



圖例  
NOTATION

ZONES		地帶
COMMERCIAL	C	商業
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA	CDA	綜合發展區
COMMERCIAL / RESIDENTIAL	CR	商業 / 住宅
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	R(A)	住宅 (甲類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	R(B)	住宅 (乙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	R(C)	住宅 (丙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP E)	R(E)	住宅 (戊類)
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	GIC	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	O	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	OU	其他指定用途
GREEN BELT	GB	綠化地帶
COMMUNICATIONS		交通
RAILWAY AND STATION (UNDERGROUND)	—	鐵路及車站 (地下)
MAJOR ROAD AND JUNCTION	—	主要道路及路口
ELEVATED ROAD	—	高架道路
RAILWAY RESERVE	—	鐵路專用範圍
MISCELLANEOUS		其他
BOUNDARY OF PLANNING SCHEME	—	規劃範圍界線
BOUNDARY OF COUNTRY PARK	—	郊野公園界線
BUILDING HEIGHT CONTROL ZONE BOUNDARY	—	建築物高度管制區界線
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN METRES ABOVE PRINCIPAL DATUM)	△	最高建築物高度 (在主水平基準上若干米)
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN NUMBER OF STOREYS)	S	最高建築物高度 (樓層數目)
NON-BUILDING AREA	NBA	非建築用地

土地用途及面積一覽表  
SCHEDULE OF USES AND AREAS

USES	大約面積及百分比 APPROXIMATE AREA & %		用途
	公頃 HECTARES	% 百分比	
COMMERCIAL	4.58	1.65	商業
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA	6.33	2.29	綜合發展區
COMMERCIAL / RESIDENTIAL	19.25	6.95	商業 / 住宅
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	31.97	11.55	住宅 (甲類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	15.11	5.48	住宅 (乙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	0.80	0.29	住宅 (丙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP E)	0.43	0.16	住宅 (戊類)
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	27.49	9.93	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	34.35	12.41	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	3.55	1.28	其他指定用途
GREEN BELT	87.88	31.74	綠化地帶
MAJOR ROAD ETC.	45.14	16.29	主要道路等
TOTAL PLANNING SCHEME AREA	276.87	100.00	規劃範圍總面積

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

核准圖編號 S/H 8/24 的修訂  
AMENDMENT TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/H8/24

AMENDMENT EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 5  
OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

AMENDMENT ITEM A

(參看附表)  
(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

香港城市規劃委員會依據城市規劃條例擬備的北角 (港島規劃區第8區) 分區計劃大綱圖  
TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE, HONG KONG TOWN PLANNING BOARD  
HONG KONG PLANNING AREA No. 8 - NORTH POINT - OUTLINE ZONING PLAN

SCALE 1:5000 比例尺  
METRES 100 0 200 400 600 800 METRES 米

2016年8月5日 按照城市規劃條例第5條展示的  
核准圖編號 S/H8/24 的修訂  
AMENDMENT TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/H8/24 EXHIBITED  
UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE ON  
5 AUGUST 2016

Raymond LEE 李啟榮  
SECRETARY 城市規劃委員會秘書  
TOWN PLANNING BOARD

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/H8/25

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO  
THE APPROVED NORTH POINT OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H8/24  
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD  
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

**I. Amendment to Matters shown on the Plan**

- Item A – Rezoning of Tin Chiu Street Playground at the junction of Java Road, Tin Chiu Street and Marble Road from “Government, Institution or Community” to “Residential (Group A)” with stipulation of building height restriction.

The proposed railway reserve of the Shatin to Central Link on the Plan is updated for information.

**II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan**

- (a) Incorporation of ‘Art Studio (excluding those involving direct provision of services or goods)’ as a Column 1 use under Schedule II of “Residential (Group E)” zone and corresponding amendment to replace ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture’ under Column 2 by ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (not elsewhere specified)’.
- (b) Revision to the plot ratio/gross floor area exemption clause in the Remarks of the Notes for the “Comprehensive Development Area”, “Comprehensive Development Area (1)”, “Comprehensive Development Area (2)”, “Comprehensive Development Area (3)”, “Commercial/Residential”, “Residential (Group A)”, “Residential (Group B)” and “Residential (Group C)” zones.

Town Planning Board

5 August 2016

**Summary of Representations and Comments to Representations and the Planning Department's Responses  
in respect of the Draft North Point Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H8/25**

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
1	Angel Tse	<p>Support Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>1.1 There are objections from environmentalists against construction of housing, reclamation, and development of new towns and country parks which lead to high land price and rental cost.</p> <p>1.2 Many people live in small flats or partitioned flats (劏房). They urgently need the government to provide housing to tackle the long term housing supply problem.</p>	<p>1.1 Noted.</p> <p>1.2 Noted.</p>
2	<p>陳淑莊議員 (立法會議員) Hon. Tanya Chan (Legislative Council Member)</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>2.1 Paragraph 8.7.8 of the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP states that Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Expert Evaluation (EE) has been carried out and concluded that “design measures including corner splays design with setbacks from the site boundary and a ground floor empty bay would facilitate wind flow and alleviate the potential ventilation impact to the surrounding area”. This shows the EE has acknowledged that the proposed residential development will have adverse air ventilation impact to the surrounding area. Since the mitigation measures are not statutory or compulsory, the proposed residential development would cause blockage of ventilation corridor and sunlight penetration to the area.</p>	<p>2.1 (a) The representation site is separated from adjacent street blocks by Java Road, Tin Chiu Street and Marble Road, which have a width of not less than 17m and conducive to air and sunlight penetration. The proposed public housing development does not reduce the width of Java Road/Tin Chiu Street/Marble Road and is generally aligned with the surrounding developments.</p> <p>(b) An AVA EE has been carried out by the Housing Department (HD) to evaluate the wind performance of the site comparing scenarios under an OZP compliant scheme and the proposed public housing development in a qualitative way. According to the AVA EE, the annual wind directions are from N, ENE, E and ESE, while</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
			<p>summer winds are from ENE, E, S, SW and WSW (<b>Drawings H-7 and 8</b>). Under the N and S wind directions, the prevailing winds mainly flow along Tin Chiu Street. For ENE, E, SW, and WSW wind conditions, the prevailing winds would mainly flow along Marble Road and Java Road; while under ESE wind, the wind would flow along Marble Road. Although the proposed development would induce some localised impact at part of Java Road, Marble Road and Tin Chiu Street, the representation site is situated at the end of a street block and bounded by roads on three sides with a configuration facilitating provision of splayed street corners (<b>Drawing H-1</b>). The proposed design measures including a 2m setback from site boundary at the two splayed corners and provision of a ground floor empty bay of 3.5m (width) x 3m (height) abutting Tin Chiu Street could facilitate air flow. They could achieve the effect of reducing ground coverage, increasing building permeability and maintaining connectivity of air path as proposed under the “Urban Climatic Map and Standards for Wind Environment – Feasibility Study” for improving urban climate. With these measures, the proposed development is not anticipated to have significant adverse air ventilation impact on the overall surrounding pedestrian wind environment as compared with the OZP compliant scheme.</p> <p>(c) The proposed design measures to enhance air ventilation performance will be incorporated in the planning brief of the proposed public housing development for implementation. HD will conduct an AVA Initial Study to further investigate quantitatively the proposed wind enhancement at the detailed design stage. Such a requirement will also be specified in the planning brief.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>2.2 The former soccer pitch at Man Hong Street had been taken away for construction of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Headquarters building (ICAC HQ) but only children's playing facilities and benches are provided at Tong Shui Road Garden in return. The government should first reprovide a soccer pitch to compensate for the residents' loss before considering the reprovisioning of Tin Chiu Street Playground (TCSP).</p> <p>2.3 The proposed residential development together with the ex-NPE redevelopment would provide about 1,000 flats. The existing transport infrastructure would not be able to</p>	<p>2.2 (a) It should be noted that when the soccer pitch at Man Hong Street was rezoned from "O" to "G/IC" for the development of ICAC HQ in 2002, a site at Tong Shui Road was rezoned from "G/IC" to "O" for the development of a local open space (i.e. Tong Shui Road Garden) in return. Subsequent efforts have been made to increase the open space provision in the major redevelopment sites in North Point, including incorporating 1.5 ha and 3,530m<sup>2</sup> of public open space in the planning briefs for the redevelopments at the ex-NPE site and the ex-Government Supplies Department Depot at Oil Street respectively (<b>Plan H-1b</b>).</p> <p>(b) For the planning scheme area of North Point OZP (including the proposed residential development under Amendment Item A), there will be an overall surplus of 5.66 ha of open space with reference to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). The specific types of open space facilities provided/to be provided in individual open space sites are to be determined by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) taking account of the site characteristics and local context of individual sites. In considering the provision of recreational and sports facilities, LCSD would take into account factors such as the demand for such facilities, usage of existing facilities, HKPSG, resource availability as well as the views of the relevant district council.</p> <p>2.3 (a) As the proposed residential development is well served by public transport services including Mass Transit Railway, franchised buses, minibuses and ferry and there is</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>accommodate the traffic flow generated by the additional population. The new developments would worsen the existing traffic congestion.</p> <p><u>Proposal:</u></p> <p>2.4 To reconsider whether the site is suitable for public housing development from the air ventilation, open space supply and traffic perspectives.</p>	<p>a new Public Transport Interchange at the ex-NPE redevelopment, residents are expected to take the public transport.</p> <p>(b) According to the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) carried out by HD, the traffic generation and attraction due to planned and committed developments in the vicinity of the site (e.g. ex-NPE redevelopment) have been considered. The TIA reveals that the proposed development would not have adverse traffic impact on the road network (including Java Road and Tin Chiu Street) in the vicinity of the proposed public housing development (<b>Plan H-1b</b>).</p> <p>(c) The Transport Department (TD) will keep monitoring the traffic conditions and implement appropriate traffic management measures if necessary.</p> <p>2.4 (a) The representation site has been identified as one of the potential housing sites to meet the housing demand in the short to medium term. HD has conducted relevant preliminary technical assessments and relevant government departments have already confirmed that the proposed residential development at the site would not result in significant adverse impacts or insurmountable technical problems on visual, air ventilation, traffic, environmental, infrastructure and other technical aspects.</p> <p>(b) Provision of open space and major community facilities has also been duly assessed. There is no shortfall of open space as per HKPSG requirement in the area as discussed in the response 2.2(b) above. Also, there is</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
			<p>neither designated GIC use for the representation site nor request from the relevant government departments to use the site for standalone GIC facilities. Although there is shortfall of one sports centre, it should be noted that the representation site is too small (0.12 ha) to accommodate a standard sports centre (0.6 ha) and there is already a sports centre located nearby (i.e. Java Road Sports Centre) (<b>Plan H-1b</b>).</p> <p>(c) TCSP will be reprovisioned at Drainage Service Department (DSD)'s temporary works area adjacent to the Tin Chiu Street Children's Playground. The reprovisioning site for TCSP can be accessed via the footpath along Tin Chiu Street, which is within 5-minute walk from the representation site. Upgraded playground facilities including a standard size 5-a-side soccer pitch and a standard basketball court with ancillary facilities including storage cages, garden benches, etc. will be provided at the reprovisioned playground, which will be an enhancement to the existing TCSP with only non-standard ball courts. The existing TCSP will remain open for public enjoyment until the reprovisioned playground is completed.</p> <p>(d) In view of the above, it is considered that the representation site is feasible for public housing development and the rezoning is appropriate.</p>
3	梁兆新議員 (東區區議員) Mr. Leung Siu Sun	Oppose Amendment Item A  <u>Grounds of representation:</u> 3.1 With reference to the private developments in the area,	3.1 Future property price and management fees of the proposed

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
	Patrick (Eastern District Council Member)	<p>the property price and management fee of the proposed residential development would be high and may not be affordable to the general public.</p> <p>3.2 The site is located in an area having busy road traffic with buses routing through Tin Chiu Street to the new bus terminal. The ingress/egress of vehicles to/from the proposed development would worsen the existing traffic condition.</p> <p>3.3 There has been a strong request to restrict the buildings along the waterfront to 100mPD to achieve a stepped height profile.</p>	<p>residential development are not a land use related issue and fall outside the purview of the Town Planning Board (the Board).</p> <p>3.2 (a) The North Point Ferry Pier Public Transport Interchange has commenced operation since May 2016. No significant impact to the nearby traffic was observed during the operation stage.</p> <p>(b) Since the scale of the proposed development is small and the proposed vehicular access will be at Marble Road, the disturbance to the existing traffic at Java Road would be minimal and the additional traffic generated from the proposed development would not have adverse impact on the traffic of Tin Chiu Street according to the TIA submitted by HD. TD will keep monitoring the traffic conditions and implement appropriate traffic management measures if necessary.</p> <p>3.3 The proposed public housing development is subject to a maximum BH of 110mPD, which generally follows the BH band for the street blocks between Java Road and King's Road west of Tin Chiu Street. This is in line with the overall BH profile of the area stepping up from the waterfront towards the inland area (<b>Plan H-1</b>). Based on the photomontages (<b>Drawings H-3 to 6</b>) and the visual appraisal conducted by HD, the proposed development will be comparable in scale and height to the surrounding area with predominantly high-rise residential buildings (e.g. Island Lodge) mingled with GIC uses (e.g. CHQ, Chan's Creative School (Hong Kong Island)). The proposed development will not affect views to the ridgelines or</p>



Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>3.4 The existing TCSP forms a ventilation corridor facilitating air flow from the harbour to King's Road and does not affect sun light penetration to the surrounding buildings.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>3.5 To retain the playground and open space for the residents in North Point</p>	<p>Victoria Harbour. Visual effect of the proposed development on medium range and long range is considered negligible. Views from close range will inevitably result in some loss of visual permeability. In overall terms, while the resultant visual impact is slightly adverse, the proposed development will not be incompatible with its surroundings.</p> <p>3.4 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>3.5 (a) Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>
4	<p>曾卓兒 (自由黨港島東區支部主席) Pearl Tsang (Chairman of the Liberal Party Eastern District Branch Office)</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>4.1 The traffic in the Marble Road and Java Road area is already very congested. The new development at the ex-NPE site will further increase the traffic and pedestrian flow. The proposed public housing development would bring heavy burden to the transport network.</p> <p>4.2 Residents will lose an existing open space due to the rezoning.</p>	<p>4.1 Please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>4.2 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>4.3 Schools, residential developments and North Point Welfare Association Chan Shu Kui Hall are located nearby. The proposed public housing development would bring adverse noise and other pollution impacts.</p> <p>4.4 The proposed public housing development of 110mPD would adversely affect the air ventilation of the streets inland.</p>	<p>4.3 The proposed residential use is not a polluting use under HKPSG and would not cause long term pollution problem to the district. The short term potential noise and air pollution during construction phase will be controlled under different environmental control ordinances, including Noise Control Ordinance (Cap. 400) and Air Pollution Control Ordinance (Cap. 311).</p> <p>4.4 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p>
5	中西區關注組 Central & Western Concern Group	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>5.1 Strongly object to the loss of public open space, park and an air ventilation corridor. The North Point area is lacking parkland compared to its population. TCSP is a valuable recreational area near a built-up urban place that is convenient for residents and importantly, an air corridor to assist in flow of air from the sea to the crowded King's Road and environs running up the hill.</p> <p>5.2 There are other areas in Hong Kong which can be used for subsidised housing instead of this valuable open space.</p>	<p>5.1 (a) On air ventilation aspect, please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>(b) For the concern on open space, please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p> <p>5.2 Measures to increase land supply in both short to medium term and medium to long term are required to meet the pressing housing demand and various social and economic needs of the Hong Kong community. To achieve the housing supply target of 460,000 units in the coming 10 years under the Long Tern Housing Strategy (LTHS), the government has to continue to adopt a multi-pronged approach to make available sufficient supply of housing</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
			land. The representation site has been identified as one of the potential housing sites to meet the housing demand in the short to medium term. The Government will also take forward a number of major land supply projects to increase land supply in the medium to long term, including but not limited to New Development Areas and extension of new town, New Territories North development, studying brownfield sites.
6 to 29	<p>環保觸覺 Green Sense (R6)</p> <p>美港聯盟 Alliance for a Beautiful Hong Kong (R7)</p> <p>22 individuals (Name of representers shown at <b>Attachment A</b>)</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>6.1 Hong Kong's urban areas have always suffered from a serious lack of public open space. Request for better quality of life has been ignored and scattered open spaces and "G/IC" sites in downtown areas have been rezoned in recent years for in-filling of residential buildings which cause harm to the environment, community and urban landscape.</p> <p>6.2 BH, Air Ventilation and Environmental Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Because of the pressures from the environmental groups and other parties, the building layout of the ex-NPE redevelopment has been revised during the planning application stage to reduce the wall effect</li> </ul>	<p>6.1 To achieve the housing supply target under LTHS, land use reviews including reviews on the Government land currently vacant, under Short Term Tenancies or different short term government uses, as well as reviews on "G/IC" sites, etc. are the key measure with a view to identifying more suitable sites for residential use. The practical planning circumstances and considerations of individual sites will be taken into account to ensure the provision of adequate community facilities and open space, etc. in accordance with HKPSG. Factors like local characteristics and existing development intensity, as well as the potential impacts on the environment, landscape and air ventilation, etc. will also be considered.</p> <p>6.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c), 3.3 and 4.3 above are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>and to maintain ventilation corridors including one at TCSP. The approval of a high-rise building at TCSP would violate this planning concept and damage the living environment of North Point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed building at TCSP site, together with the adjacent Customs Headquarters Building (CHQ) and the ex-NPE redevelopment, would form a wall of buildings. This would compromise the area's ability to adjust to the micro-climate, and lead to rise in temperature, different types of pollution and negative environmental impact.</li> <li>• The AVA conducted by the consultants for the proposed development was a rough assessment report without data support. The assessment is vague and unconvincing (<b>R6</b> only).</li> <li>• The reprovisioned playground proposed is unable to help ventilate the North Point downtown and compensate for the ventilation impact of the proposed development.</li> </ul> <p>6.3 North Point is a mature, densely populated community which is already packed with buildings. The proposed reprovisioning site of TCSP is farther away from the residential neighbourhood that residents would find it inconvenient to access. Even if there is no reduction in the size of the open space, its quality would obviously be downgraded.</p> <p>6.4 The government should stop squeezing buildings into</p>	<p>6.3 Please refer to responses 2.4 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>6.4 The Government is now working on its territorial</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>small spaces, but should tackle the housing problem at source by reviewing its population growth strategy (<b>R6 to R13, R15 to R20, R22 to R29</b> only).</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>6.5 To retain the site as public open space (<b>R8 and R11</b> only).</p> <p>6.6 To retain the site as a sports facility for public use (<b>R9 and R10</b> only)</p>	<p>development strategy (Hong Kong 2030+) to set out long term broad directions for land supply and town planning which takes into account considerations including but not limited to Hong Kong's future population. However, to address the acute housing shortage problem, measures to increase land supply in short to medium term including Amendment Item A are still required.</p> <p>6.5 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p> <p>6.6 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>
30 to 321 and 340	<p>鄭達鴻議員 (東區區議員) Mr. Tat Cheng (Eastern District Council Member) (<b>R30</b>)</p> <p>東發大廈 A及D座業主 立案法團 Incorporated Owners of</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>30.1 BH, Air Ventilation and Environmental Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed public housing development of 110mPD at this tiny site is taller than the nearby private development of 80mPD. This would affect the air ventilation (<b>R30 to R191, R193 to R204, R206 to R215, R217, R219 to R226, R228 to R230, R232, R234, R235, R238 to R247, R249 to R268, R270 to R295, R297 to R303, R305 to R321 and R340</b> only).</li> <li>The proposed public housing development may create noise impact on the adjacent North Point</li> </ul>	<p>30.1 (a) Regarding the concern on BH, please refer to the response 3.3 above.</p> <p>(b) Regarding the concern on air ventilation impact, please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>(c) Regarding the concern on environment, please refer to the response 4.3 above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
	<p>Block A and D, Tung Fat Mansion (R31)</p> <p>291 individuals (Name of representers shown at Attachment A)</p>	<p>Welfare Association Chan Shu Kui Hall (R30 to R177, R181, R187, R190 to R193, R195 to R199, R202, R208 to R211, R213, R214, R217, R219, R222 to R225, R228 to R230, R234, R238 to R240, R244 to R248, R250, R254 to R269, R271, R273, R276, R279, R283, R297 to R304, R307, R309, R312 to R314, R320 and R340 only).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) should not develop walled building (HOS) and the impacts to residents should not be ignored (R30 only)</li> <li>• The proposed high-rise building would affect air ventilation (R265).</li> <li>• The proposed development would aggravate the air pollution problem. Usage of air conditioners will be increased, which would worsen the greenhouse effect (R51 only).</li> <li>• The proposed development would adversely affect the air quality (R80 only) / aggravate the pollution problem from the heavily trafficked King's Road and affect the health of citizens (R87 only). Air quality in North Point is poor already (R318 only). Fresh air is needed (R129 only).</li> <li>• The proposed development would block the air flow into North Point and Fortress Hill, affecting the health of students studying in the area (R94 only).</li> <li>• The proposed development would cause adverse air</li> </ul>	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>ventilation impact, affecting the health of the elderly (<b>R103</b> only).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The air ventilation will be worsened when the old buildings along Marble Road are redeveloped (<b>R320</b> only).</li> <li>Oppose to walled building by the proposed development (<b>R144</b> only).</li> </ul> <p>30.2 Open Space / Recreational facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HD scarifies the open space for building in-fill needle-type residential block (<b>R30 to R183, R185, R187 to R201, R203 to R211, R213 to R221, R223 to R231, R233 to R248, R250, R252 to R277, R279 to R281, R283 to R315, R317 to R321 and R340</b> only).</li> <li>There is shortage of recreational facilities/open space that the only soccer pitch in the area should not be taken away (<b>R36, R51, R134, R158, R159, R190, R244, R293 and R318</b> only). The rezoning will further reduce the open space in the area (<b>R72, R80, R87, R260, R263, R266 and R270</b> only).</li> <li>The ICAC HQ and CHQ already took away a considerable amount of recreational space (<b>R49</b> only).</li> <li>The site is the only soccer pitch in North Point downtown. The remaining soccer pitches in Braemar Hill are inconvenient (<b>R68</b> only).</li> </ul>	<p>30.2 (a) Regarding the provision of open space and major community facilities, please refer to responses 2.4 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>(b) Regarding the loss of open space due to ICAC HQ development, please refer to the responses 2.2(a) and (b) above. As for the CHQ site at Tin Chiu Street, it has all along been zoned “G/IC” on the OZP and was not intended for open space use, though part of it was once used as a basketball court on a temporary basis.</p> <p>(c) With regard to the concern on the lack of open space/ recreational facilities in the North Point downtown, it should be noted that apart from the reprovisioned TCSP, there are several existing playgrounds and a sports centre (i.e. Java Road Sports Centre) located in the vicinity of the representation site. When the ex-NPE redevelopment to the northwest of TCSP is completed, 1.5 ha of public open space will also be available for public enjoyment (<b>Plan H-1b</b>).</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose to the demolition of public ball courts in urban area but tolerating the abuse uses of land in the New Territories and brownfields (<b>R78</b> only).</li> <li>• There will be loss of playground for the youth and the residents to release their stress (<b>R103</b> only).</li> <li>• Provision of open space in North Point is less than other districts (<b>R134</b> and <b>R142</b> only).</li> <li>• There is a serious shortage of recreational facilities in the district. The existing ball courts on the site have high patronage (<b>R134</b> and <b>R135</b> only).</li> <li>• There will be more people living in the area once the ex-NPE redevelopment is occupied. There is a need for more parkland for children and elderly. The little park at the subject site is vital to the community's health (<b>R141</b> only).</li> <li>• Oppose to relocation of the ball courts (<b>R144</b> only).</li> <li>• North Point is densely populated/too crowded but there is too little open space (<b>R168</b>, <b>R227</b>, <b>R281</b> and <b>R293</b> only).</li> <li>• The proposed development would deprive the right of citizens to enjoy the open space (<b>R269</b> only).</li> <li>• TCSP is the only leisure space / park for the children, elderly and local residents (<b>R287</b>, <b>R288</b></li> </ul>	



Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>and <b>R291</b> only). Elderly will go there for exercise every day (<b>R292</b>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed development would cause the area to the west of Marble Road and King's Road more congested, resulting in inadequate open space, public space and transport services. These will affect the existing residents, working population and the residents of the future HOS (<b>R164</b> only).</li> </ul> <p>30.3 Traffic Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is illegal parking problem at Marble Road where there are a few recyclable waste collecting shops. The proposed public housing development, together with the ex-NPE redevelopment and commissioning of the new public transport interchange, would worsen the traffic congestion in the area (<b>R30 to R177, R179 to R181, R184, R186, R189 to R193, R195 to R199, R203, R204, R207 to R211, R213 to R215, R217, R219, R223 to R225, R227 to R234, R237, R239 to R248, R250, R253 to R269, R271, R273 to R276, R279, R281, R282, R284, R289, R297 to R304, R306 to R309, R311 to R315, R319 to R321 and R340</b> only).</li> <li>The increase of traffic flow by the proposed development would threaten the safety of students of the primary school at Tin Chiu Street (<b>R231</b> only).</li> </ul> <p>30.4 The property price and management fee of the proposed residential development of single building block would</p>	<p>30.3 (a) On traffic concerns, please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) and 3.2 (a) and (b) above.</p> <p>(b) It should also be noted that car parking spaces will be provided within the ex-NPE redevelopment and the proposed residential development at the representation site in accordance with the requirement stipulated in HKPSG. To cope with the demand of coach parking spaces in the vicinity of Java Road, 30 public coach parking spaces would be provided in the ex-NPE redevelopment. Regarding the concern on illegal parking, this would be enforced by the Hong Kong Police Force.</p> <p>30.4 Please refer to the response 3.1 above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>be high and may not be affordable to the HOS applicants (<b>R30 to R177, R179, R186, R188 to R190, R192, R195 to R199, R203, R204, R206, R208 to R211, R213, R214, R217, R219, R223 to R225, R228 to R230, R232, R234, R238, R240, R241, R243, R245 to R247, R250, R252 to R268, R270 to R273, R276 to R279, R284, R297 to R303, R307 to R309, R311 to R314, R318, R320 and R340</b> only).</p> <p>30.5 The Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (TFHK) of the Harbourfront Commission has objected to the housing project. HD is unable to convince the public to proceed with the proposed development (<b>R30 to R177, R179, R180, R182, R185 to R190, R192, R195 to R199, R203, R206, R208 to R211, R213, R214, R216, R217, R219, R223 to R225, R228 to R232, R234, R239, R240, R242, R244 to R248, R255 to R268, R271, R273, R276, R279, R282, R284, R289, R297 to R303, R305 to R309, R312 to R315 and R319 to R321</b> only).</p> <p>30.6 Effectiveness of the proposed subsidised housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not cost-effective to provide subsidised housing at such a prime site (<b>R70</b> only).</li> <li>The number of residential units supplied by the proposed development is limited and not cost-effective (<b>R134, R186 and R301</b> only).</li> <li>The proposed single HOS block would not help much in addressing the housing problem, but affect the living environment of existing community</li> </ul>	<p>30.5 Harbourfront Commission's TFHK was consulted on the reprovisioning proposal of TCSP on 25.5.2016 by LCSD. TFHK Members raised concerns mainly on the design of the reprovisioned playground, and relevant government departments have suitably refined the design after the meeting taking into account TFHK Members' comments. TFHK Members did not raise specific objection to the rezoning of the existing TCSP site for public housing development at the meeting.</p> <p>30.6 (a) Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a), (b) and (d), and 6.1 above.</p> <p>(b) The Government will also take forward a number of major land supply projects to increase land supply in the medium to long term, including but not limited to New Development Areas and extension of new town, developing the New Territories North, studying brownfield sites.</p> <p>(c) Regarding illegal occupation of Government land, it</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>(<b>R245</b> only).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed development would not solve the high housing price problem. The government should tackle the illegal occupation of Government land in the New Territories first (<b>R162</b> only).</li> <li>Instead of this tiny site, why not resuming the Fanling Golf Course for development (<b>R88</b> and <b>R92</b> only).</li> <li>Why not redeveloping the ex-NPE for public housing but converting a small open space for public housing (<b>R304</b> only).</li> </ul> <p><u>Proposals</u></p> <p>30.7 To retain TCSP for recreational use (<b>R31</b> and <b>R167</b> only) / To retain TCSP as its original use (<b>R299</b>, <b>R300</b> and <b>R302</b> only) / To retain the open space (<b>R155</b> only).</p> <p>30.8 To consider developing the New Territories and outlying islands (<b>R36</b> only) / To provide subsidised housing in Wang Chau (<b>R250</b> only) / To resume the old buildings and brownfield sites for redevelopment, but adopt a different approach from that of the Urban Renewal Authority (<b>R251</b> only).</p> <p>30.9 To use the vacant flats at The Tanner Hill to address the housing need of the public (<b>R70</b> and <b>R155</b> only).</p>	<p>is a land administration issue which will be dealt with by the Lands Department separately.</p> <p>(d) The eastern and western parts of the ex-NPE site were sold in 2012 and 2013 respectively and are now under construction in accordance with the planning permissions. In the ex-NPE redevelopment, 1.5 ha of public open space and a number of community facilities and transport facilities will be provided to meet local and district needs.</p> <p>30.7 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p> <p>30.8 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) to (b) above.</p> <p>30.9 The Tanner Hill site held by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) is zoned “R(A)” on the draft North Point OZP No. S/H8/25. Arrangement of existing vacant flats in that development is under the purview of HKHS.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>30.10 To redevelop Model Housing Estate and increase its plot ratio (<b>R70</b> only).</p> <p>30.11 To reinstate the pet garden near the North Point Ferry Pier (<b>R241</b> only).</p>	<p>30.10 Model Housing Estate is zoned “R(A)” on the draft North Point OZP No. S/H8/25. Redevelopment of the existing public housing estate is under the purview of HKHA.</p> <p>30.11 According to the Landscape Master Plan under the approved planning Application No. A/H8/419 (i.e. ex-NPE redevelopment), there will be a pet garden on the waterfront promenade to be constructed and the design of which would be subject to the satisfaction of LCSD.</p>
322	Lau Yue Wai	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>322.1 There is a shortage of GIC facilities in the district.</p> <p>322.2 The football pitch and basketball court at the existing TCSP are very popular to the local people and have a very high usage.</p> <p>322.3 The proposed OZP amendment will form a very bad precedent case for removal of GIC facilities in the district.</p>	<p>322.1 Please refer to response 2.4 (b) above.</p> <p>322.2 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.</p> <p>322.3 Please refer to the responses in 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>
323	Kylie Cheung	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>323.1 The proposed amendment will increase the pressure on traffic and recreational facilities in the vicinity.</p>	<p>323.1 Regarding the traffic concern, please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) above. For the considerations about provision of recreational facilities, please refer to the response 2.4 (b) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>323.2 The relaxation of height limit will block the ventilation of fresh air into the inner area of North Point.</p> <p><u>Proposals</u></p> <p>323.3 To retain TCSP for recreational use.</p> <p>323.4 To relocate the CHQ and convert the CHQ site for residential use.</p>	<p>323.2 Please refer to responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>323.3 Not supported and please refer to responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p> <p>323.4 As advised by the Customs and Excises Department (C&amp;ED), most of the administrative and investigation formations of C&amp;ED which were previously scattered over the territory are accommodated in CHQ. It is equipped with a Customer Service Centre to provide one-stop, integrated and speedy services to the public. CHQ helps enhance C&amp;ED's operational efficiency and meets its development needs. As CHQ has just been commissioned for six years since its completion of construction in late 2010, C&amp;ED has no plan in hand to relocate CHQ at this stage. The response 5.2 above is also relevant.</p>
324	Yang Kenny	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose Amendment Item A</li> <li>• Oppose amendments (a) and (b) to the Notes</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>324.1 The site is too small for residential purpose. From an economic perspective, efforts should be focused on making use of scalable land.</p> <p>324.2 The relaxation of height limit destroys the beautiful coast of Victoria Harbour.</p>	<p>324.1 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) and (b) above.</p> <p>324.2 Please refer to the response 3.3 above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>324.3 It is unfair to the existing residents in North Point who will suffer from poorer air ventilation due to the proposed development.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>324.4 To withdraw the OZP amendments and retain the existing TCSP/basketball court.</p>	<p>324.3 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>324.4 Not supported. Regarding Amendment Item A, please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above. The incorporation of ‘Art Studio (excluding those involving direct provision of services or goods)’ as a Column 1 use in Schedule II of the “R(E)” zone is meant to support art development, while the clarification of the plot ratio/GFA exemption clause for various development zones is to reflect the existing practice. These amendments are considered appropriate.</p>
325	Sun Hoi Yan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose Amendment Item A</li> <li>• Oppose amendment (b) to the Notes</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>325.1 The rezoning of the playground for housing development will result in heat island effect, higher temperature in summer, and aggravate the pollution problem in the densely populated and heavy trafficked area.</p> <p>325.2 The government should not construct high-rise building in a high density area. Although there would be more housing choices, the living environment will be deteriorated due to the loss of open space. There are only two outdoor basketball courts at Tin Chiu Street</p>	<p>325.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>325.2 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>and Pak Fuk Road in North Point. The proposed amendment will deprive the youth of their right to enjoy outdoor sports, affecting their health and well-being. Long term town planning to cater for the growing population is needed. The general public is suffering from the planning errors and chaos in the search for housing land.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u> 325.3 To retain TCSP as its original land use.</p>	<p>325.3 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>
326	Mei Hong	<p>Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 326.1 There is a shortage of greenery area and children's playing facilities in North Point. It is unreasonable to rezone the small site for residential use.</p> <p>326.2 The proposed public housing development will obstruct air ventilation and worsen the air quality in the area.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u> 326.3 To retain TCSP as its original land use.</p>	<p>326.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above. On greenery aspect, no tree is founded within the representation site. There are 12 trees located on the pavements of Java Road, Tin Chiu Street and Marble Road immediately outside the site (<b>Plan H-5</b>). These trees are all common species, and no Champion tree or registered old and valuable tree is found. The trees will be retained as far as practicable as advised by HD.</p> <p>326.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>326.3 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
327	Halina Cheung	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>327.1 The subject site is too small for residential development which would not help much in meeting the housing demand.</p> <p>327.2 The proposed development will block air ventilation and cause wall effect.</p> <p>327.3 The residential, hotel and commercial uses at the ex-NPE site will significantly increase the pedestrian flow and add burden to the transport infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>327.4 To shelve the housing project.</p>	<p>327.1 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) and (b) above.</p> <p>327.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>327.3 Please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>327.4 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>
328	Nic Cheung	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u></p> <p>328.1 The existing CHQ and the future development at the ex-NPE site have already blocked / will block the ventilation corridor and sunlight penetration to the nearby old buildings.</p> <p>328.2 Land near waterfront should only be used for low-rise development e.g. open space, community centre, and cultural/recreational use.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>328.3 To shelve the housing project.</p>	<p>328.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>328.2 Please refer to the response 3.3 above.</p> <p>328.3 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to</p>



Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
			(d) above.
329	Gladys	Oppose Amendment Item A  <u>Proposal</u> 329.1 To retain the site for leisure.	329.1 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.
330	Amy	Oppose Amendment Item A  <u>Ground of representation:</u> 330.1 A playground is needed at the site. The area is too crowded.	330.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.
331	Wong Wing Hang	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose Amendment Item A</li> <li>• Oppose amendments (a) and (b) to the Notes</li> </ul> <u>Grounds of representation:</u> 331.1 There is already a lack of recreational facilities in North Point.  331.2 CHQ is excessively high. The proposed development will make air ventilation get further worse.	331.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.  331.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.
332	Lai Chui Ping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose Amendment Item A</li> <li>• Oppose amendments (a) and (b) to the Notes</li> </ul> <u>Ground of representation:</u> 332.1 The basketball court and playground are heavily used	332.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (c) above.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		from day to night. It is ridiculous to build another tall building like CHQ.	
333	焦樹榮	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>333.1 The proposed public housing development would narrow the air ventilation corridor along Tin Chiu Street and form a wall of buildings causing heat and air pollutants accumulated at King's Road. The area would lose its ability to adjust to the micro-climate. The proposed residential development would violate the planning concept of having three ventilation corridors at the ex-NPE site.</p> <p>333.2 The proposed residential development would only produce some 200 flats which would not help much in addressing the housing problem, but affect all residents in North Point.</p> <p>333.3 The traffic at the section of King's Road between North Point Road and Tin Chiu Street is already very congested. The proposed residential development will aggravate the traffic congestion problem.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>333.4 To use the proposed reprovisioning site for TCSP for residential development.</p> <p>333.5 To consider residential development in Kai Tak and</p>	<p>333.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>333.2 Please refer to the response 2.4 (a) above.</p> <p>333.3 Please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>333.4 Not supported; as residential development is considered incompatible with the existing vehicular ferry pier use serving for dangerous goods vehicles.</p> <p>333.5 Please refer to the response 5.2 above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		Wang Chau.	
334	Gladys Chung	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u> 334.1 The proposed in-fill needle-type building will cause wall effect and blockage of air ventilation.</p>	334.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.
335	Rita Wong	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 335.1 The proposed rezoning to “R(A)” would deprive the right of local residents to enjoy the public open space.</p> <p>335.2 The site is a major ventilation corridor. The proposed high-rise building would affect air ventilation, and aggravate the air pollution problem in the area.</p>	<p>335.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p> <p>335.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p>
336 and 337	<p>謝敏琪 (R336)</p> <p>林國強 Victor Lam (R337)</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 336.1 The proposed high-rise building would affect air ventilation.</p> <p>336.2 The proposed development would block the view from the residences nearby.</p>	<p>336.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>336.2 In the context of Hong Kong where development is taking place in a rapid pace, it is not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations. In the interest of the public, it is far more important to protect public views, particularly those easily accessible and popular to</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		336.3 The residents in North Point would lose a recreational facility for the coming 5 years.	the public or tourists. The response 3.3 above is also relevant.  336.3 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.
338	葉蔭聰	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>338.1 The serious shortage of car parking spaces has resulted in illegal parking at Marble Road, threatening the safety of road users and causing traffic congestion. The proposed residential development will aggravate the traffic congestion problem.</p> <p>338.2 Because of the pressures from locals/interested groups, the building layout of the ex-NPE redevelopment has been revised during the planning application stage to reduce the wall effect and to maintain ventilation corridors including one at TCSP. It is unreasonable to convert TCSP into a high-rise building blocking the ventilation corridor.</p> <p>338.3 North Point is a densely populated community packed with buildings. The proposed reprovisioning site of TCSP is far away from the residential neighbourhood, inconvenient, and of lower leisure quality.</p> <p>338.4 The government should look into the source of housing demand and tackle the housing problem by restraining the population growth.</p>	<p>338.1 Please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) and 30.3(b) above.</p> <p>338.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>338.3 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.</p> <p>338.4 Please refer to the response 6.4 above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
339	胡達權	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>339.1 The proposed development is taller than the redevelopment at the ex-NPE site which would cause wall effect and adverse air ventilation impact, affecting the health and living environment of residents.</p> <p>339.2 There is a shortage of recreational facilities in the district. The proposed residential development would deprive the right of local residents to enjoy the public open space, affecting the well-being of the youth and causing community grievance.</p> <p>339.3 The property price of the proposed residential development may not be affordable to HOS applicants. It is unfair for the middle-income tax payers who are not eligible for the subsidised housing at such a prime site but need to pay for it.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>339.4 To restrict the BH of the site to 80m.</p>	<p>339.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) and 3.3 above.</p> <p>339.2 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p> <p>339.3 Please refer to the response 3.1 above.</p> <p>339.4 Not supported and please refer to the response 3.3 above.</p>
341 and 424	<p>Joe Chan (R341)</p> <p>Elaine Ho (R424)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose Amendment Item A (<b>R341</b> only)</li> <li>• Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25 (<b>R424</b> only)</li> </ul> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u></p> <p>341.1 The population in North Point is increasing rapidly as a number of developments will be completed soon, but</p>	<p>341.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>the amount of public open space is diminishing. The proposed residential development would bring additional population to the area. No consideration has been given to the supporting community facilities. Living quality of local residents will be affected.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u> 341.2 To stop the housing project.</p>	<p>341.2 Not supported and please refer to the response 2.4 (a) above.</p>
342	Ho Tak Yin	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 342.1 To retain the existing basketball court with high usage.</p> <p>342.2 Oppose any development of more than 20 storeys, which would have adverse air ventilation and visual impacts.</p> <p>342.3 The proposed development is not pragmatic.</p>	<p>342.1 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.</p> <p>342.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) and 3.3 above.</p> <p>342.3 Please refer to the responses 30.6(a) and (b) above.</p>
343	Ho Kin	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 343.1 Open space for local residents is reduced. There is no other football pitch in vicinity.</p> <p>343.2 Increase in traffic flow affecting safety of students.</p> <p>343.3 Wall effect.</p>	<p>343.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p> <p>343.2 Please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>343.3 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
344	Wong Ing	<p>Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u></p> <p>344.1 There are a shortage of recreational and sports facilities but too many buildings in North Point. The local residents need more open space for leisure/exercise.</p>	<p>344.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c), and 30.2 (c) above.</p>
345	Li Oi Ling, Tracy	<p>Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u></p> <p>345.1 There are too many residential buildings but a shortage of recreational facilities in North Point.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>345.2 To consider residential development in Repulse Bay or the Peak.</p>	<p>345.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c), and 30.2 (c) above.</p> <p>345.2 Please refer to the response 5.2 above.</p>
346	Kan Yun Hei	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>346.1 The site is the only public open space for the surrounding community.</p> <p>346.2 The proposed development would cause air pollution.</p>	<p>346.1 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.</p> <p>346.2 Please refer to the response 4.3 above.</p>
347	Ms. Fung	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p>	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>347.1 The proposed 34-storey building would block the ventilation corridor.</p> <p>347.2 The site is one of the rare open spaces in the area.</p> <p>347.3 The proposed residential development may not be affordable to the general public. Single block design is of low efficiency.</p>	<p>347.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>347.2 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.</p> <p>347.3 Please refer to the responses 3.1 and 30.6 (a) and (b) above.</p>
348	Yang Wen Hua	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>348.1 It is bad planning to give up the large ex-NPE site for private housing development a few years ago but take a small open space for construction of a single public housing block now.</p> <p>348.2 Proposing an excessively high wall building in the densely populated North Point area would affect the air quality and health of the public.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>348.3 To consider developing new towns.</p>	<p>348.1 Please refer to the response 30.6 (d) above.</p> <p>348.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) and 3.3 above.</p> <p>348.3 Please refer to the response 5.2 above.</p>
349 and 350	<p>Mak Ka Ming (R349)</p> <p>Miu Man Chun (R350)</p>	<p>Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25 and approved OZP No. S/H8/24</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>349.1 There is a serious shortage of recreational facilities in the district. The existing ball courts on the site have</p>	<p>349.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p>



Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>high patronage.</p> <p>349.2 The building height control is inadequate. Wall effect and air ventilation would be worsened.</p> <p>349.3 The proposed development would affect the living quality of the area, leading to community conflicts.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>349.4 To retain TCSP for its original land use.</p> <p>349.5 To restrict the building height of the site to 80m.</p>	<p>349.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) and 3.3 above.</p> <p>349.3 Please refer to the response 2.4 (a) above.</p> <p>349.4 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>349.5 Not supported and please refer to the response 3.3 above.</p>
351	Li Hoi Man	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>351.1 Oppose to build more walled buildings.</p> <p>351.2 The subject site is too small for residential development which is not cost-effective, but causes social disharmony.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>351.3 To shelve the housing project.</p>	<p>351.1 Please refer to the response 2.4 (a) above.</p> <p>351.2 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) and (b) above.</p> <p>351.3 Not supported and please refer to the response 2.4 (a) above.</p>
352	Chan Mei Yun	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p>	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>352.1 There is a serious shortage of open space in the area around the MTR North Point Station. The government has not compensated for the loss of soccer pitch and open space due to construction of ICAC HQ.</p> <p>352.2 The low-density area around Tin Chiu Street and Man Hong Street serves as an important wind entrance to the North Point area. The proposed building at the TCSP site, together with the adjacent CHQ and the ex-NPE redevelopment, would form a wall of buildings blocking winds blowing from the north-east.</p>	<p>352.1 Please refer to the responses 2.2 (a) and (b), and 2.4 (c) above.</p> <p>352.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p>
353	符傳碩	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>353.1 TPB has restricted the building height of the ex-NPE redevelopment. The proposed development is a taller building, together with CHQ which is a walled building without air ventilation enhancement design, would aggravate the air pollution from traffic emission along King's Road.</p> <p>353.2 The property price of the proposed residential development may not be affordable to the general public.</p> <p>353.3 The existing recreational facilities at the subject site are heavily used by the local residents.</p>	<p>353.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>353.2 Please refer to the response 3.1 above.</p> <p>353.3 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.</p>
354	Jamie Yang	Oppose Amendment Item A	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>354.1 The only soccer pitch in the area should not be taken away.</p> <p>354.2 Air ventilation in the area would be affected.</p> <p>354.3 Single block development is not cost-effective. It is ridiculous for HKHA to surrender the ex-NPE site to the government for private housing development a few years ago but take a small open space for public housing development now.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>354.4 To use the vacant flats at The Tanner Hill to address the housing need of the public.</p>	<p>354.1 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.</p> <p>354.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>354.3 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a), (b) and (d) above.</p> <p>354.4 Please refer to the response 30.9 above.</p>
355	Li Yi Man Rita	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>355.1 The site is surrounded by high density residential developments. The wall effect created by the ex-NPE redevelopment together with the proposed development would worsen the heat island effect and air pollution problem from vehicle emissions at the busy road sections of King's Road, Tin Chiu Street and Java Road.</p> <p>355.2 With increase in population due to new developments in the area but reduction in open space (the small King's Road Playground and Tin Chiu Street Children's</p>	<p>355.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>355.2 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (c) and 30.2 (c) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>Playground are far from meeting the local needs, while Quarry Bay Park and Chai Wan Park are too far away for North Point residents), the open space provision could not comply with the standard stated in HKPSG.</p> <p>355.3 Housing shortage problem should have been addressed if the government could proactively resolve the issues about brownfields and Small House policy.</p>	<p>355.3 Please refer to the response 5.2 above.</p>
356	Yang Wing Wing	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u></p> <p>356.1 North Point is densely populated with buildings built close to one another. The proposed residential development would cause wall effect and adverse visual impact, which affect the health of residents, especially the elderly.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>356.2 To use the vacant flats at The Tanner Hill for public housing or develop new towns.</p>	<p>356.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) and 3.3 above.</p> <p>356.2 Please refer to the response 30.9 above.</p>
357	Wong Lai Hing	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>357.1 North Point is densely populated with buildings built close to one another. The proposed residential development would cause wall effect, which affects the dispersion of air pollutants and the health of residents, especially the elderly.</p>	<p>357.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		357.2 The proposed public housing development is excessively tall which is incompatible with the surrounding buildings and causes adverse visual impact to the local residents.	357.2 Please refer to the response 3.3 above.
358	Chung Chi Yip	<p>Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>358.1 It is ridiculous for HKHA to surrender the NPE site to the government but take a small open space for construction of a single public housing block.</p> <p>358.2 The proposed in-fill needle-type residential building would cause wall effect, heat island effect and adverse visual impact to the surrounding areas.</p> <p>358.3 Possible air pollution generated from the nearby sewerage treatment plant will threaten the health of the residents. This should be assessed.</p> <p>358.4 The AVA EE (2016) conducted by HD uses the data of wind tunnel test 8 years ago and does not include detailed calculations and figures. There is no analysis in the AVA EE to feature the recommendations in the</p>	<p>358.1 Please refer to the response 30.6 (d) above.</p> <p>358.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>358.3 The representation site is more than 100m from the North Point Preliminary Treatment Works. According to the Environmental Impact Assessment study for the HATS Stage 2A project, with mitigation measures implemented, e.g. deodorisation system, the predicted odour levels at the representation site would be 1-2 odour units (OU), which is within the acceptable criterion (i.e. 50U). Objectionable odour is also controlled under Air Pollution Control Ordinance (Cap 311).</p> <p>358.4 (a) In the AVA EE for the subject proposed public housing development, three sets of wind data have been considered: (1) the wind availability of the development site from a wind tunnel experiment previously conducted</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>Urban Climatic Map published by PlanD. A comprehensive assessment using updated wind data on the proposal's implications on the surrounding environment, road temperature and dispersion of air pollutants is required.</p>	<p>in 2008 for the “Final Report for An Instructed project at the Ex-NPE Site, North Point, Hong Kong” by the CLP Power Wind/Wave Tunnel Facility at The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology; and (2) the mathematical models – RAMS from PlanD, and (3) the closest weather station – North Point Weather Station from the Hong Kong Observatory. The latest RAMS data have taken into account topography and building morphology in the area. As advised by the Chief Town Planner/Urban and Design, the wind data adopted in the AVA EE are considered appropriate in determining the annual and summer prevailing winds available to the project site and in line with the general approach of conducting an AVA EE.</p> <p>(b) The proposed design measures including a 2m setback from site boundary at the two splayed corners and provision of a ground floor empty bay of 3.5m (width) x 3m (height) abutting Tin Chiu Street could facilitate air flow. They could achieve the effect of reducing ground coverage, increasing building permeability and maintaining connectivity of air path as proposed under the “Urban Climatic Map and Standards for Wind Environment – Feasibility Study” for improving urban climate. With these measures, the proposed development is not anticipated to have significant adverse air ventilation impact on the overall surrounding pedestrian wind environment. HD will also conduct an AVA Initial study to further investigate quantitatively the proposed wind enhancement at the detailed design stage.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>358.5 Some previous media reports relating to the ex-NPE redevelopment and the views of the Alliance for a Beautiful Hong Kong (<b>R7</b>) are submitted for the Board's reference.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>358.6 To use the vacant flats at The Tanner Hill for public housing.</p>	<p>358.5 Please refer to the responses 6.1 to 6.4 above .</p> <p>358.6 Please refer to the response 30.9 above.</p>
359	Heung Mon Png Rose	<p>Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>359.1 To keep the air corridor.</p> <p>359.2 Air quality is already poor in the area. The aim should be to improve it, not to hasten its deterioration.</p>	<p>359.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>359.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p>
360	Wong Sam Kiu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose Amendment Item A</li> <li>• Oppose amendments (a) and (b) to the Notes</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>360.1 No more basketball court and football pitch nearby.</p> <p>360.2 The proposed development would affect air ventilation.</p>	<p>360.1 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.</p> <p>360.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p>
361	Wong Hon Kiu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose Amendment Item A</li> <li>• Oppose amendments (a) and (b) to the Notes</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>361.1 No more ball courts for playing nearby.</p>	<p>361.1 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		361.2 The proposed tall building would affect the air quality.	361.2 Please refer to the response 4.3 above.
362	Claudio Wong	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>362.1 There are limited facilities in North Point. Removing one of the few soccer and basketball courts which is highly utilised by the young and elder people is strongly opposed.</p> <p>362.2 A neighbourhood with only buildings is not acceptable, especially as the land around the North Point Ferry Piers is under construction as residential area which increases the density of the area quickly.</p>	<p>362.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p> <p>362.2 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p>
363	Lam Kim	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u></p> <p>363.1 The only recreational facility/green environment in the area should be kept.</p>	363.1 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.
364	David Lam	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>364.1 The site is too small.</p> <p>364.2 The propose building will cause poor air quality.</p>	<p>364.1 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) and (b) above.</p> <p>364.2 Please refer to the response 4.3 above.</p>



Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<u>Proposal</u> 364.3 To relocate the CHQ and use this site for residential development.	364.3 Not supported and please refer to the response 323.4 above.
365	Ip Sin Man Carmela	Oppose Amendment Item A  <u>Grounds of representation:</u> 365.1 The area around the site is extremely crowded. The ex-NPE redevelopment has already caused wall effect. The proposed high-rise development will worsen the wall effect.  365.2 There is shortage of green fields or parks in such a densely populated district.  <u>Proposal</u> 365.3 To redevelop the Water Supplies Department (WSD) Hong Kong Regional Building at Man Hong Street for residential development.	365.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.  365.2 Please refer to the response 2.4 (b) above.  365.3 Please refer to the response 30.6(b) above.
366 and 367	Siu Seung Shing (R366)  Peter Siu (R367)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose Amendment Item A</li> <li>• Oppose amendments (a) and (b) to the Notes</li> </ul> <u>Grounds of representation:</u> 366.1 The site is too small for building public housing estate.  366.2 Lack of outdoor recreational facilities.  366.3 Increase in traffic load to the congested Java Road.	366.1 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) and (b) above.  366.2 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.  366.3 Please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) above.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
368	Ho Wa Tan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose Amendment Item A</li> <li>• Oppose amendments (a) and (b) to the Notes</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>368.1 There is a lack of recreational facilities in North Point. The ball courts at the subject site are major sports facilities in the neighbourhood for the youngsters, kids and public.</p> <p>368.2 The subject site is too small for proper housing development.</p> <p>368.3 The site is a major ventilation corridor in the area. There is a big housing project by the waterfront (i.e. the ex-NPE redevelopment). The proposed development will further dampen the air circulation.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>368.4 To retain TCSP.</p>	<p>368.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c), and 30.2 (c) above.</p> <p>368.2 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) and (b) above.</p> <p>368.3 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>368.4 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>
369	Andy Cheung	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>369.1 There is a serious shortage of open space in North Point. There is little new supply of open space. The government has not compensated for the loss of soccer pitch due to construction of ICAC HQ. The proposed development would deprive the local residents of the open space left.</p>	<p>369.1 Please refer to the responses 2.2 (a) and (b), 2.4 (c) and 30.2 (c) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>369.2 The CHQ and the ex-NPE redevelopment have already blocked part of the ventilation corridor. The proposed development will worsen the wall effect and blockage to the north-easterly winds.</p> <p>369.3 The reprovisioning site for TCSP at the waterfront was intended by the PlanD for open space use a long time ago.</p> <p>369.4 The proposed residential development would only produce some 200 flats and would not help addressing the housing problem.</p>	<p>369.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>369.3 The reprovisioning site for TCSP is zoned “G/IC” on the North Point OZP. It was originally part of the North Point Vehicular Ferry Pier and was released for other uses in 2009. It has been subsequently taken up by DSD as temporary works area for the HATS Stage 2A project. Before it is agreed by relevant government departments for reprovisioning of the existing TCSP, there is no designated use for the site and it has not been counted towards open space provision for the area.</p> <p>369.4 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) and (b) above.</p>
370	Ho Chee Choi	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>370.1 Construction of a high residential building next to the CHQ and the ex-NPE redevelopment will worsen the wall effect.</p> <p>370.2 The proposed residential development would increase the pressure on the existing transport system.</p> <p>370.3 There is a shortage of playgrounds/parks in the district. The proposed residential development ignores the need</p>	<p>370.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>370.2 Please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>370.3 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (c) and 30.2 (c) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>for more playground/parks in light of the growing population and crowded environment with more and more new buildings.</p> <p>370.4 The subject site is too small for residential development.</p>	<p>370.4 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) and (b) above.</p>
371	Ho Yan Yin	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>371.1 The proposed development will further deteriorate the already bad wall effect in the area. Poor ventilation in the district would pose risk to physical health, make it difficult for pollutants to disperse and worsen the living environment of the residents.</p> <p>371.2 The proposed residential development would add burden to the existing transport system.</p> <p>371.3 Lack of sports facility in the district. TCSP is an essential facility for the district.</p>	<p>371.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>371.2 Please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>371.3 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p>
372	Mandy Tsai	<p>Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>372.1 The CHQ has already blocked the sea breeze. The proposed development will worsen the wall effect.</p> <p>372.2 The area has a dense population but not enough recreational and sports facilities. The existing</p>	<p>372.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>372.2 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>playground is accessible and heavily used by young people.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u> 372.3 To consider residential development in other suitable sites in the Eastern District e.g. Shau Kei Wan.</p>	372.3 Please refer to the response 5.2 above.
373	Mr. Heung	<p>Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 373.1 The proposed residential development would block the air flow, and worsen the air quality which would affect the health of residents.</p> <p>373.2 The new developments in the area are excessive and it is too congested to accommodate further housing development.</p> <p>373.3 More recreational facilities (parks, playgrounds, swimming pool) are required to serve the North Point residents.</p>	<p>373.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>373.2 Please refer to the response 2.4 (a) above.</p> <p>373.3 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p>
374 and 375	<p>Andrew Hu (R374)</p> <p>Vivian Lau (R375)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25 and the approved OZP No. S/H8/24 (<b>R374</b>)</li> <li>• Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25 (<b>R375</b>)</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 374.1 There are limited children's playgrounds in the area.</p> <p>374.2 The proposed residential development would block the</p>	<p>374.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p> <p>374.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>wind/fresh air and worsen the air pollution in the area. Circulation of fresh air is a key to avoid the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) given there is a wet market in the area.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u> 374.3 To move the public housing development uphill e.g. Braemar Hill Road (near Chinese International School) or Pak Fuk Road (near Pak Fuk Road Safety Town).</p>	374.3 Please refer to the response 5.2 above.
376	Tony Yang	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 376.1 There is a lack of recreational space for the elderly in North Point with an aging community.</p> <p>376.2 Adverse ventilation impact.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u> 376.3 To abandon the proposal and identify areas in the New Territories for large scale public housing.</p>	<p>376.1 Please refer to the response 30.2 (c) above.</p> <p>376.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>376.3 Not supported and please refer to the response 5.2 above.</p>
377, 379 and 384	<p>Ng Sai Hang (R377)</p> <p>Kwan Wing Yin (R379)</p> <p>Janice Li (R384)</p>	<p>Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u> 377.1 The proposed residential development would block the wind breeze and worsen the air quality.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u> 377.2 To use the reprovisioning site for TCSP in front of</p>	<p>377.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 and 4.3 above.</p> <p>377.2 Not supported and please refer to the response 333.4</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		CHQ for residential development. ( <b>R379</b> only)	above.
378	Ng Ka Hon	Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25  <u>Ground of representation:</u> 378.1 The proposed residential development would cause air pollution to worsen in the area.	378.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) and 4.3 above.
380	Ng Sai Kuan	Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25  <u>Ground of representation:</u> 380.1 Reduced playground space for the community.	380.1 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.
381	Li Kuen Chan	Oppose Amendment Item A  <u>Grounds of representation:</u> 381.1 The area has too many buildings already. The proposed development would block the wind breeze, and trap the vehicle emissions.	381.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) and 2.4(a) above.
382	Rita	Oppose Amendment Item A  <u>Ground of representation:</u> 382.1 The proposed development would worsen the living quality of residents and increase the pressure on the existing transport network.	382.1 Please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) and 2.4(a) above.
383	Enoch Cheung	Oppose Amendment Item A	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>383.1 There is a shortage of public open space in North Point. Teenagers and kids need the playground.</p> <p>383.2 The reprovisioning site for TCSP at the waterfront was intended by PlanD for open space use a long time ago. The proposed residential development would result in a net loss of existing/planned open space in the area.</p>	<p>383.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p> <p>383.2 Please refer to the response 369.3 above.</p>
385	Chang Kwai Yeung	<p>Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>385.1 The proposed development would reduce air circulation in the congested North Point. Air ventilation is already poor with many tall buildings near the waterfront.</p> <p>385.2 The subject site is too small for residential development. It would only produce some 200 flats which is not cost-effective.</p> <p>385.3 The proposed BH of 110mPD would affect the already limited sea view of the buildings behind.</p>	<p>385.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>385.2 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) and (b) above.</p> <p>385.3 Please refer to the response 336.2 above.</p>
386	Lawrence Li	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>386.1 The proposed development would deprive the right of local residents to enjoy the public open space, which also leads to wall effect.</p>	<p>386.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) and 2.4 (c) above.</p>



Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		386.2 There will be many new housing units after the completion of the ex-NPE redevelopment. There is no point to add one more building in the area.	386.2 Please refer to the response 2.4 (a) above.
387	Ng Nga Man	<p>Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u></p> <p>387.1 The proposed residential development would restrict the wind flow and block the breezeway, which would worsen the air quality in the area where there are already numerous buses running on King's Road and carbon dioxide emission from the high traffic volume on the Island Eastern Corridor.</p>	387.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) and 2.4 above.
388	Goh Chee Yeong	<p>Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>388.1 The proposed development would reduce the air flow of the surrounding area.</p> <p>388.2 There are already many new developments in the area. The proposal will increase the population and make the area much more cramped.</p>	<p>388.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>388.2 Please refer to the response 2.4 (a) above.</p>
389	Li Kuen Chan	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>389.1 Environmental consideration such as air pollution is more important than economic development.</p>	389.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		389.2 There are schools nearby and students may have difficulty in finding a football court and basketball court nearby.	389.2 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.
390	Choi Sau Ying	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u></p> <p>390.1 The proposed development would lead to air pollution as the buildings are so close that the wind cannot blow away air pollutants which would affect people's health.</p>	390.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.
391	Mr. Yap	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>391.1 The community open space is a valuable necessity.</p> <p>391.2 The CHQ should not have been built.</p>	<p>391.1 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.</p> <p>391.2 Please refer to the response 323.4 above.</p>
392	Say Swee Onn	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>392.1 Playground and sport area for physical exercise and visual relaxation are very scarce in the district. The proposed development will take away the existing right of residents nearby.</p> <p>392.2 The proposed residential development in addition to the ex-NPE redevelopment would increase the pressure on the existing transport system and worsen the traffic condition at Java Road.</p>	<p>392.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p> <p>392.2 Please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		392.3 The proposed single block development is inefficient which would not help much in addressing the housing problem.	392.3 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) and (b) above.
393	Irene	<p>Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>393.1 Air ventilation impact to the surrounding area.</p> <p>393.2 The proposed development does not match with the setting of the district.</p> <p>393.3 Building one block on a limited land area would not help solving the housing problem.</p> <p>393.4 Local residents would not have suitable area for leisure. Young people cannot locate suitable place for releasing stress.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>393.5 To redevelop Model Housing Estate for provision of more residential units to solve the housing problem.</p>	<p>393.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>393.2 The site is situated in an urban neighbourhood mixed with residential and commercial developments, GIC facilities and open spaces. The proposed residential development is generally compatible with the surrounding land uses. In visual term, the response 3.3 above is relevant.</p> <p>393.3 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) and (b) above.</p> <p>393.4 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p> <p>393.5 Please refer to the response 30.10 above.</p>
394	Jois Turner	Oppose Amendment Item A	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 394.1 The existing playground at the subject site is heavily used by young people. More open space is required in the area. The government has not compensated for the loss of playground due to construction of CHQ.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u> 394.2 To cancel the draft OZP.</p>	<p>394.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c), and 30.2 (c) above.</p> <p>394.2 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>
395	Pierre Kwok	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 395.1 There is no other playground in the North Point waterfront for the residents to enjoy.</p> <p>395.2 The proposed residential development would create another row of buildings, causing adverse visual impact and creating tunnel effect which restricts air flow in the area.</p> <p>395.3 The subject site is too small to produce significant number of housing units.</p>	<p>395.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (c) and 30.2 (c) above.</p> <p>395.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) and 3.3 above.</p> <p>395.3 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) and (b) above.</p>
396	Peter Chow	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 396.1 TCSP is heavily used by the public. The proposed rezoning would deprive the right of local residents to enjoy the public open space.</p>	<p>396.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (c) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>396.2 Local open space in Hong Kong is far below standard. Victoria Park is a park for the whole territory. It should be excluded from the calculation of open space for North Point. There is no planning ground to convert TCSP for residential use.</p> <p>396.3 The subject site is too small for a meaningful housing scheme.</p> <p>396.4 The proposed development and the committed development in the waterfront would block the view corridors towards the harbour, cause wall effect and disturb the free-flowing of sea breeze and mountain breeze. It would also deprive the right of local</p>	<p>396.2 (a) As a matter of fact, open space standards under HKPSG cannot be achieved uniformly throughout the territory at this stage. While new development areas would be planned to meet the set standards under HKPSG, the old and existing developed areas should be planned to pursue incremental improvements toward the standards through such means as urban renewal.</p> <p>(b) Efforts have been made to increase the open space provision in the major redevelopment sites in North Point, including incorporating 1.5 ha and 3,530m<sup>2</sup> of public open space in the planning briefs for the redevelopments at the ex-NPE site and the ex-Government Supplies Department Depot at Oil Street respectively.</p> <p>(c) Victoria Park falls within the boundary of the North Point OZP and is designated “District Open Space” on the draft North Point (Western Part) Outline Development Plan No. D/H8W/B. Please also note that in assessing the open space provision for Eastern District, Victoria Park has not been taken into account.</p> <p>(d) Please refer to response 2.4 (a) above.</p> <p>396.3 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) and (b) above.</p> <p>396.4 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) and 336.2 above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>residents to enjoy the waterfront.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u> 396.5 To rezone TCSP to “Open Space”.</p> <p>396.6 To consider residential development in brownfield sites and the New Territories.</p>	<p>396.5 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p> <p>396.6 Please refer to the response 30.6 (b) above.</p>
397	Martin Turner	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 397.1 The existing playground at the subject site is heavily used. Reduction in open space should only be permitted under exceptional circumstances. Removal of the playground is not acceptable in view of the deficit in GIC facilities, ongoing population growth and expectation for improved harbourfront with additional recreational activities. The proposed reprovisioned playground should be additional to the existing one but not in a way of replacement.</p> <p>397.2 The proposed development would cause adverse air ventilation impact. Poor ventilation would build up higher levels of air pollutants and affect the health of residents.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u> 397.3 To withdraw the draft OZP.</p>	<p>397.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p> <p>397.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>397.3 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
398	Chang Wai Hing Henry	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>398.1 There is a shortage of open space and recreational facilities in North Point. The existing recreational facilities at the subject site are easily accessible and heavily used by the local residents. It is doubtful whether the proposed reprovisioned playground could create similar effect as TCSP due to the latter's accessibility and local residents already form a habit to go there for leisure.</p> <p>398.2 Ventilation, traffic and visual impacts, and demand for public facilities are important issues. The Board should make best efforts to scrutinise the AVA and various technical assessments.</p>	<p>398.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above. It should also be noted that the reprovisioned playground is located in the vicinity of residential buildings, its usage is expected to be high.</p> <p>398.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c), 2.3 (a) to (c), and 2.4 (a) above.</p>
399	Kwok Chung Yee	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u></p> <p>399.1 The subject site is the only spot along the North Point coast to allow wind flows to the district. With the proposed building, heat and pollutants cannot be removed by air flow, causing harm to the health of residents.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>399.2 To cancel the draft OZP.</p>	<p>399.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>399.2 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
400	Chu Lai Leng	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u> 400.1 The proposed residential building would worsen the air quality in North Point by blocking a wide ventilation breezeway.</p>	400.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.
401	Henry Chan	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u> 401.1 The proposed residential building would worsen the air quality in North Point especially around King's Road. Buildings along King's Road from MTR Fortress Hill Station to MTR North Point Station already form a 'continuous barrier' for air ventilation, trapping a large amount of toxic vehicle emissions from the heavy traffic. The ex-NPE redevelopment and the proposed development would further elongate the barrier and sacrifice the health of residents.</p>	401.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.
402 to 405	<p>Wong Tai Poot (R402)</p> <p>Wong Kin Bong (R403)</p> <p>Li Mei Luen (R404)</p> <p>Pranay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25 (<b>R402</b> only)</li> <li>• Oppose the housing project (<b>R403</b> and <b>R404</b> only)</li> <li>• Oppose the amendments to the approved OZP No. S/H8/24 (<b>R405</b> only)</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 402.1 The reprovisioning site for TCSP at the waterfront was intended by PlanD for open space use a long time ago. The proposed residential development would result in a net loss of existing/planned open space in the area.</p>	402.1 Please refer to the response 369.3 above.



Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
	Kumar (R405)	<p>402.2 There is a serious shortage of open space in North Point and little new supply of open space. The government has not compensated for the loss of a soccer pitch due to construction of ICAC HQ. The proposed development would deprive the local residents of the open space left.</p> <p>402.3 The CHQ and the ex-NPE redevelopment have already blocked part of the ventilation corridor. The proposed development will further worsen the wall effect and blockage to the north-east winds.</p> <p>402.4 It is bad planning for the government to sell the ex-NPE site, which could have been used for public housing, for private development and now proposes to use a small open space for construction of a single public housing block.</p> <p>402.5 The proposed amendment has isolated the redevelopment potential of the adjacent North Point Welfare Association Chan Shu Kui Hall which is underutilised and shows signs of aging. (<b>R402 to R404 only</b>)</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>402.6 To use some of the land along the North Point waterfront allocated which has been allocated to the developers for HOS development (<b>R405 only</b>).</p>	<p>402.2 Please refer to the responses 2.2 (a) and (b), 2.4 (c) and 30.2 (c) above.</p> <p>402.3 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>402.4 Please refer to the response 30.6 (d) above.</p> <p>402.5 North Point Welfare Association Building falls on a private lot. The rezoning of TCSP would not affect the redevelopment of the building on its own.</p> <p>402.6 Please refer to the response 5.2 above.</p>
406	Mary	Oppose Amendment Item A	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
	Mulvihill	<p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>406.1 The Hong Kong 2030 Study has explored a theoretical scheme to use the corner site at Java Road and Tin Chiu Street for open space development but that site has been developed into CHQ, which has created a significant blockage of ventilation. The proposed development would further block the ventilation.</p> <p>406.2 The 2013 Policy Address is meant to review sites which are vacant or held under short term tenancies. TCSP does not fit this criterion as it is a very popular community facility for decades. The government responded at the District Council meeting that the reprovisioning site was not large enough, there was not enough funding to reprovision a 7-a-side soccer pitch and applying funding from LegCo would take too much time. However, there is inadequate information on the size of the site, and the expediency of the project is taking priority over the interests of the community.</p> <p>406.3 The AVA report clearly indicates the proposed development's negative impacts on the ventilation performance under various wind directions. The proposed development of 110mPD would greatly detract from the visual permeability in the locality. The ex-NPE redevelopment has already blocked the ventilation so the buildings behind are dependent upon ventilation coming across TCSP.</p>	<p>406.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>406.2 According to HKPSG, the minimum size for a 7-a-side soccer pitch is 61.26m x 36.57m with margin of 5m on each side of the pitch (i.e. about 3,319m<sup>2</sup> in total). The proposed reprovisioning site has an area of about 2,362m<sup>2</sup>. Due to the irregular configuration of the reprovisioning site, only a standard 5-a-side hard-surfaced soccer pitch of about 38m (L) x 20m (W) and a standard basketball court of about 28m (L) x 15m (W) with ancillary facilities including flood-light system, storage cages, garden bench, power sockets etc. could be provided at the reprovisioning site. The new ball courts are up to the current standard, which is an improvement to the non-standard ones at the existing TCSP.</p> <p>406.3 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) and 3.3 above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>406.4 The average annual growth rate of population in TIA is slightly decreasing but the planned population as stated in the ES of the OZP is increasing. The TIA is not reliable.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>406.5 The playground should be retained.</p> <p>406.6 To convert the proposed reprovisioning site for TCSP into a sitting-out area which includes a memorial or plaque to the refugees and prisoners of war interred at the North Point refugee camp during World War II.</p>	<p>406.4 The population growth rate under the TIA and the planned population stated in the ES of the OZP cannot be compared directly as the assessment area under the TIA is different from the planning scheme of the North Point OZP.</p> <p>406.5 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.</p> <p>406.6 The reprovisioning site for TSCP is primarily to accommodate the soccer pitch and basketball court affected by the proposed residential development.</p>
407	Chan Fung Nei	<p>Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>407.1 The area is getting more and more congested but fewer and fewer playgrounds for children and teenagers to have balanced growth and development. Remove the sports facilities for the young generation will affect their healthy growth.</p> <p>407.2 There are always tourist coaches parking in the area. The proposed residential development would make the area more congested.</p>	<p>407.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p> <p>407.2 Please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) above. To cope with the demand for coach parking spaces in the vicinity of Java Road, 30 public coach parking spaces would be provided at the ex-NPE site.</p>
408	Li Yi Lut	Oppose Amendment Item A	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>408.1 There are no more vacant seats in the MTR trains after 8:30am. This has yet to take account of the commercial/residential activities brought about by the redevelopments in North Point.</p> <p>408.2 People living there cannot use the existing playground facilities after rezoning.</p> <p>408.3 The proposed development would block air ventilation and worsen the pollution problem.</p>	<p>408.1 Please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>408.2 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.</p> <p>408.3 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p>
409	Peter Poon	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>409.1 Affect air ventilation of North Point/inner streets.</p> <p>409.2 No building should be constructed at the representation site. The ICAC HQ and CHQ already took away considerable amount of land. The remaining open space should not be taken away.</p>	<p>409.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>409.2 Please refer to the responses 2.2 (a) and (b), 2.4 (c), and 30.2 (c) above.</p>
410	Vivi Chan	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>410.1 Affect air ventilation of North Point area.</p> <p>410.2 No building should be constructed at the site.</p>	<p>410.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>410.2 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
411	Winnie Tam	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u> 411.1 Oppose to any wall building that affects air quality and health of the primary students nearby.</p>	411.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.
412 to 414	<p>Alice (R412)</p> <p>Jevon (R413)</p> <p>Charmian (R414)</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 412.1 Oppose to any wall building that affects air ventilation. 412.2 Oppose to take away the only ball courts in the area.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u> 412.3 To retain TCSP (<b>R414</b> only).</p>	<p>412.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>412.2 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.</p> <p>412.3 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>
415	Ivy Lee	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u> 415.1 The population of North Point is too high.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u> 415.2 To find housing land in Wang Chau.</p>	<p>415.1 Please refer to the response 2.4 (a) above.</p> <p>415.2 Please refer to the response 5.2 above.</p>
416	Yip Wah Yung	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u> 416.1 There is a shortage of recreational area in the densely populated North Point. The small playground should</p>	416.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		not be converted to residential use.	
417	Shan Hok Shing	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>417.1 There is a shortage of recreational area in this densely populated area.</p> <p>417.2 The proposed development would cause wall effect and worsen air pollution.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>417.3 To retain TCSP.</p>	<p>417.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p> <p>417.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>417.3 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>
418	Emma Poon	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u></p> <p>418.1 The subject site is the only open space for children.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>418.2 Should not amend the OZP.</p>	<p>418.1 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.</p> <p>418.2 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>
419	Irene Chan	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u></p> <p>419.1 Leisure facilities should not be reduced. The subject site is the only park in North Point.</p>	<p>419.1 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.</p>

<b>Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)</b>	<b>Representer</b>	<b>Subject of Representation</b>	<b>Responses to Representations</b>
420	Lawrence Lee	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u> 420.1 Oppose to reduce the ball court facilities in the area, and hence young people's opportunities for outdoor sports.</p>	420.1 Please refer to the response 2.4 (c) above.
421	Alvin Lee	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u> 421.1 Oppose to convert this piece of scarce outdoor recreational land in the district for residential use, which affects the interests of local residents.</p>	421.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.
422	Richard Leung	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u> 422.1 Oppose to convert the ball courts for residential use. More open space is required to serve the aging community in North Point.</p>	422.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) and 30.2 (c) above.
423	Chan Chun Ho	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 423.1 The subject site is a piece of scarce recreational open space in the district which is not suitable for residential development.  423.2 The proposed development would block the ventilation corridor and cause wall effect.</p>	<p>423.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>423.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		423.3 The subject site is too small for residential development as only very tiny flats could be produced.	423.3 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) and (b) above.
425	Peter S	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>425.1 The building height of the proposed residential development is not compatible with the private comprehensive development at the ex-NPE site.</p> <p>425.2 The proposed development would block air ventilation to the Marble Road and King's Road area.</p> <p>425.3 The subject site is too small for residential development. It would only produce some 200 flats which would not help much in addressing the housing problem.</p> <p>425.4 The existing recreational facilities at the subject site are heavily used by the residents and students. There is shortage of recreational facilities.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>425.5 To retain TCSP.</p>	<p>425.1 Please refer to the response 3.3 above.</p> <p>425.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>425.3 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (a) and (b) above.</p> <p>425.4 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (c) and 30.2 (c) above.</p> <p>425.5 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>
426	Edna Chan	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p>	



Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>426.1 The construction of CHQ and ICAC HQ have already taken away considerable amount of open space and playground. The reprovisioning playground is smaller than TCSP. The proposed amendment will further reduce the available open space.</p> <p>426.2 The government has restricted the BH of the ex-NPE redevelopment and requested to reserve the ventilation corridor. However, a taller building is now proposed at the entrance to the ventilation corridor which would block the air and sunlight penetration to the district.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>426.3 To retain TCSP.</p> <p>426.4 To consider sites on Braemar Hill for subsidising housing.</p>	<p>426.1 Please refer to the responses 2.2 (a), 2.4 (b) and (c), and 30.2 (c) above.</p> <p>426.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>426.3 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p> <p>426.4 Please refer to the response 5.2 above.</p>
427	Emily Cheung	<p>Oppose the draft OZP No. S/H8/25</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>427.1 The low-density area around Tin Chiu Street and Man Hong Street serves as an important wind entrance to the North Point area. The CHQ has already affected air ventilation. The proposed development would further affect the air ventilation in North Point.</p> <p>427.2 There is a shortage of open space in the district especially for the elderly. The government has not compensated for the loss of playground facilities due to</p>	<p>427.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>427.2 Please refer to the responses 2.2 (a), and 2.4 (b) and (c), above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>construction of ICAC HQ. The proposed development would further reduce the available open space.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u> 427.3 To convert the site to a park with facilities for stretching exercise.</p>	427.3 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.
428	Carol Ho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose Amendment Item A</li> <li>• Oppose amendment (a) to the Notes</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 428.1 The government should provide quality open space for citizens rather than exploiting open public space to increase housing land.</p> <p>428.2 ‘Art Studio’ and ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture’ uses under private management cannot replace outdoor public space.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u> 428.3 To rezone TCSP for open public space.</p>	<p>428.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>428.2 The amendment (a) to the Notes is only applicable to industrial buildings or industrial-office buildings in “Residential (Group E)” zone, which is unrelated to the rezoning of TCSP from “G/IC” to “R(A)” under Amendment Item A.</p> <p>428.3 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>
429	Carmela Ho	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u> 429.1 The proposed development would block the ventilation corridor and cause wall effect, affecting the health of residents.</p>	429.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>429.2 The construction of CHQ and ICAC HQ has already taken away two playgrounds. The reprovisioning of TCSP should only be a compensation for these playgrounds, but not the current TCSP.</p> <p>429.3 North Point is already densely populated and congested. There is a serious shortage of open space in the area. Victoria Park should not be fully counted as open space for North Point.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>429.4 To renovate TCSP together with the adjacent North Point Welfare Association Chan Shu Kui Hall to improve the recreational facilities and public spaces in the district.</p>	<p>429.2 Please refer to the responses 2.2 (a) and 30.2(c) above.</p> <p>429.3 Please refer to the response 396.2 above.</p> <p>429.4 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) and 402.5 above.</p>
430	Law Hin Cheung	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>430.1 The government should not use the surplus in district open space provision to offset the deficit in local open space. Victoria Park should be regarded as a regional open space that only 50% of it should be counted as open space for the North Point area. There are a lot of office developments in North Point but no additional open space is provided for the working population which is not in line with HKPSG.</p> <p>430.2 The government has not compensated for the loss of soccer pitch and open space due to construction of</p>	<p>430.1 Please refer to the responses 30.2 (a) and 396.2 (b) above. North Point is a neighbourhood of mixed developments with residential and commercial buildings. All the open spaces are for public enjoyment including the residents and working population in North Point.</p> <p>430.2 Please refer to the response 2.2 (a) above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>ICAC HQ.</p> <p>430.3 The reprovisioning site for TCSP at the waterfront was previously considered by PlanD for open space use which could not be materialised due to the HATS project. The site should be regarded as “planned open space”. The proposed development would result in a net loss of existing/planned open space in the area.</p> <p>430.4 It is bad planning to give up the large NPE site but take a small open space for construction of a single public housing block.</p> <p>430.5 There is no mention of the original planned GIC use of the site.</p> <p>430.6 The rezoning has isolated the redevelopment of Chan Shu Kui City Hall without considering the opportunity for comprehensive redevelopment of the two sites together.</p>	<p>430.3 Please refer to the response 369.3 above.</p> <p>430.4 Please refer to the response 30.6 (d) above.</p> <p>430.5 The site was previously reserved for the provision of a community hall and Home Affairs Bureau has confirmed that the site could be released for other uses. It should be noted that a proposed community hall will be provided within the ex-NPE redevelopment to the northwest of the subject site according to the respective Planning Brief and approved Application No. A/H8/419. There is currently no designated GIC use for the site, nor request from relevant departments for taking up the site for standalone GIC facilities.</p> <p>430.6 Please refer to the response 402.5 above.</p>
431 to 434	Y. P. Lee (R431)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose Amendment Item A</li> <li>• Oppose to amendments (a) and (b) to the Notes</li> </ul>	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
	H. K. Yeung (R432)  M. H. Lee (R433)  H.Y. Yeung (R434)	<p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>431.1 The only soccer pitch in the area should not be taken away. The shortage of open space especially easily accessible open space for the elderly in this crowded area is becoming more serious with increasing population brought about by the recent/new developments.</p> <p>431.2 The proposed development would cause adverse air ventilation impact.</p> <p>431.3 The proposed development would worsen the traffic congestion and illegal parking problem.</p> <p>431.4 The Harbourfront Commission's TFHK has objected to the housing project.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>431.5 To cancel the zoning amendment.</p>	<p>431.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>431.2 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>431.3 Please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) above. Illegal parking would be enforced by the Hong Kong Police Force.</p> <p>431.4 Please refer to the response 30.5 above.</p> <p>431.5 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>
435	Name Illegible	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>435.1 The proposed development would cause wall effect. The site is located at a major ventilation corridor of North Point previously identified by PlanD.</p> <p>435.2 It is difficult to understand why the government not</p>	<p>435.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>435.2 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) and 5.2 above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<p>considers housing at more sizable land in Wang Chau and Tuen Mun, but proposes housing on this small site. This makes the North Point residents highly dissatisfied.</p> <p>435.3 The population in North Point is already very high. The MTR can hardly cope with the morning traffic.</p>	<p>435.3 Please refer to the responses 2.3 (a) to (c) above.</p>
436	Wan Tak Yuen	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>436.1 Tin Chiu Street has been considered for low-rise development to ensure air flow along Kai Yuen Street. The CHQ and ex-NPE redevelopment have already narrowed the ventilation corridor along Tin Chiu Street. There is no more breathing space in the area. Pollution problem from the traffic along Island Eastern Corridor and King's Road is already very serious. The health of residents will be affected.</p> <p>436.2 The site is the only soccer pitch in the area. The rezoning would set an undesirable precedent for high-rise development in the nearby "G/IC" sites.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>436.3 To retain TCSP for sports activities.</p>	<p>436.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>436.2 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (c) above.</p> <p>436.3 Not supported and please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (d) above.</p>
437	Eva Wong	Oppose Amendment Item A	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
		<u>Ground of representation:</u> 437.1 The proposed development would block the ventilation corridor in the area.  437.2 The housing shortage problem should be resolved by controlling the population growth.	437.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.  437.2 Please refer to the response 6.4 above.
438	Lee Suk Yee	Oppose Amendment Item A  <u>Grounds of representation:</u> 438.1 The government has yet to compensate for the loss of soccer pitch due to construction of ICAC HQ.  438.2 It is bad planning to give up the large NPE site but take a small open space which is heavily used by residents for construction of a single public housing block.  438.3 The rezoning has isolated the redevelopment of the adjacent Chan Shu Kui City Hall without considering the opportunity for comprehensive redevelopment of the two sites together.	438.1 Please refer to the response 2.2 (a) above.  438.2 Please refer to the responses 30.6 (d) above.  438.3 Please refer to the response 402.5 above.
439	Carol Gube	Oppose Amendment Item A  <u>Grounds of representation:</u> 439.1 The government should provide quality open space for citizens rather than exploiting open public space to increase housing land. The proposed residential development would deprive the right of local residents to enjoy the public open space.	439.1 Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (c) above.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representations
440	港運城小業主	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u></p> <p>440.1 The CHQ and the redevelopment at the NPE have already blocked the sea breeze/air ventilation and harbour view. The proposed development will worsen the situation.</p>	440.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.
441	馬家寶	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <p>441.1 The rezoning has ignored the residents' need for open space, living quality, and the area's transport and population capacities. The proposed development would block the ventilation corridor and worsen the heat island effect in North Point.</p>	441.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c), 2.3 (a) to (c) and 2.4 (a) to (d) above.
442	Lam Wing Yee	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Ground of representation:</u></p> <p>442.1 There is serious air pollution in North Point, especially with buses passing through Tsat Tsz Mui Road. The CHQ and ICAC HQ already form a wall of buildings. It is inappropriate to construct another wall building in the area.</p>	442.1 Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) above.



## Comments

<b>Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-C)</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Gist of Comment</b>	<b>Response to Comments</b>
1	環保觸覺 Green Sense	<p>(a) There are still many brownfields and military land in Hong Kong for housing development.</p> <p>(b) The government should not neglect other planning principles in achieving a short term goal.</p> <p>(c) The great majority number of adverse representations illustrate that the public has grave concern on the proposed amendment.</p> <p>(d) The rezoning of an open space in a congested community for residential use would increase the community's grievance.</p> <p>(e) The air ventilation and traffic problems mentioned in the representations could not be solved.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to the response 5.2 above.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to the response 2.4 (a) above.</p> <p>(c) Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p> <p>(d) Please refer to the responses 2.4 (b) and (c) above.</p> <p>(e) Please refer to the responses 2.1 (a) to (c) and 2.3 (a) to (c) above.</p>
2	Mok Kun Ki	<p>(a) Object to erosion of public space. The public would no longer tolerate the loss of public space because of housing land supply while there are abuse uses of land in the New Territories every day and scandals of school sites.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to the responses 2.4 (a) to (c) and 5.2 above. It should also be noted that unauthorised developments in rural areas would be dealt with by the Planning Authority separately.</p>
3	Mary Mulvihill	<p>(a) There is already shortfall of open space in North Point area (-4.49ha). The proposed amendment contradicts to the proposal under the Hong Kong 2030+ to adopt higher ratios of 3.5m<sup>2</sup> and a minimum of 2.5m<sup>2</sup> per person for strategic planning of GIC facilities and open space land requirement respectively. The proposed</p>	<p>(a) Regarding the proposed public open space and "G/IC" land target provision targets under the Hong Kong 2030+, it should be noted that those targets are still under consultation and, if endorsed, may not be achieved all at once nor uniformly throughout the territory. The</p>

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-C)	Commenter	Gist of Comment	Response to Comments
		<p>amendment is not acceptable that there will be further erosion of existing facilities.</p> <p>(b) HC has objected to the proposed reprovisioned playground facilities surrounded by high netting at harbourfront.</p>	<p>intention is that new development areas would be planned to meet those targets, whereas for the existing built up area, opportunities will be seized as far as practicable.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to the response 30.5 above.</p>
4	Lai Ming Chuen Jan	<p>(a) Hong Kong's urban areas have always suffered from a serious lack of public open space. Request for better quality of life has been ignored and scattered open spaces and "G/IC" sites in downtown areas have been rezoned in recent years for in-filling of residential buildings which cause harm to the environment, community and urban landscape.</p> <p>(b) Because of the pressures from the environmental groups and other parties, the building layout of the ex-NPE redevelopment has been revised during the planning application stage to reduce the wall effect and to maintain ventilation corridors including one at TCSP. The approval of a high-rise building at TCSP would violate this planning concept and damage the living environment of North Point.</p> <p>(c) The proposed building at TCSP site, together with the adjacent CHQ and the ex-NPE redevelopment, would form a wall of buildings. This would compromise the area's ability to adjust to the micro-climate, and lead to rise in temperature, different types of pollution and negative environmental impact.</p>	<p>The comments are same as Representations No. R6 to R29. Please refer to the responses 6.1 to 6.4 above.</p>

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-C)	Commenter	Gist of Comment	Response to Comments
		<p>(d) The reprovisioned playground proposed is unable to help ventilate the North Point downtown and compensate for the ventilation impact of the proposed development.</p> <p>(e) North Point is a mature, densely populated community which is already packed with buildings. The proposed reprovisioning site of TCSP is farther away from the residential neighbourhood that residents would find it inconvenient to access. Even if there is no reduction in the size of the open space, its quality would obviously be downgraded.</p> <p>(f) The government should stop squeezing buildings into small spaces, but should tackle the housing problem at source by reviewing its population growth strategy.</p>	

**List of Representatives in respect of  
Draft North Point Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H8/25**

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
1	Angel Tse
2	陳淑莊議員 (立法會議員) Hon. Tanya Chan (Legislative Council Member)
3	梁兆新議員 (東區區議員) Leung Siu Sun Patrick (Eastern District Council Member)
4	曾卓兒 (自由黨港島東區支部 主席) Pearl Tsang (Chairman of the Liberal Party Eastern District Branch Office)
5	中西區關注組 Central & Western Concern Group
6	環保觸覺 Green Sense
7	美港聯盟 Alliance for a Beautiful Hong Kong
8	Melanie Moore
9	Evelyn Moore

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
10	Genevieve Moore
11	John Moore
12	Joan Shang
13	Steve Brammar
14	Chrystele Gademer
15	Mahesh Datwani
16	Janice Henderson
17	YK Mok
18	Louise Garnaut
19	Mok Kun Ki Ben
20	Cherry
21	余智健 Yu Chi Kin
22	Barbara Kong
23	YY Yeung
24	Yeung Tsz Kit
25	Chung Chi Wai
26	張智健
27	林君宜 Estelle Lam
28	Patrick Wong
29	盧啓元 Lo Kai Yuen Harrison

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
30	鄭達鴻議員 (東區區議員) Tat Cheng (Eastern District Council Member)
31	東發大廈 A 及 D 座業主立案法 團 Incorporated Owners of Block A and D, Tung Fat Mansion
32	Wong Wing Lai
33	Wade Chan
34	Gary Ho
35	Lee Hwa Lun
36	李立仁
37	Mr Yau
38	Lee Siu Pang
39	Tracy Lee
40	Lee Ting
41	Mr. Fung
42	Edey Chan
43	Choi Heung Leung
44	Lee Lung Yui

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
45	Riley Ip
46	Kwan Yim Pui
47	Rachel Tam
48	Yau Chun Fai
49	Kong Wai Kin
50	Ho Cheng Kwun Terence
51	王嘉明
52	Eric Fisher
53	Grazia Chan
54	Ng Kuen Kuen
55	Lok See Chung
56	Gladys Chan
57	Mak Suk Yi
58	Kwok Yee Lai
59	Jeff
60	Jessica Poon
61	Nelson Fung
62	Queenie
63	Raymond Ko
64	Chan Yiu Kwong

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
65	Sam
66	Mak Kwok Kwuen
67	Tsui Chak Lan
68	Joseph Lee
69	Lisa Tong
70	Veron Suen
71	Peggy Hung
72	Lau Chor Ngai
73	Yu Sin Yu
74	Sam
75	Angel Lam
76	Lee Hun Mui
77	Lee Shuk Yee
78	Fok Wai Kong
79	Wong Yiu Fai
80	Chu Kwok Fai
81	Vienna Kwok
82	Derek Kwan
83	Quby Tang
84	Liz Cheung

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
85	Keith Ling
86	Lui Wing Yat
87	Winnie Cheng
88	Chris K.F. Ha
89	Joey Dai
90	Victoria Chan
91	Ng Ching Ching
92	Fok Ling Fung
93	Cheung Kwok Yin
94	Yip Chak Hang
95	H. Yung
96	Chu Man Him
97	Wong Chung Ting
98	C. Tsui
99	Lau Wai Yin
100	Wong King Yan Calven
101	Carol Cheung
102	Bobby Hui
103	Mak Wing Sze
104	C. F. Chang

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
105	Wong Hoi Ling
106	Danny Au Yeung
107	Griffin
108	Irene Lee
109	Cheung Hok Kan
110	Lee Yick Chun
111	Lee Yick Yung
112	何秀蘭
113	李永強
114	Adrian Yeung
115	Li Hing Yu
116	Jenny Tam
117	Sze Man Miu
118	Ivy Lai
119	Chan Pui Sze
120	Cheung Yu Yan
121	Man Ling Ingrid Ip
122	Elaine Chan
123	Chiu Man Kuen
124	Wong Kwok Hong

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
125	大鴻
126	Susan Lam
127	Perry Tang
128	Yan N.H.
129	Chan Jeff Wea Fan
130	Natalie
131	Pui Laj Wong
132	Liu Tsz Hin
133	Janet Tam
134	Ms. Lam
135	Angela Hui
136	Wynne Choi
137	Crystal Chiu
138	Ada Wong
139	Sin Wai Hong
140	Tsang Yuen Ching
141	Lam Kar Wah
142	Chin W. Y.
143	Pauline Lau
144	Y. K. Wu

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
145	Chong
146	Christine Lee
147	Florence Leung
148	Carrie Wong
149	Tango Beh
150	Wan Kam Lok
151	陳麗珍
152	Tennie Tang
153	Daisy Li
154	李林美津
155	尹頌熙
156	Ms. Ma
157	Chau Mei Wah
158	W. Leung
159	Ryan
160	Timmy Cheng
161	吳子莉
162	Kevin Li
163	Kwan Chun Yu
164	葉偉文

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
165	徐慧宜
166	郭愷晴
167	Helen Ying
168	Johnny Siu
169	Mary Chung
170	Chan Sit Yiu Ping, Angela
171	Jerry Sin
172	Frankie Lam
173	Kelly Chan
174	Judy Wong
175	林建家
176	Ellena Chan
177	Joel
178	Yan Cho Tak
179	Cheng Suet Mui
180	Ivy Leung
181	何珮如, 吳滿金
182	Ko Wing Yi
183	Xiang Lui Hua
184	Hui Pui Wah

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
185	William Kan
186	顧晉謙
187	阮法政
188	Kwok Kwong Lee
189	Eva Lee
190	林麗紅
191	姓名不詳 Name Illegible
192	潘榮華
193	潘麗芳
194	張敏儀
195	唐淑菁
196	Ng Kwok Leung
197	Chan Lai Hing
198	Doris Kan
199	Seven Wu
200	唐淑賢
201	吳璟禧
202	Katherine Wong
203	蔡偉明
204	吳太

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
205	姓名不詳 Name Illegible
206	Eudora Lee
207	Ellis Tsang
208	潘崇進
209	郭秀萍
210	余惠琮
211	姓名不詳 Name Illegible
212	曾琬琚
213	鄭秀玲
214	Chan Chun Yu
215	Trevor Tsang
216	Chan Choi Mei
217	Cecilia Wong
218	李迪邦
219	王浩英
220	曾文傑
221	Paul Wong
222	Chris Cheung
223	Leung Siu Ling
224	Wong Hoi Fei

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
225	Eugene Ling
226	朱玉妹
227	黃翠蓮
228	周麗貞
229	江玉蓮
230	梁璜基
231	吳文剛
232	Louis Hui
233	So Ting Fung
234	Lo Kit Yiu
235	Chan Wing Yip
236	Lee Yik Koon
237	Shum Wai Keung Danny
238	Go Pak Yuk
239	蘇霆雋
240	潘鳳瑛
241	Louis Pang
242	陳麗萍
243	洪爾玉
244	Cheung Fong

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
245	文小姐
246	莊彩云
247	姓名不詳 Name Illegible
248	Ho King Hung
249	Lo Chun Shing
250	吳北榕
251	Annie Yau
252	Chan Wai Sing
253	Lee Man Lie
254	Yau Kam Yiu
255	Wong Shun Wah
256	Chu Ka Chun
257	Hammond Chu
258	黃銘華
259	蔡國英
260	顏小洋
261	Jess Cheung
262	Joe Yip
263	Sandy Ngan
264	葉惠芳

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
265	Lily Fung
266	葉林青
267	歐麗娥
268	葉巧盈
269	Wong
270	David Lau
271	葉巧兒
272	謝德棣
273	歐琬琪
274	Lee Sau Wah
275	Chiu Wai Man
276	方自強
277	姓名不詳 Name Illegible
278	曾信得
279	Cecilia Hung
280	陳澤權
281	Leung Kwok Lau
282	鄭純明
283	鄭宏署
284	彭詠詩



Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
285	Ng Yee Ying
286	Kang Pui Man
287	劉穎昕
288	黃燕萍
289	Thomas Lee
290	Kevin Sott
291	劉華炎
292	張月娥
293	姓名不詳 Name Illegible
294	梁耀強
295	Wong Lai Ying
296	周先生
297	Eliza Cheng
298	Timmy Cheng
299	Lau Chi Wing
300	范偉文
301	李珍
302	范明睿
303	姓名不詳 Name Illegible
304	梁小姐

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
305	曾日明
306	陳大衛
307	麥機暉
308	馮榮進
309	J. Lo
310	林景新
311	Van Ng
312	陳越
313	高福明
314	Raymond Kwong
315	潘偉
316	Cheuk Pui Yin
317	Fan Yuen Wah
318	Sharon Law
319	Au Sai Kin
320	Ms. Cheung
321	Chan Hin Wai
322	Lau Yue Wai
323	Kylie Cheung
324	Yang Kenny

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
325	Sun Hoi Yan
326	Mei Hong
327	Halina Cheung
328	Nic Cheung
329	Gladys
330	Amy
331	Wong Wing Hang
332	Lai Chui Ping
333	焦樹榮
334	Gladys Chung
335	Rita Wong
336	謝敏琪
337	林國強 Victor Lam
338	葉蔭聰
339	胡達權
340	陳蘊儀
341	Joe Chan
342	Ho Tak Yin
343	Ho Kin
344	Wong Ing

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
345	Li Oi Ling, Tracy
346	Kan Yun Hei
347	Ms. Fung
348	Yang Wen Hua
349	Mak Ka Ming
350	Miu Man Chun
351	Li Hoi Man
352	Chan Mei Yun
353	符傳碩
354	Jamie Yang
355	Li Yi Man Rita
356	Yang Wing Wing
357	Wong Lai Hing
358	Chung Chi Yip
359	Heung Mon Png Rose
360	Wong Sam Kiu
361	Wong Hon Kiu
362	Claudio Wong
363	Lam Kim
364	David Lam

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
365	Ip Sin Man Carmela
366	Siu Seung Shing
367	Peter Siu
368	Ho Wa Tan
369	Andy Cheung
370	Ho Chee Choi
371	Ho Yan Yin
372	Mandy Tsai
373	Mr. Heung
374	Andrew Hu
375	Vivian Lau
376	Tony Yang
377	Ng Sai Hang
378	Ng Ka Hon
379	Kwan Wing Yin
380	Ng Sai Kuan
381	Li Kuen Chan
382	Rita
383	Enoch Cheung
384	Janice Li

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
385	Chang Kwai Yeung
386	Lawrence Li
387	Ng Nga Man
388	Goh Chee Yeong
389	Li Kuen Chan
390	Choi Sau Ying
391	Mr. Yap
392	Say Swee Onn
393	Irene
394	Jois Turner
395	Pierre Kwok
396	Peter Chow
397	Martin Turner
398	Chang Wai Hing Henry
399	Kwok Chung Yee
400	Chu Lai Leng
401	Henry Chan
402	Wong Tai Poot
403	Wong Kin Bong
404	Li Mei Luen

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
405	Pranay Kumar
406	Mary Mulvihill
407	Chan Fung Nei
408	Li Yi Lut
409	Peter Poon
410	Vivi Chan
411	Winnie Tam
412	Alice
413	Jevon
414	Charmian
415	Ivy Lee
416	Yip Wah Yung
417	Shan Hok Shing
418	Emma Poon
419	Irene Chan
420	Lawrence Lee
421	Alvin Lee
422	Richard Leung
423	Chan Chun Ho
424	Elaine Ho

Rep. No. (TPB/R/ S/H8/25-	Name of 'Representer'
425	Peter S
426	Edna Chan
427	Emily Cheung
428	Carol Ho
429	Carmela Ho
430	Law Hin Cheung
431	Y. P. Lee
432	H. K. Yeung
433	M. H. Lee
434	H. Y. Yeung
435	姓名不詳 Name Illegible
436	Wan Tak Yuen
437	Eva Wong
438	Lee Suk Yee
439	Carol Gube
440	港運城小業主
441	馬家寶
442	Lam Wing Yee

**List of Commenters in respect of**  
**Draft North Point Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H8/25**

<b>Com. No. (TPB/R/S/H8/25-C)</b>	<b>Name of ‘Commenter’</b>
1	環保觸覺 Green Sense
2	Mok Kun Ki
3	Mary Mulvihill
4	Lai Ming Chuen Jan

**Provision of Open Space and Major Community Facilities for  
the Planning Scheme Area of North Point OZP**

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population*)	Provision		Surplus/Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (Inclusive of existing provision)	
District Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons	15.81 ha	21.00 ha	25.96 ha	+10.15 ha
Local Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons	15.81 ha	9.90 ha	11.32 ha	-4.49 ha
Secondary School	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17	160 classrooms	389 classrooms	389 classrooms	+229 Classrooms
Primary School	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11	220 classrooms	260 classrooms	308 classrooms	+88 Classrooms
Kindergarten / Nursery	26 classrooms for 1,000 children aged 3 to under 6	60 classrooms	154 classrooms	154 classrooms	+94 Classrooms
District Police Station	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons	0	1	1	+1
Divisional Police Station	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons	0	0	0	0
Clinic/Health Centre	1 per 100,000 persons	1	1	1	0
Magistracy (with 8 courtrooms)	1 per 660,000 persons	0	0	0	0
Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24	1	3	3	+2
Integrated Family Services Centre	1 per 100,000 to 150,000 persons	1	3	4	+3
Library	1 district library for every 200,000 persons	0	2	2	+2
Sports Centre	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons	2	1	1	-1 <sup>#</sup>
Sports Ground/Sports Complex	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons	0	0	0	0
Swimming Pool Complex – standard	1 complex per 287,000 persons	0	1	1	+1

\* The planned population for the area is 181,300 (including usual residents, mobile residents and transients). In estimating the requirements for social welfare facilities, open space and recreational facilities, transients are excluded. In estimating the requirements for educational facilities, mobile residents and transients are excluded.

# Provision of recreational and sports facilities shall be considered by LCSD taking into account various factors including the demand for such facilities, usage of existing facilities, HKPSG, resource availability as well as views of the relevant District Council. It should be noted that the site under Amendment Item A is too small (0.12 ha) to accommodate a standard sports centre (0.6 ha) and there is already a sports centre located nearby (i.e. Java Road Sports Centre).