



圖例
NOTATION

ZONES		地帶
COMMERCIAL	C	商業
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	R(A)	住宅 (甲類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	R(C)	住宅 (丙類)
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	G/C	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	O	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	OU	其他指定用途

COMMUNICATIONS		交通
RAILWAY AND STATION (UNDERGROUND)	[Symbol]	鐵路及車站 (地下)
MAJOR ROAD AND JUNCTION	[Symbol]	主要道路及路口
ELEVATED ROAD	[Symbol]	高架道路
PEDESTRIAN PRECINCT / STREET	[Symbol]	行人專用區或街道

MISCELLANEOUS		其他
BOUNDARY OF PLANNING SCHEME	[Symbol]	規劃範圍界線
LAND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION / URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY DEVELOPMENT SCHEME PLAN AREA	[Symbol]	土地發展公司 / 市區重建局發展計劃範圍
BUILDING HEIGHT CONTROL ZONE BOUNDARY	[Symbol]	建築物高度管制區界線
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN METRES ABOVE PRINCIPAL DATUM)	[Symbol]	最高建築物高度 (在主水平基準上若干米)
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN NUMBER OF STOREYS)	[Symbol]	最高建築物高度 (樓層數目)
PETROL FILLING STATION	[Symbol]	加油站
NON-BUILDING AREA	[Symbol]	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	21.04	14.41	商業
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	38.58	26.43	住宅 (甲類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	0.26	0.18	住宅 (丙類)
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	13.23	9.06	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	13.13	8.99	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	13.18	9.03	其他指定用途
PEDESTRIAN PRECINCT / STREET	0.40	0.27	行人專用區或街道
RAILWAY	0.14	0.10	鐵路
MAJOR ROAD ETC.	46.10	30.89	主要道路等
LAND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION / URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY DEVELOPMENT SCHEME PLAN AREA	0.93	0.64	土地發展公司 / 市區重建局發展計劃範圍
TOTAL PLANNING SCHEME AREA	145.99	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7條展示。
THE ATTACHED NOTES ALSO FORM PART OF THIS PLAN
AND HAVE BEEN AMENDED FOR EXHIBITION UNDER
SECTION 7 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

草圖編號 S/H 3/32 的修訂
AMENDMENTS TO DRAFT PLAN No. S/H3/32

按照城市規劃條例第7條展示的修訂 AMENDMENTS EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 7 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE		
修訂項目 A 1 項 AMENDMENT ITEM A1	修訂項目 A 7 項 AMENDMENT ITEM A7	修訂項目 C 1 項 AMENDMENT ITEM C1
修訂項目 A 2 項 AMENDMENT ITEM A2	修訂項目 B 項 AMENDMENT ITEM B	修訂項目 C 2 項 AMENDMENT ITEM C2
修訂項目 A 3 項 AMENDMENT ITEM A3	修訂項目 C 3 項 AMENDMENT ITEM C3	修訂項目 C 4 項 AMENDMENT ITEM C4
修訂項目 A 4 項 AMENDMENT ITEM A4	修訂項目 C 4 項 AMENDMENT ITEM C4	
修訂項目 A 5 項 AMENDMENT ITEM A5		
修訂項目 A 6 項 AMENDMENT ITEM A6		

(參看附表)
(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

2019年8月9日 按照城市規劃條例第7條展示的
草圖編號 S/H3/32 的修訂
AMENDMENTS TO DRAFT PLAN No. S/H3/32 EXHIBITED
UNDER SECTION 7 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE ON
9 AUGUST 2019

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

香港城市規劃委員會依據城市規劃條例擬備的西營盤及上環（港島規劃區第3區）分區計劃大綱圖
TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE, HONG KONG TOWN PLANNING BOARD
HONG KONG PLANNING AREA No. 3 - SAI YING PUN & SHEUNG WAN - OUTLINE ZONING PLAN

SCALE 1:5000 比例尺
0 100 200 300 400 500 600 700 800 METRES

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/H3/33

SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENT TO
THE DRAFT SAI YING PUN & SHEUNG WAN OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H3/32
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)

I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan

- Item A1 – Incorporation of the area covered by the approved Urban Renewal Authority Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Development Scheme Plan No. S/H3/URA1/4 into the Plan.
- Item A2 – Zoning of the site at 4-10 Shing Wong Street, 16 Wa In Fong West and a portion of Wa In Fong West as “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Cultural, Community, Commercial and Open Space Uses” with stipulation of building height restriction of 4 storeys.
- Item A3 – Zoning of the sites at 60-66 Staunton Street, 88-90 Staunton Street, 2-2A Shing Wong Street, 2-10 Wa In Fong West, and a portion of Chung Wo Lane and Wa In Fong West as “OU” annotated “Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses” with stipulation of building height restriction of 4 storeys.
- Item A4 – Rezoning of the site at 1-12 Wing Lee Street and 17-19 Shing Wong Street from “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) to “OU” annotated “Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses” with stipulation of building height restriction of 4 storeys.
- Item A5 – Zoning of the sites at 8 and 13 Wa In Fong East, 4-6 Chung Wo Lane, Chung Wo Lane Sitting-out Area, the Government land adjacent to 6 Chung Wo Lane, and a portion of Chung Wo Lane and Wa In Fong East as “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”).
- Item A6 – Zoning of a strip of land near 13 Wa In Fong East as “Residential (Group A)25” (“R(A)25”) with stipulation of building height restriction of 150mPD.
- Item A7 – Zoning of a strip of land near Chung Wo Lane as “R(A)” with stipulation of building height restriction of 150mPD.
- Item B – Rezoning of the site comprising the Centre Point at 72 Staunton Street from “R(C)” and “R(A)” to “R(A)25” with stipulation of building height restriction of 150mPD.
- Item C1 – Rezoning of the site at 1-7 Tak Sing Lane from “Open Space” (“O”), “R(A)8” and area shown as ‘Pedestrian Precinct/Street’ (‘PPS’) to “R(A)24” with stipulation of building height restriction of 120mPD.
- Item C2 – Rezoning of Tak Sing Lane from “O” to area shown as ‘PPS’.

- Item C3 – Rezoning of a strip of land adjacent to Goodwill Garden at 83 Third Street from “R(A)8” to area shown as ‘PPS’.
- Item C4 – Rezoning of a portion of the site comprising Goodwill Garden at 83 Third Street from area shown as ‘PPS’ to “R(A)8” with stipulation of building height restriction of 120mPD.

II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (a) Incorporation in the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(A)” zone the requirement for provision of a 24-hour public passageway within the “R(A)24” zone.
- (b) Incorporation in the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(A)” zone the gross floor area restriction and requirement for provision of a public open space within the “R(A)25” zone.
- (c) Deletion of the set of the Notes for the “CDA” zone.
- (d) Incorporation of a new set of Notes for the “OU” annotated “Cultural, Community, Commercial and Open Space Uses”.
- (e) Incorporation of a new set of Notes for the “OU” annotated “Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses”.

Town Planning Board

9 August 2019

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/32

(MPC Paper No.10/19)

7. The Secretary reported that the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) area was one of the subject sites for the proposed amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
(the Chairman)
<i>as the Director of
Planning</i> | - | being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of URA; |
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang
(the Vice-chairman) | - | being the Deputy Chairman of the Appeal Board Panel of URA; |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - | being a non-executive director of the URA Board, a member of the Lands, Rehousing and Compensation Committee and the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of URA, and a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA; |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung | } | being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA; |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law | | |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with URA; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his firm having current business dealings with URA; and |

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which was currently in discussion with URA on housing development issues.

8. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had not yet arrived to join the meeting. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the proposed amendments to the OZP in relation to the URA site were proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of those Members as a Member of URA only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting. The Committee agreed to this arrangement.

9. The following representatives from PlanD, URA and Social Ventures Hong Kong (SVhk) (URA's consultant) were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr Louis K.H. Kau - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK);
Ms Natalie L.Y. Luk - Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK);
Mr Wilfred Au - Director, Planning and Design, URA;
Mr Mike Kwan - General Manager, Planning and Design, URA; and
Mr Francis Ngai - Founder and Chief Executive Officer, SVhk

Presentation and Question Sessions

10. 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:

- (a) the proposed amendments to the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP were mainly related to: (a) zoning of the area covered by the URA Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street DSP and rezoning of the Wing Lee Street area; (b) rezoning of a site at 70-72 Staunton Street (i.e. Centre Point) to reflect the existing development; and (c) rezoning of a site at Tak Sing Lane to take

forward the decision of the Committee on s.12A application No. Y/H3/6;

URA Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Area - Amendment Items A1 to A7

Background

- (b) the redevelopment project of Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Development Scheme (H19) was first proposed by URA in 2003, comprising three sites (i.e. Sites A, B and C) zoned “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”). Site A (i.e. the tenement buildings at Wing Lee Street and the Bridges Street Market) was excised from the DSP on 8.7.2011 and the Wing Lee Street area and the Bridges Street Market site were then designated as “CDA” and “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Historical Site Preserved for Cultural and Recreational Uses” zones respectively on the OZP;
- (c) following the announcement in the 2018 Policy Address, a revitalisation proposal for the URA-owned properties in the DSP area was submitted by URA on 5.3.2019, and an updated one on 12.7.2019 having considered the findings of the Community Making Study (CMS) which had incorporated the local comments. The Central & Western District Council (C&WDC) was consulted on 4.7.2019 and its members in general welcomed the findings;
- (d) in view of the latest intention to revitalise the area instead of a comprehensive redevelopment as envisaged in the approved DSP, URA considered that the project was no longer possible to be implemented by way of a development scheme under section 25 of the URA Ordinance;

Proposed Amendments to Matters shown on the OZP

- (e) Amendment Item A1 (about 2,034m²) – incorporation of the area covered by the approved URA Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street DSP No. S/H3/URA1/4 into the OZP;

- (f) Amendment Item A2 (about 452m²) – zoning of the site at 4-10 Shing Wong Street, 16 Wa In Fong East and a portion of Wa In Fong West as “OU” annotated “Cultural, Community, Commercial and Open Space Uses” (“OU(Cultural, Community, Commercial and Open Space Uses)”), with stipulation of a building height restriction (BHR) of four storeys, provision of a public open space (POS) of not less than 135m², of which 90m² would be at-grade, and not less than 50% of the total gross floor area (GFA) of the future development should be for cultural and community uses;
- (g) Amendment Item A3 (about 824m²) – zoning of the sites at 60-66 Staunton Street, 88-90 Staunton Street, 2-2A Shing Wong Street, 2-10 Wa In Fong West and a portion of Wa In Fong West and Chung Wo Lane as “OU” annotated “Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses” (“OU(Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses)”) and stipulation of a BHR of four storeys;
- (h) Amendment Item A4 (about 699m²) – rezoning of the site at 1-12 Wing Lee Street and 17-19 Shing Wong Street from “CDA” to “OU(Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses)” and stipulation of a BHR of four storeys;
- (i) Amendment Item A5 (about 669m²) – zoning of the sites at 8 and 13 Wa In Fong East, 4-6 Chung Wo Lane, Chung Wo Lane Sitting-out Area, the government land adjacent to 6 Chung Wo Lane and a portion of Wa In Fong East and Chung Wo Lane as “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) with a maximum plot ratio of 5 and BHR of 12 storeys;
- (j) Amendment Item A6 (about 22m²) – zoning of the strip of land near 13 Wa In Fong East as “Residential (Group A)25” (“R(A)25”) and stipulation of a BHR of 150mPD to reflect the area within the private lots of Centre Point which was proposed to be rezoned as the same “R(A)25” zone;

- (k) Amendment Item A7 (about 29m²) – zoning of the strip of land near Chung Wo Lane as “R(A)” and stipulation of a BHR of 150mPD to reflect the area within the same private lot of the adjacent pedestrian lane currently zoned “R(A)” with the same BHR;

70-72 Staunton Street - Amendment Item B

Background

- (l) the proposed OZP amendment was to reflect the existing development on the site;

Proposed Amendment to Matters shown on the OZP

- (m) Amendment Item B (about 797m²) – rezoning of the site comprising Centre Point from “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) and “R(A)” to “R(A)25” and stipulation of a BHR of 150mPD, a maximum GFA of 8,265m² and provision of a POS of not less than 712m²;

1-7 Tak Sing Lane, Sai Ying Pun - Amendment Items C1 to C4

Background

- (n) on 17.4.2015, the Committee decided not to agree with s.12A rezoning application No. Y/H3/6 for the site and a judicial review (JR) application against the decision was lodged by the applicant. On 12.1.2018, the Court of First Instance handed down the Judgment allowing the JR and quashed the decision of the Committee. On 18.1.2019, the Committee reconsidered the application with further information submitted by the applicant, and decided to partially agree with the application by rezoning the site to an appropriate sub-zone of “R(A)” with stipulation of a BHR of 120mPD and the requirement for provision of a 24-hour public access through the site on the OZP;

Proposed Amendments to Matters shown on the OZP

- (o) Amendment Item C1 (about 401m²) – rezoning of the site at 1-7 Tak Sing Lane from “Open Space” (“O”), “R(A)8” and area shown as ‘Pedestrian Precinct/Street’ (‘PPS’) to “R(A)24” with stipulation of a BHR restriction of 120mPD and requirement for the provision of a 24-hour public passageway;
- (p) Amendment Item C2 (about 176m²) – rezoning of Tak Sing Lane from “O” to an area shown as ‘PPS’ to retain the remaining part of Tak Sing Lane as a public passageway;
- (q) Amendment Item C3 (about 61m²) – rezoning of a strip of land at Third Street from “R(A)8” to an area shown as ‘PPS’ to reflect the existing use of the concerned area;
- (r) Amendment Item C4 (about 58m²) – rezoning of a portion of the site at 83 Third Street from an area shown as ‘PPS’ to “R(A)8” and stipulation of a BHR of 120mPD to reflect the existing use of the concerned area;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes and Explanatory Statement of the OZP

- (s) corresponding revisions to the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) had been made to take into account the proposed amendments and to follow the revised Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans promulgated by the Board; and

Public Consultation

- (t) C&WDC would be consulted on the amendments prior to or during the exhibition period of the draft OZP depending on the meeting schedule of C&WDC.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai arrived to join the meeting during the presentation.]

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Messrs Wilfred Au and Francis Ngai, representatives of URA and SVhk, made the following main points in relation to URA's revitalization project:

- (a) there was strong local objection to the redevelopment project of Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Development Scheme in the past. The 2018 Policy Address announced that the area would be revitalized, instead of redeveloped, by URA and the emphasis was on place making and synergy with nearby revitalization projects, such as Former Police Married Quarters (PMQ) and Hong Kong News-Expo;
- (b) revitalization of the neighbourhood in the area would be the target for the current project, which was different from other URA projects in the past. The community making process mainly adopted bottom-up approach to gauge community aspirations, while observing the statutory procedures under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance);
- (c) CMS was conducted between January and May 2019 to understand the needs and aspirations of local community stakeholders, such as local residents, nearby schools, pedestrians, C&WDC members and concerned non-governmental organizations (NGOs) towards the future development of this neighbourhood including the proposed revitalization project;
- (d) four visions (Knowledge Common, Impact Common, Community Common and Wellness Common) and six directions including collaboration with community stakeholders to further explore community making, had been recommended by CMS for urban renewal of the study area;
- (e) for the existing residential properties owned by URA in the area, the residential use would be retained and some properties would be renovated or refurbished for provision of co-living spaces and some were for transitional housing with collaboration of the Hong Kong Council of Social

Service; and

- (f) regarding the concept of the proposed Community Hub to be built at the vacant site at 4-10 Shing Wong Street, there was no development scheme at the moment, and the detailed proposal would later be formulated based on the four visions and six directions and further design development to cater for cultural and community use.

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Amendment Items A1 to A7

Place making and community making

12. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the definitions of place making and community making; and
- (b) how place and community making could be achieved noting that there was no detail in URA's revitalization proposal, and how the OZP amendments could help facilitate the place and community making processes.

13. Messrs Wilfred Au and Francis Ngai made the following responses:

- (a) URA was still acquiring experience on place and community making. Notwithstanding that, the idea of place making had been explored in the past two years at URA's projects at Graham Street (H18), H6 CONET at The Centre and Central Market. Place making focused on hardware elements, e.g. landscape. Community making focused on "life-scape" and human-centric elements, and it referred to the process where local stakeholders were actively engaged and their needs and perspectives embedded into the overall design including hardware facilities provided by URA; and

- (b) URA had been in liaison with the operators of the nearby revitalisation projects such as Hong Kong News-Expo with a view to formulating further ideas for community making and place making for the neighbourhood in the area. On the other hand, URA would also pay attention to the comments/views raised in the representations on the subject OZP later.

14. A Member expressed disappointment that there was no discussion on the target group of the community making process and considered that the historical, traditional and interpersonal relationships of the local community should be taken into account. In response, Mr Francis Ngai said that different stakeholders were involved in the community making process including organizers for traditional local activities such as Yu Lan Ghost Festival. Their views would be incorporated to support the ideation of community initiatives to reconnect and preserve the neighbourhood's rich cultural heritage.

Stepped street, public realm and green neighbourhood

15. Some Members raised the following questions/suggestions:

- (a) how the planning, design and enhancement works of Shing Wong Street, which was a stepped street, would facilitate the community making process;
- (b) reasons for failure to reach consensus on the future use of the vacant site at 4-10 Shing Wong Street;
- (c) how the concept of three-dimensional space could be used to explore the interfaces between the revitalization project, public realm and the high-rise developments in the vicinity in respect of the area along Shing Wong Street;
- (d) how green neighbourhood, i.e. green spaces between buildings, could be achieved; and

- (e) the implementation of barrier-free access within the proposed revitalization project given that the revitalization project was located on sloping ground with a number of internal stepped streets.

16. Messrs Wilfred Au and Francis Ngai made the following responses:

- (a) Shing Wong Street formed part of the urban fabric and served as a resting point between Caine Road and Hollywood Road. It would be necessary to discuss with stakeholders regarding its future use, design and interface with URA's project. Nonetheless, not less than 50% of the total floor space of the proposed Community Hub would be reserved for cultural and community uses;
- (b) there were diverse views on whether the existing trees at the vacant site should be retained or removed for providing more floor space for future uses. Nonetheless, URA was committed to preserve the trees as far as possible subject to the findings of the tree survey and future design of non-domestic hub. The paving of anti-slippery emery coating on the steps along Shing Wong Street by the Highways Department also aroused strong local objections;
- (c) activities and shared space to be organized / provided in the proposed Community Hub for the local residents / pedestrians would help the revitalization project to interface with the existing developments in the vicinity. While there was no development scheme yet, the issues of interface and green neighbourhood could be further explored at the architectural design stage; and
- (d) a lift had been built at Hong Kong News-Expo to provide barrier-free access to Shing Wong Street which was in close proximity to the proposed Community Hub. Another barrier-free lift was also provided from Centre Point to 8 Wa In Fong East. Given the proposed Community Hub would also be barrier-free, it could help link up the northern and southern portions of the revitalization area.

Proposed uses

17. The Vice-chairman and a Member raised the following questions:
- (a) how the “non-SOHO” development approach for minimizing nuisance to the revitalization area could be implemented if ‘Eating Place’ was a use always permitted on the ground floor of the URA-owned properties or whether there would be any restriction on the type of ‘Eating Place; and
 - (b) differences between transitional housing and co-living spaces.
18. Messrs Louis K.H. Kau, Wilfred Au and Francis Ngai made the following responses:
- (a) ‘Eating Place’ was a Column 1 use which was always permitted within the proposed “OU(Cultural, Community, Commercial and Open Space Uses)” zone and on ground floor only at the “OU(Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses)” zone;
 - (b) while URA committed that no selling of alcohol would be allowed at URA-owned properties, the type of ‘Eating Place’ to be allowed had yet to be determined; and
 - (c) the objectives of the transitional housing and co-living spaces were different. Transitional housing would be provided on a temporary basis in collaboration with the Hong Kong Council of Social Service at URA-owned properties at Staunton Street for low-income families in need. Co-living space, which was yet to be implemented, was put forward by URA to promote and explore the concept of co-living, which might set a precedent for other districts.

Heritage aspect

19. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Louis K.H. Kau illustrated the locations of the heritage buildings in the vicinity of the revitalization project, including PMQ at Hollywood Road, the ex-Bridges Street Market (Hong Kong News-Expo) and the YMCA at Bridges Street, and Kam Tong Hall (Dr Sun Yat-sen Museum) to the further south. The stepped street at Shing Wong Street was pending for grading assessment by the Antiquities Advisory Board. A Member said that the nearby heritage revitalization projects should also be taken into account during the community making process, whereas another Member was of the view that the subject revitalization proposal could be complementary to nearby heritage revitalization projects.

Population and provision of GIC facilities

20. The Chairman and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the current population within the revitalization area and age distribution;
- (b) whether the provision of social welfare facilities was sufficient in the area;
and
- (c) whether social welfare facilities were permitted uses within the proposed revitalization scheme.

21. Mr Louis K.H. Kau made the following responses:

- (a) he had no information at hand regarding the population in the area. Notwithstanding that, the URA owned properties at Wing Lee Street were currently used by NGOs to provide rental accommodation under 'Light Home' scheme or transitional housing to their clientele;
- (b) referring to Attachment VII of the Paper, there was a shortfall of hospital beds within the OZP area but it could be addressed by the surplus provision of hospital beds in the Southern District which was within the same

hospital cluster. There would be shortfalls of 547 places and 167 beds for community care services and residential care homes for the elderly respectively. In the long term, the actual provision of these facilities would be subject to the consideration of the Social Welfare Department during the planning and development process as appropriate; and

- (c) 'Social Welfare Facility' was a Column 1 use always permitted within the proposed "OU(Cultural, Community, Commercial and Open Space Uses)" and "OU(Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses)" zones. A Neighbourhood Elderly Centre sub-base would be provided at the URA Queen's Road West / In Ku Lane Development Scheme site.

22. Mr Wilfred Au supplemented that about 20% of the population in the area were the elderly with reference to the 2016 By-census. While no less than 50% of the total GFA in the proposed Community Hub would be used for cultural and community uses, the exact level of GIC provision would be subject to the views of the relevant government departments and the local community.

Proposed BHR for Amendment Item A4

23. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the BH profile for the surrounding area of the proposed revitalization scheme; and
- (b) the rationale for the proposed BHR of four storeys for Amendment Item A4.

24. Mr Louis K.H. Kau made the following responses:

- (a) owing to the topography of the area, the BH bands increased progressively uphill with a stepped height profile. The surrounding area was predominantly occupied by high-rise residential developments within "R(A)" zone. The BHRs for "R(A)" zone along Hollywood Road and

Bridges Street were about 120-130mPD and 150-160mPD respectively and more than 160mPD to the south of Caine Road; and

- (b) the site of Amendment Item A4 was vacant and a BHR of four storeys was recommended given the existing buildings on Wing Lee Street and within the proposed revitalization area were predominantly four-storey high or less. Taking into account the BH of Koon Nam House to the immediate south-west was five storeys (75mPD) and the average 4m floor-to-floor height for residential use, the maximum BH of future development at the site (i.e. 16m) was equivalent to about 70mPD. A minor relaxation of BHR clause had also been recommended in the Notes for the proposed “OU(Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses)” zone.

25. Mr Wilfred Au supplemented that while the BHR of four storeys was not proposed by URA, it was in line with the indicative massing of the proposed Community Hub with POS submitted in March 2019. However, this indicative design notion was outdated and yet to be determined via community making processes.

26. Noting that the BHR for the surrounding residential developments varied from 120-160mPD and the current shortfall of social welfare facilities in the area, a Member asked whether new structures could be built on top of the existing tenement buildings in the revitalization area for providing more floor spaces for social welfare facilities while retaining the building facades. The Member also asked if any air ventilation assessment (AVA) was conducted.

27. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that while no AVA had been conducted for the current revitalization scheme, it should be noted that no adverse air ventilation impact was anticipated with reference to the previous redevelopment scheme with a higher BH of about 20 storeys proposed by URA.

28. Mr Wilfred Au supplemented that the technical feasibility of the proposed additional structures on top of the existing tenement buildings was yet to be ascertained by any technical assessment.

29. In view of the scarce land resources in the territory and the local need for GIC facilities in particular elderly facilities, a Member had reservation on the proposed BHR as it would pose restrictions for providing more GIC facilities. The Member suggested that the proposed BHR of four storeys could be more lenient to allow flexibility for creation of more floor spaces to provide facilities to meet local needs, as well as to facilitate place and community making. Noting that the BHR for the surrounding developments were imposed in terms of mPD and with reference to the estimated BH of future development at the site based on URA's indicative scheme submitted in March 2019, a Member suggested to impose a BHR of 70mPD for the site.

30. In view of absence of a concrete/detailed development scheme by URA, some Members concurred with the view that more flexibility should be allowed for creation of more floor spaces to meet local needs.

31. Noting that the BHR for the subject site of Amendment Item A5, which was proposed to be zoned as "R(C)", was 12 storeys, a Member suggested the same BHR could be imposed for Amendment Item A4.

32. Members noted that BHR in terms of number of storey, instead of mPD, was proposed by PlanD taking into account the special circumstances of the varied heights of the existing buildings on a sloping ground and the intention to maintain the low-rise character while keeping a stepped BH profile. BHR in terms of number of storeys would also allow flexibility as there was no restriction on the floor-to-floor height.

Conclusion

33. Members in general supported URA's visions/directions for the proposed revitalization project and appreciated the emphasis on community and place making. There were diverse views regarding the proposed BHR for Amendment Item A4. Members cast a vote on three options: (i) four storeys (as recommended by PlanD); (ii) 70mPD (equivalent to about four storeys at the subject site); and (iii) 12 storeys (with reference to the BHR of the adjoining site for Amendment Item A5 proposed to be zoned as "R(C)"). Members in the majority were in support of option (i), and agreed to impose a BHR of four storeys for the subject site of Amendment Item A4 as recommended in the Paper. Members also agreed to

Amendment Items A1 to A3 and A5 to A7.

Amendment Item B

34. Noting that the site was originally zoned “R(A)” and “R(C)” and the development parameters of the existing residential development exceeded those stipulated under “R(C)” zone on the OZP, a Member enquired whether the subject site was involved in any planning application. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that the site was the subject of planning applications for residential development approved in 1998, 2002 and 2009 respectively and the development was completed in 2011 in accordance with the approved scheme. Members agreed to Amendment Item B.

Amendment Items C1 to C4

35. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that in January 2019, the Committee decided to partially agree to the rezoning application (No. Y/H3/6), i.e. by rezoning the site to an appropriate sub-zone of “R(A)” with stipulation of a maximum BHR of 120mPD and the requirement for provision of a 24-hour public access through the site on the OZP. Members agreed to Amendment Items C1 to C4.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join the meeting during the discussion.]

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

36. Members had no comment on the proposed amendments to the Notes and ES of the OZP.

37. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/32 and that the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/32A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/H3/33 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for exhibition under section 7 of the Ordinance; and

- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/32A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and agree that the revised ES is suitable for publication together with the OZP.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, Ms Natalie L.Y. Luk, TP/HK, Messrs Wilfred Au, Mike Kwan and Francis Ngai for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

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

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H3/441 Proposed Office, Shop and Services/Eating Place in “Residential (Group A)” Zone, 3-6 Glenealy, Central, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/441)

38. The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had declared interest on the item for being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which was having current business dealings with KTA.

39. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that Mr Daniel K.S. Lau could stay in the meeting as he had no involvement in the application.

40. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 12.7.2019 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to demonstrate the feasibility and enforceability of the proposed pedestrian enhancement scheme. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

**Summary of Representations and Comments and the Planning Department's Response
in respect of the Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H3/33**

(GROUP 2)

(1) The grounds and proposals of representers (TPB/R/S/H3/33-8 (part), 13 to 57) as well as responses are summarised below:

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
13 to 24 (Individuals)	<p>(a) Oppose Item C1.</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(b) The development density in the area is very high. The open space should be preserved to ensure the living quality of the residents nearby. (R13 to R23)</p> <p>(c) Further development will cause adverse impact on air ventilation, health, safety, privacy and living quality. (R15, R16 and R23)</p> <p>(d) Infill development will affect the quality of life and living environment in the area. (R15, R16, R23 and R24)</p>	<p>(i) The Tak Sing Lane Site (TSL Site) (i.e. Representation Sites C1 and C2) was the subject of a s.12A application No. Y/H3/6 which was partially agreed by the MPC on 18.1.2019. According to the indicative scheme submitted by the applicant, the proposed development would have a PR of 8.514 and building height (BH) of 120mPD at main roof level. Given the TSL Site is surrounded by other existing high-rise residential buildings with building heights ranging from 87mPD to 107mPD the proposed development is not incompatible with the surrounding developments.</p> <p>(ii) The rezoning of the Representation Site C1 (i.e. 1-7 Tak Sing Lane) to "R(A)24" would inevitably affect the visual relief offered by the existing low-rise developments at the site to the surrounding buildings. While the Representation Site C1 may not be the most ideal location for high-rise residential development from the urban design perspective, the proposed development is considered not incompatible visually with the surrounding built-up context.</p> <p>(iii) The technical assessments provided by the applicants in the s.12A application (No. Y/H3/6) including sewerage impact assessment, air ventilation assessment (AVA), and visual appraisal have also demonstrated that the proposed development would have no insurmountable impacts on the surrounding developments. Concerned departments including Environmental Protection Department,</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p>Buildings Department and Fire Services Department did not have any adverse comments on the s.12A application.</p> <p>(iv) In view of the above and the Government has no implementation programme for the planned “Open Space” (“O”) zone at Tak Sing Lane, the MPC decided on 18.1.2019 to partially agree to the application by rezoning the Representation Site C1 (about 401m²) to an appropriate sub-zone of “R(A)” with stipulation of a building height restriction (BHR) of 120mPD and the requirement for provision of a 24-hour public access through the site on the OZP.</p>
	<p>(e) The proposed OZP amendment has defeated the original planning intention of zoning the site as “O” to control the living density. (R24)</p> <p>(f) Government should resume the land for open space use. (R24)</p>	<p>(v) Although the planned open space at the Tak Sing Lane has been zoned on the OZP since 1970, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) has indicated previously, in various junctures, that there is no programme to resume private land for open space development. In other words, the “O” zoning of TSL Site has already held up the owners’ development right of the site for about 50 years. As the prospect for implementing the planned open space at the TSL Site is slim, it is considered that the original “O” zoning of the TSL Site is no longer appropriate.</p> <p>(vi) According to the requirements of Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), there is an overall surplus existing and planned open space are 15.66ha and 17.43ha respectively from the district council perspective with a planned population of 261,455. Notwithstanding that, for the area covered by the Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP, there is an overall deficit in the provision of existing and planned open space by 4.01ha and 4.61ha respectively mainly due to the shortfall of local open space. Despite the deficit, the provision of local open space has been increased in recent years, which includes the public open space provided at the URA Yu Lok Lane/Centre Street development (about 1,303m²) and the Former Central Police Station Compound (i.e. Tai Kwun) (about 3,430m²),</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		some smaller open spaces and sitting-out areas in other parts of Sai Ying Pun and Sheung Wan area (about 256m ²), as well as the planned open space of not less than 135m ² at 4-6 Shing Wong Street under the “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Cultural, Community, Commercial and Open Space Uses” zone to be implemented by the URA. Hence, there is no strong planning justification for retaining the TSL Site as “O”.
	<u>Representers’ Proposal</u> (g) To preserve the open space use (R13 to R23)	(vii) Responses (v) and (vi) above are relevant. Hence, the representers’ proposal is not supported.
25 to 30 (Individuals)	(a) Oppose Items C1 and C2 <u>Grounds of Representations</u> (b) The development density in the area is very high. The open space should be preserved to ensure the living quality of the residents nearby. (R25, R27 to R29) (c) Population density is too high in the area. (R26 and R30) (d) More space is needed to ensure the quality of life. (R26)	(i) Responses (i) to (vi) to R13 to R24 above are relevant.
	(e) The proposed development will affect the foundation of other buildings. (R30)	(ii) The proposed development at the site is subject to the compliance with statutory requirements under relevant ordinances and regulations, including the Buildings Ordinance. Hence, concern on the adverse impacts on the foundation of nearby buildings caused by the proposed development will be adequately addressed under the prevailing regulations.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
	<u>Representers' Proposal</u> (f) To preserve the open space use. (R25 to R29)	(iii) Responses (v) and (vi) to R13 to R24 above are relevant. Hence, the representers' proposal is not supported.
31 to 36 (Individuals)	(a) Oppose Items C1 and C4 <u>Grounds of Representations</u> (b) The development density in the area is very high. The open space should be preserved to ensure the living quality of the residents nearby. (R31, R33 to R36) (c) There are already a lot of residential developments in the area and the open space should be preserved. (R31) (d) Further development will cause adverse impact on air ventilation, light penetration, health, safety and living quality. (R32 to R35)	(i) Responses (i) to (vi) to R13 to R24 above are relevant. (ii) The proposed development at the site is subject to the compliance with statutory requirements under relevant ordinances and regulations, including the Buildings Ordinance. Hence, concerns on the adverse impact on the natural lighting will be adequately addressed under the prevailing regulations.
	<u>Representers' Proposal</u> (e) To preserve the open space use. (R31, R33 to R36)	(iii) Responses (v) and (vi) to R13 to R24 above are relevant. Hence, the representers' proposal is not supported.
37 to 41 Individuals	(a) Oppose Amendment Items C1 to C3. <u>Grounds of Representations</u> (b) The development density in the area is very high. The open space should be preserved to ensure the living quality of the residents nearby. (R38 to R41)	(i) Responses (i) to (vi) to R13 to R24 above are relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
	<p>(c) Further development will cause adverse impacts on health, safety and living quality. (R37)</p> <p>(d) Retaining the open space can maintain the air ventilation in the neighbourhood. (R38)</p>	
	<p><u>Representers' Proposal</u></p> <p>(e) To preserve the open space use. (R38 to R41)</p>	<p>(ii) Responses (v) and (vi) to R13 to R24 above are relevant. Hence, the representers' proposal is not supported.</p>
42 to 47 Individuals	<p>(a) Oppose Items C1, C2 and C4.</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(b) The development density in the area is very high. The open space should be preserved to ensure the living quality of the residents nearby. (R42 and R43)</p> <p>(c) Future development will be too close to the nearby buildings. (R44 to R46)</p> <p>(d) There is limited road capacity to support more residential developments. (R47)</p>	<p>(i) Responses (i) to (vi) to R13 to R24 above are relevant.</p>
	<p><u>Representers' Proposal</u></p> <p>(e) To preserve the open space use. (R42 and R43)</p>	<p>(ii) Responses (v) and (vi) to R13 to R24 above are relevant. Hence, the representers' proposal is not supported.</p>
8 (part), 48 to 57 (Individuals)	<p>(a) Oppose Items C1 to C4</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(b) Application No. Y/H3/6 (which relates to Items C1, C2, C3 and C4) has previously attracted many objections. (R8 (part))</p>	<p>(i) Noted. During statutory publication periods of the application No. Y/H3/6, a total of 1,301 public comments were received. Amongst them, 7 were supporting comments, 1,290 opposing comments and 4</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		comments not indicating support or oppose.
	<p>(c) Items C1 and C2 are surrounded by tall buildings, and development of an open space can mitigate the wall effect and address the deficit of open space in the area. (R8 (part))</p> <p>(d) There has been a shortage of open space in the Central and Western district, rezoning the site from “O” for residential use will further increase the shortage and lower the living quality of the residents nearby. (R56 and R57)</p>	(ii) Responses (v) and (vi) to R13 to R24 above are relevant.
	<p>(e) The development density in the area is very high. The open space should be preserved to ensure the living quality of the residents nearby. (R48 to R57)</p> <p>(f) Further development will cause adverse impact on air ventilation, health, safety, light penetration and living quality. (R8 (part), R53 to R56)</p> <p>(g) There are too many infill developments in Sai Ying Pun. (R57)</p>	(iii) Responses (i) to (vi) to R13 to R24 above are relevant.
	<p><u>Representers’ Proposal</u></p> <p>(h) To preserve the open space use. (R48 to R57)</p>	(iv) Responses (v) and (vi) to R13 to R24 above are relevant. Hence, the representers’ proposal is not supported.

- (2) The 21 comments are submitted by individuals (**TPB/R/H3/33/33-C3, C6 to C24**) and owners of the Representation Site C1 (**C25**). The grounds of the commenters, as well as responses are summarised below:

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Related Representation	Gist of Comments	Response to Comments
C3 (Individual)	Nil	(a) There are strong public objections to the amendments.	(i) Noted.
		(b) The community wants to preserve the historic and cultural elements of the area.	(ii) The existing seven 3-storey residential buildings at 1-7 Tak Sing Lane was completed in the early 1950s. They are not historic buildings graded by the Antiquities Advisory Board. (iii) The “R(A)24” zone (Item C1) requires the provision of a 24-hour public passageway of not less than 1.65m wide connecting Tak Sing Lane and Third Street, and the two existing pedestrian access at Tak Sing Lane (Item C2) and Third Street (Item C3) are designated as area shown as ‘PPS’ to clearly reflect the planning intention of providing the pedestrian connection between Third Street and Second Street. This has also retained the urban fabric of streets and lane in the area.
		(c) There is an urgent need for open space in this district.	(iv) Response (vi) to R13 to R24 above is relevant.
C6 (Individual)	R13 to R57	(a) Oppose rezoning the site from “Open Space” (“O”) to “Residential (Group A)” or any other uses.	(i) Responses (i) to (vi) to R13 to R24 above are relevant.
C7 to C24 (Individuals)	R24	(a) Oppose rezoning the site and/or demolishing the existing building. (b) The existing low-rise buildings are of rich history and local culture which should be retained and preserved. (C8(part), C9, C12, C14, C17 and C20)	(i) Responses (ii) and (iii) to C3 above are relevant

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Related Representation	Gist of Comments	Response to Comments
		(c) The urban fabric of streets and lanes in the area should be respected (C17).	
		(d) The site is a unique place which gives quality of living, tranquillity and community to Sai Ying Pun. (C19)	
		(e) The high-rise building in the small site will have negative effects on the foundations of the surrounding buildings (C8 and C21)	(ii) Responses (i) to (vi) to R13 to R24 and response (ii) to R25 to R30 above are relevant.
		(f) Further development will cause noise, pollution and adverse impacts on light penetration, traffic, visual quality and living quality. (C9, C10, C14, C18, C22 and C23)	
		(g) The development density in the area is very high. The open space should be preserved to ensure the living quality of the residents nearby. (C17 and C24)	
		(h) Tak Sing Lane is a relief from the high-rise buildings in the area. (C11)	(iii) Response (ii) to C3 are relevant.
		(i) More open space is needed among tall buildings and the existing buildings should be preserved to maintain housing diversity in the area. (C22)	
		(j) The site could be used for organic community garden. (C16)	(iv) Noted. As the TSL Site is a private land, its future use is subject to the lot owner's own decision.
C25 (Leung Chung)	R13 to R24, R37 to R41	(a) The "O" zoning of the site is outdated and jeopardised the development rights of the land	(i) Noted.

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Related Representation	Gist of Comments	Response to Comments
Ching Edwin & Wong Fung San Hanny)		<p>owners as there had been no program for implementing the open space by the government.</p> <p>(b) The argument of “a severe shortage of local open space” was not a strong reason to retain the site for open space use as it is the government’s duty to develop open space on suitable and available government land.</p> <p>(c) The proposed 24-hour public access and open space for public use in the future development could benefit the public.</p>	
	R8(part), R25 to R30, R42 to R47, R48 to R57	<p>(d) As demonstrated in the AVA submitted in support of the s.12A application (No. Y/H3/6), the proposed development has no adverse air ventilation impact on the local area.</p> <p>(e) Regarding the concerns on the impacts on health, safety, light penetration, living quality and foundation, the approval of the general building plans obtained for the proposed development has confirmed the proposed development is feasible under the Buildings Ordinance.</p>	(ii) Noted.
	R42 to R47	(f) As justified in the s.12A application, given the proposed development is of limited scale and is in close proximity to the Sai Ying Pun MTR Station, there will be no provision of parking facilities, and additional pedestrian and vehicular flows generated is limited.	(iii) Noted.

有關《西營盤及上環分區計劃大綱草圖編 S/H3/33》的申述人名單

List of Representatives

In respect of the Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/33

(第二組)

(GROUP 2)

Representation No. 申述個案編號	Name of 'Representer' 申述人名稱
TPB/R/S/H3/33-8	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/H3/33-13	Sze Wai Sin
TPB/R/S/H3/33-14	Tse Kwong Yuen
TPB/R/S/H3/33-15	Mak Yee Ching
TPB/R/S/H3/33-16	Ma Ling
TPB/R/S/H3/33-17	Chow Wan Sze
TPB/R/S/H3/33-18	Fung Tak Ming
TPB/R/S/H3/33-19	Yuen Lee Yan
TPB/R/S/H3/33-20	Fung Tak Lam
TPB/R/S/H3/33-21	Mok Lai Ngor
TPB/R/S/H3/33-22	Wong Hei Man
TPB/R/S/H3/33-23	Wong Kar Wing Clara
TPB/R/S/H3/33-24	Cheung Kai Yin
TPB/R/S/H3/33-25	Ho Wai Chong
TPB/R/S/H3/33-26	Law Yiu Sabrina
TPB/R/S/H3/33-27	余燊茂
TPB/R/S/H3/33-28	余立鳴
TPB/R/S/H3/33-29	余如鳳
TPB/R/S/H3/33-30	Sin Wai Wah
TPB/R/S/H3/33-31	Yu Chi Ying
TPB/R/S/H3/33-32	Chan Man Wa
TPB/R/S/H3/33-33	Chun Wai Ka
TPB/R/S/H3/33-34	Chan Man Wa
TPB/R/S/H3/33-35	Chun Chun Ming
TPB/R/S/H3/33-36	梁愛華
TPB/R/S/H3/33-37	Ho Chi Shing
TPB/R/S/H3/33-38	Chan Tsui Hung
TPB/R/S/H3/33-39	Leung Kin Kwan
TPB/R/S/H3/33-40	梁玉傑
TPB/R/S/H3/33-41	梁學強

Representation No. 申述個案編號	Name of 'Representer' 申述人名稱
TPB/R/S/H3/33-42	Wu Ngai Yan Rosalind
TPB/R/S/H3/33-43	Yu Chi Ching
TPB/R/S/H3/33-44	Yu Tak Shun
TPB/R/S/H3/33-45	Chow Siu Lin
TPB/R/S/H3/33-46	Tsang Ching Nam
TPB/R/S/H3/33-47	Li Kin Lun
TPB/R/S/H3/33-48	Chow Kin Keung
TPB/R/S/H3/33-49	Chow Ngan Foon
TPB/R/S/H3/33-50	Chow Fu
TPB/R/S/H3/33-51	Tam Chi Wan
TPB/R/S/H3/33-52	Tam Chung Wai
TPB/R/S/H3/33-53	李海文
TPB/R/S/H3/33-54	史千里
TPB/R/S/H3/33-55	周敏琦
TPB/R/S/H3/33-56	Lam Ka Man
TPB/R/S/H3/33-57	李偉鈞

有關《西營盤及上環分區計劃大綱草圖編 S/H3/33》的提意見人名單

List of Commenters

In respect of the Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/33

(第二組)

(GROUP 2)

Comment No. 意見編號	Name of 'Commenter' 提意見人名稱
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C3	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C6	Mak Kau
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C7	Mohamad Ghamlouch
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C8	Emilia Meredith Mason
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C9	Stefano Tronci
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C10	Christina Monique Themar
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C11	Damitha Tilanka Weerakoon
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C12	Alice Yeh
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C13	Andrea Pietrucci
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C14	Dahlmann, Sven Cristoph
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C15	Camille Aurelier Nathalie Roche
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C16	Alison Jane Quodling
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C17	Cheng Tan Fai
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C18	Fu Hiu Chi
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C19	Nguyen Thi-kim-hanh
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C20	Karin Chow
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C21	Rodriguez, Dervin H.
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C22	Travis Huggins
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C23	LI Mei Yu
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C24	Tse Kwong Yuen
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C25	Leung Chung Ching Edwin Wong Fung San Hanny

**Provision of Major GIC and Recreational Facilities and Open Space in
Sai Ying Pun and Sheung Wan Area**
西營盤及上環地區休憩用地及主要政府、機構或社區設施、康樂設施的供應

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 (按照已計劃 的供應計算)
			Existing Provision 現有供應	Planned Provision (including existing provision) 已計劃供應 (包括現有供 應)	
District Open Space 地區休憩用地	10 ha per 100,000 persons [#] 每 100,000 人 10 公頃 [#]	10 ha 公頃	9.75	11.09	+1.09 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 [#]	10 ha 公頃	5.01	5.4	-4.61 ha 公頃
Secondary School 中學	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17 每 40 人屬於 12-17 歲年齡組別 1 間全 日制課室	124 classrooms 課室	158	158	+34 classrooms 課室
Primary School 小學	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11 每 25.5 人屬於 6-11 歲年齡組別 1 間全 日制課室	132 classrooms 課室	225	212	+79 classrooms 課室
Kindergarten/ Nursery 幼兒班與 幼稚園	34 whole-day classrooms for 1,000 children aged of 3 to under 6 每 1,000 人屬於 3-6 歲年齡組別 34 間 全日制課室	37 classrooms 課室	101	101	+63 classrooms 課室

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 (按照已計劃的供應計算)
			Existing Provision 現有供應	Planned Provision (including existing provision) 已計劃供應 (包括現有供應)	
District Police Station 警區警署	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons 每 200,000 至 500,000 人 1 間	0	2	2	+2
Divisional Police Station 分區警署	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons 每 100,000 至 200,000 人 1 間	0	1	1	+1
Hospital 醫院	5.5 beds per 1,000 persons 每 1,000 人 5.5 張病床	642 beds 床位	533	533	-109 beds 床位
Clinic/Health Centre 普通科診療所／健康中心	1 per 100,000 persons 每 100,000 人 1 間	1	3	3	+2
Magistracy (with 8 courtrooms) 裁判法院 (8 個法庭)	1 per 660,000 persons 每 660,000 人 1 間	0	0	0	0
Child Care Centre 幼兒中心	100 aided places per 25,000 persons** 每 25,000 人 100 個資助服務名額**	400 places 名額	354	354	-46 places 名額
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 人屬於 6-24 歲年齡組別 1 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 (按照已計劃的供應計算)
			Existing Provision 現有供應	Planned Provision (including existing provision) 已計劃供應 (包括現有供應)	
Integrated Family Services Centre 綜合家庭服務中心	1 per 100,000 to 150,000 persons [#] 每 100,000 至 150,000 人 1 間 [#]	0	1	1	+1
Community Care Services (CCS) facilities [^] (including Day Care Centres/Unit for the Elderly and Integrated Home Care Services) 社區照顧服務設施(包括長者日間護理中心/單位及綜合家居照顧服務)	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 ^{#^*}	594	194	194	-400
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 ^{#^*}	735 beds 床位	720	720	-15.6 beds 床位
Library 圖書館	1 district library for every 200,000 persons [#] 每 200,000 人 1 間 [#]	0	1	1	+1
Sports Centre 體育中心	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons [#] 每 50,000 至 65,000 人 1 間 [#]	1	3	3	+2

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 (按照已計劃的供應計算)
			Existing Provision 現有供應	Planned Provision (including existing provision) 已計劃供應 (包括現有供應)	
Sports Ground/ Sports Complex 運動場館／運動場	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons [#] 每 200,000 至 250,000 人 1 個 [#]	0	0	0	0
Swimming Pool Complex 游泳池場館	1 complex per 287,000 persons [#] 每 287,000 人 1 個 [#]	0	0	0	0

Note:

The planned population for the area is 116,812.

西營盤及上環地區的規劃人口約為 116,812 人

The requirements exclude planned population of transients

有關要求不包括流動居民

^ The planning standard of community care services (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.

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。

* This is a long-term goal and the actual provision would be subject to the consideration of the SWD 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。