

TPB Paper No. 10125
For Consideration by the
Town Planning Board on 17.6.2016

DRAFT CENTRAL DISTRICT OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H4/15
CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/H4/15-1 TO 72
AND COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/H4/15-C1 TO C14

**DRAFT CENTRAL DISTRICT OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H4/15
CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/H4/15-1 TO 72
AND COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/H4/15-C1 TO C14**

Subject of Representation	Representers (No. TPB/R/S/H4/15-)	Commenters (No. TPB/R/S/H4/15-)
<p>Amendment Item A - Rezoning of the Murray Road Multi-storey Carpark site from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Commercial (3)” (“C(3)”) and stipulation of building height restriction</p> <p>Amendment Item B1 – Rezoning of the eastern part of the existing Queensway Plaza site from an area shown as ‘Road’ and “Open Space” (“O”) to “C(4)” and stipulation of building height restriction</p> <p>Amendment Item B2 – Rezoning of the western part of the existing Queensway Plaza site from an area shown as ‘Road’ and “C” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Elevated Walkway cum Retail Uses” (“OU(Elevated Walkway cum Retail Uses)”) and stipulation of building height restriction</p> <p>Amendment Item B3 – Rezoning of the existing bus lay-by between the Queensway Plaza and Queensway from “O” to an area shown as ‘Road’</p>	<p><u>Total: 72</u></p> <p><u>Support</u> R1 to R4: Individuals (R3 & R4 for Item B1 only)</p> <p><u>Oppose</u> R5: Central & Western Concern Group</p> <p>R6: The Alliance for a Beautiful Hong Kong Limited</p> <p>R7: Hui Chi Fung (Central and Western District Councillor)</p> <p>R16: Good Day Wanchai</p> <p>R65: Designing Hong Kong (Item A only)</p> <p>R68: Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design (Items B1, B2 and B3 only)</p> <p>R8 to R15, R17 to R64, R66, R67, R69 & R70: Individuals (R66 for Item A only; R69 to R70 for Item B1 only)</p> <p><u>Providing Views</u> R71: Chairman, Central & Western District Council</p> <p>R72: Individual</p>	<p><u>Total: 14</u></p> <p><u>Support representations</u> C2 to C8: Individuals (Item B1 only)</p> <p><u>Support R1 & R2 and Oppose R64 to R66</u> C1: Paul Zimmerman (Southern District Councillor)</p> <p><u>Support R5</u> C9: Individual</p> <p><u>Support R71</u> C11 to C13: Individuals</p> <p><u>Provide Views on R9</u> C14: Individual</p>

Note: The lists of representers and commenters are enclosed at **Annexes VII and VIII** respectively. A full set of representations and comments is at **Annexes III and IV** respectively.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 11.12.2015, the draft Central District Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H4/15 (**Annex I**) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The amendments are set out in the Schedule of Amendments at **Annex II**. The amendments mainly involve:
- (a) the rezoning of the Murray Road Multi-storey Carpark (MRMCP) site from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Commercial (3)” (“C(3)”) for commercial development with stipulation of a maximum building height of 190mPD (including roof-top structures), maximum site coverage of 65% (excluding basements) and the provision of a minimum of 102 public car parking spaces and 69 public motorcycle parking spaces (**Amendment Item A**);
 - (b) the rezoning of the eastern part of the existing Queensway Plaza (QP) site from an area shown as ‘Road’ and “Open Space” (“O”) to “C(4)” for commercial development with stipulation of a maximum building height of 200mPD (including roof-top structures), a maximum site coverage of 65% (excluding basements) and the provision of not less than 2,100m² of public open space out of which not less than 1,400m² should be at-grade (**Amendment Item B1**);
 - (c) the rezoning of the western part of the existing QP site from an area shown as ‘Road’ and “C” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Elevated Walkway cum Retail Uses” (“OU(Elevated Walkway cum Retail Uses)”) with stipulation of a maximum building height of 21mPD to reflect the existing building height (**Amendment Item B2**);
 - (d) the rezoning of the existing bus lay-by between the QP and Queensway from “O” to an area shown as ‘Road’ (**Amendment Item B3**); and
 - (e) amendments to the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP to reflect the above amendments and to update the general information of various land use zonings and the planning area, where appropriate.
- 1.2 During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 72 representations were received. On 11.3.2016, the representations were published and, in the first 3 weeks of the publication period, 14 comments related to the representations were received. On 6.5.2016, the Town Planning Board (the Board) agreed to consider the representations (**R1 to R72**) and comments (**C1 to C14**) collectively in one group. This paper is to provide the Board with information for consideration of the representations and comments. The representers and commenters have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the Ordinance.

2. Background

Amendment Item A: The Murray Road Multi-storey Car Park Site (Plan H-1)

- 2.1 It is the Government’s policy to relocate government offices with no specific location requirements out of high-value areas, including core business districts.

The 2014 Policy Address stated that the Government will increase land supply for commercial and business uses in the existing core business district in Central, and will convert suitable “G/IC” sites (including the MRMCP in Central) into commercial uses where practicable.

Amendment Items B1 to B3: Queensway Plaza Site (Plan H-1)

- 2.2 On 9.1.2014, the ‘*Planning and Design Study on the Redevelopment of Queensway Plaza, Admiralty – Feasibility Study*’ (‘the QP Study’) was commissioned by the Planning Department (PlanD). The main objective of the QP Study is to investigate the planning, architectural and engineering feasibility in redeveloping the Study Site for commercial uses, including Grade A office and retail uses, and to make recommendations to upgrade the existing public realm with convenient pedestrian connections to Central and Wan Chai.
- 2.3 The QP Study identified a core part of QP suitable for redevelopment and proposed a scheme with the development of a commercial tower for Grade A office atop a five-storey retail/dining podium (including a landscape podium deck) and five levels of basements, generating a total GFA of 93,300m² equivalent to a non-domestic PR of 15.
- 2.4 Due to structural constraints pertaining to the western part of QP (i.e. Queensway Walkway), the QP Study proposed to retain the existing Queensway Walkway. Some enhancement measures, including those for the QP rooftop, are proposed. Upon implementation of these enhancement measures, about 2,400m² GFA (subject to survey) for retail/dining and public passageway could be provided.
- 2.5 The existing bus lay-by between QP and Queensway falls within the “O” zone on Central District OZP No. S/H4/14. The rezoning of the site to an area shown as ‘Road’ is to reflect the existing use.

Amendment to the OZP

- 2.6 The proposed amendments were submitted to the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board for consideration on 20.11.2015. After taking into account all the relevant planning considerations, MPC agreed that the proposed amendments (i.e. **Amendment Items A, B1, B2 and B3**) were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance.
- 2.7 The draft OZP was exhibited on 11.12.2015 for public inspection. The relevant MPC paper No. 12/15 and the minutes of the MPC meeting are deposited at the Board’s Secretariat for Members’ inspection. The MPC Paper and minutes are also available at the Board’s website.

3. Consultation with Central and Western District Council

The Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) had been consulted on the proposed rezoning of the MRMCP site on 16.7.2015. For the QP site, C&WDC was consulted on the recommended development scheme (RDS) on 8.1.2015. An Information Note on the revised RDS, which had taken on board comments received, was issued to C&WDC on 30.9.2015. The views of C&WDC in respect of the two sites were reported to the

MPC when the proposed amendments to the OZP were submitted on 20.11.2015. Upon publication of the draft OZP on 11.12.2015, the C&WDC was further consulted on 21.1.2016. The C&WDC had expressed both supporting and opposing views to the proposed amendments including concerns on insufficient public car parking spaces in the future commercial development at MRMCP site; the negative air ventilation and heat island effect; adverse visual impact on the ridgeline and to residents in the Mid-levels; the reduced breathing space; and adverse traffic impact arising from the proposed rezoning. The extract of the minutes of the C&WDC meeting with the members' views and PlanD's responses is at **Annex V**.

4. The Representations

4.1 Subject of Representations

Among the 72 representations received, 4 representations supported the proposed zoning amendments with **R1** and **R2** supporting the rezoning of both the MRMCP and QP sites whereas **R3** and **R4** supported the rezoning of the QP site only. A total of 66 representations (**R5** to **R70**) objected to the proposed amendments to the OZP with **R5** to **R64** and **R67** objecting to all the Amendment Items, **R65** to **R66** objecting to the MRMCP site (**Amendment Item A**) only, **R68** objecting to the QP site (Amendment Items B1 to B3) only, and **R69** to **R70** objecting to the redevelopment of the eastern portion of the QP site only (**Amendment Item B1**). There are two representations (**R71** and **R72**) providing comments on the amendment items. A full set of the representations is at **Annex III** and a summary of the representations and PlanD's responses is at **Annex VI**.

4.2 Supportive Representations

Proposals of Representations

4.2.1 Among the four supportive representations, **R1** and **R2** supported all Amendment Items whereas **R3** and **R4** supported the proposed redevelopment of the eastern portion of the QP site (**Amendment Item B1**). Representations **R1** to **R4** have also submitted several general proposals which are summarised as follows:

Land Use Mix (MRMCP and QP)

- (a) Residential use, serviced apartments and other social uses (such as market) should be provided in the area. In this regard 'Flat' and 'Residential Institution' uses should be added under Column 1 of the Notes for "C(3)" and "C(4)" zones. (**R1**)
- (b) A mixed use development to create a focal point should be provided and a minimum GFA for retail use should be stipulated in the Notes of the "C(4)" zone or in the ES. (**R2**) Besides, planning intentions specific to the "Commercial (3)" ("C(3)") and "C(4)" zones should be stipulated in the Notes. (**R1**) **R3** also proposed that the provision of a retail floor space of not less than 20,000m² GFA should be stipulated in the ES.

Linkage to the Surrounding (MRMCP and QP)

- (c) More linkages to the surrounding should be provided and an elevated walkway along Drake Street between the Central Government Offices (CGO) and the High Court should be designated. The provision of pedestrian linkages should be stipulated in the land lease. **(R1)**

4.2.2 For the QP redevelopment, **R3** and **R4** have put forward the following suggestions:

Control Mechanism

- (a) To ensure the timely implementation of the redevelopment, the controls and requirements should be clearly stated in the Notes and/or ES of the OZP, or incorporated into the lease. **(R3)**
- (b) A planning brief for the QP site should be prepared and presented to the Board at the same meeting when the representations and comments are considered so as to allow public input. **(R3)**

Pedestrian Connections and Interface with MTR Facilities

- (c) The existing pedestrian connections to Central and the adjacent buildings should be maintained throughout the demolition and construction period to minimise nuisance to the public and disturbance to business activities. The requirement should be stipulated in the land lease. **(R4)**
- (d) The main links to the MTR station and ground level should be retained or reprovisioned during the construction period. **(R3)** The Exit C1 of the Admiralty MTR Station and its connection to the existing footbridge across Queensway should remain open throughout the redevelopment period as this is the key access route for developments in the surrounding. **(R4)** The MTR Exits C1, C2 and the associated pedestrian passage should be linked into the new lot of the site. The existing passageways to the MTR should be realigned and MTR Exit C2 should be relocated to enhance the efficiency of the basement of the future development. **(R3)**
- (e) The construction of basements under MTR facilities should be allowed. **(R3)**
- (f) It should be clarified whether the proposed pedestrian bridge connecting to the Tamar footbridge is to be built by the developer or by the Government. **(R3)**

Internal Transport Facilities

- (g) The provision of internal transport facilities, i.e. car parking spaces and loading/unloading bays should not be required to follow the

Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) due to the good transport network available and the constraints of the site which render the development of 5 levels of basements impractical. The exemption should be stipulated in the ES of the OZP. **(R3)**

Site Coverage Calculation

- (h) With a maximum site coverage restriction of 65%, the requirement to provide connections to the footbridge system would constrain the design of the podium level. In this regard, the footbridges should be exempted from site coverage calculation and this should be specified in the ES of the OZP. **(R3)**

Covered Open Space

- (i) As there will be difficulties in providing 1,400m² of open space at the ground level, given the various requirements of the development, a proportion of not more than 25% being covered open space should be allowed and this should be specified in the ES of the OZP. **(R3)**

Other Design Requirements

- (j) The design requirement of the atrium within the podium should be specified at this stage. In this regard, an atrium with a minimum area of 400m² and a minimum height of 8m should be stipulated in the ES of the OZP while flexibility for its location should be allowed. **(R3)**
- (k) There should be flexibility in deciding the location of the refuse collection point on G/F. **(R3)**
- (l) It is necessary to clarify whether the existing tree cluster needs to be maintained as this would have implications on the extent of the basement. **(R3)**
- (m) Flexibility should be allowed in the design of vehicular ramps in the basement of the site. **(R3)**

Traffic Arrangements

- (n) Modifications to the vehicular traffic arrangements on G/F should be made to improve efficiency and enhance public safety. The southern section of Tamar Street is proposed to be turned into a one-way northbound carriageway to minimize conflicting traffic movements. The bus lane at the centre of the site is proposed to be relocated to the eastbound carriageway of Drake Street while the carriageway in the northern part of the site is proposed to be used by taxis and general traffic. **(R3)** (Please refer to Drawing 3 of Appendix A of **R3**'s submission)
- (o) Temporary traffic arrangements should be considered including the temporary relocation of the taxi ranks to an area near Lippo Centre;

the temporary closure of MTR Exit C2; and the rerouting of bus access to United Centre. Government should also allow flexibility in the provision of pedestrian connections to surrounding developments during the construction period by specifying only the main connection points rather than the alignment of the temporary pedestrian link. **(R3)**

4.3 Adverse Representations

Grounds of Representations

MRMCP (Amendment A)

4.3.1 The major grounds of the adverse representations in relation to the MRMCP site (**Amendment Item A**) are as follows:

- (a) The existing MRMCP should be retained on grounds including adverse impacts on traffic and air ventilation and car park provision. These are summarized together with other grounds in the following paragraphs. **(R5, R6, R9 to R12, R14 to R59, R62 to R64)**

Traffic Impact

- (b) The redevelopment will aggravate pedestrian and vehicular traffic. **(R53 to R63)** The provision of new parking facilities will exacerbate traffic congestion in the area. Private cars should not be encouraged to enter the area. **(R5, R6, R10 to R12)**
- (c) The redevelopment will draw cars south of Connaught Road and aggravate the traffic congestion. The "Park-n-walk strategy" should be adopted to reduce traffic south of Connaught Road i.e. park in the north of Connaught Road and walk to the south of Connaught Road. **(R65)**
- (d) Insufficient information has been provided to the Board as the MPC paper only provided a summary of the traffic impact assessment (TIA). Trip generations/ attractions, pedestrian/ traffic surveys and junction calculation sheets should also be provided. **(R67)**

Car Park Provision

- (e) The MRMCP currently provides parking facilities for the Central Business District. There are different views on the level of car parking provision at MRMCP upon its redevelopment.
- (f) **R7, R8, R10 to R63** consider that there would be a reduction in car parking space provision upon redevelopment. This will cause on-street illegal parking **(R14, R53 to R63)** and inconvenience to the public. **(R7, R8 & R13)**
- (g) **R65** considers the early closure of the MRMCP will aggravate the

shortage of car parking spaces in Central for 4-5 years. It contradicts the strategy to reduce traffic congestion in Central, including the plan to impose electronic road pricing (ERP). The suggestion that car parking spaces available in Cheung Kong Centre will be a suitable replacement is unrealistic.

- (h) However, **R65** and **R66** opine that the provision of 69 motorcycle and 102 public car parking spaces after the rezoning is excessive and does not help to address the problem of traffic congestion in Central District. Since the Government plans to implement the ERP Scheme, the provision of car parking spaces should be reduced in the redevelopment project to encourage drivers to use public transportation. (**R66**)
- (i) **R5, R6, R9, R10** to **R12** suggest retaining the existing car park should be retained if the ERP Scheme is implemented, as it would be an important car park at the periphery of the Central Business District.
- (j) The MPC Paper proposed a total of 250 car parking spaces, which is more than the 102 car parking spaces proposed in the TIA. (**R67**)

Pedestrian Connection

- (k) When there are currently 2 elevated public walkways at the site, explanation should be provided on why only one elevated public walkway will be re-provisioned. (**R67**)

Air Pollution

- (l) Traffic congestion would worsen the air pollution which would bring negative impacts to Hong Kong's economy. (**R66**)

Air Ventilation Impact

- (m) The redevelopment of the site into a tower block up to 190mPD would cause adverse air ventilation impact. It will cause a wall effect and the blocking of airflow. The serious wall effect would worsen the canyon effect. (**R5, R6, R9** to **R63**)
- (n) Incorrect information is provided in the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) in that the "Scheme under Study" in the AVA is not 190mPD and the result of the AVA cannot reflect the real situation of the local wind environment after redevelopment. (**R67**)

Visual Impact

- (o) There is a technical error in the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) in that it cannot be demonstrated that an assessment area equal to approximately 3 times the overall building height of the subject development was adopted, as required by the VIA assessment guidelines. (**R67**)

Loss of Community Facilities

- (p) The loss of community facilities is not compensated for. The public's need for land to provide community and public facilities are disregarded. (R7 & R8)

Supply of Grade-A Offices

- (q) No information on the supply and demand of Grade-A office is provided. (R7 & R8)

QP (Amendment B1 to B3)

4.3.2 The major grounds of the adverse representations in relation to the QP site (**Amendment Items B1, B2 and B3**) are as follows:

- (a) The existing developments should be retained on grounds of adverse impacts on various aspects, including traffic and air ventilation, road layout, provision and design of public open space (POS). (R5, R6, R10 to R12, R15 to R59, R62 to R64) The existing at-grade POS should also be retained. (R13 to R52, R54 to R64) The main grounds of the representers are summarised below.

Traffic Impact

- (b) The increase in pedestrian and vehicular traffic arising from the new office development would worsen traffic congestion and pollution. (R7 to R63) The proposed commercial use would attract more traffic. Also, the opening of the Central-Wanchai Bypass may not be effective in diverting the traffic generated by the redevelopment project. The additional traffic brought by the proposed 5 storeys of basement would also add to air pollution in this locality. (R68)
- (c) The redevelopment of the site for commercial use would worsen the issue of picking-up and dropping-off passengers along Queensway. (R63)

Road Layout

- (d) The existing lay-by and road design should be retained and **Amendment Item B3** is unnecessary. There is no reason to change the current road design if the Board does not approve the proposed OZP amendments. (R5, R6 and R10 to R12) Besides, the proposed additional lay-by at Rodney Street will only encourage illegal parking and add to the traffic congestion. (R10 to R12)
- (e) The traffic circulation pattern is not well illustrated. The irregular shaped junction between Tamar Street and Drake Street would be a point of great conflict. (R68)
- (f) The existing public transport interchange (PTI) and related facilities

should be improved. **(R68)**

Pedestrian Connections

- (g) There may be constraints in providing a pedestrian footbridge around Admiralty Centre to connect with Tamar. There is no clear illustration of barrier free access and the vertical movement of pedestrians. **(R68)** The pedestrian connection and circulation upon redevelopment is not clearly shown. **(R67)**
- (h) The provision for pedestrians is inadequate. The analysis in the TIA about the pedestrian flows on vertical access points at AM and PM peak hours are at comfort levels of D and E which are not acceptable. **(R68)**
- (i) The increase in office floorspace would attract more commuters and aggravate the already over-crowded situation at Admiralty MTR Station. **(R14, R53 to R63)** The Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited should be consulted as the redevelopment would affect the existing and planned railway projects and railway alignment. **(R67)** The additional MTR lines would bring traffic chaos and more commuters to the district. **(R9)**

Loss of Public Open Space and Community Facilities

- (j) The proposal would result in the loss of at-grade open space for public enjoyment. **(R7, R8, R9, R50)** The loss of at-grade open space and greenery is poor planning which does not serve the interests of Hong Kong people. **(R50)**
- (k) The proposed at-grade POS of 1,600m² and indoor atrium space to be provided upon redevelopment would only serve as a pedestrian walkway or a spot for advertising/promotion activities rather than a quality public space. **(R13 to R63)**
- (l) The proposed landscape podium may not be user-friendly as gardens at upper-levels are inaccessible and unpopular. **(R68)** The proposed podium garden would only provide miserable and shadeless areas with low usage rates or transformed into a commercial facility with refreshment counters and for staging exhibitions and promotion. **(R9)**
- (m) Part of the POS to be reprovided is in the form of a covered open space and is not supported. **(R9, R13, R15 to R63)** The redevelopment project would aggravate the shadowing effects over the existing spaces and affect the quality of space at the pedestrian level. **(R68)** Recreation and seating facilities in QP including those on the ground floor and the roof level should be improved. The current open space including Admiralty Garden should be enhanced. **(R5, R6, R10 to R12)** The provision of at-grade open space near the congested traffic is not preferable as it may become a health hazard due to the heavy traffic on road. The area reserved for

at-grade open space should be utilised to ease traffic congestion and the open space should be provided at overhead decks away from roadside traffic. **(R70)**

- (n) The community facilities and open space provision in Admiralty is poor. **(R5, R6, R10 to R12)** The current open space should be enhanced with the provision of display spaces and information boards to explain the history of the Admiralty area. **(R5 & R6)**
- (o) There is no information on the future management of the proposed open space. **(R67)**

Tree Felling and Greening

- (p) There are numerous trees in Admiralty Garden providing urban greening acting as a balance against the congested traffic conditions. There are no details on the no. of trees to be felled to make way for the proposed redevelopment. **(R10 to R63)** There is also no information on the compensatory planting to be provided. **(R13 to R63)**
- (q) The proposed greening coverage of 30% is inadequate. **(R13 to R63)**
- (r) A greener Central Business District should be promoted and roadside planting should be encouraged. A complete tree survey report and comprehensive compensatory planting plan should be provided. Demonstration on how to match the Central Greening Master Plan should be provided. **(R69)**

Visual and Urban Design

- (s) The redevelopment proposal for QP is excessive, arbitrary and incompatible with the surrounding existing buildings. The massing of the proposed development would be out of place from the urban design point of view. Not all space in the urban area need to be filled up. **(R68)** The redevelopment will increase the urban density. **(R7 and R8)** Building another high-rise block at the QP site would make the environment at Admiralty more congested. **(R51)**
- (t) The existing building height of QP should be provided to compare and assess the visual implications. **(R67)** No illustration is provided to highlight the interface of the redevelopment project with the existing Admiralty Centre. **(R68)**
- (u) The selection of the view corridor from the East Wing of the CGO to the western portion of QP site is inappropriate as the view would be blocked by CGO. Another view corridor should be considered for assessment. A view corridor along Tim Wa Avenue passing through the podium of Far East Finance Building and the western portion of the QP site should be adopted for the VIA. **(R70)**

Air Ventilation

- (v) The redevelopment of the site into a tower block up to 200mPD will cause adverse impact on air ventilation. It would cause wall effect and canyon effect. The original low-rise QP provides breathing space for the area, allowing airflow and sea breezes from Tamar on to the business section of Admiralty. The redevelopment of QP would block the breezes that flow from the harbourfront to Central District through the 'Open Door' breezeway provided by the CGO. **(R5 to R63)**

Others

- (w) Explanation for not incorporating the provision of car parking spaces in the Notes of "C" zone should be provided. **(R67)**
- (x) No information is provided to address the water and air nuisance generated by the new refuse collection point. The 'Refuse Collection Point' to be specified as Column 1 use should be justified. **(R67)**
- (y) The proposed redevelopment scheme should be subject to public engagement. **(R68)**
- (z) The problem of inadequate eating places and long queues during lunch hour in Admiralty would be exacerbated. **(R63)**
- (aa) 'Commercial Bathhouse/Massage Establishment' should not be included as a Column 1 use or Column 2 use of the "OU(Elevated Walkway cum Retail Use)" zone as it is incompatible with the retail use. **(R67)**
- (bb) The restriction of non-domestic GFA and the requirement of the pedestrian connection should be stipulated in the "OU(Elevated Walkway cum Retail Use)" zone. **(R67)**
- (cc) Explanation for not submitting the planning brief and Master Layout Plan (MLP) at this stage to the Board for consideration should be provided. **(R67)**
- (dd) The area of "OU" should be updated in the ES. **(R67)**
- (ee) The splayed façade would likely cause an adverse glare impact on motorists and pedestrians. **(R68)**

Representer's Proposals

- 4.3.3 **R5, R6 and R10 to R12** proposed that the western part of the existing Queensway Plaza should be rezoned from an area shown as 'Road' and "Commercial" to "OU" annotated "Elevated Walkway cum Information & History Display Spaces & Information Boards" and the existing building height of Queensway Plaza and Walkway should be specified as the

maximum building height of the site.

- 4.3.4 **R9** proposed to develop QP into a low-rise entertainment node built around an open courtyard and a community meeting place with a direct connection to Tamar Park.
- 4.3.5 **R65** proposes that the sale of MRMCP should be deferred until new parking spaces have been completed to the north of the Connaught Road corridor and the pedestrian connections across Connaught Road corridor have been enhanced. Moreover, the car parking provision for the site should be reduced for consistency with the plan to reduce congestion and impose ERP in Central.
- 4.3.6 **R66** proposes to reduce the number of public car parking spaces and public motorcycle parking spaces required to be provided at the MRMCP site and a maximum amount of parking spaces rather than the minimum should be stipulated.
- 4.3.7 **R70** proposes to delete “(not less than 1,400m² of which should be at-grade)” under the Notes of “C(4)” zone in order to provide more flexibility on how the open space should be provided.

4.4 Representations Providing Views

Grounds of Representations

- 4.4.1 There are two representations (**R71** & **R72**) providing views on all the amendment items. The Chairman, C&WDC (**R71**) provided both supporting and opposing views. Some views indicated support for more commercial land on the condition that the traffic and environmental issues should be addressed first and other views supported the proposed direct pedestrian connection to the CGO, but raised concern on the aggravation of the traffic problem and requested a solution to address the shortage of parking spaces in Central District and information on the supply and demand of offices. He was also concerned that the reprovisioning of car parking spaces at MRMCPs cannot meet the car parking demand, whether the existing government departments in MRMCP can be relocated, and whether any benefits to the community such as green space could be provided. His concerns related to QP include the bus rerouting proposal and adverse traffic, air ventilation and visual impacts.
- 4.4.2 **R72** raised concern on the provision of affordable eating places in Admiralty after the redevelopments.

Representer's Proposals

- 4.4.3 **R72** proposed to provide a minimum floor area for cafés and restaurants at the QP redevelopment.

5. Comments on Representations

- 5.1 Among the 14 comments on representations received, 7 supported the **Amendment Item B1 (C2 to C8)**; 3 objected to all the Amendment Items (**C1, C9 and C10**) on various grounds including the car parking provision, pedestrian connection, adverse impacts on traffic and air ventilation; and 4 provided various views on the Amendment Items (**C11 to C14**) including the provision of green coverage, the design and management of the POS, pedestrian connection, road layout, procedure of road gazette and adverse impacts on traffic air ventilation and visual. A full set of comments on representations is at **Annex IV** and the summary of the comments and PlanD's responses is at **Annex VI**.

6. Planning Consideration and Assessment

- 6.1 The Representation Sites and its Surrounding Areas (**Plans H-1 to H-2 and H-6, aerial photo on Plans H-3 and H-7, site photos on Plans H-4 and H-8**)

MRMCP (Amendment Item A)

- 6.1.1 The MRMCP is a government building located at Murray Road with a site area of about 2,780m². It is currently a 10-storey high building which comprises Government offices, a public car park (with a total of 388 car parking spaces and 55 motorcycle parking spaces in 5 storeys) and a public toilet. The site is situated in the core commercial district and is surrounded by several high-rise buildings, namely Bank of China Tower, Fairmount House, Bank of America Tower, Hutchison House, and AIA Central. To its immediate north is Lambeth Walk Rest Garden and to its west is Chater Garden. The site abuts Murray Road and Queensway. Access to the existing building is from Lambeth Walk.

QP (Amendment Items B1 to B3)

- 6.1.2 The QP site is located at a prime location in Admiralty which is bounded by Queensway to the south, Tamar Street to the west and Drake Street to the north. The Site adjoins United Centre to the east. With an area of about 6,699m², it is surrounded by a number of high-rise commercial buildings with offices, retail shops and hotels including Admiralty Centre to the north, Lippo Centre to the west, Far East Finance Centre to the northwest and Pacific Place to the south. The Site is on top of the MTR Admiralty Station.

- 6.2 Planning Intention

- 6.2.1 The planning intentions of "C(3)", "C(4)" and "OU(Elevated Walkway cum Retail Uses)" zones in relation to the amendment items above are as follows:

- (a) The "C(3)" and "C(4)" zones are intended primarily for commercial developments, which may include uses such as office, shop, services, place of entertainment, eating place and hotel, functioning as territorial business/financial centre(s) and regional or district

commercial/shopping centre(s). These areas are usually major employment nodes.

- (b) The “OU(Elevated Walkway cum Retail Uses)” zone is intended primarily for the provision of an elevated walkway with retail uses.

6.3 Responses to Representations

Supportive Representations

- 6.3.1 The supportive views of representations **R1** to **R4** are noted. PlanD’s responses to the general proposals of **R1** to **R4** are set out in the paragraphs below.

Land Use Mix (MRMCP and QP)

- 6.3.2 The MRMCP and QP sites are located within the central business district. The amendment items are in line with the 2014 Policy Address which stated that the Government will increase land supply for commercial and business uses in the existing business district in Central. The planning intention of both sites is for commercial development. According to the Notes of the OZP, there are a number of Column 1 uses that are always permitted within “C(3)” and “C(4)” zones. In this regard, adequate flexibility has already been provided for the future developer to decide on the mix of use (i.e. office, retail and eating place) for the future development.
- 6.3.3 Residential use, serviced apartments and other social uses, while not incompatible with the commercial uses, are not in line with the intention to increase land supply for commercial development.

Linkage to Surrounding Area (MRMCP and QP)

- 6.3.4 There are now extensive footbridges/linkages among the existing buildings in the area and the redevelopment of MRMCP and QP would not affect the existing linkages. Commissioner for Transport (C for T) considers the existing linkages sufficient. In addition, the Government is examining the feasibility of providing a new footbridge to connect the site with the Tamar footbridge, extending the elevated walkway system to CGO and the harbourfront.
- 6.3.5 With respect to the detailed proposals regarding QP redevelopment put forth by **R3**, the responses are set out below:

Control Mechanism

- 6.3.6 The main development parameters including the maximum building height, maximum site coverage and the required provision of POS are already stipulated in the Notes of the OZP to provide guidance on the implementation of the proposed development at QP.
- 6.3.7 A Planning and Design Brief (PDB) is being prepared to guide the design

and development of the site. It would set out clearly the design principles and the basic design parameters and requirements to ensure that the salient planning and design issues would be addressed in the future redevelopment yet allowing flexibility to cater for innovative design according to the site circumstances. The PDB will be attached to the land sale document. It will be specified under the lease that a MLP making reference to the PDB shall be submitted by the respective developer(s) to the Government to ensure an integrated and compatible layout for the development at the site before development proceeds. The PDB will be submitted to the Board for consideration, taking into account suitable points raised by the representers and the views of the Board.

Pedestrian Connections and Interface with MTR facilities

- 6.3.8 The future developers would be required to maintain pedestrian connectivity with the surrounding developments including Pacific Place, United Centre, Harcourt Garden, Admiralty Centre, Far East Finance Centre, Queensway Walkway and Lippo Centre and all the way to Central through the existing walkways during both the construction period and upon completion of the development.
- 6.3.9 The future development is required to provide a direct and barrier-free connection between the MTR concourse and the basement of the future development and with all existing footbridges and MTR exits. The connection point with MTR concourse, as agreed with MTRCL, will be specified in the lease.
- 6.3.10 The future development is required to avoid encroaching onto the existing MTR facilities within the site; but the development can be built above, adjacent to and under the MTR facilities.
- 6.3.11 Subject to further study, a new footbridge is proposed to connect the site with the Tamar footbridge, extending the elevated walkway system to the CGO and the harbourfront. The Government is exploring the technical feasibility of the footbridge and yet to decide on the implementation. If the new footbridge is in place, the extended elevated walkway system would be enhanced to provide direct connection at elevated level from the High Court to the CGO.

Internal Transport Facilities

- 6.3.12 C for T considered it necessary to provide adequate internal transport facilities, i.e. car parking spaces and loading/unloading bays, for the redevelopment of QP based on HKPSG to ensure that the future commercial developments would have sufficient internal transport facilities to match manifest operational requirements.

Site Coverage Calculation

- 6.3.13 The recommended development scheme formulated under the QP Study has demonstrated a workable scheme with site coverage not exceeding the 65% limit with all footbridge connections included for site coverage

calculations. In any case, the site coverage is determined in accordance with the Building (Planning) Regulations and the granting of exemption from the site coverage calculation shall be subject to the approval of the Building Authority. Should the future developer propose a more favourable scheme with a site coverage exceeding the 65% limit, there is flexibility under the existing mechanism to apply for a minor relaxation of the planning control.

Covered Open Space

- 6.3.14 Whilst not precluding the provision of covered open space to suit site circumstances, in the design of the POS, a more important consideration is on the function and overall integration of the covered portion with the remaining POS and the building development. The suggestion to stipulate a maximum percentage of covered open space in the ES of the OZP is considered not necessary. Rather, the PDB will set out clearly the principles that need to be considered in the design of the POS, including integration with the proposed development, adoption of high landscape quality and maximization of greening areas. In formulating the MLP and Landscape Master Plan (LMP), the future developer is required to observe the '*Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines*' promulgated by Development Bureau and should endeavour to create quality POS of high visibility and usability. It will be up to the future developer to demonstrate that the design of the POS including the extent of the covered portion is acceptable, taking into account the design objective, site constraint, and the function of the covered space.

Other Design Requirements

- 6.3.15 The PDB for the QP site will set out the design principles and the basic parameters including, inter alia, provision of special design feature such as atrium design to create focal point at the intersection of pedestrian routes at the main elevated walkway level, re-provisioning of the existing RCP as per the standards in terms of dimension and vehicular access design as required by FEHD, safeguarding the designated Tree Protection Zone and in-situ preservation of the OVT and mature trees within the zone, etc. Flexibility will be allowed to cater for innovative design according to the site circumstances. While specifying a minimum site requirement for the atrium could be considered, a 8m high headroom for the atrium may be too restrictive for innovative building design. The layout of the internal vehicular ramp, the exact location of the RCP, or the design and configuration of other design features will be subject to detailed design of the future development.

Traffic Arrangements

- 6.3.16 Regarding the road layout within and surrounding the site, C for T is of the view that the representer's proposal of relocating the bus lane to the eastbound carriageway of Drake Street will impose serious conflicting movement with the taxis leaving the taxi stand and result in loss of a bus stop and bus stacking bays.

6.3.17 From the bus operation point of view, the following problems on bus operation are envisaged from the proposed re-routing of the existing bus routes:

- (a) Currently, the bus bay to the south of the taxi stand is a terminating bus stop for bus routes 590A and 90B. Three to four buses are required to be stacked at the bus stop for normal bus operation. Without any re-provisioning location of bus stops in the proposal, the bus operation will be significantly affected in an adverse manner;
- (b) The current traffic at Admiralty (East) PTI and Admiralty (West) PTI is already very congested. Bus companies would review the existing bus stop arrangements at Admiralty (East) PTI, Admiralty (West) PTI and the bus bay to the south of the taxi stand. It is anticipated that more bus stops may be relocated to that bus bay. The proposed deletion of the existing bus stop without re-provisioning will further aggravate the adverse situation for bus operation; and
- (c) The traffic on Drake Street is congested. It is anticipated that there would be traffic conflicts between the buses turning from Drake Street to Admiralty (East) PTI and the long taxi queue at the taxi stand thereat causing adverse impact on bus operation.

6.3.18 Moreover, the re-routing proposal does not address the impact or provide rectification measures of (1) the deletion of the existing loading and unloading bay; (2) the induced traffic impact on the already very congested Drake Street and possible obstruction to taxi stand operation and existing loading/unloading activities; and (3) the practicality of maneuvering long buses (12.8m) and sharp turning from Drake Street to the Admiralty (East) PTI.

6.3.19 Regarding the temporary traffic arrangement, the future developer will be required under the lease to conduct a TIA for construction traffic, which should include assessment on pedestrian, vehicular traffic and public transport facilities and recommendation on the temporary traffic arrangement during the construction stage, to the satisfaction of C for T.

Adverse Representations

MRMCP (Amendment A)

Traffic Impact

6.3.20 A TIA was conducted for the MRMCP site to ascertain the traffic impact of the proposed development. To estimate the number of public parking spaces required for private cars and motor cycles after the redevelopment of the MRMCP, the TIA examined the parking demand against parking supply for a reasonable walking catchment area (i.e. within 300m away from the MRMCP). Factors such as the current parking utilization of adjacent public parking spaces (i.e. Star Ferry Car Park, City Hall Car Park, Cheung Kong Centre/ICBC/Citibank Car Parks), new

developments/redevelopments in the study area which were known at the time of conducting the TIA and the growth of traffic flow, etc. were considered. The TIA concluded that there would be a shortfall of 102 nos. and 69 nos. public parking spaces for private cars and motor cycles respectively in 2024. Moreover, the commercial development would itself generate the need for about 150 private car parking spaces. In this regard, a minimum of 250 car parking spaces is recommended to be provided at the site.

- 6.3.21 It was estimated that the proposed traffic trips generated from the redevelopment during AM and PM peak periods are 203 pcu/hr (two-way) and 158 pcu/hr (two-way) respectively. The TIA revealed that all identified critical junctions will perform satisfactorily in the design years and concluded that the future proposed development would not cause any adverse traffic impact to the surrounding road network.
- 6.3.22 There are existing pedestrian facilities at various locations across Connaught Road Central (i.e. connecting north of Connaught Road Central and south of Connaught Road Central) for public to choose from. Together with the existing and future car parking facilities both to the north and south of Connaught Road Central and the existing extended public transport network, there is adequate flexibility for the public to choose whether to “park-n-walk” or to take public transport.
- 6.3.23 The summary of TIA enclosed in the MPC Paper has provided the key findings and conclusions of the assessment to the public. The full TIA report containing existing vehicular and pedestrian traffic data; the assumptions on vehicular and pedestrian traffic growth and the junction capacity assessments under various scenarios had been deposited at the TPB Secretariat for members’ inspection when the proposed amendments were submitted to the MPC for consideration on 20.11.2015.

Car Park Provision

- 6.3.24 Although 388 public car parking spaces are currently provided at the site, the TIA conducted for the site indicated that the provision of 102 public car parking spaces at the MRMCP site is appropriate to meet the parking demand. Besides, an additional 150 private car parking spaces will be provided to serve the commercial development at the site.
- 6.3.25 The TIA estimated that there would be an interim shortage of public parking spaces for private cars and motor cycles respectively (i.e. between the decommissioning and reprovision of public parking spaces in MRMCP) within the reasonable walking catchment area of the MRMCP site. Due to the stringent physical constraints, there is no suitable location to provide temporary public car parking spaces. However, the public can still use the public parking spaces for private cars and/or motor cycles in the vicinity of the MRMCP such as City Hall Car Park, Star Ferry Car Park, Cheung Kong Centre/ICBC/Citibank Car Park and Admiralty Car Park. Moreover, Transport Department (TD) will continue to explore and provide on-street parking spaces for motor cycles where appropriate.

6.3.26 ERP is a traffic management tool to tackle localized road traffic congestion. It aims to rationalize vehicular flows in targeted areas during traffic congestion periods by levying appropriate charges on vehicles using the roads in the areas. The objective of an ERP scheme is to provide a disincentive to vehicle users so that they will use their vehicles less in making trips to the charging area in peak hours and switch to public transport, and / or make their trips to the charging area in non-peak hours. In planning the ERP pilot scheme, the Government will explore appropriate complementary measures which could encourage and facilitate drivers or passengers to make better use of public transport, or to travel to the charging area during non-peak hours. According to TD, some members of the public or stakeholders expressed that more parking spaces should be provided at the periphery of the charging area of the ERP pilot scheme as one of the complementary measures. But there are voices that car parking spaces should be reduced to suit the Government's plan to implement the ERP Pilot Scheme. The Government will examine the need of this proposed complementary measure with reference to all relevant public views on car parking provisions and the objectives of the ERP Pilot Scheme under the feasibility study of ERP pilot scheme separately. The proposed commercial development at MRMCP would not pre-empt the implementation of the ERP.

Pedestrian Connection

6.3.27 According to the ES of the OZP, the MRMCP site will form an important pedestrian connection linking the commercial developments in Admiralty and Central by means of a footbridge network. In this regard, the future development is required to maintain the same level of linkage with the adjoining footbridge network. MRMCP is currently connected on 4 sides to the existing footbridge system. The future development will be required to retain connecting points on the 4 sides of the development to the footbridge system.

Air Pollution

6.3.28 The findings of the TIA for MRMCP suggested that there is no adverse traffic impact from the proposed developments and that the proposal would not cause any traffic congestion. In this connection, Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) considers that it is unlikely to have adverse environmental impact from the induced traffic flow.

Air Ventilation Impact

6.3.29 Two schemes have been tested under the AVA study for the MRMCP site. The details of the two schemes (i.e. Scheme 1 and Scheme 2) are provided in Attachment IV to MPC Paper No. 12/15. Scheme 1 has a 60% site coverage and building height of 147.5mPD; while Scheme 2 consists of a development at 100% coverage for podium with building height of 129.5mPD. The AVA identified a good design direction and concluded that the building height of the development is of secondary importance in terms of air ventilation performance and that a development with smaller

footprint and more setback from site boundary would perform better from the air ventilation standpoint as slimmer buildings would help to reduce potential blockage. The current site coverage and building height restrictions imposed for the site are generally in line with the AVA findings.

- 6.3.30 The proposed MRMCP at 190mPD has also been incorporated and modelled in the AVA for the QP Study. Cumulative impacts of the proposed developments on the pedestrian wind environment have been evaluated and no significant adverse air ventilation impacts are noted.

Visual Impact

- 6.3.31 The visual appraisal was undertaken in accordance with the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Submission of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board TPB PG-No.41. As specified in Para. 4.3 of the Guidelines, the assessment area is expected to cover the area of influence within which the proposed development is pronouncedly visible from key sensitive viewers. The extent of the assessment for VIA would vary case by case depending on the size of development, the site context and the distance and location of the sensitive viewers. While a distance equal to 3 times the height of the building is usually adopted as initial reference in approximating the extent of the assessment area, the boundary of assessment will be refined taking into account the view from areas with direct sightlines to the site.

Loss of Community Facilities

- 6.3.32 There are a few G/IC facilities on MRMCP, including government offices, a public toilet and a public car park. Relevant management/maintenance departments have been consulted and it was confirmed that only a public car park will need to be reprovisioned. The future developments will incorporate the reprovisioning facility accordingly. Government departments have no other specific facility requirement for the site.

Supply of Grade-A Offices

- 6.3.33 According to the 2015 Policy Address, the demand of economic activities for office, retailing, hotel, trading and logistics space is huge. The Government will continue to increase the commercial and economic land supply through measures such as converting non-location bound suitable GIC sites in core business districts into commercial use.
- 6.3.34 The vacancy rate of Grade-A offices in Central is low. According to the “Hong Kong Property Review 2016” published by Rating and Valuation Department, the vacancy rate of Grade-A offices in Central decreased from 6.5% in 2005 to 5.4% in 2015, which is lower than the overall vacancy rate in Hong Kong Island (5.6%) and that in the territory (7.8%). Moreover, the average rents of Grade-A offices in Central increased drastically from \$410/m² in 2005 to \$1030/m² in 2015. These reflect the shortage in supply and the demand for offices in the Central Business District.

QP (Amendment B1 to B3)

Traffic Impact

- 6.3.35 Under the QP Study, a TIA has been undertaken. It was confirmed that, with suitable mitigation measure in place (i.e. the prohibition of loading and unloading activities within the site during peak hours viz. 7am to 10am and 4pm to 7pm), the proposed development would not cause significant adverse traffic impact to the surrounding road network.
- 6.3.36 To improve the vehicular and pedestrian circulation of the Admiralty area, TD has completed the Admiralty Traffic Study in 2012 to identify improvement schemes. The ground floor vehicular circulation, re-organisation of loading/unloading and the general pick-up/drop-off points as recommended under the traffic study have been implemented and are in general adopted in the QP Study with slight modifications to cater for the redevelopment. Adequate loading and unloading and car parking spaces would be provided within the QP site in accordance with the HKPSG.

Road Layout

- 6.3.37 **Amendment Item B3** is to reflect the existing bus lay-by between the QP and Queensway from “O” to an area shown as ‘Road’. The existing bus lay-by will be retained and the road design would not be changed.
- 6.3.38 According to C for T, the additional loading bay at Rodney Street is to cater for the pick-up and drop-off activities for vehicle and will facilitate access to the elevated walkway system and the Admiralty MTR Station via the elevator to be provided upon the opening of the South Island Line (East).
- 6.3.39 The road layout proposed under the QP Study has taken on board the road layout for the area (including the junction between Tamar Street and Drake Street) as recommended under the Admiralty Traffic Study completed by TD in 2012 with some minor modifications to cater for the QP redevelopment. The design of the road junction and the ingress/egress of the QP site comply with the Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM).
- 6.3.40 C for T will ensure that the PTI will be designed in accordance with the latest design standard.

Pedestrian Connections

- 6.3.41 Study will be undertaken to investigate the feasibility of the proposed footbridge to connect the site with Tamar Footbridge and associated barrier free access facilities. The pedestrian connection and circulation upon redevelopment is covered in the MPC paper. Plan 9 of the MPC paper illustrates a schematic temporary arrangement to cater for pedestrian circulation in the area during construction at the site. The future development is required to provide suitable facilities to maintain

pedestrian connectivity with the MTR Exits and the adjoining developments at elevated level including Admiralty Centre, United Centre, Pacific Place, Lippo Centre, Far East Finance Centre, the East Walkway to Harcourt Garden.

- 6.3.42 According to the TIA undertaken in the QP Study which has taken into account the further operation of the MTR Lines under construction (including South Island Line (East) and Shatin-Central Link), the performance of all MTR entrances and footbridges in and around the site will be operating at an adequate level except the proposed vertical access point near MTR Exit C1 upon completion of the proposed development. The future developer is required to provide a direct underground barrier-free pedestrian connection between the MTR station concourse and the basement floor of the proposed development. It will help divert part of the pedestrian flow through the development to the elevated walkway level and improve the pedestrian traffic at the proposed vertical access near MTR Exit C1.
- 6.3.43 MTRCL was consulted during the course of the QP Study and had no comments on the proposed redevelopment at the QP site.

Loss of Public Open Space and Community Facilities

- 6.3.44 The existing Admiralty Garden has a site area of 1,700m². To compensate for the loss of this open space, the future developer is required to provide POS of not less than 2,100m² including at-grade open space of 1,400m². During previous consultations in the course of the QP Study, there were different public views on the location of POS at-grade or at upper levels for different considerations. The Study recommended the provision of an at-grade POS of not less than 1,400m² and to be integrated with the OVT preserved in-situ at the site. The rooftop garden of the Queensway Walkway will also be enhanced for public enjoyment. To ensure enhancement of the amenity of the area, the future development is required to provide at least 30% greening in the POS area. To ensure a quality POS design, the PDB would set out the design principles and parameters including design integration with the proposed development and surrounding pedestrian connections, provision of visual and physical connection with the rooftop POS above Queensway Walkway, etc. The requirement to submit LMP for Government's approval will be incorporated into the lease.
- 6.3.45 The proposed provision of at-grade POS of not less than 1,400m² is conducive to creating an entrance plaza to complement the building to be erected at the site, enhance the visual amenity at street level, and provide a suitable environment for preservation of the existing OVT and adjoining trees in situ. The trees could add to the visual appeal of the at-grade POS and provide buffer from the roads. The future developer is required to design and integrate the POS (including the above-grade POS) with the proposed development and surrounding pedestrian connections in accordance with the design principles and guidelines as set out in the PDB.

- 6.3.46 On the detailed design of the POS, the future developer is required to observe the 'Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines' promulgated by Development Bureau and endeavour to provide quality POS of high visibility and usability.
- 6.3.47 There is about 14.4 ha open space in Central District OZP, generally in line with the provision standard in HKPSG. Most of the community facilities have a location preference for being close to residential developments for their target users. As such, there are less community facilities in Admiralty, a business area.
- 6.3.48 The future developer will be required to manage and maintain the POS within the site.

Tree Felling and Greening

- 6.3.49 A tree survey was conducted under the QP Study. 45 existing trees were recorded within the site comprising 25 native and exotic species, including one registered OVT. The study recommends retaining 11 nos. trees including the OVT, transplanting 7 nos. trees and felling 25 nos. trees. A tree protection zone is designated to protect the OVT and its adjoining mature trees. The future developer is required to preserve the trees within the zone, and to submit a tree survey and tree preservation proposal as part of the LMP.
- 6.3.50 The future development will be required to have a minimum coverage of 30% for greening within the POS and maximise tree planting opportunities. The requirement of minimum 30% coverage for greening with the POS is in line with the 'Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines'.
- 6.3.51 The QP Study recommends provision of a 'green link' connecting the future development at QP site to Chater Garden via the preserved Queensway Walkway and its roof-top open space and to Harcourt Garden via the existing East Walkway with possible greening enhancement. The future developer is also required to maximise greening opportunities within the proposed development and design.
- 6.3.52 In formulating the LMP, the future developer is required to observe the 'Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines' promulgated by Development Bureau and should accordingly make reference to the GMP developed by CEDD, to complement the greening theme and concept for the Admiralty area.

Visual and Urban Design

- 6.3.53 The redevelopment proposal for QP for commercial use is set within a cluster of high-rise commercial developments. It is not incompatible with the surrounding developments in terms of scale and height. The future development is subject to a maximum site coverage of 65% to allow opportunities to enhance visual openness and amenity at street level. In addition, it is required to set back 5.5m, 7.5m and 15m from Drake

Street, United Centre and Tamar Street respectively to allow wider separation from adjoining developments to enhance air and visual permeability. In addition, at least 30% of the public open space area within the site will be provided for greening to add to the amenity of the area.

- 6.3.54 The existing QP has been included in the photomontages in the VIA for comparison with the proposed redevelopment. The future development is subject to a setback requirement of 5.5m from the northern site boundary for a minimum 15m separation from Admiralty Centre to enhance air and visual permeability.
- 6.3.55 The QP Study has not adopted a view corridor from the East Wing of the CGO to the western portion of QP as claimed by representer **R70**. In fact, the design concept of the CGO emphasises a sense of openness with an iconic built form designed to ensure visual connection between the waterfront and the hinterland. It allows a visual corridor from Tamar Park through the opening of the building to the green mountain backdrop. The visual corridor from Tamar Park has been taken on board and safeguarded in the proposed Scheme under the QP Study. The alternative view corridor along Tim Wa Avenue suggested by representer **R70** will not be affected by the QP redevelopment.

Air Ventilation Impact

- 6.3.56 The future development is subject to site coverage and set back requirements as mentioned in Para. 6.3.53 above to allow wider separation from adjoining developments and increase the overall permeability.
- 6.3.57 Under the QP Study, an AVA Study was conducted using Computational Fluid Dynamics on three scenarios, namely the Baseline Scenario (i.e. the existing condition), Scheme A (a tower building of 203mPD atop a 26mPD high podium with terraced open space) and Scheme B (a tower building of 185mPD atop a 26mPD high podium with an elevated plaza) at Queensway. According to the simulation results, Scheme A and Scheme B had only a marginal effect on the local wind environment when compared against the Baseline Scenario. This is mainly due to the fact that Queensway is already highly sheltered by the surrounding buildings. Any increase in building height and massing at the site would only have limited effect on the pedestrian wind environment in its immediate vicinity. The recommended scheme of the QP Study is an improvement scheme with a further reduced building footprint as compared with Schemes A and B.
- 6.3.58 As demonstrated in the subsequent AVA Detailed Study by wind tunnel test carried out under the QP Study, the redevelopment proposal would not bring about adverse air ventilation impact to the surrounding areas. The annual prevailing wind of the area is from the NE quadrant and the summer prevailing wind from the SW quadrant. The proposed redevelopment with the provision of building setbacks of 5.5m from Drake Street, 7.5m from United Centre and 15m from Tamar Street as well as the reduced podium footprint with site coverage of not more than

65% plus the chamfered podium design in the south-western corner of the site to allow in-situ preservation of an existing OVT could help minimise the wind stagnant area and facilitate wind penetration through the site, in particular along Tamar Street and areas near the south-western corner of the site.

Others

- 6.3.59 There is no need to specify the parking requirements on the OZP as the provision of private car parking spaces should be in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG and to the satisfaction of C for T.
- 6.3.60 The existing 'Refuse Collection Point' (RCP) needs to be reprovisioned in-situ in order to maintain the existing services for its catchment area. Under the proposed arrangement, the future developer will be responsible for the design and construction of the RCP according to the Government's specifications and to the Government's satisfaction. The design, planning, construction and operation of the RCP should follow the environmental planning principles in Chapter 9 of the HKPSG and subject to related environmental pollution control ordinances. As the design of the RCP will be comprehensively designed and integrated with the commercial development, any possible development impacts e.g. the water and air nuisances could be addressed in the context of the proposed development subject to approval by relevant authorities. There is therefore no need for the RCP to obtain planning permission from the Board separately.
- 6.3.61 A number of consultations with C&WDC were carried out before and after the submission of the proposed zoning amendments to MPC. The exhibition of the draft OZP for public comments and submission of representations for the consideration by the Board is also a form of public consultation.
- 6.3.62 On the inadequacy of eating places, it should be noted that 'Shop and Services' and 'Eating Place' are Column 1 uses that are always permitted within "C(3)" and "C(4)" zones. This allows maximum flexibility for the future developer to decide on the mix of uses (i.e. office, retail and eating places) for the future development.
- 6.3.63 The said 'Commercial Bathhouse/Massage Establishment' uses are not incompatible with other commercial uses. According to the Master Schedule of Notes, 'Commercial Bathhouse/Massage Establishment' and 'Shop and Services' uses are column 1 uses within "C" zone.
- 6.3.64 "OU(Elevated Walkway cum Retail Uses)" is intended primarily for the provision of an elevated walkway with retail uses. According to the Notes of the OZP, a building height restriction of 21mPD is stipulated within "OU(Elevated Walkway cum Retail Uses)". Given that the building bulk of the walkway is largely controlled via the building height restriction, it is considered not necessary to impose any GFA restriction.
- 6.3.65 A PDB to guide the future development of the site will be prepared taking

into account the views of the Board members on the representations. The Board will be consulted accordingly.

- 6.3.66 The area of the “OU” zone on the OZP is correct and up-to-date.
- 6.3.67 The glare impact caused by the redevelopment depends on the design of the building and its external façade. The future developer is required to adopt a low reflective façade treatment to minimize reflection of sunlight to minimize the glare impact to meet the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines.
- 6.3.68 PlanD’s response to the representers’ proposals are given in the paragraphs below.
- 6.3.69 The western part of the existing QP (**Amendment Item B2**) is currently a shopping arcade. The planning intention of the “OU(Elevated Walkway cum Retail Uses)” zone is to reflect the existing use. According to the Notes of the OZP, the provision of history display spaces and information boards is always permitted and could be fully integrated with the commercial use. As such, it is not necessary to rezone the site to the proposed “OU” annotated “Elevated Walkway cum Information & History Display Spaces & Information Boards” zone. A maximum building height of 21mPD was specified for the western portion of the existing QP to reflect the existing height of the building.
- 6.3.70 In view of the demand for commercial floorspace within the core business area, QP is considered suitable for redevelopment. While its site potential would be optimised, the PDB will set out the important planning and design principles to guide its redevelopment into a focal point with good connectivity with its surroundings.
- 6.3.71 To come up with the requirement of parking spaces in the redevelopment of MRMCP, the TIA had considered the reprovision of public car parking spaces at Site 3 of the New Central Harbournfront and also assumed that the internal parking facilities of the developments in the New Central Harbourfront would be self-contained and would be provided according to the requirements as stipulated in the HKPSG. The TIA showed that the parking demand can be met only if there is reprovisioning of public car parking spaces within the new development together with the surrounding public car parking spaces. TD advised that the objective of an ERP scheme is to provide disincentive to vehicle users to use their vehicles in making trips to the charging area in peak hours. With reference to different public views on car parking provision, the Government will examine the feasibility of ERP pilot scheme separately. Notwithstanding, the redevelopment of MRMCP would not pre-empt the implementation of ERP in Central.
- 6.3.72 The existing Admiralty Garden has a site area of 1,700m². To compensate for the loss of this open space, the future developer is required to provide POS of not less than 2,100m² including at-grade open space of 1,400m² for public use.

Representations Providing Views

6.3.73 The representers' views are similar to those raised in the adverse representations. The responses to the representations in paragraph 6.3.1 to 6.3.72 above are relevant. The major grounds of comments and PlanD's responses are at **Annex VI**.

6.3.74 The proposal to set aside a minimum floor area for cafes and restaurants is similar to the proposal by **R3**. The responses in Para.6.3.2 above are relevant.

6.4 Responses to Grounds of Comments

The grounds of comments are similar to those raised in the representations. The responses to the representations in paragraph 6.3 above are relevant. The major grounds of comments and PlanD's responses are at **Annex VI**.

7. Consultation

7.1 The following Government bureaux/departments have been consulted and their comments have been incorporated in the above paragraphs, where appropriate:

- (a) C for T;
- (b) DEP;
- (c) Government Property Agency;
- (d) District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West & South, Lands Department;
- (e) Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department;
- (f) Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD;
- (g) Chief Town Planner/Housing & Office Land Supply, PlanD; and
- (h) Chief Town Planner/Strategic Planning, PlanD.

7.2 The following departments have no comment on the representations/comments:

- (a) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD);
- (b) Chief Engineer/Land Works, CEDD;
- (c) Project Manager (Hong Kong Island & Island Development), CEDD;
- (d) Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department;
- (e) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- (f) District Officer (Central and Western), Home Affairs Department;
- (g) Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation;
- (h) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;
- (i) Chief Engineer/Railway Development 2-2, Railway Development Office, Highways Department (HyD);
- (j) Chief Highway Engineer/Hong Kong, HyD;
- (k) Antiquities and Monuments Office, Leisure and Cultural Services Department;
- (l) Director of Social Welfare;
- (m) Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department;
- (n) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services;

- (o) Director of Fire Services; and
- (p) Commissioner of Police.

8. Planning Department's Views

- 8.1 The supportive views of **R1** to **R4** and the comments provided by **R71** and **R72** are noted. Based on the assessment in paragraph 6 above, PlanD has the following suggested response to the points raised by the supportive representations:

Murray Road Multi-storey Car Park (Amendment A) and Queensway Plaza (Amendment B1 to B3) (For R1 to R4, R71 and R72)

- (a) Adequate flexibility has already been provided under the “C(3)” and “C(4)” zones for the future developer to decide on the mix of use in the future development as ‘Office’, ‘Shop and Services’, ‘Market’ and ‘Eating Place’ are always permitted while ‘Flat’ and ‘Residential Institution’ use may be permitted with or without condition on application to the Town Planning Board. Stipulating a minimal retail GFA for the “C(4)” zones would reduce the flexibility currently provided and considered as unnecessary.

Murray Road Multi-storey Car Park (Amendment A) (For R1, R2, R71 and R72)

- (b) The existing linkages from MRMCP to the Murray Road/Chater Road junction and to the tram stop or Queensway are sufficient. The proposed development of MRMCP would not affect the existing linkages.

Queensway Plaza (Amendment B1 to B3) (For R3 and R4)

- (c) The AVA for the QP site has confirmed that, with the provision of building setbacks, a reduced podium footprint and a chamfered podium design, the wind stagnation area would be minimized and the proposed development would not cause significant adverse air ventilation impact to the surrounding area.
- (d) The main development parameters of the QP development including maximum building height, maximum site coverage and required POS provision are already stipulated on the OZP. Besides, a Planning and Design Brief will be prepared to guide design and development of the site.
- (e) The future developer would be required to maintain pedestrian connectivity with the surrounding developments both during the construction period and upon completion of the development. A TIA on the temporary vehicular traffic arrangements and temporary pedestrian connection arrangements will also need to be conducted.
- (f) The future development is required to avoid encroaching onto the existing MTR facilities. Nevertheless the future development is allowed to build above, adjacent and under the MTR facilities and required to provide

direct and barrier-free connections to the MTR concourse and exits.

- (g) The proposal to relocate the bus lane to the eastbound carriageway of Drake Street would impose serious conflicting movement with taxis leaving the taxi stand and result in loss of a bus stop and bus stacking bays which would adversely affect bus operations.
- (h) It is considered necessary to provide adequate car parking spaces and loading/unloading bays based on the HKPSG to ensure that the future development would have sufficient internal transport facilities to match manifest operational requirements.
- (i) The Planning and Design Brief will only set out the design principles and the basic design parameters including inter alia the provision of special design features such as an atrium as a focal point at the intersection of pedestrian routes, the reprovisioning of the refuse collection point, the in-situ preservation of the OVT, etc. Flexibility will be provided to cater for innovative design.

8.2 Based on the assessment in paragraph 6 above and for the following reasons, PlanD does not support **R5** to **R70** and considers that the Plan should not be amended to meet the representations:

Murray Road Multi-storey Car Park (Amendment Item A) (For **R5 to **R67**)**

- (a) The TIA conducted for the proposed development for MRMCP demonstrated that the proposal would not cause adverse traffic impact to the surrounding areas. The TIA also revealed that all identified critical junctions will perform satisfactorily in the design years.
- (b) The proposed provision of 102 public car parking spaces and 69 public motorcycle parking spaces, as recommended by the TIA, is appropriate to meet the projected parking demand in the area.
- (c) The requirement of the future development at the MRMCP site to maintain the same level of linkage with the adjoining footbridge network would provide adequate linkage to the commercial development in the area.
- (d) No adverse environmental impact as a result of traffic congestion in the area is anticipated.
- (e) The AVA concludes that the building height of the development is of secondary importance in terms of air ventilation performance and that a development with a smaller footprint and more setback from site boundary would perform better from the air ventilation standpoint. A maximum site coverage of 65% for the site is stipulated for this site. No adverse air ventilation impacts is anticipated.
- (f) There is no significant visual impact. The visual appraisal was undertaken in accordance with the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Submission of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the

Town Planning Board (“TPB PG-No.41”), and has taken into account the impacts as viewed from areas with direct sightlines to the site as required in the guidelines.

- (g) There is a shortage in supply of offices in the Central Business District (CBD). There is a need to increase the commercial land supply through measures such as converting non-location bound G/IC sites in the CBD into commercial use.

Queensway Plaza (Amendment Item B1 to B3) (For R5 to R64 and R67 to R70)

- (h) TIA has been undertaken. It has confirmed that, with suitable mitigation measure in place (i.e. the prohibition of loading and unloading activities within the site during peak hours viz. 7am to 10am and 4pm to 7pm), the proposed development would not have significant adverse traffic impact.
- (i) **Amendment Item B3** is to reflect the existing bus lay-by between the QP and Queensway from “O” to an area shown as ‘Road’. The existing bus lay-by will be retained and the road design would not be changed.
- (j) The future developer would be required to maintain pedestrian connectivity with the surrounding developments both during the construction period and upon completion of the development. A TIA on the temporary vehicular traffic arrangements and temporary pedestrian connection arrangements will also need to be conducted.
- (k) There is no need to specify the parking requirements on the OZP as the provision of private car parking spaces should be in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG and to the satisfaction of C for T.
- (l) According to the AVA, it is anticipated that the QP redevelopment would not have significant adverse air ventilation impact.
- (m) To compensate for the loss of the existing Admiralty Garden of 1,700m², the future developer is required to provide public open space of not less than 2,100m² including at-grade open space of 1,400m². It is necessary to incorporate this reprovisioning requirement in the Notes of the OZP.
- (n) Adequate information has been provided on tree felling and greening based on a tree survey conducted.
- (o) It is necessary to reprovision the existing RCP within the site. As it will be comprehensively designed and constructed with the QP redevelopment, no adverse impact is anticipated and hence ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ is specified as Column 1 use within “C(4)” zone.
- (p) According to the Visual Impact Assessment, there is no significant visual impact imposed by the proposed development. The future development is subject to maximum site coverage of 65% and setback from Drake Street, United Centre and Tamar Street to allow opportunities to enhance visual openness and amenity at street level.

9. Decision Sought

The Board is invited to give consideration to the representations and comments and decide whether to propose/not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet/partially meet the representations.

Attachments

Annex I	Draft Central District Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H4/15 (reduced size)
Annex II	Schedule of Amendments to the Approved Central District Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H4/14
Annex III	Submissions made by the Representers
Annex IV	Submissions made by the Commenters
Annex V	Extract of Minutes of Meeting of C&WDC held on 21.1.2016
Annex VI	Summary of Representations and Comments and PlanD's Responses
Annex VII	List of Representers
Annex VIII	List of Commenters
Plan H-1	Location Plan of the Representation Sites
Plan H-2	Site Plan of the Representation Sites under Amendment Item A
Plan H-3	Aerial Photo of Proposed Amendment Item A
Plan H-4	Site Photos of Proposed Amendment Item A
Plan H-5	Temporary Arrangement of elevated pedestrian walkway for Proposed Amendment Item A
Plan H-6	Site Plan of Proposed Amendment Items B1 to B3
Plan H-7	Aerial Photo of Proposed Amendment Items B1 to B3
Plan H-8	Site Photos of Proposed Amendment Items B1 to B3
Plan H-9	Temporary Arrangement of elevated pedestrian walkway for Proposed Amendment Item B
Plan H-10 to 12	Photomontages of Proposed Amendment Items A and B1
Plan H-13 to 15	Photomontages of Proposed Amendment Item A
Plan H-16 to 18	Photomontages of Proposed Amendment Item B1

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
JUNE 2016**