i.e. desirable level), operation of this pedestrian crossing at this particular junction is still considered acceptable.

(d) Stacking of vehicles, illegal parking, impact on inner streets and special events

While it is noted that stacking vehicles and illegal parking are the factors contributing to the existing traffic congestion, yet it is related to drivers’ behaviors and enforcement issues which are regardless of the presence of the development. Besides, public car park would be provided within the CHR Site in addition to the ancillary parking provision of the development to cater for the parking demand in the vicinity. Nonetheless, appropriate site factors had been applied in the calculation to discount the junction capacity in order to take into account the effect caused by the stacking vehicles and illegal parking. These factors were derived based on site observation.

With the proposed junction improvement schemes, all the critical junctions would be operating within capacities after completion of the proposed development. In general, most vehicles are able to clear the junctions without waiting for more than one traffic signal cycle during peak hours and queues would not accumulate persistently to prohibit the traffic between the main roads and inner streets. In addition, it is anticipated that the traffic impact caused by the proposed development to the inner streets and areas is not significant as the traffic to/from the CHR Site would mainly travel on major roads/streets.

When there is an event at Hong Kong Stadium, special traffic and transport arrangement (including road closure and traffic diversion) would be implemented by the Hong Kong Police Force for crowd control and road safety. The corresponding traffic advice would be published by the Transport Department to inform the public about the traffic arrangement in advance.

(e) Movement of emergency vehicle

Regarding the concern on emergency vehicular access, the future road network with the proposed improvement schemes would be able to cope with the additional traffic generated by the proposed development. The predicted traffic conditions at critical junctions in the vicinity of the CHR Site would be similar before and after the commission of proposed development, the traffic situation to be encountered by the emergency vehicles during emergency operation are also expected to be similar as of today. In any case, for situation which the ambulance is obstructed by traffic congestion, Emergency Medical Assistance Motorcycle (EMAMC) would be deployed by the Fire Services Department, which is equipped with paramedic equipment for rapid provision of pre-hospital paramedical care and treatment for the public.

(f) Transport facilities and relocation of minibus terminus

To mitigate traffic impacts induced at the existing road network outside the CHR Site, junction improvement works were proposed to smoothen traffic movement and provide additional turning lanes. Provisions of internal traffic and pedestrian facilities to serve the developments within the Site would be determined during internal layout design. Regarding the relocation of the minibus terminus from Lan Fong Road and nearby areas, while there is a provision for such facilities under the current zoning, the final arrangement, including whether to relocate such facilities to the CHR Site or providing en-route stops for green minibus routes, is subject to TD's further deliberation and local consultation with the stakeholders.

Provision of Major Community Facilities in Wan Chai District
在灣仔區提供的主要社區設施

Type of Facilities 設施種類	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) 《香港規劃標準與準則》	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population) 《香港規劃標準與準則》要求(按規劃人口計算)	Provision 供應		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision) 剩餘/短缺 (與已規劃供應比較)
			Existing Provision 現有供應	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision) 已規劃供應 (包括現有供應)	
Secondary School 中學	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17 每40名12-17歲青少年 設一個全日制學校課室	170 classrooms 個課室	449 classrooms 個課室	449 classrooms 個課室	+279 classrooms 個課室
Primary School 小學	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11 每25.5名6-11歲兒童 設一個全日制學校課室	171 classrooms 個課室	409 classrooms 個課室	445 classrooms 個課室	+274 classrooms 個課室
Kindergarten and Nursery 幼兒班與幼稚園	34 classrooms for 1,000 children aged 3 to 6 每1,000名3-6歲以下幼童設34個課室	41 classrooms 個課室	184 classrooms 個課室	196 classrooms 個課室	+155 classrooms 個課室
District Police Station 警區警署	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons 每 200,000 至 500,000 人設一間	0	1	1	+1
Divisional Police Station 分區警署	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons 每 100,000 至 200,000 人設一間	1	2	2	+1
Clinic/ Health Centre 普通科診療所/健康中心	1 per 100,000 persons 每100,000人設一間	2	3	3	+1
Specialist Clinic/ Polyclinic 專科診療所/分科診療所	1 whenever a regional or district hospital is built 每興建一所醫院，便應同時設置一所專科診療所/分科診療所	N/A 不適用	3	3	N/A 不適用
Hospital Beds 醫院床位	5.5 beds per 1,000 persons 每1,000人設5.5個床位	1,216 beds 個床位	2,005 beds 個床位	2,234 beds 個床位	+1018 beds 個床位
Magistracy 裁判法院	1 per 660,000 persons 每660,000人設一間	0	1	1	+1

Type of Facilities 設施種類	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) 《香港規劃標準與準則》	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population) 《香港規劃標準與準則》要求(按規劃人口計算)	Provision 供應		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision) 剩餘/短缺 (與已規劃供應比較)
			Existing Provision 現有供應	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision) 已規劃供應 (包括現有供應)	
District Elderly Community Centres 長者地區中心	One in each new development area with a population of around 170 000 or above 每個人口約為 170 000人或以上的新發展區設一間	N/A 不適用	2	2	N/A 不適用
Neighbourhood Elderly Centres 長者鄰舍中心	One in a cluster of new and redeveloped housing areas with a population of 15 000 to 20 000 persons, including both public and private housing 每個人口為 15 000 人至 20 000 人的新建和重新發展的住宅區(包括公營及私營房屋)設一間	N/A 不適用	3	3	N/A 不適用
Day Care Centres/ Day Care Units^ (Centre-base) 長者日間護理中心／長者日間護理單位^ (以中心為本)	17.2 subsidised places per 1 000 elderly persons aged 65 or above~ ^ 每 1 000 名年滿 65歲或以上的長者設17.2 個資助服務名額~ ^	446	110	110	-336
Residential Care Homes for the Elderly 安老院舍	21.3 subsidised beds per 1 000 elderly persons aged 65 or above~ 每 1 000 名 65 歲或以上 的長者設 21.3 個資助床位~	1,381	572 ^	572	-809
Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre 綜合青少年服務中心	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24 每 12,000 名 6-24歲兒童/青年設一間	1	2	2	+1

Type of Facilities 設施種類	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) 《香港規劃標準與準則》	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population) 《香港規劃標準與準則》要求(按規劃人口計算)	Provision 供應		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision) 剩餘/短缺 (與已規劃供應比較)
			Existing Provision 現有供應	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision) 已規劃供應 (包括現有供應)	
Integrated Family Services Centre 綜合家庭服務中心	1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons 每100,000至150,000人設一間	1	1	1	0
District Open Space 地區休憩用地	10 ha per 100,000 persons [#] 每100,000人10公頃 [#]	18.52 ha 公頃	35.89 ha 公頃	40.26 ha 公頃	+21.74 ha 公頃
Local Open Space 鄰舍休憩用地	10 ha per 100,000 persons [#] 每100,000人10公頃 [#]	18.52 ha 公頃	15.33 ha 公頃	15.97 ha 公頃	-2.55 ha 公頃
Sports Centre 體育中心	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons 每50,000至65,000人設一個	2	3	3	+1
Sports Ground/ Sports Complex 運動場/運動場館	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons 每200,000至250,000人設一個	0	4	4	+4
Swimming Pool Complex – Standard 游泳池場館—標準池	1 complex per 287,000 persons 每287,000人設一個場館	0	2	2	+2
Post Office 郵政局	Accessible within 1.2 km in urban area 在市區設於1.2公里的範圍內	N/A 不適用	7	7	N/A 不適用

Note 註：

The planned population of the Wan Chai District is about 185,200. If including transient population, the overall figure is about 221,300
灣仔區的規劃人口約為 185,200人。若連同暫住人口，總數將約為221,300人。

The requirements excludes planned population of transients and the provision is based on the information as at January 2020.
有關要求不包括流動居民，供應所根據的資料為截至2020年1月。

△ Provided by Social Welfare Department. The figure refers to the number of subsidised (Residential Care Homes for the Elderly) RCHE places. The total number of RCHE within the district, including both subvented and self-financing RCHE, is 572.
由社會福利署提供。有關數字為資助安老宿位。區內津助和自負盈虧安老院舍共提供572個安老宿位。

~ This is a long-term goal and the actual provision would be subject to the consideration of the Social Welfare Department in the planning and development process as appropriate.
此乃長遠目標，在規劃和發展過程中，社會福利署會就實際提供的服務作出適當考慮。

^ The facilities belong to the centre-based facilities of Community Care Services (CCS). The planning standard of the CCS Facilities (including both centre-based and home-based) is population-based. There is no rigid distribution between centre-based CCS and home-based CCS stated in the Elderly Services Programme Plan. Nonetheless, in general, 60% of CCS demand will be provided by home-based CCS and the remaining 40% will be provided by centre-based CCS.

這些設施屬於以中心為本的社區護理服務。社區照顧服務設施(包括中心為本及家居為本)的規劃標準是以人口為基礎。《安老服務計劃方案》對中心為本及家居為本的社區照顧服務的分配沒有硬性的規定。不過，一般來說，家居為本的服務及中心為本的服務分別滿足六成和四成社區照顧服務方面的需求。