

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**TPB Paper No. 10858
For Consideration by the
Town Planning Board on 21.10.2022**

**REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/H3/444
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**PROPOSED OFFICE AND SHOP AND SERVICES
IN “RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)6” ZONE
380 DES VOEUX ROAD WEST, SHEK TONG TSUI, HONG KONG**

REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/H3/444
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

**Proposed Office and Shop and Services
in “Residential (Group A)6” Zone,
380 Des Voeux Road West, Shek Tong Tsui, Hong Kong**

1. Background

- 1.1 On 25.10.2021, the applicant, Luck Rich Properties Limited represented by DeSPACE (International) Limited, sought planning permission for a proposed 24-storey commercial development with office and shop and services uses at the application site (the Site) under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Site falls within an area zoned “Residential (Group A)6” (“R(A)6”) on the approved Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H3/34 (**Plan R-1**). According to the Notes of the OZP for “R(A)” zone, ‘Office’ and ‘Shop and Services’ uses not within the lowest three floors of a building require planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board).
- 1.2 On 22.4.2022, the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board decided to reject the application and the reasons were:
- (a) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “R(A)6” zone which was for high-density residential developments and there was no strong planning justification for a departure from the planning intention of the “R(A)6” zone; and
 - (b) the proposed development did not comply with Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 5 (TPB PG-No. 5) in that the proposed office was located in a predominantly residential area.
- 1.3 For Members’ reference, the following documents are attached:
- (a) MPC Paper No. A/H3/444A (Annex A)
 - (b) Extract of minutes of the MPC meeting held on 22.4.2022 (Annex B)
 - (c) Secretary of the Board’s letter dated 6.5.2022 (Annex C)

2. Application for Review

- 2.1 On 27.5.2022, the applicant applied, under section 17(1) of the Ordinance, for a review of the MPC’s decision to reject the application (**Annex D-1**). On 3.8.2022, the applicant’s representative submitted written representation,

including justifications, two additional notional residential schemes and traffic noise measurement results, in support of the review application (**Annex D-2**).

- 2.2 Compared with the s.16 application, there is no change to the layout and major development parameters, including gross floor area (GFA), plot ratio (PR) and building height (BH), of the proposed commercial development at the Site under the review application. Details of the proposed development are set out below and shown on Drawings A-1 to A-7 of **Annex A**.

Major Development Parameters	
Site Area	139.2m ² (about)
Maximum Non-Domestic Plot Ratio (PR)	15
Maximum Non-Domestic Gross Floor Area (GFA)	Not more than 2,088m ²
- Office (3/F and above)	- Not more than 1,754m ²
- Shop and Services (Lowest 3 Floors)	- Not more than 334m ² (E&M facilities on 1/F is not accountable for GFA)
Site Coverage (SC)	
- Podium (G/F to 2/F)	100%
- Tower (3/F to 23/F)	60%
No. of Blocks	1
BH (at main roof level)	100mPD
No. of Storeys	24 (G/F to 23/F)
Parking Spaces and Loading/Unloading (L/UL) Facilities	Nil
Floor	Main Uses
G/F	Shop and Services / Lift Lobby
1/F	E&M facilities
2/F	Shop and Services
3/F	Office / Flat Roof
4/F to 23/F	Office

3. **Justifications from the Applicant**

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the review application are detailed in the written representation at **Annex D-2**. They can be summarised as follows:

(a) **In Line with the Planning Intention**

- (i) The decisions of two appeal cases¹ held that while the planning intention of “R(A)” zone is primarily for high-density residential development, it would also be consistent with the planning intention to permit Column 2 uses (such as office) if planning permission is given based on the

¹ The two cited appeal cases, namely No. 2 of 2019 (3-6 Glenealy) and No. 4 of 2019 (36 Gage Street), involved similar proposed office and shop and services/eating place development in the “R(A)” zone on the same OZP. The appeals were dismissed by the Town Planning Appeal Board on 24.11.2020 and 17.1.2022 respectively.

individual merits by reference to relevant planning criteria. The Appeal Board held the view that it would be incorrect to judge a proposed office use within “R(A)” zone would necessarily be a deviation from the planning intention.

(b) Located in a Predominantly Mixed Commercial/Residential Area

- (i) Consideration should be given to the character and general impression of the locality when determining the predominance of land use. The Sai Ying Pun area is characterised by busy streets and vibrant on-street commercial activities. The broader area of the Site is perceived as highly intermixed with commercial and residential developments. The proposed office development would blend in with the mixed character of the Sai Ying Pun area.

(c) In Compliance with the TPB PG-No. 5

- (i) There has been a demand for small offices in the Central and Western (C&W) district as demonstrated by the relatively low vacancy rate for Grade C private offices (i.e. 8.7%) as compared to the overall figure in Hong Kong (i.e. 9.3%). It is anticipated that there will be strong demands for commercial space in Hong Kong in the future under the policy visions of “Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030”.
- (ii) The proposed development, which provides properly-designed small-scale office space of about 43.6m², will meet the local demand of small businesses that could not afford the high rent in the Central Business District (CBD) and Sheung Wan.
- (iii) The Traffic Review submitted under the s.16 application demonstrated that the proposed development would not cause congestion and disruption to the traffic flow of the locality. The Transport Department had no adverse comment on the s.16 application.
- (iv) The Site is located in a predominantly mixed-use area, particularly along Des Voeux Road West (DVRW) which is flanked by a variety of uses including residential, retails, restaurants, etc. It is also well-served by public transportation, including Mass Transit Railway, bus, trams and minibus.
- (v) Office development is more efficient and can achieve environmental gains by avoiding environmental nuisance caused by road traffic and surrounding retail uses.

(d) Not Conducive to Residential Development

- (i) As demonstrated in the notional residential scheme submitted under the s.16 application which assumed a SC of 39% and PR of 5.4 (Drawings A-8 and A-9 of **Annex A**), the maximum floor plate would be less than 54m² and only GFA of about 18m² for domestic use could be yield for each floor after excluding the area of 36m² required for staircases, lift

shafts and common corridors. Two additional notional residential schemes² assuming other PR/SC assumptions are prepared for the s.17 review (**Drawings R-1 to R-4**). Under all three notional residential schemes, only a very limited number of flats of substandard size would be produced. Developing the Site for residential use is considered a waste of land resources.

- (ii) Substandard “nano-flats” are not the type of buildings deemed acceptable by the Buildings Department (BD) with more stringent standards nowadays.
- (iii) The Site is subject to noise and air impacts from DVRW, and fixed window design is undesirable for residential development. Traffic noise measurement conducted for the Site reveals that most of the measured road traffic noise levels during day-time and early evening periods (07:00 to 20:00) has exceeded the maximum permissible level (i.e. 70dB(A)) under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) for buildings which rely on openable windows for ventilation. The persistent exceedance of the standards could hardly be overcome by any noise mitigation measures.

(e) Similar Applications

- (i) A number of similar applications³ for non-residential developments in residential zones had been approved by the Board based on individual merits with consideration on land use and site suitability.

4. The Section 16 Application

The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans R-1, R-2 and R-6 to R-9)

- 4.1 The situations of the Site and its surrounding areas at the time of the consideration of the s.16 application by the MPC were described in paragraph 8 of **Annex A**. There has been no material change of the situations since then.

² The two additional notional schemes involve a 26-storey residential development providing 24 domestic units with usable floor area (UFA) of about 10.9m² (Scheme A – PR of 8 and SC of 33.33%) and a 5-storey residential development providing 4 domestic units with UFA of about 49.8m² (Scheme B – PR of 3.3 and SC of 66.6%). These two additional schemes are to demonstrate that the residential development will only produce very limited number of flats and sub-standard in size (“nano-flats”).

³ The Applicant has cited five similar applications (Applications No. A/H3/392, A/K2/193, A/H3/402, A/K3/574 and A/K3/561) to demonstrate that the current review application is in line with the Board’s prevailing position on non-housing proposal in residential zone. Details of the Applications Nos. A/H3/392, A/K2/193, A/H3/402 and A/K3/574 have been described in paragraphs 2.9, 2.10 and 7.2 of **Annex A**. Application No. A/K3/561 is a newly cited similar application which is for a proposed 21-storey hotel at 11-25 Tai Nan Street, Kowloon (with site area of about 711.498m²) falling within “R(A)” zone on the Mong Kok OZP. The application involved amalgamating a residual site (23-25 Tai Nan Street) with an adjoining site (11-21 Tai Nan Street) which was covered by an approved application (No. A/K3/544) for hotel development. The application was approved with conditions by the Board on review on 13.2.2015 mainly on sympathetic grounds that the application was unique; it would be beneficial from an urban renewal point of view as amalgamation of the building at 23-25 Tai Nan Street with the adjoining development would result in more efficient use of land; and the net gain in the number of residential units that could be provided upon redevelopment of 23-25 Tai Nan Street was limited.

Planning Intention

- 4.2 There has been no change in the planning intention of the “R(A)” zone as mentioned in paragraph 9 of **Annex A**.

Town Planning Board Guidelines

- 4.3 Town Planning Board Guidelines on Application for ‘Office Development in “R(A)” Zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ (TPB PG-No. 5), which was relevant to the consideration of the s.16 application, remain valid and relevant to the review application. The relevant assessment criteria of the Guidelines were summarised in paragraph 5 of **Annex A**.

Previous Application

- 4.4 The Site is not the subject of any previous application.

Similar Applications

- 4.5 The similar applications at the time of the consideration of the s.16 application were mentioned in paragraph 7 of **Annex A**. Since then, no additional similar applications within the Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan area has been considered by the MPC.

5. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

- 5.1 Comments on the s.16 application made by relevant government departments are stated in paragraph 10 of **Annex A**.
- 5.2 For the review application, relevant government departments have been further consulted and their new/updated comments are summarised as follows:

Building Matters

- 5.2.1 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department (CBS/HKW, BD):

- (a) His previous comments on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 10.1.4 of **Annex A** are still valid.
- (b) No in-principle objection under the Buildings Ordinance (BO) to the two additional notional schemes for domestic use (**Drawings R-1 to R-4**) and the comparison table at Table 5.1 in Attachment A of **Annex D-2** subject to the following comments:
 - (i) the permissible SC and PR of Scheme B at Table 5.1

are incorrect⁴. According to the First Schedule of the B(P)R, the permissible SC and PR for a domestic building over 15m but not exceeding 18m on a Class A site should be 60% and 3.6 respectively.

- (ii) the comments as stated in paragraph 10.1.4(b)(i) to 10.1.4(b)(iv) of **Annex A** are relevant.
- (c) There is no minimum flat size requirement and flat production requirement under the BO, therefore, the applicant's allegation at pages 9 to 11 of the written representation (**Annex D-2**) that the limited flat production and substandard flat size are deemed unacceptable by BD is invalid. If the building plans comply with the provisions of the BO and its subsidiary regulations, the BD is required to give approval of the plans under the BO.
- (d) Detailed comments under the BO will be provided at building plan submission stage.

Environment

5.2.2 Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP):

- (a) His previous comments on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 10.1.8 of **Annex A** are still valid, and EPD has no objection to the application.
- (b) According to the written representation (**Annex D-2**), the applicant has enclosed a set of noise measurements at one unit of the existing residential building. However, such measurement results may not reflect the noise situations of a new residential building at the Site.

Traffic

5.2.3 Comments of the Commissioner of Police (C of P):

- (a) No specific traffic comment from regional traffic police perspective.
- (b) The proposal should not cause adverse traffic obstruction in or beyond the site of works and each Temporary Traffic Arrangement involving works on public carriageway and/or footpath, if any, has to be submitted to Police (Road Management Office) and other stakeholders for detailed comment prior to its implementation.

⁴ Based on the notional residential scheme (Scheme B), the height of the building is 18m (**Drawings R-3** and **R-4**). As shown in Table 5.1 in Attachment A of **Annex D-2**, the SC and PR adopted for Scheme B are 66.6% and 3.3 respectively, which are the permissible SC and PR for a domestic building not exceeding 15m on a Class A site. However, for a domestic building over 15m but not exceeding 18m on a Class A site, the SC and PR should be 60% and 3.3 respectively.

Heritage Conservation

5.2.4 Comments of the Executive Secretary of the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO), Development Bureau (DEVB):

The building at the Site is a pre-war building which may have potential heritage value. If the subject application is approved and the building has to be demolished, the applicant is suggested to consider preserving some parts of the building and/or fabrics with historic value, if identified any, for incorporating in the new development. In addition, the following approval condition is suggested to be included if the application is approved:

- “the submission of 3D scanning, photographic and video records of the existing building, both its exteriors and interiors, prior to commencement of any works to the satisfaction of the AMO of DEVB or of the Board.”

5.3 The following government departments have no further views/comments on the review application and maintain their previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 10 of **Annex A**:

- (a) District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South, Lands Department;
- (b) Commissioner for Transport;
- (c) Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department;
- (d) Chief Highway Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department;
- (e) Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department;
- (f) Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department; and
- (g) Director of Fire Services.

5.4 The following government departments maintain their views of having no comment on the application:

- (a) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- (b) Head of the Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD);
- (c) Project Manager (South), CEDD; and
- (d) District Officer (Central and Western), Home Affairs Department.

6. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Periods

6.1 On 10.6.2022 and 12.8.2022, the review application and the written representation were published for public inspection. During the statutory public inspection periods, a total of 5 opposing comments were received from the Incorporated Owners of Grace Mansion⁵ and individuals (**Annex E**). The major grounds of the public comments are summarised as follows:

⁵ Grace Mansion is a residential development adjoining the Site.

- (a) there is no justification for review;
- (b) the developments along DVRW are mainly residential in nature. The shops on the lower floors and nearby commercial developments, such as The Rockpool and Hong Kong Plaza, mainly serve the daily needs of residents in the area;
- (c) the proposed office development is not compatible with the residential nature of the area and would likely cause environmental hygiene, noise and security concerns to the residents nearby;
- (d) there is a trend for medium to large-sized office and shop and services in the area. The proposed development of small office units does not meet local demand and would be a waste of land resources; and
- (e) in view of the acute housing demand in Hong Kong, it would be more suitable to provide small flats at the Site rather than small office units. Provision of residential units at the Site would be favourable as it could help balance job distribution and reduce daily commuting trips to/from CBD, thus reducing traffic congestion.

6.2 At the s.16 stage of the application, a total of 9 public comments were received, including 6 supporting comments and 3 opposing comments submitted by individuals. The major views were summarised in paragraph 11 of **Annex A**.

7. Planning Considerations and Assessments

- 7.1 The application is for a review of the MPC's decision on 22.4.2022 to reject the s.16 application for proposed commercial development with office and shop and services uses at the Site zoned "R(A)6" on the OZP (**Plan R-1**). The rejection reasons, as detailed in paragraph 1.2 above, were that the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the "R(A)6" zone and there was no strong planning justification for a departure from such planning intention; and non-compliance with TPB PG-No. 5 in that the proposed office was located in a predominantly residential area.
- 7.2 In support of the review application, the applicant has submitted written representation and justifications as detailed in paragraph 3 above that (a) it is incorrect to judge that the proposed office use within "R(A)" zone would necessarily be a deviation from the planning intention; (b) the Site is located in a predominantly mixed commercial/residential area; (c) the proposed development is in compliance with TPB PG-No. 5; (d) the Site is not conducive to residential development; and (e) there were similar applications approved by the Board.
- 7.3 The major development parameters and layout of the proposed development remain unchanged in the subject review application. Since the consideration of the s.16 application by the MPC on 22.4.2022, there has been no material change in the planning circumstances. Having considered the review

submission, the planning considerations and assessments on the review application are appended below.

Planning Intention

- 7.4 The Site is zoned “R(A)6” which is intended primarily for high-density residential development with commercial uses always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building or in the purpose-designed non-residential portion of an existing building. In general, strong justifications should be provided for a departure from such planning intention.
- 7.5 Regarding justification in paragraph 3(a), while the Appeal Board held the view that allowing the application(s) (i.e. office in “R(A)” zone) will not necessarily be inconsistent with the planning intention, consideration for planning permission must be decided on its individual merits by taking into account relevant planning criteria or considerations, in particular, TPB-PG No. 5. Hence, for this case, the acceptability of the proposal should be decided holistically on its individual merits and assessed taking into account the site context, compatibility with the existing and planned land uses of the locality as well as relevant planning considerations and TPB-PG No. 5. In view of the above and taking into consideration the assessments set out in the following paragraphs, there is no strong justification for a departure from the planning intention of the “R(A)6” zone.

Land Use Compatibility

- 7.6 Regarding justification in paragraph 3(b) that the Site is situated in a mixed-use locality and the proposed development would blend in with the mixed character of the area, it should be noted that the Site is located at the fringe of the Sai Ying Pun area close to Kennedy Town which is predominantly occupied by residential developments intermixed with small-scale commercial/retail or hotel uses. As mentioned in paragraph 8.2 of **Annex A**, the locality of the Site are mainly high-rise residential developments with small-scale retail uses on the lower floors, such as provision/retail shops and restaurants serving the local community. In the immediate neighbourhood within the same street block, apart from the hotel development (The Henry) at 322 DVRW (with building plans for conversion of an office building into hotel approved by the Building Authority on 18.9.2008 when the Site was zoned “Commercial/Residential” on the OZP, in which both hotel and office are always permitted), all the other buildings are residential developments with permitted retail uses on the lower floors (**Plan R-4**). Hence, the Site is considered to be located in a predominantly residential area.

Not in line with TPB PG-No. 5

- 7.7 Regarding justification in paragraph 3(c), the applicant claims that the proposed development is in compliance with the TPB PG-No. 5. The applicant asserts that there has been a demand for small offices in the C&W district as evidenced by the lower vacancy rate for Grade C private offices in the said district as compared with the overall figure in Hong Kong. However, the mere fact that Grade C office buildings have the lower vacancy percentage within the C&W district does not demonstrate that there is any

demand for increased office units (Grade C) in the same district. The applicant fails to demonstrate that there is a demand for increased office space in the district.

- 7.8 The applicant stresses that the proposed office development meets the criteria on properly designed office, and would not cause traffic congestion/disruption or environmental nuisance. Whilst it is considered that the proposed office development will not create environmental nuisance because it will have central air-conditioning and not cause any traffic problems, it should be noted that the aforementioned issues did not form part of the rejection reasons for the s.16 application. Concerning the issue of land use compatibility, the Site is located in a predominantly residential area as elaborated in paragraph 7.6 above. Hence, the proposed development has not satisfied planning criterion (e) of TPB PG-No. 5 in that the proposed office building should not be located in a predominantly residential area as highlighted in paragraph 5.1(e) of **Annex A**.

Suitability for Residential Development

- 7.9 Regarding justification in paragraph 3(d), the applicant submitted two additional notional residential schemes with different SC/PR assumptions (**Drawings R-1 to R-4**) in attempt to demonstrate that the Site is not conducive to residential development. The applicant claims that under both notional residential schemes, only a very limited number of flats of sub-standard size could be yield, which are not the type of buildings acceptable to BD given the more stringent standards nowadays. As advised by CBS/HKW of BD, there is no minimum flat size requirement and flat production requirement under the BO. Approval of the building plans depends on whether they can comply with the provisions of the BO and its subsidiary regulations. Moreover, the size of the proposed residential flats to be built at the Site would be dependent on the design of the future development and the applicant's decision whether to redevelop the Site with the maximum permissible SC/PR under B(P)R. Nevertheless, whilst it is acknowledged that the number of flats and flat size would be constrained due to site configuration, it is still considered feasible to develop the Site for residential development, which is in line with the planning intention and predominant residential character of the area.
- 7.10 The applicant further argues that the Site is subject to noise impacts from DVRW as revealed in the submitted traffic noise measurement results taken at one of the units of the existing residential building (**Annex D-2**). However, DEP considers that the noise measurement results only reflects the existing situation of one of the residential units at the Site and such measurement results may not be equivalent to the noise situations of a new residential development. Therefore, the applicant's claim that the noise impact on residential development at the Site could hardly be overcome by any noise mitigation measures has not been ascertained. The possibility of implementing practicable mitigation measures had not been explored.

Similar Applications

- 7.11 Regarding justification in paragraph 3(e), reference is made to five similar applications (four of which had been mentioned previously in the s.16 application) for commercial/hotel uses in “R(A)” zone involving small site area approved by the Board in the Sheung Wan area and Kowloon district (No. A/H3/392, A/H3/402, A/K2/193, A/K3/574 and A/K3/561). While “similar applications” usually refer to the similar applications on the same OZP, responses to the applicant’s claim have still been made for reference. As elaborated in paragraph 12.7 of **Annex A**, each of these applications have different site background/context, scale of development and planning history. Regarding the newly cited Application No. A/K3/561 for proposed hotel in Mong Kok, it involves a different use and different location on a different OZP as compared to the current application, and it is a unique case involving amalgamating a residual site (23-25 Tai Nan Street) with an adjoining site (11-21 Tai Nan Street) which was already covered by an approved application (No. A/K3/544) for hotel development. In view of the different context of each case, the current application should be considered on its own merits. The Committee’s decisions in respect of those approved applications were not relevant to the subject application.

Public Comments

- 7.12 Regarding the public comments objecting to the review application as mentioned in paragraph 6 above, government departments’ comments in paragraph 5 and the planning considerations and assessments above are relevant.

8. Planning Department’s Views

- 8.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 7 above, having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 6 above, and given that there has been no change in planning circumstances since the consideration of the subject application by the MPC on 22.4.2022, the Planning Department maintains its previous view of not supporting the application for the following reasons:
- (a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “R(A)6” zone which is for high-density residential developments and there is no strong planning justification for a departure from the planning intention of the “R(A)6” zone; and
 - (b) the proposed development does not comply with Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 5 (TPB PG-No. 5) in that the proposed office is located in a predominantly residential area.
- 8.2 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to approve the review application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 21.10.2026, and after the said date, the permission shall cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted is commenced or the

permission is renewed. The following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are suggested for Members' reference:

Approval Conditions

- (a) the submission of a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) in relation to (a) and (b) above, the implementation of the local drainage and sewerage upgrading/drainage and sewerage connection works as identified in the DIA and the SIA to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (d) the submission of 3D scanning, photographic and video records of the existing building, both its exteriors and interiors, prior to commencement of any works to the satisfaction of the Antiquities and Monuments Office of the Development Bureau or of the Town Planning Board.

Advisory Clauses

The recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Annex F**.

9. Decision Sought

- 9.1 The Board is invited to consider the application for a review of the MPC's decision and decide whether to accede to the application.
- 9.2 Should the Board decide to reject the review application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicant.
- 9.3 Should the Board decide to approve the application on review, Members are invited to consider the approval condition(s) and advisory clause(s), if any, to be attached to the permission, and the date when the validity of the permission should expire.

10. Attachments

Drawings R-1 to R-4	Additional Notional Residential Schemes (Schemes A and B)
Plan R-1	Location Plan
Plan R-2	Site Plan
Plan R-3	Plan showing BH of Surrounding Existing Developments
Plan R-4	Plan showing the Surrounding Existing Developments
Plan R-5	Plan on previous OZPs

Plans R-6 to R-9	Site Photos
Annex A	MPC Paper No. A/H3/444A
Annex B	Extract of Minutes of the MPC Meeting held on 22.4.2022
Annex C	Secretary of the Board's Letter dated 6.5.2022
Annex D-1	Letter from the Applicant's Representative dated 26.5.2022 Applying for Review
Annex D-2	Written Representation from the Applicant's Representative received on 3.8.2022
Annex E	Public Comments on the Review Application
Annex F	Recommended Advisory Clauses

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
OCTOBER 2022**