

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 2025-08-27 星期三 03:09:21
To: tpbpd/PLAND <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Subject: AMENDMENTS TO THE APPROVED WAN CHAI OZP PLAN NO. S/H5/31

Submission Number:
TPB/R/S/H5/32 -S028

AMENDMENTS TO THE APPROVED WAN CHAI OZP PLAN NO. S/H5/31

Dear TPB Members,

Item A – about 993m². Rezoning of a site at 31-36 Sau Wa Fong and 8-12 St. Francis Street from “Res (Group A)”, “Res (Group C)” and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Res (Group A)9” with designation of 31-36 Sau Wa Fong as sub-area (a) and 8-12 St. Francis Street as sub-area (b) and the land in the north-eastern portion as non-building area.

STRONG OBJECTIONS, NOTE THE INCREMENTAL INCREASE IN BOTH HEIGHT AND PR THAT IS INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE PLANNING INTENTION FOR THIS AREA OF HISTORIC IMPORTANCE

Y/H5/7 / A/H5/413 Original dimensions in brackets

31-36 Sau Wa Fong and 8-12 St. Francis Street, Wan Chai

Site area: About 989.13sq.m (735.96sq.m)

Zoning: "Res (Group A)", "Res (Group C)" and Area Shown as 'Road'

Proposed Amendment: Rezone to "Res (Group A) 9" / 216 Units (115 Units) / PR 10.17 (5) / 110Mpd (71mPD) / 1 Lay-by

When the Sau Wa Fong area was discussed at the 22 February 2013 S/H5/27 there was unanimous agreement that every effort should be made to preserve its unique character. For this reason, it was excluded from the subsequent Wanchai OZP exercise.

10.2 The planning intention of the “R(C)” zone covering the Sau Wa Fong areas is for low to medium-rise residential developments subject to **PR of 5 and BH of 12 storeys restrictions** (or the PR and height of the existing building, whichever is the greater) to preserve the local character and to avoid adverse visual, air ventilation **and traffic impacts from more intensive development.**

Fast forward to A/H5/413: Justifications for proposed relaxation on BHR is minor in nature and the proposed development with BH of about 71.05mPD is considered compatible with the medium to high-rise neighbourhood. According to the applicant, the proposed development would be a **15-storey high building** in order to accommodate all the permissible GFA for the Site (based on a PR of 5 for the Site)

NOTE AN INITIAL CREASE IN HEIGHT FROM 12 STOREYS. THIS SUBSEQUENTLY INCREASED TO 28 STOREYS AND A PR MORE THAN DOUBLE.

According to the applicant's assessment, the existing facilities (including nearby car parking spaces and kerbsides for L/UL activities) can still meet the demand for parking and L/UL facilities arising from the redevelopment after taking into account the planned/committed developments in the vicinity

BUT NO DETAILS PROVIDED WITH REGARD TO CAPACITY AND CURRENT OCCUPATION OF NEARBY PARKING FACILITIES

*"Creating a 4.5m-to-9m-wide public passage (comprising staircase, **lift**, **covered walkway** and pavement)." In fact, the attraction of the district is its quaint old fashioned character, lots of steps open to the sky.*

"Designating about 5% domestic GFA for arts facilities to strengthen the artistic and cultural atmosphere in the area" The brownie points. Space that can easily be converted to commercial use.

STRONGEST OBJECTIONS TO THE REZONING PROPOSAL. THE DOUBLEING OF HEIGHT AND PR CANNOT BE JUSTIFIED IN A DISTRICT WITH ONLY PEDESTRIAN ACCESS

Note - there is an old well that should be preserved - AMO

it is noted that preservation of the well at the backyard of 12 St. Francis Street (Plan Z-2) for incorporating into the new developments is considered not feasible owing to the reasons as stated in Appendix Ia. In view of the historical interest of the well, which was a common feature of the tenement buildings built in the 1950s and a testament to the use of well water for flushing in the post-war period, the applicants are advised to consider providing traces of existence of the well as well as a means of interpretation to tell its history and its associated buildings, as far as possible;

NO MENTION OF THIS IN THE PAPER. STRONG OBJECTIONS TO ITS DESTRUCTION AT A TIME THAT HONG KONG IS DESPERATELY TRYING TO APPEAL TO TOURISTS.

Within the setback area, the applicants proposed a lift and stairs along the northern boundary to form a barrier-free public passageway (not less than 4.5m wide and open to the public on a 24-hour basis) linking St. Francis Street and Sau Wa Fong

BUT NO MENTION IN: the stipulation of appropriate controls and requirements as follows:

AND WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR COSTS AND MAINTENANCE

Item B1 – about 3,101m². Rezoning of a site at 1, 1A, 2 and 3 Hillside Terrace, 55 Ship Street (Nam Koo Terrace), 1-5 Schooner Street, 53 Ship Street, 18 Sau Wa Fong, Inland Lot 9048 and adjoining government land from "CDA", "R(C)" and an area shown as 'Road' to "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Residential Development with Historic Building Preserved" with stipulation of BHD and designation of the land at the northern corner as non-building area.

Y/H5/8 Approved 10 Jan 2025 A/H5/418 (Y/H5/5) Original dimensions in brackets

1, 1A, 2 and 3 Hillside Terrace, 55 Ship Street (Nam Koo Terrace), 1-5 Schooner Street, 53 Ship Street, 18 Sau Wa Fong, Inland Lot 9048 and adjoining government land, Wanchai

Site area: About 3,157.6m² (2,845.7sq.m) (2,427.9sq.m) including 447.8m² (14.2%) (300sq.m) Government Land

Zoning: "CDA", "R(C)" and an area shown as 'Road'

Proposed Amendment: "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Residential Development with Historic Building Preserved" / 312 Units (255 Units) (221 Units) / PR 9.197 (5) / 120Mpd (91mPD) / OS 2,800m² Open to Public.

*"This project is undertaken as part of **Hopewell's comprehensive vision** for the continuous urban renewal and revitalization of Wan Chai, as well as implementation of Open Space for public use"*

Read as Hopewell's vision to exploit the lots to their maximum, trash heritage and wring the last dollar out of the project by moving the goalposts, yet again. It is because of the machinations of this greedy developer that this part of Wanchai has been in limbo for more than two decades and a once very attractive hillside open space full of lovely old trees has been reduced to tiers of concrete platforms surrounded by high walls. Note that no visuals are provided to show the interface with the adjacent Hopewell II development.

The development intensity is now double that explicitly laid out in every Wanchai OZP, that the maximum building height for Sau Wa Fong is limited to 12 stories. This to preserve the local character but more importantly to address the reality of no unloading, access for fire engines, and the lack of barrier free access for the disabled and elderly.

One can only question why these issues were not properly addressed during the discussion on Y/H5/5

Summarizing up, the chairman said that while the Members were in support of the site to "CDA" more effort should be made by the applicant to improve the design of public open space in terms of both quality and quantity, the accessibility of the site, the provision of community/social welfare facilities, and the air ventilation of the surrounding area"

Instead of responding to the board, the developer continues to push the boundaries and further increase the density of the development and to fudge the data.

Because of the difficulties in accessing the site the open space will not be popular, and no doubt the developer is relying on this. No opening times given in the current paper (previously 11pm) but residents of the tower would certainly not tolerate any boisterous activities like the gathering of domestic helpers engaging in singing and dancing. Conflict between members of the public exercising their right to enjoy OS and residents is guaranteed.

"Open Space": NKT building area cannot be included as "OS" area as public cannot get ready access...only by appointment and most of the Hill Side Terrace "OS" is under the building. Sunlight and ventilation to "OS" is blocked by St.Francis school classroom block which is immediately to the south thus blocking sun. The additional proposed bulk further

encloses the OS with wall effect and it is clear that any penetration of sunlight would be limited to a few hours a day.

DRAWING Z – 5 SHOWS HOW THE IMPACT HAS BEEN FOTOSHOPPED. FOR THE APPROVED SCHEME NKT IS IN THE SHADOW WHILE THE AREA WITH THE FOUNTAIN ETC GETS NATURAL LIGHT. HOWEVER AMAZINGLY IN THE IDS IMAGE ALL IS BATHED IN LIGHT EVEN THOUGH THE WALL EFFECT EXTENDS TO THE PERIMETER OF THE SITE. A PICTURE SPEAKS A 1,000 WORDS.

NOT ONLY IS THE QUALITY OF THE OS INFERIOR TO THE APPROVED PLAN, THE AMOUNT OF OS HAS SHRUNK.

“According to the applicant’s Indicative Scheme, a total of 3,179.9m² open space (including open-air open space together with the footprint of NKT (1,638.6m²) and covered open space underneath residential floors (1,027.7m²) at the podium roof level, and open-air open space (255.6m²) and covered pedestrian walkway (258m²) at G/F adjoining Schooner Street) will be provided.”

*“in-situ preservation of the historic building of NKT for **adaptive reuse as cultural and commercial facilities**”* “the ground floor of the building was planned to be converted into an eating place operated on a non-profit-making basis, while the first floor would be a history display area. Both ground floor and the first floor would be open for public appreciation”

SO 1,639SQ.M IS THE NKT FOOTPRINT. HOWEVER, ONLY THE FRONT AREA COULD BE OS. THE BUILDING ITSELF IS TO BE USED FOR COMMERCIAL AND EXHIBITION SPACE.

1,028SQ.M IS COVERED, IN OTHER WORDS NOT GENUINE OS. IN ADDITION, THIS IS GFA EXEMPT, SO A BONUS FOR THE DEVELOPER.

255.6SQ.M IS PASSAGE AND 258 IS A WALKWAY, MORE FAKE OS.

THIS IS MORE OF THE TRICKERY USED IN THE PROVISION OF OS AT THE ADJOINING HOPEWELL II SITE. THE OPEN AREA IS ON KENNEDY ROAD, A LONG WAY FROM WHERE MOST OF THE COMMUNITY CONGREGATE. IT PROVIDES LITTLE SHELTER AND LITTLE IN THE WAY OF CHILDREN AND ELDERLY RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.

THE OS ON THE LOWER LEVELS IS NOTHING MORE THAN SOME PAVED SQUARES AND POTTED PLANTS WITH A VERY SMALL CHILDREN’S PLAY AREA.

Heritage: There are serious concerns with regard to the damage already done and that planned in the future with regard to Nam Koo Terrace. The high granite plinth would be built over under the plan. This is an integral part of the heritage building and represents its location overlooking the original harbour before extensive reclamation moved the shoreline. In addition, the public would be denied the pleasure of viewing the building from a distance.

Preserving a building's setting is crucial for maintaining its historical integrity and providing a sense of place and identity for the community.

WITHOUT THE PLINTH, THE FOUNTAINS, ETC THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF NKT IS LOST

Traffic: No mention has been made of the impact of the lack of vehicular access on the already traffic laden QRE Road. Large delivery trucks would block the traffic as a development of a possible 500 or so units plus the proposed retail would require frequent offloading of heavy items. Nor is there any mention of arrangements for the removal of the large amount of daily garbage that would be generated. The development would certainly have a strong negative impact on QRE traffic flow.

An additional purpose to the revised plan is to introduce a row of retail shops to the Schooner Street frontage. Note that there is no mention of providing GIC facilities even though the amount of government land included in the plan is now 450sq.m.

Not only should TPB reject this application. It should also review the previous approval as it is clear that the impact of the development was not properly evaluated.

Not only has the traffic impact been ignored, the lack of space for fire services to operate has also been brushed aside. This despite recent examples of how limited access can delay the necessary response to fire and other incidents.

The recent fire at the Mariner's Club redevelopment on a narrow cul-de-sac should concentrate minds on the issues of access for fire and other services. Unfortunately, government departments are turning a blind eye to the inherent limitations of certain sites and the reasons why dense development was considered undesirable when the OZP was formulated.

And there is the anomaly in the justification of the approval for Site A that has limited access with the complete brush off of issues relating to Site B.

*"The proposed increase in development intensity was considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments and not unacceptable by relevant government departments, **provided that direct vehicular access was made available** from St. Francis Street and loading/unloading (L/UL) facilities were included within the SWF Site,"*

Not only is lack of vehicular access an issue, the impact of a large number of residents on what is essentially the main entrance to both a shopping mall and a 2,000 room hotel with conference facilities has been ignored. I would suggest that members make a site visit. HCII is a large commercial complex with NO STREET FRONTAGE AND NO DEDICATED ENTRANCE. Access is via Hopewell Centre, most inconvenient, or via the narrow-sloped Ship Street. It is inconceivable that furniture and other large items could be brought into the site without causing considerable disruption to pedestrian flow.

That there is no provision for access to the proposed development for the disabled had been conveniently ignored.

SITE B HAS ZERO VEHICULAR ACCESS. IN OTHER WORDS ONE OZP, TWO SYSTEMS.

Members have failed in their duty to carefully assess the possible risks.

DEVELOPER SAYS THERE WILL BE FEWER BUT LARGER UNITS BUT THERE IS NO MECHANISM TO STIPULATE OR CAP THE NUMBER APART FROM THE RECENT INTRODUCTION OF MINIMUM SIZE. THE NUMBER OF UNITS COULD THEREFORE EVENTUALLY BE 600.

One of the justifications for rezoning so much 'GB' to residential was that development in the NT would reduce stress on densely populated urban districts in order to ensure a better quality of life for residents. However, plans like these continue to increase density, unacceptable in a district that is completely deficient in both local and district open space.

Members must also take into consideration that the number of residents will be further increased as"

"GFA exemption will be submitted to the Buildings Department (BD) for approval at the building plans submission stage. A relaxation of the PR for the preservation of NKT under B(P)R will also be submitted to BD at the building plans submission stage. According to the applicant, the total non-domestic PR will be 0.237 if the GFA of the preserved NKT is excluded."

As for the 'pressing housing shortage', this may apply to the provision of public housing but is certainly not the case in the private market. A combination of economic downturn, emigration and increases in interest rates have had an impact on the appetite for acquiring residential units for investment. While there have been some successful launches recently, the majority of developments coming on the market have sold only a percentage of the units of offer. Developers are now withholding stock to avoid a glut and a further slump in prices.

Item B2 – about 21m2. Rezoning of a strip of government land on the stairs of Ship Street from "Open Space" to "OU" annotated "Elevated Walkway".

STRONG OBJECT TO FURTHER EROSION OF THE PUBLIC REALM

The OZP should be rejected. Both developments have been allowed to exploit and manipulate the regulations and guidelines. In the case of Site B, the callous developer has allowed a heritage site of both cultural and historical significance to fall into ruin while he played a long game to transform a once very pleasant district into the modern equivalent of Kowloon Walled City.

Members in allowed the plans to get to this stage have also departed from the opening statement of its own website: https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/about_us/intro.html

Introduction: Planning System in Hong Kong

Town Planning in Hong Kong aims **to promote the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community** through the process of guiding and controlling the development and use of land, and to bring about a better organized, efficient and desirable place to live and work.

Mary Mulvihill



Many of the points raised via the previous amendment remain relevant

From: [REDACTED]
To: "tpbpd" <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2019 2:57:06 AM
Subject: Re: Y/H5/5 Nam Koo CDA

Dear TPB Members,

MLP is outside the scope of the 12A Application and its only purpose is to insinuate that there will be additional OS, but under cover. It actually confirms the fact that the plan is inappropriate and not in line with the planning intention of the OZP.

Not only is this not OS but it is quite obvious that the residents of the tower would strongly object to outsiders gathering under their building until late in the evening.

Why does the board allow the developer to set the agenda on this matter?

Members have a duty to ensure that community interests are paramount.

Previous objections upheld.

Mary Mulvihill

From: [REDACTED]
To: "tpbpd" <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Sent: Friday, May 3, 2019 10:18:01 PM
Subject: Re: Y/H5/5 Nam Koo CDA

Dear TPB Members,

It is quite clear that

THIS APPLICATION IS OUT OF TIME.

TPB is failing in its duty to implement its own guidelines and timelines.

Two months from November 2018 indicates a deadline of end of January 2019. It is now May, four months later, yet you continue to allow the Applicant to extend the time frame. I would point out that there is no way that Drainage and Sewerage details could be considered as **VERY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES** when we are talking about a site in the middle of Wanchai, a long developed central urban district.

Why is this particular Applicant being allowed to procrastinate? Does he have some hold over the board and/or the Hong Kong government apparatus?

Minutes of 616th Meeting of the

Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 16.11.2018

https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/meetings/MPC/Minutes/m616mpc_e.pdf

5. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 25.10.2018 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to provide technical clarification on the traffic impact assessment and the proposed in response to departmental comments.

6. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information. **Since it was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for the preparation of the further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.**

What is more the adjoining park, part of the HCII development is due to be handed over to LCSD by DECEMBER 2019 but it is quite clear this will not happen.

Wanchai District has been in deficit with regard to the provision of Local Open Space for decades. The most recent OZP showed a deficit of 2.62ha. However the data is a misrepresentation as it includes projects like the HCII that have been outstanding for decades.

I would also point out that the OS is part of the Greening Master Plan for Wanchai. This is a POLICY initiative dating back to 2010. The Audit Commission has taken the relevant government departments to task on their failure to implement the programme.

https://www.aud.gov.hk/pdf_e/e72ch02.pdf

Management of Greening Master Plans

https://www.cedd.gov.hk/eng/greening/urban/sw_wc_cwb/doc/sw_cwb_theme.pdf

Green Oases. Map for Wanchai GMP clearly indicates that part of the HKII site in included in the concept. This was scheduled to be completed in 2018.

DEVB has the overall policy responsibility for greening, landscape and tree management. The Greening, Landscape and Tree Management Section (GLTMS) has been established under DEVB to take up the overall policy responsibility for formulating and coordinating landscape and tree management strategy and initiatives in Hong Kong. The Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) is responsible for the development and implementation of GMPs, and serves as the executive arm of the GMP Committee. CEDD handed over the greening works completed under GMPs mostly to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) for maintenance.

The Green Oases at HCII should have been provided by the developer. The related departments are therefore responsible to ensure implementation. Instead they have failed to take part in the TPB process and **shirked their duty to object to the repeated deferments and delays of all plans pertaining to this corner of Wanchai.**

Members please remember that when you joined the board it was on the understanding that you uphold its integrity and guidelines.

Please demonstrate that you are worthy of the appointment by kicking out this application.

Mary Mulvihill

From [REDACTED]
To: "tpbpd" <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 2:20:12 AM
Subject: Re: Y/H5/5 Nam Koo CDA

Dear TPB Members,

While some of the site is outside the boundaries of the Hopewell II development, it was hijacked by the developer to push its agenda with regard to that project. Therefore Nam Koo Terrace and the OS cannot be considered as a separate development. It is an integral element of the approval for this project.

The following are just a fraction of the promises made to TPB, Legco and the general public over the years.

A/H5/217 (Jan 1994)

"to develop the land surrounding Nam Koo Terrace and at Hillside Terrace to "Public Open Space". Further to this statement TPB rezoned the sites offered by Hopewell in compensation for the Mega-tower approval to "Open Space" ("O"). This agreement is reflected in Wan Chai OZP S/H5/8.

23 July 2004 TPB

<https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/200407/23/0723244.htm>

"Falling within an area mainly zoned "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Comprehensive Redevelopment Area" ("OU(CRA)") and partly zoned "Open Space", the proposed development would contribute positively to urban renewal in the Wan Chai district. **It would also help preserve Nam Koo Terrace while allowing public access to this**

historical building. By including land already zoned for open space use within the development, implementation of the open space could be fast-tracked.

Oct 30 2005

Site Area : about 11,500 square metres

Scope : 2 hotel blocks with over 2000 guest rooms, retail, cinema, conference facilities

Anticipated Completion : 2009

Location : Kennedy Road in Wanchai, to the west of Hopewell Centre

A HK\$4.5 billion hotel project in South Wanchai between Hopewell Centre and Ship Street with over 2,000 rooms and quality modern shopping, restaurant and other facilities, which will:

1. Bring urban renewal of the old and dilapidated area between Ship Street and the Hopewell Centre into a reality.
2. Inject vibrancy and dynamism to South Wanchai.
3. **Provide the public with about 9,964 square meters of much needed open space,** safe, amenable and conveniently accessible instead of inaccessible slopes and unsafe alley ways of no amenity value.
4. **Bring preservation of the Nam Koo Terrace, a site of historical interest.**

19 Nov 2008:

http://www.hopewellcentre2.com/eng/pdf/2008_Nov_19_Hopewell_Centre_II_Press_Release_Eng.pdf

Mr. Wu said. "Although Nam Koo Terrace is not included in the site of the development plan that was approved by the Town Planning Board in 1994, Hopewell Holdings has agreed to conserve and revitalise this valuable historic building"

LCQ5: Hopewell Centre II

<http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/200811/19/P200811190174.htm>

Following is a question by the Hon Tanya Chan and a reply by the Secretary for Development, Mrs **Carrie Lam**, in the Legislative Council today (November 19): Besides, the developer **undertakes to preserve and revitalize the adjoining Nam Koo Terrace, a Grade I historical building, which is located outside the application site. The developer will also develop the land surrounding Nam Koo Terrace, which is also owned by the developer, into open space for public use.**

20 Nov 2008:

http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/hkedition/2008-11/20/content_7221634.htm

The developer will also spend about HK\$20 million to preserve and transplant 510 trees.

Despite Nam Koo Terrace being located outside the plot, Hopewell Holdings set out to preserve and revitalize it, as well as develop the nearby land for tourists.

Nam Koo Terrace is a 90-year-old Grade I historic building.

Feb 13, 2009 https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/meetings/MPC/Minutes/m390mpc_e.pdf

Y/H5/3 Application for Amendment to the Approved Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/25 from "Open Space" to "Commercial", QRE Plaza, 196-206 Queen's Road East, Wan Chai

(b) as far as the subject site was concerned, in considering the proposed land exchange for the hotel development in June 1994, the Government did not agree to include the site

which fell outside the future regrant lot for surrender in the land exchange based on the prevailing land policy at that time. **However, noting the public aspiration for open space development in the area, the applicant had recently undertaken to preserve and revitalize Nam Koo Terrace which was zoned "O" on the Wan Chai OZP and located next to the Hopewell Centre II project. The applicant would develop the land surrounding Nam Koo Terrace into an open space of about 1,700m² for public use.**

The current Wanchai OZP is still under consideration by TPB. No changes were proposed to the Sau Wa Fong area in every aspect in recognition of its special character.

What the board should be considering is why the following recommendation of the 13 Feb 2009 meeting has not been realized:

22. A Member raised concerns about the mismatch in priority accorded by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) to the implementation of open spaces to address the shortfall in open space provision to serve the needs of the local residents. The LCSD should be urged for early implementation of the public open spaces, particularly in the old urban areas with large shortfall. Clarification was also sought on the current mechanism on implementation of public open spaces. Other Members shared the same view and suggested that consideration should be given to putting this implementation responsibility under the Development Bureau for better co-ordination.

Nam Koo Terrace is a building with profound links to the atrocities committed in World War II. It should be renovated immediately in line with its sad history and opened to the public as a monument to the 4,000 Hong Kong women who were victims of the Japanese occupation. The administration has been trying very hard to cover up the true facts.

Hopewell has been allowed to hold the residents of Wanchai hostage for 30 years via its manipulation of the process. It is high time that a halt be called and that **TPB DEMAND** that the long promised and ever shrinking in size and quality Open Space be delivered to the community and that the heritage building be restored and open to the public as promised.

The first step is to throw out this totally inappropriate application.

Mary Mulvihill

From: [REDACTED]
To: "tpbpd" <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Sent: Friday, May 18, 2018 11:27:55 PM
Subject: Y/H5/5 Nam Koo CDA

Y/H5/5

1, 1A, 2 and 3 Hill Side Terrace, 55 Ship Street (Nam Koo Terrace), 1-5 Schooner Street, 53 Ship Street (Miu Kang Terrace) and adjoining Government Land, Wan Chai,
Site area : About 2,427.9m² Includes Government Land of about 300 m²
Zoning : "Open Space", "Res (Group C)" and "GIC"
Proposed Amendment : Rezone to "CDA" 255 Flats / ?? Parking

Dear TPB Members,

The Sau Wa Fong area was discussed at the 22 February 2013 S/H5/27 and there was unanimous agreement that every effort should be made to preserve its unique character. For this reason it has been excluded from the current OZP exercise.

I strongly object to this application.

The remark that the proposal is part of Hopewell's vision to revitalize Wanchai South is preposterous in view of the fact that this developer has locked up a large section of the district for decades and deprived a community with a serious deficit of open space of its right to enjoy open air recreational facilities.

Moreover the continuing urban decay of Nam Koo Terrace as everyone knows is the manner in which Hopewell has continued to procrastinate and submit countless changes to the plans to develop its so called 'Mega Tower' project, Hopewell Centre II. One could write a book on the tricks it has employed over the years that have resulted in a steady diminishing of the OS and the number of trees. Unfortunately both the administration and TPB have failed to curb the ambitions of Hopewell and have accommodated its every ploy to increase the size of the development via the appropriation of GFA that should be devoted to community uses.

The application for rezoning to CDA for such a small area is inappropriate. CDA has traditionally been used as a tool to redevelop large amalgamated sites. The size of these CDA is usually measured in hectares not sq.mts. An indication of this can be found in the attachment to

LCQ15: Planning of Comprehensive Development Area attached.

When Legco conducted a review of CDA some years ago the consensus was that this form of town planning can only be used when there are no other options.

Note that among the conditions for a CDA is for data on transport and parking, not provided in the application.

(iii) the details and extent of Government, institution or community (GIC) and recreational facilities, **public transport and parking facilities**, and open space to be provided within the area;

Nam Koo Terrace and Hill Side Terrace were rezoned "O" in 1994 with the express purpose to increase the public open space for passive recreation in Wan Chai District. The proposal to use NKT, a Grade 1 historical building, as a marriage registry is preposterous in view of the fact that it was used by the Japanese during the Occupation of Hong Kong and there are reports that many local women were killed inside.

This house is a renowned 'Ghost House' as there are stories of multiple deaths there even prior to the Japanese era.

When our Chief Executive was bartering a deal with Hopewell in 2008 to encourage it to get on with the Mega development she announced that the developer had committed to preserving and revitalizing the heritage building and to provide open space around it.

(b) as far as the subject site was concerned, in considering the proposed land exchange for the hotel development in June 1994, the Government did not agree to include the site which fell outside the future regrant lot for surrender in the land exchange based on the prevailing land policy at that time. **However, noting the public aspiration for open space development in the area, the applicant had recently undertaken to preserve and revitalize Nam Koo Terrace which was zoned "O" on the Wan Chai OZP and located next to the Hopewell Centre II project.** The applicant would develop the land surrounding Nam Koo Terrace into an open space of about 1,700m² for public use.
[http://www.hopewellcentre2.com/eng/pdf/2008 Nov 19 Hopewell Centre II Press Release Eng.pdf](http://www.hopewellcentre2.com/eng/pdf/2008_Nov_19_Hopewell_Centre_II_Press_Release_Eng.pdf)

Such a rezoning to "CDA" paves the way for over-development as clearly exhibited by the Indicative Proposed Scheme. This scheme blatantly evades the planning intention, height restrictions, access and traffic limitations clearly stated on the Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plans, both in the Schedule of Uses and the Explanatory Statements. The restrictions have been placed due to public safety and public convenience considerations, and cannot be ignored. They also acknowledge the local character of this area.

TPB members cannot allow the developer to 'freeze' a further section of the district as the hotel area has been frozen for 20-30 years for the benefit of one developer and no benefit to the public.

Neither can he be allowed to use the CDA zoning as a frozen compulsory acquisition tool in his favour. This is a very desirable residential area, there are many developers who would quickly redevelop any sites that become available.

There is also the impact of a 90mPD wall on the St.Francis new school building.

CDA zoning is not appropriate for what is essentially a single residential block.

Historically Schooner Street, Ship Street, Sa Wan Fong have a restricted development to 6 or 12 floors because there is no vehicular access - and emergency services cannot access.

It seems once again Hopewell trying to abuse the planning system by using a "CDA" ploy.

TPB must call time on this developers exploitation of the system, particularly in this case as it calls into question the integrity of our Chief Executive.

Mary Mulvihill