

**REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/K20/133  
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**Proposed Comprehensive Office, Commercial and Retail Development  
with Relaxation of Building Height Restrictions  
on mainly “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” Zone  
at the Site of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link  
West Kowloon Station, Kowloon**

**1. Background**

- 1.1 On 16.9.2020, the applicants, Century Opal Limited and Max Century (H.K.) Limited represented by Masterplan Limited, sought planning permission under s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) for a proposed comprehensive office, commercial and retail development (including ‘Office’, ‘Shop and Services’, ‘Eating Place’, ‘Private Club’, ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture’ and ‘Place of Entertainment’ uses) and relaxation of the building height restrictions (BHRs) on the site of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link (XRL) West Kowloon Station (WKS) at the junction of Lin Cheung Road and Austin Road West (the Site). The Site falls within an area mainly zoned “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) (about 96.3%) with minor encroachment onto areas shown as ‘Road’ (about 3.7%) on the approved South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K20/30 (the OZP) (**Plans R-1 and R-2**). The Site is restricted to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 5.0 for development above WKS and 0.68 for the above-ground railway facilities; and maximum building height (BH) of 90, 100 and 115mPD as shown on the OZP.
- 1.2 On 22.1.2021, the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to reject the s.16 application and the reason was:
- the applicants failed to demonstrate that there were outstanding planning or design merits to justify the proposed relaxation of BHRs, which would breach the ridgeline from strategic viewpoint.
- 1.3 During the deliberation of the s.16 application, while MPC Members considered that the proposed development generally complied with the OZP and the Planning Brief (PB)<sup>1</sup> requirements, they generally considered that the application could not be supported as the applicants had not provided strong justification to demonstrate outstanding planning or design merits in the application that warranted a favourable consideration for relaxation of BHRs breaching the ridgeline. They

---

<sup>1</sup> The PB for the “CDA(1)” site was endorsed by the MPC on 4.12.2009. It sets out the broad planning principles and development requirements to facilitate the preparation of the MLP for the comprehensive development of the Site.

also considered that there was still room to improve the scheme such as providing a more inclusive and vibrant open space, better integrating the old neighbourhood with the new developments, as well as providing more public gains to the local community.

1.4 For Members' reference, the following documents are attached:

- |     |   |                  |
|-----|---|------------------|
| (a) | MPC Paper No. A/K20/133A                                | <b>(Annex A)</b> |
| (b) | Extract of minutes of the MPC meeting held on 22.1.2021 | <b>(Annex B)</b> |
| (c) | Secretary of the Board's letter dated 5.2.2021          | <b>(Annex C)</b> |

## 2. Application for Review

2.1 On 25.2.2021, the applicants applied, under s.17(1) of the Ordinance, for a review of the MPC's decision to reject the application. The applicants have submitted a revised scheme supplemented by relevant technical assessments as listed in paragraph 2.11 below.

2.2 As compared with the proposed scheme rejected by MPC (the s.16 Scheme), the Revised Scheme mainly involves changes in the design of the two proposed office towers (including reduction of BH and changes in architectural design), re-arrangement of the private open spaces for public use/landscaped areas on various levels and enhancement to the pedestrian connections within the topside development zone (the scheme area) (**Drawings R-1 to R-8 and Plan R-3**). The applicants have also engaged the local community in reviewing the uses of the private open spaces. Notwithstanding the changes, other major uses and development parameters, including the total PR and GFA, the respective GFAs for commercial/retail and office uses and the total open space provision, remain the same as the s.16 Scheme. A comparison among the OZP/PB requirements, the s.16 Scheme and the Revised Scheme is set out in the following table and the major changes are highlighted in the following paragraphs for Members' reference:

Major Development Parameters	OZP/PB Requirements	S.16 Scheme (a)	Revised Scheme (b)	Difference (b) – (a)
Site area	58,800m <sup>2</sup>	58,800m <sup>2</sup>	58,800m <sup>2</sup>	No change
Proposed Uses	Office, Commercial/Retail	Office, Commercial/Retail	Office, Commercial/Retail	No change
Total GFA	Total: 294,000 m <sup>2</sup>	Total: 294,000m <sup>2</sup>	Total: 294,000m <sup>2</sup>	No change
• Commercial/ Retail	--	56,000m <sup>2</sup>	56,000m <sup>2</sup>	
• Office	--	238,000m <sup>2</sup>	238,000m <sup>2</sup>	
Total PR (topside development)	Total: 5.0	Total: 5.0	Total: 5.0	No change
• Commercial/ Retail	--	0.95	0.95	
• Office	--	4.05	4.05	
Total PR for above-ground railway facilities	Not more than 0.68	Not more than 0.68	Not more than 0.68	No change
Site coverage				
• Commercial/ Retail	--	48%	48%	No change
• Office	--	23%	24%	+1%

<b>Major Development Parameters</b>	<b>OZP/PB Requirements</b>	<b>S.16 Scheme (a)</b>	<b>Revised Scheme (b)</b>	<b>Difference (b) – (a)</b>
No. of towers	No more than 4	2	2	No change
No. of storeys • Tower 1 • Tower 2 (excl. basement carpark)	--	30 20-24	23-30 19-24	0 to -7 0 to -1
BH (main roof level) • Tower 1	90, 100 and 115mPD	159mPD	118 – 148mPD	-11 to -41m (-6.9 to -25.8%)
• Tower 2	90 and 100mPD	114 – 131mPD	101 – 122mPD	-9 to -13m (-6.9 to -11.4%)
Floor-to-floor height of typical office floor	--	4.2m	4.2m	No change
Public open space at G/F*	Not less than 8,900m <sup>2</sup>	Not less than 8,900m <sup>2</sup>	Not less than 8,900m <sup>2</sup>	No change
Private open space for public use	--	8,500m <sup>2</sup> at L2 and L4	8,500m <sup>2</sup> at L2 and L4	No change in total provision with improved design (see paras. 2.5 to 2.7)
Rooftop Observation Deck (ROD) for public	--	--	New ROD on the south-eastern roof of Tower 1	New ROD in response to MPC Members' suggestion
Pedestrian Connectivity • West Kowloon Parkway  • Direct vertical access	--	4m – 14m (in width)  L2 to L4	5m – 15m (in width)  L1 to L4	+1m with improved design (see paras. 2.5 and 3(e))  Improved direct vertical access between retail levels and open space
Green coverage	Not less than 30% of the site area	Not less than 33% of the site area	Not less than 33% of the site area	No change
Car parking & L/UL facilities	Provided in basement	Provided in basement	Provided in basement	No change
• Private car parking spaces	Provision should be to the satisfaction of C for T	Not less than 550	Not less than 550	No change. C for T has no adverse
• L/UL spaces		36 (LGV) & 68 (HGV)	36 (LGV) & 68 (HGV)	

Major Development Parameters	OZP/PB Requirements	S.16 Scheme (a)	Revised Scheme (b)	Difference (b) – (a)
• Pick-up/drop-off bay (taxi and private car)		Not less than 14	Not less than 14	comments on the provisions
Urban design considerations	Variation in building profile and stepped BH	Stepped BH profile descending towards the south	Stepped BH profile descending towards the south	No change
	No massive podium-like structure	Site coverage of the retail podium : 48%	Site coverage of the retail podium : 48%	No change
	Building gap	About 50m	About 50m	No change

\* The public open space of 8,900m<sup>2</sup> is located outside the scheme area and has been fully implemented by MTRC and opened for public use.

### Building height

- 2.3 There are two office towers, namely Tower 1 of 23 to 30 storeys (118–148mPD) and Tower 2 of 19 to 24 storeys (101–122mPD), both including five levels (G/F to 4/F) of podium for retail use but excluding two basement levels for car parking and L/UL facilities (**Drawings R-1 to R-3**). As compared with the s.16 Scheme, while stepped BH profile is maintained, the BHs of the two towers have been reduced in general by about 9m to 41m through deletion of special floors for structural transfer purpose, replacement of the 15m high L4 for ‘The Market’ by a retail floor and modifications to the building design (**Drawing R-3**).
- 2.4 The current proposed BHs of the two towers as shown on **Drawing R-3** would avoid breaching the remaining portion of the ridgeline to the west of The Coronation when viewed from strategic vantage point at Central Pier No. 7 (**Drawing R-11**).

### Open space, greenery provision and placemaking

- 2.5 The proposed private open spaces for public use have been rearranged under the Revised Scheme while retaining the same overall provision of about 8,500m<sup>2</sup>. Majority of the open space is provided along the eastern fringe of L2 (about 5,090m<sup>2</sup>), part of which would also be served as a pedestrian walkway (namely the West Kowloon Parkway<sup>2</sup> (WKP)), as well as the area between the two towers on L4 (about 2,690m<sup>2</sup>), which would be used for major activity and exhibition area (‘The Plateau’) (**Drawings R-12 and R-13**). The proposed opening hours for open space are 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. daily while WKP will be opened 24 hours daily. A new ROD (about 700m<sup>2</sup> in addition to the 8,500m<sup>2</sup> private open spaces for public use) is proposed on the south-eastern roof of Tower 1 for public access free of charge with opening hours from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. subject to change for operational needs (**Drawing R-14**). An extra 1,500m<sup>2</sup> open space at the roof of the two office towers would be retained for the tenants/workers (**Drawing R-15**).

<sup>2</sup> The proposed WKP of about 1.5km long consists of the proposed landscape deck under the Central Kowloon Route project, existing landscape deck above WKSBT, portion within the scheme area at L2 and the portion to the south of the scheme area connecting to the WKCD (**Drawing R-21**).

- 2.6 Various design features of the private open space, including spaces for community events ('The Rise') on L4, as well as pet friendly open space ('Bay Arbour'), pop up performance area ('Artist's Plaza') and family-oriented children play space ('Secret Play Garden') on L2, are proposed to allow flexibility for hosting community activities after taking into account the findings of the community engagement events and surveys conducted by the applicants (Appendix 6 of **Annex E** and **Drawings R-16 and R-17**).
- 2.7 There are two proposed viewing platforms including the 'The Strata Balcony' in the north at L4 for view to Kowloon hinterland and the 'Harbour Lookout' in the south at L2 (outside the scheme area) for view to the harbour, West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) and Hong Kong Island (**Drawings R-12 and R-13**). 'The Strata Balcony' would be open to the public from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. while the 'Harbour Lookout' in the south would be opened 24 hours.

*Pedestrian connectivity*

- 2.8 While maintaining the proposed WKP connecting Yau Ma Tei, the Site and the WKCD (**Drawing R-20**) and the various connections to the surrounding developments, including the developments at MTR Kowloon and Austin Stations and the open space at WKS (**Drawings R-23 to R-25**), the Revised Scheme has proposed widening WKP from 4m-14m to 5m-15m (**Plan R-3** and **Drawings R-12 and R-25**) and a barrier-free vertical connection between L1 and L4 integrating the open spaces and retail floors (**Drawings R-24 to R-27**).

*Architectural and sustainability*

- 2.9 The built form of office towers has been changed from the irregular chamfered shape to a more regular petal shape under the Revised Scheme and the podium levels have also adopted a more curvilinear edge (**Drawings R-2 and R-28**). The provision of about 50m wide building gap between the two office towers and building separation from about 70m to 125m from the residential developments above Kowloon Station located to the west have been retained (**Drawing R-29**).
- 2.10 Sustainable design features including solar panels, solar lightings, rainwater harvest system, rain water turbulent energy generation, green roof with solar and wind energy generation, waste management and recycling system, and electric vehicle charging facilities will be provided within the proposed development (**Drawing R-30**).
- 2.11 In support of the review, the applicants have submitted the following documents:
- (a) Letter dated 25.2.2021 applying for a review of the MPC's decision (**Annex D**)
  - (b) Letter dated 31.5.2021 providing a Revised Scheme with supplementary planning statement and technical assessments\* (**Annex E**)

- (c) Letter dated 4.6.2021 providing further information (FI) for clarification of development details<sup>#</sup> (Annex F)
- (d) Letter dated 10.6.2021 providing FI for clarification of development details<sup>#</sup> (Annex G)
- (e) Letter dated 29.7.2021 providing FI to respond to departmental and public comments<sup>#</sup> (Annex H)
- (f) Letter dated 10.8.2021 providing FI to respond to departmental comments<sup>#</sup> (Annex I)

\* accepted but not exempted from publication and recounting requirements

<sup>#</sup> accepted and exempted from publication and recounting requirements

- 2.12 The review application was originally scheduled for consideration by the Board on 21.5.2021. Upon request by the applicants, the Board agreed to defer a decision on the review application for two months on 21.5.2021. With the FI submitted by the applicants between 31.5.2021 and 10.8.2021, the review application is scheduled for consideration by the Board at this meeting.

### 3. Justifications from the Applicants

The justifications put forth by the applicants in support of the review application are detailed in the FIs at **Annexes E to I**. They are summarised as follows:

#### Respecting the ridgeline

- (a) To address MPC Members' concerns on the ridgeline when viewed from Central Pier No. 7, the Revised Scheme has restructured the BHs of the office towers to reduce the impact on the ridgeline as far as possible (**Drawings R-2 and R-3**). As shown on the photomontage of the revised Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), the modified tower configuration results in keeping majority of the proposed development below the ridgeline, except the south-eastern portion of Tower 1 breaching the portion of ridgeline which has already been compromised by an existing residential development (i.e. The Coronation (139mPD)) (**Drawings R-9 to R-11**). As compared with the s.16 Scheme, the Revised Scheme can better preserve the ridgeline of Beacon Hill/Lion Rock when viewed from Central Pier No. 7 (**Drawings R-10 and R-11**).

#### Improved open space design and placemaking

- (b) The open space design has been restructured in response to MPC Members' concerns. The enlarged 'Parkway Plaza' at L2 (previously where the 'The Halo' was located) has allowed a more accessible function space that is on the same level as WKP, and merges with the Sky Corridor above WKS (**Drawings R-12 and R-22**). Besides, the 'Parkway Pavilions' will provide alfresco dining, exhibition space, wellness station, and supporting amenities on L2 that add vibrancy to the open space and comfort for visitors (**Drawing R-17**). Furthermore, the new 'Parkway Tower'

will provide convenient vertical access between the open spaces at L2 and L4 (**Drawings R-22, R-25 and R-27**).

- (c) A specialist consultant was commissioned to carry out community engagement to engage the local community to develop a placemaking identity for the open space within the scheme area (Appendix 6 of **Annex E**). This community-based approach will ensure the design of the open space could respond to the needs of the local community, and would attract more people to the Site to further activate the open space and bring vibrancy. The placemaking strategy has been applied to the open space to curate a diversity of programs and functions that would held year-round, and include cultural and recreation functions that relate to the local community.

#### Revised Public Viewing Points

- (d) The two viewing points proposed under the s.16 Scheme, i.e. ‘Strata Balcony’ at L4 and ‘Harbour Lookout’ at L2, have been retained (**Drawings R-12 and R-13**). In response to MPC Members’ suggestion, a new public ROD on the south-eastern rooftop of Tower 1 at a height of 148mPD with an access lift operating from L4 is provided in the Revised Scheme (**Drawing R-14**). The public ROD on Tower 1 is located furthest away from the developments to the west, to provide separation from the residential flats and will primarily be designed and oriented with views to the harbour. It will be much lower than the developments to the west such as Sorrento and The Arch. However, this location is high enough to provide panoramic and scenic views over the WKCD development to Hong Kong Island and the harbour (**Drawing R-14**).

#### Improved West Kowloon Parkway and Integration between new and old Neighbourhood

- (e) The applicants have improved WKP within the scheme area under the Revised Scheme through increasing the width of the pedestrian corridor, and providing additional retail pavilions with alfresco seating, landscape integration with the WKS, more extensive shading and weather-proof features, a new ‘Parkway Tower’ that connects with other levels, defined activity and function spaces (**Drawings R-16, R-17 and R-22**).
- (f) In order to further enhance WKP, the applicants have reached out to the management parties of other portions of WKP that falls outside the scheme area. An agreement has been sought to improve the design and management of the landscaped deck over the West Kowloon Station Bus Terminus (WKSBT) to the immediate north of the Site and proposed escalator connection to the south outside the scheme area (**Drawings R-21 and R-25, Plan R-3** and Appendix 7 of **Annex E**). This will strengthen the integration between the new and old neighbourhoods, and adopt a coherent landscape design to strengthen the place identity of the WKP in the district.
- (g) An initial design of the landscaped deck over the WKSBT has been submitted to and acknowledged by KCRC, and the final design is subject to further discussion with relevant parties. The applicants will also liaise with other management bodies for the remaining part of WKP (including the Central Kowloon Route Landscape Deck managed by the Highways Department (HyD) and the Central Square in WKCD

managed by the WKCD Authority) to ensure a smooth interface in implementation stage.

Improved Integration with WKS

- (h) The proposed development is physically integrated with WKS, particularly at the G/F and L1 retail levels (**Drawings R-23 and R-24**). Vertical pedestrian movement within the proposed development has been revised to provide better access to the connection points at these two levels. A seamless landscape connection would be created at L2 between the Sky Corridor above WKS and the WKP in the proposed development, bringing continuity to the pedestrian system (**Drawings R-22 and R-25**).
- (i) In terms of architectural design, the podium levels in the Revised Scheme, have been modified to more curved in form and more visually consistent with the architectural form of WKS (**Drawing R-28**). The curved tower bottom could be visually linked to the curvilinear shape of WKS.

Sustainability

- (j) This Sustainability Statement at Appendix 13 of **Annex E** has concluded that the Revised Scheme meets the “Sustainability Principles and Sustainability Indicators” of the Harbour Planning Guidelines. Besides, the Revised Scheme outperforms the approved scheme in the sustainability indicators through provision of large open space at the podium levels. The Sustainability Statement has also demonstrated that in determining the function and the positioning of the development in its neighbourhood, the social sustainability functions have been given a high priority.
- (k) In addition to the above, the proposed development is designed to achieve a Platinum ranking under the Hong Kong’s BEAM Plus by the Hong Kong Green Building Council and the LEED certification program operated by the US Green Building Association. Sustainable design features including solar panels, solar lightings, rainwater harvest system, rain water turbulent energy generation, green roof with solar and wind energy generation, waste management and recycling system, and electric vehicle charging facilities will be adopted (**Drawing A-30**).

No adverse impacts on various technical aspects

- (l) Most of the technical assessments (i.e. Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), Environmental Assessment (EA), Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA)) submitted at the s.16 application stage are still relevant. The VIA, Landscape Master Plan (LMP) and Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) have been revised as a result of the design modifications. As demonstrated in the submitted revised technical assessments, the proposed development will not generate adverse impacts on visual air ventilation and landscape design aspects. Relevant mitigation measures are proposed to minimise the potential nuisances and pollution during the construction and operation of the proposed development.



#### **4. The Section 16 Application**

##### The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans R-1 to R-6)

- 4.1 The situation 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 since then.

##### Planning Intention

- 4.2 There has been no change in the planning intention of the “CDA(1)” zone, which was mentioned in paragraph 9 of **Annex A**.

##### Planning Brief

- 4.3 Major design requirements stipulated under the PB were detailed in paragraph 10 of **Annex A**. A compliance table of major development parameters and planning requirements of the PB and the Revised Scheme is set out in **Annex I**.

##### Town Planning Board Guidelines

- 4.4 The Town Planning Board Guidelines for Designation of “CDA” zones and Monitoring the Progress of “CDA” Developments (TPB-PG No.17A) relevant to the consideration of the s.16 application is still valid. The relevant assessment criteria were summarised at paragraph 4 of **Annex A**.

##### Previous Application

- 4.5 The Site is subject to a MLP which was previously approved with conditions by the MPC of the Board on 7.5.2010 under application No. A/K20/113 (the approved scheme) submitted by a different applicant, i.e. the MTRC (**Drawing R-31**). Details of the approved scheme, and comparison table of the major development parameters of the Revised Scheme and the approved scheme are at Appendix II of **Annex A** and **Annex K** respectively.

##### Similar Application

- 4.6 There is no similar application in the vicinity of the Site.

#### **5. Comments from Relevant Government Departments**

- 5.1 Comments on the s.16 application made by relevant Government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) were stated in paragraph 11 and Appendix VI of **Annex A**.
- 5.2 For the review application, the following B/Ds have been further consulted. Their major comments together with their further comments on the applicants' submission are summarised as follows:

### **Land Administration**

#### 5.2.1 Comments of the Chief Estate Surveyor/Railway Development, Lands Department (CES/RD, LandsD):

- (a) he has no adverse comment on the application;
- (b) the Site falls within the lot area of KIL 11262 (“the Lot”) sold by tender in November 2019 (the Site excludes the covered footbridge area at the western boundary of the Lot). The Lot is held under Conditions of Sale No. 20354 dated 27.12.2019 (“the Conditions of Sale”) for a term of fifty years from the date of the Agreement. According to the Conditions of Sale, the site area of the Lot is about 59,746m<sup>2</sup> (including the covered footbridge area) and the GFA shall not exceed 294,000m<sup>2</sup>, restricted for the purpose of non-industrial (excluding residential, godown and petrol filling station but including hotel). There is no restriction under the Conditions of Sale regarding BH and the distribution of GFA between commercial/retail and office use. Provision of ground floor passage areas, footbridge connections, pedestrian walkways and integrated entrances of WKS are required under the Conditions of Sale. For the Vesting Deed of XRL, it is restricted for railway purposes and may permit the use for purposes ancillary thereto, excluding staff housing and including within WKS only the provision of services or articles for the use or enjoyment of passengers on the Railway;
- (c) the applicants are reminded to deal with the minor discrepancies on spot level and vesting area boundary in detailed design stage; and
- (d) his previous comments detailed in paragraph 11.1.2 and Appendix VI of **Annex A** remain valid.

### **Traffic**

#### 5.2.2 Comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T):

- (a) as there is no change on the provision of internal traffic facilities and arrangement compared to the s.16 application, he has no adverse comment on the review application from traffic engineering viewpoint;
- (b) his previous comments detailed in paragraph 11.1.2 of **Annex A** remain valid; and
- (c) should the application be approved, it is recommended to impose an approval condition on the submission of a revised TIA and implementation of the traffic improvement measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the C for T or of the Board.

### **Urban Design and Landscape Aspects**

#### **5.2.3 Comments of the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department (CA/CMD2, ArchSD):**

- (a) regarding the proposed BH in the Revised Scheme, it is noted that the proposed development consists of two tower blocks with BH ranging from 101mPD to 148mPD (top of architectural feature ranging from 131mPD to 158mPD). From the photomontages submitted by the applicants, it is noted that Tower 2 is lower than the ridgeline and a portion of Tower 1 protrudes above the ridgeline at a location, which has been partly compromised by the existing development (i.e. The Coronation). The proposed development may not be incompatible to the immediate adjacent developments including the Arch and the Harbourside (with height of 231mPD and 261mPD respectively); and
- (b) noting that the proposed development will be higher than some adjacent residential developments, including The Austin and Grand Austin (with height ranging from 102mPD to 121mPD), he understood that the application will be considered holistically in a wider perspective including the design merits.

#### **5.2.4 Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD):**

##### *Urban Design and Visual*

- (a) the Revised Scheme under review has generally complied with the planning requirements relating to urban design and landscape as well as pedestrian connections as set out in the PB. Compared to the s.16 Scheme, the general layout and key development parameters (in terms of GFA and open space provision) of the Revised Scheme remains largely the same. While the major design measures of the s.16 Scheme including variation in BHs, provision of north-south pedestrian connection (i.e. WKP), provision of landscaped open space, proposed setback and 50m building separation of the office towers have generally been retained, the applicants have proposed the following key changes in design to address the concerns of the MPC Members:
  - (i) reduction in the BHs of Tower 1 and Tower 2 from 159mPD and 114/131mPD to 118/148mPD and 101/122mPD respectively arising from change in design and built form, reduction in number of office floors, and slight increase in SC of office towers from 23% to 24%;
  - (ii) changes in design features mainly involve removal of the 15m high-ceiling 'The Market' at L4, reduction in height and area of the rooftop architectural features and gardens, and removal of the linking stairway 'The Halo'; and

- (iii) restructuring of the open space design mainly involves replacing the linking stairway 'The Halo' by 'Parkway Tower' serving as vertical connection between L1 and L4, and rearrangement and reconfiguration of the open spaces (e.g. enlarged open space 'Parkway Plaza' at L2, addition of new landscaped platform at L3, and widening of open spaces along the eastern boundary of the scheme area at L2 with more supporting facilities such as 'Parkway Pavilions'), while the total open space provision for public use remains the same (i.e. 8,500m<sup>2</sup>).
- (b) in view of the surrounding context and as illustrated in the visual materials and photomontages in the VIA, the proposed development with reduced BHs under the Revised Scheme is generally compatible with the surrounding BH profile of the existing and planned developments;
- (c) compared to the s.16 Scheme, the visual obstruction to the ridgeline of Beacon Hill/Lion Rock, which is considered as a valuable attribute of the cityscape according to the PB, under the Revised Scheme with a lower BH of up to a maximum of 148mPD (main roof) and 158mPD (including roof-top structures) is reduced when viewed from the strategic viewing point at Central Pier No. 7. Although the proposed development will still protrude above the ridgeline of Beacon Hill/Lion Rock and encroach onto the "20% building free zone"<sup>3</sup> below the ridgeline, it is noted that the extent of protrusion is reduced and confined to the eastern portion of the ridgeline view which has already been partially compromised by the existing residential development (i.e. The Coronation);
- (d) the increase in size and widening of open spaces along the eastern boundary of the scheme area at L2 may improve usability of the open space and facilitate pedestrian circulation along the proposed WKP. Further supporting facilities such as 'Parkway Pavilions' with alfresco dining and seating areas, exhibition space, wellness station and supporting amenities will be provided in this area, which may add vibrancy and enhance pedestrian comfort of the open space;
- (e) it is noted that the roof of the south-eastern rooftop of Tower 1 (about 700m<sup>2</sup>) at 148mPD will be open to the public as a ROD free of charge with similar operating hours as the retail mall. The ROD will be landscaped and may have food and beverage outlet to enhance the public enjoyment of the harbour views;

#### *Air Ventilation*

- (f) an AVA – Initial Study using computational fluid dynamics has been conducted to support the review application. Three scenarios, i.e. the

---

<sup>3</sup> It is mentioned in the Urban Design Guidelines of the HKPSG that a 20% 'building free zone' should be allowed for to protect the ridgeline views, while flexibility may be considered on individual merits and for special landmark buildings to give punctuation effects at suitable locations.

baseline scheme (previously approved scheme under Application No. A/K20/113), s.16 Scheme and Revised Scheme, have been assessed in the study;

- (g) according to the simulation results, a slight increase in the site spatial average velocity ratio in both annual and summer conditions and local spatial average velocity ratio (LVR) in annual condition and comparable LVR in summer condition are found when comparing the baseline scheme with the Revised Scheme;
- (h) no significant adverse air ventilation impact is anticipated due to the proposed development. Some mitigation measures are incorporated in the Revised Scheme, which include (1) around 50m building gap between the two towers and (2) curvilinear design near the bottom of the two towers;

#### *Landscape*

- (i) in view that landscape provisions are proposed in the development to enhance the quality of public realm in accordance with the landscape planning requirements as set out in the approved PB for the Site and the applicants will explore opportunity to provide more soft landscape areas, tree planting, shading facilities and sitting-out areas in detailed design stage, she has no objection to the application from landscape planning perspective; and
- (j) should the application be approved, an approval condition on the submission and implementation of a revised LMP to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Board is recommended.

#### **Environment**

##### 5.2.5 Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP):

- (a) based on the information provided, it is noted that the major differences of the Revised Scheme and the s.16 Scheme are the reduction in BH and the changes in the building layout. Other major parameters would remain unchanged and the mitigation measures recommended in the EA for the s.16 planning application are also applicable to the Revised Scheme;
- (b) on the above basis, her comments provided for the s.16 planning application detailed in paragraph 11.1.7 of **Annex A** remain valid. She considers the proposed development would not cause insurmountable environmental impact, and she has no in-principle objection to the planning application; and
- (c) to address the sewerage impacts arising from the proposed development, the following approval conditions should be imposed if the Board decides to approve the review application:

- (i) the submission of a revised SIA for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the DEP or of the Board; and
- (ii) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works as identified in the revised SIA for the proposed development in condition (a) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Board.

### **Building Matters**

#### **5.2.6 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/NTE2 & Rail, Buildings Department (CBS/NTE2&R, BD):**

- (a) he has no in-principle objection to the application under the Buildings Ordinance (BO);
- (b) the applicants shall note the following:
  - (i) the proposed 'Harbour Lookout' and southern escalators outside the scheme area should be included in the GFA/PR and SC calculations under the BO;
  - (ii) the requirements for GFA concessions under PNAP APP-151 in particular the 10% overall cap on GFA concessions and, where appropriate, the Sustainable Building Design requirements under PNAP APP-152 should be complied with; and
  - (iii) proposed works at the landscape deck above WKSBT which may affect the "Emergency Assembly Area" of WKS fall under the scope of the Instrument of Exemption under section 54(2) of Mass Transit Railway Ordinance (Cap. 556) and therefore should be subject to the Safety and Security Coordinating Committee (SSCC) and the Station and Transport Integration Committee's (STIC) agreement. The terms of reference and procedures for consultation with SSCC and STIC should be those adopted by the respective committees. The applicants should consult and coordinate with MTRC in preparing the submission documents; and
- (c) detailed comments under BO for the proposed development can only be provided upon formal plan submission to BD.

#### **5.2.7 Comments of the Chief Engineer, Railway Development Office (CE/RDO), HyD:**

the XRL has been in operation since September 2018. The applicants may consult MTRC on any matters concerning impact brought by the proposed development on the operation, maintenance and safety of the existing railway network.

## **Fire Safety**

### 5.2.8 Comments of the Director of Fire Services (D of FS):

he has no objection in-principle to the application provided that fire service installations and water supplies being provided to the satisfaction of Fire Service Department.

### 5.3 The following Government B/Ds maintain their previous views of having no objection to or no comment on the review application:

- (a) Secretary for Development (Harbour Office);
- (b) Secretary for Security;
- (c) Secretary of Home Affairs;
- (d) Commissioner of Police;
- (e) District Officer (Yau Tsim Mong), Home Affairs Department;
- (f) Commissioner of Customs and Excise;
- (g) Engineer/South Division 2, Civil Engineering and Development Department;
- (h) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department; and
- (i) Chief Engineer/Mainland South and Chief Engineer/Land Drainage Division, DSD.

## **6. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period**

- 6.1 During the statutory public inspection periods, a total of 1,946 public comments were received, including 1,378 supporting comments from local residents and members of the general public (samples at **Annex L1**), and 568 objecting comments from a Legislative Council Member, current and the then Yau Tsim Mong District Council Members, residents and Owners' Corporations from nearby residential developments (i.e. Sorrento, The Waterfront, The Arch, The Harbourside, The Cullinan, The Austin, Coronation and Kowloon Station Development Owners' Committee), local residents and members of the general public (samples at **Annex L2**). A full set of the public comments received is deposited at the Secretariat for Members' reference. The major grounds of the public comments are summarised as follows:

### **Supporting views (1,378) (Annex L1)**

- (a) the proposed BH and building design are compatible and in harmony with the surrounding area. There will be no adverse visual impact or wall effect brought by the proposed development;
- (b) the proposed development will create a new landmark in the prime location of Hong Kong. The proposed ROD will provide a new viewpoint for public to enjoy the view of the Victoria Harbour, Kowloon and Hong Kong Island. The proposed development will also facilitate the transformation of West Kowloon by introducing more commercial activities in the area and creating more job opportunities;

- (c) the increase in provision of large open space serves in the West Kowloon area will improve living environment of local residents and enhance the well-being of workers. The multi-function open space will become a new focal point for residents and bring vibrancy to the area. The Revised Scheme also promotes environmental sustainability;
- (d) the connection with neighbouring areas including the Tai Kok Tsui and Yau Ma Tei areas, WKS, WKCD and the waterfront will be improved through the proposed WKP. The walking experience will be enhanced; and
- (e) the existing four railways (i.e. the Kowloon Station of Airport Express Line and Tung Chung Line, the WKS of XRL and the Austin Station of West Rail Line) will be better utilised and thus alleviate the environmental pollution brought by road traffic.

Objecting views (568) (Annex L2)

- (a) The proposed relaxation of BHRs is not in line with the planning intention of PB and violate the BHRs stipulated on the OZP. The Board shall uphold its previous decision of rejecting the application to preserve the view of the ridgeline. Despite the applicants have revised the building configuration and BH, part of the ridgeline will still be blocked by Tower 1. The reference that the applicants made (i.e. The Coronation which the rooftop M&E rooms have breached the ridgeline) was an example of failing to safeguard the ridgeline;
- (b) the building design is incompatible with WKS and surrounding area. The proposed large buildings will cause adverse impacts on air ventilation and visual aspects. The increase in BH will result in wall effect and eventually intensify heat island effect;
- (c) due to COVID-19, there is a change in business mode and decrease in demand for office space and the proposed office development is not necessary. Moreover, there is excess provision of open space, office and retail space within the Yau Tsim Mong area. The public benefits brought by the proposed development may be over-exaggerated by the applicants. The proposed open space may also create noise nuisance to nearby residents;
- (d) the proposed ROD is in close vicinity to nearby residential developments and thus will violate residents' privacy. The blockage of views will also affect the property price of nearby residential developments. Besides, the glass curtain walls used in the proposed buildings will reflect the sunlight and heat to the nearby residential developments. The use of external lighting decoration may be a potential source of light pollution and create nuisances to nearby residents;
- (e) the proposed development with an additional 550 private car parking spaces will attract more traffic flow resulting in traffic congestion, noise and air pollution. The increase in population will create pressure on district amenities and facilities; and



- (f) the results of the technical assessments may be biased since the consultants are employed by developers. As such, there is doubt on the impacts on the surrounding areas generated by the proposed development.
- 6.2 At the s.16 planning application stage, a total of 4,089 public comments were received including 1,232 supporting comments, 2,842 objecting comments and 15 providing comments/concerns. Their major views are summarised in paragraph 13 of **Annex A** with samples of public comments at Appendices VIIIa to IIIc of **Annex A**.

## **7. Planning Considerations and Assessments**

- 7.1 The application is for a review of the MPC's decision on 22.1.2021 to reject the s.16 application for the proposed comprehensive office, commercial and retail development with relaxation of BHRs (Drawing A-2 of **Annex A**). The rejection reason was that the applicants failed to demonstrate that there were outstanding planning or design merits to justify the proposed relaxation of BHRs, which would breach the ridgeline from strategic viewpoint. During the deliberation, MPC Members considered that although the s.16 Scheme generally complied with the OZP and the PB requirements, there was still room to improve the scheme such as providing a more inclusive and vibrant open space, better integrating the old neighbourhood with the new developments, as well as providing more public gains to the local community.
- 7.2 In support of the review application, the applicants submitted the Revised Scheme (**Drawing R-2**) with supplementary planning statement and updated technical assessments (**Annexes E to I**) to address the rejection reason, and further demonstrate the planning or design merits of the currently proposed development to justify the proposed relaxation of BHRs. The applicants have mainly modified the proposed built form of the two office towers to allow for a more efficient use of space resulting in a general reduction of BH to minimise breaching of the concerned ridgeline. Compared to the s.16 Scheme as set out in paragraph 2.2 above, the general layout and key development parameters (in terms of GFA, PR and provision of private open space, green coverage, car parking and L/UL spaces) remain largely the same and the major design measures including stepped BH profile, provision of north-south pedestrian connection (i.e. WKP) and building gap and separation of the two office towers have also been retained. It is considered that the Revised Scheme still generally complies with the OZP and the PB requirements.

### **Proposed BH and Visual Impact on the Ridgeline**

- 7.3 To address MPC Members' concerns on the breach of the concerned ridgeline of Beacon Hill/Lion Rock viewed from the strategic viewpoint at Central Pier No. 7 under the s.16 Scheme, the BHs of Tower 1 and Tower 2 have been reduced from 159mPD and 114/131mPD to 118/148mPD and 101/122mPD respectively under the Revised Scheme through the change in design and built form, reduction in number of office floors, and slight increase in site coverage of office towers from 23% to 24% (**Drawings R-2 and R-3**). As compared with the s.16 Scheme, the

extent of protrusion on the ridgeline is reduced and confined to the eastern portion of the ridgeline view (**Drawings R-9 to R-11**). It is noted that, as shown on the photomontage, this portion of the ridgeline has already been partially compromised by the existing developments (i.e. The Coronation and Langham Place (**Drawing R-9**)). CTP/UD&L of PlanD and CA/CMD2 of ArchSD have not raised adverse comments in respect of the ridgeline view.

- 7.4 As shown on **Plan R-1**, the BHs of the existing developments located to its west above Kowloon Station range from 141mPD (The Waterfront) to 490mPD (ICC) and the BHs of developments located closest to the proposed development across Lin Cheung Road are 141mPD and 142mPD of The Waterfront, around 200mPD of Sorrento, and 214 and 226mPD of The Arch. The BHs of the existing developments located to its east above Austin Station range from 84mPD to 115mPD. For WKCD located to its south, the BHRs ranges from 70 and 100mPD. CTP/UD&L of PlanD and CA/CMD2 of ArchSD considers that the proposed BHs under the Revised Scheme may not be incompatible with the surrounding developments.

### Planning and Design Merits

#### *Connectivity with Surrounding Areas*

- 7.5 The Revised Scheme has retained the proposed pedestrian connections with the surrounding areas through the proposed WKP connecting Yau Ma Tei and WKCD and pedestrian connections to the existing Sky Corridor at WKS on L2 and various pedestrian accesses and connections with the existing footbridges of the existing developments at MTR Kowloon and Austin Stations on L1 (**Drawings R-24 and R-25**). In response to MPC Members' comment, the section of WKP within the proposed development has been widened to 5m-15m (+1m as compared with the s.16 Scheme) to avoid bottleneck. More pockets of commercial/retail space have also been designated along it with a view to adding vibrancy and enhancing pedestrian comfort (**Drawing R-20**).
- 7.6 Regarding the concerns on the prospect of enhancing the landscaping/environment of the section of WKP on WKSBT to the north and the proposed escalator connecting to the existing WKS's public open space and WKCD to the south (**Drawings R-20 and R-21**), both of which are outside the proposed development, the applicants have sought consent from KCRC for the associated design, management and maintenance right (Appendix 7 of **Annex E**).
- 7.7 To further enhance the internal connectivity, the Revised Scheme has proposed a barrier-free vertical pedestrian connection between L1 to L4, instead of that connecting L2 to L4 under the s.16 Scheme, to better integrate the open space and retail floors through a new system of elevator lifts, ramps and stairways located at the central portion of the scheme area (i.e. 'Parkway Tower') (**Drawings R-24 to R-27**).

### *Open Space*

- 7.8 The proposed private open spaces for public use have been rearranged under the Revised Scheme while retaining the same overall provision of about 8,500m<sup>2</sup> (**Drawings R-12 and R-13**). The 'Parkway Plaza' at L2, that is on the same level as WKP and merges with the landscaped paths of the Sky Corridor above WKS, has been enlarged to allow for a more accessible function space for cultural and civic activities (**Drawings R-12 and R-22**). The new 'Parkway Pavilions' on L2 is proposed in the Revised Scheme with a view to providing alfresco dining, exhibition space, wellness station, and supporting amenities that add vibrancy to the open space as well as convenience and comfort for visitors (**Drawing R-17**). Additional landscape platforms are also proposed on L3. The proposed green coverage is maintained at 33% and around 228 new trees would be planted on L2 and L4 (**Drawings R-18 and R-19**).
- 7.9 To enhance public enjoyment on the harbour view, a new ROD providing an extra open space of about 700m<sup>2</sup> in addition to the aforesaid 8,500m<sup>2</sup> private open space would be provided at the south-eastern rooftop of Tower 1 for public access free of charge through an access lift operating from L4 (**Drawing R-14**). It would be landscaped and may have food and beverage outlet (**Drawing R-14**). Another additional 1,500m<sup>2</sup> open space at the roof of the office towers would be provided for the enjoyment of tenants/workers (**Drawing R-15**).

### *Community Engagement and Integration with Old Neighbourhood*

- 7.10 The applicants have commissioned a specialist consultant to carry out community engagement events and street surveys to engage the local community, including various stakeholder groups, to develop and solidify a placemaking identity for the open spaces in the proposed development (Appendix 6 of **Annex E**). The applicants indicated that in the Revised Scheme, placemaking elements have been applied in the design of open space to encourage flexibility for hosting a wide variety of community activities, pet friendly open space, pop up performance area and family-oriented children play space (**Drawings R-16 and R-17**). The applicants have also proposed a placemaking strategy be applied to the open space for curating a diversity of programs and functions that would be held year-round that relate to the local community.

### *Architectural and Sustainable Design*

- 7.11 As compared with the s.16 Scheme, the built form of office towers has changed from an irregular chamfered shape to a more regular petal shape and the podium levels has adopted a more curvilinear edge. The applicants consider that such design would allow the proposed development to blend in better with the curvilinear forms of the WKS structures (**Drawings R-2 and R-28**). The crescent-shaped disposition of the two proposed towers has created building setback of about 70m to 125m from the residential developments above the Kowloon Station located to the west and a building gap of about 50m between the towers (**Drawing R-29**).
- 7.12 Taking into account the various planning and design features as stated in paragraphs 7.5 to 7.11 above, CTP/UD&L of PlanD considers that the Revised

Scheme has generally complied with the planning requirements relating to urban design and pedestrian connections as set out in the PB. Meanwhile, the increase in size and widening of open spaces at L2 may improve usability of the open space and facilitate pedestrian circulation along the proposed WKP. The additional supporting facilities such as “Parkway Pavilions” may add vibrancy and enhance pedestrian comfort of the open space.

- 7.13 Regarding the landscape aspect, in view that landscape provisions are in accordance with the landscape planning requirements as set out in the approved PB for the Site, CTP/UD&L of PlanD has no objection to the application from landscape planning perspective and recommends that relevant approval condition should be imposed (paragraph 8.2(c) below).
- 7.14 Sustainable design features including solar panels, solar lightings, rainwater harvest system, rain water turbulent energy generation, green roof with solar and wind energy generation, waste management and recycling system, and electric vehicle charging facilities are proposed in the Revised Scheme (**Drawing A-30**). The applicants indicate that the proposed development is aimed to achieve a Platinum ranking under the Hong Kong’s BEAM Plus by the Hong Kong Green Building Council and the LEED certification program operated by the US Green Building Association.

#### Technical Aspects

- 7.15 CTP/UD&L of PlanD considers that significant adverse air ventilation impact on the overall pedestrian wind environment is not anticipated. As there is no change on the provision of internal traffic facilities and arrangement compared to the s.16 Scheme, C for T has maintained no in-principle objection to the application and his previous comments on the s.16 application are still valid and relevant approval condition should be imposed (paragraph 8.2(d) below). DEP also has no in-principle objection to the application and her concern on sewerage aspect can be addressed by imposition of approval conditions in paragraphs 8.2(e) and (f) below.
- 7.16 Other relevant Government departments consulted including D of FS, CBS/NTE2&R of BD and CE/RDO of HyD have maintained their previous views of having no objection to/adverse comment on the review application.

#### Public Comments

- 7.17 Regarding the public comments received for the s.17 review application, the planning assessments above and departmental comments in paragraph 5 are relevant.
- 7.18 For the concerns on privacy issue, the applicants responded that the location of public ROD on the south-eastern rooftop of Tower 1 is furthest away (i.e. about 150m) from the developments to the west, to provide separation from the residential flats and will primarily be designed and oriented with views to the harbour.
- 7.19 For the concerns on light and noise nuisances, the applicants indicate that they would participate in the Environment Bureau’s ‘Charter on External Lighting’ and

the use of glass curtain wall system would comply with the regulations stipulated in BD's relevant guidelines. For any open-air activities to be organised, 'Noise Control Guidelines for Music, Singing and Instrument Performing Activities' promulgated by the Environmental Protection Department should be observed. The design of the ROD is also mainly for passive use and thus noise nuisance is not anticipated.

## **8. Planning Department's Views**

- 8.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 7 above and having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 6 above, the Planning Department maintains its previous view of having no objection to the application.
- 8.2 Should the Board decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 20.8.2025, 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 also suggested for Members' consideration:

### Approval conditions

- (a) the submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan, taking into account approval conditions (c) to (h) below, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the building heights for the proposed development (in terms of mPD) should not exceed the maximum building heights as proposed by the applicants;
- (c) the submission and implementation of a revised Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) the submission of a revised Traffic Impact Assessment and implementation of the traffic improvement measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (e) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (g) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board; and

- (h) the submission of implementation programme indicating the timing and phasing of the proposed development to the satisfaction of Director of Planning or to the Town Planning Board.

Advisory clauses

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

- 8.3 Alternatively, should the Board decide to reject the application, the following reason for rejection is suggested for Members' reference:

the applicants fail to demonstrate that there are sufficient planning and design merits to justify the proposed relaxation of building height restriction.

**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 approve the review application, 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.
- 9.3 Alternatively, should the Board decide to reject the review application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicants.

**10. Attachments**

<b>Annex A</b>	MPC Paper No. A/K20/133A
<b>Annex B</b>	Extract of minutes of the MPC meeting held on 22.1.2021
<b>Annex C</b>	Secretary of the Board's letter dated 5.2.2021
<b>Annex D</b>	Letter dated 25.2.2021 applying for a review of the MPC's decision
<b>Annex E</b>	Letter dated 31.5.2021 providing a revised scheme with supplementary planning statement and technical assessments
<b>Annex F</b>	Letter dated 4.6.2021 providing clarification on the proposed private open space (for communal use) and rooftop observation deck
<b>Annex G</b>	Letter dated 10.6.2021 providing clarification on GFA and PR of the proposed development
<b>Annex H</b>	Letter dated 29.7.2021 providing responses to departmental and public comments
<b>Annex I</b>	Letter dated 10.8.2021 providing responses to departmental comments
<b>Annex J</b>	Comparison Table of Major Development Parameters and Requirements under PB and Revised Scheme
<b>Annex K</b>	Comparison Table of Approved Scheme and Revised Scheme
<b>Annexes L1 and L2</b>	Public Comments

<b>Annex M</b>	Recommended Advisory Clauses
<b>Drawing R-1</b>	Proposed BH and OZP Height Restrictions
<b>Drawings R-2 to R-8</b>	Comparison of Master Layout Plan, Section Plan and Floor Plans with s.16 Scheme
<b>Drawings R-9 to R-11</b>	Photomontages from Central Pier No. 7
<b>Drawings R-12 and R-13</b>	Comparison of Open Space Plans with s.16 Scheme
<b>Drawings R-14 and R-15</b>	Rooftop Observation Deck and Roof Garden Plans
<b>Drawing R-16</b>	Comparison of Landscape Master Plan with s.16 Scheme
<b>Drawing R-17</b>	Open Space Plan (L2 to L4)
<b>Drawings R-18 and R-19</b>	Green Coverage Plan and Tree Planting Plan
<b>Drawing R-20</b>	Comparison of Pedestrian Connection with Approved Scheme, s.16 Scheme and Revised Scheme
<b>Drawings R-21 and R-22</b>	West Kowloon Parkway Plans
<b>Drawings R-23 to R-27</b>	Pedestrian Connection Plans (G/F to L4)
<b>Drawing R-28</b>	Plan showing the Integration with Building Form of West Kowloon Station
<b>Drawing R-29</b>	Comparison of Setback and Building Separation with Approved Scheme, s.16 Scheme and Revised Scheme
<b>Drawing R-30</b>	Sustainability Initiatives Plan
<b>Drawing R-31</b>	Comparison of Master Layout Plan, Section Plan and Floor Plans with Approved Scheme No. A/K20/113
<b>Plan R-1</b>	Location Plan
<b>Plan R-2</b>	Site Plan
<b>Plan R-3</b>	Proposed West Kowloon Parkway and open space in West Kowloon
<b>Plans R-4 to R-6</b>	Site Photos

**TPB PAPER NO. 10757  
FOR CONSIDERATION BY  
THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD  
ON 20.8.2021**

**REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/K20/133  
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**Proposed Comprehensive Office, Commercial and Retail Development  
with Relaxation of Building Height Restrictions  
on mainly “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” Zone  
at the Site of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link  
West Kowloon Station, Kowloon**