

Extracted from Confirmed Minutes of 441st Meeting of MPC held on 6.5.2011

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H3/399 Two Proposed New Buildings (Old Bailey Wing and Arbuthnot Wing) for Cultural, Recreational and Commercial Uses in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Historical Site Preserved for Cultural, Recreational and Commercial Uses” zone, Former Central Police Station, Victoria Prison and Central Magistracy Site, Hollywood Road, Central (MPC Paper No. A/H3/399)

30. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Jockey Club CPS Ltd. Mr. Raymond Chan and Mr. Felix Fong who were members of Hong Kong Jockey Club (HKJC) had declared interests in this item. The Committee noted that Mr. Chan and Mr. Fong had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

31. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd (Ove Arup) was the consultant of the applicant. Professor S.C. Wong who had current business dealings with Ove Arup had declared an interest in this item. As Professor Wong had no direct involvement in the subject application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting

Presentation and Question Sessions

32. Ms. April K.Y. Kun, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

Background

- (a) the Central Police Station (CPS) Compound was included as one of the projects under the “Conserving Central” initiative. In January 2007, HKJC

submitted a proposal (the ‘bamboo’ based scheme) to the Government for the development of the CPS Compound. On 15.7.2008, the Government announced that the partnership project with HKJC was endorsed by the Executive Council and the Government would enter into a partnership with HKJC Charities Trust to take forward the conservation and revitalization of the CPS Compound;

The Proposal

- (b) the applicant sought planning permission for two new buildings (namely Old Bailey Wing and Arbuthnot Wing) for cultural, recreational and commercial use at the Central Police Station (CPS) Compound:
 - (i) Old Bailey Wing located to the north of F Hall would accommodate a main art gallery space which could accept international exhibitions, Food & Beverage (F&B) spaces and a public viewing area. The existing General Office structures, which were of low historic value, would be removed for the new building; and
 - (ii) Arbuthnot Wing located in the south-eastern part of the CPS Compound would provide an outdoor multipurpose public space at ground level, a multipurpose space at first floor, which would link to educational facilities within D Hall. It also accommodated large centralised ancillary plant facilities to support the entire site. The existing Workshop and Laundry structures, which were of low historic value, would be removed for the new building.
- (c) although only the above two ‘new developments’ required planning permission, the applicant had submitted a scheme for the whole site for comprehensiveness of information. The project was to create the CPS Compound as a contemporary arts centre. All uses proposed within the CPS Compound were always permitted under Column 1 of the Notes for the “OU” zone, including arts related support spaces, arts related organization archive and record centre, education spaces, interpretation rooms, museum on ground floor of Barrack Block as well as commercial

use (cafés, restaurants and shops). The applicant also proposed to preserve the two courtyards, i.e. the Parade Ground and the Prison Yard; demolish the Garage for open space area and provide a green wall (covering an area of appropriately 900m²) at the Prison Yard;

- (d) a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) had been conducted, which concluded that there would be no adverse traffic impacts as a result of the proposed development. To improve the pedestrian accessibility of the site and the surroundings, a new footbridge to connect to the Mid-levels Escalator would be erected; and new openings on Old Bailey Street and Arbutnot Road would be added to create cross pedestrian flow between SOHO and Lan Kwai Fong;

Departmental Comments

- (e) the Commissioner for Heritage (C for H) fully supported the application as the application was based on a development scheme that respected the heritage value of the site, public views and the BH restriction;
- (f) the Antiquities and Monuments Office, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (AMO, LCSD) considered the application acceptable from heritage conservation point of view as it had adopted a scheme to adequately preserve and interpret the cultural significance of the site. The Cultural and Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA), as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the project prepared under the EIA Ordinance, was considered acceptable to AMO;
- (g) the Commissioner for Tourism (C for Tourism) supported the application as the revitalisation of the CPS Compound would enhance the appeal of the Central to visitors in particular those who liked the unique arts and cultural characteristics of Hong Kong;
- (h) the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) advised that the overall proposed development, including the proposed erection of the 2 new buildings and removal of 3 existing buildings, within the 3 declared

monuments (i.e. The Former Central Police Station, Victoria Prison and Central Magistracy) was a designated project controlled under the EIAO. On 18.4.2011, DEP approved with conditions the EIA Report of the proposed development and granted an Environmental Permit (EP);

- (i) the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had no objection to the application subject to the design and provision of improvement measures proposed by the applicant;
- (j) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had no objection to the application from the landscape planning point of view. It was noted that two existing trees were proposed to be removed while six numbers of new trees were proposed to compensate the loss of the existing trees. Thus, significant adverse landscape impact arising from the proposed redevelopment on the area was not anticipated. As regards the urban design aspect, CTP/UD&L advised that whether the proposed architectural solution could achieve the conservation objective was a matter of public perception on the aesthetic and compatibility aspects of the proposal;
- (k) the Chief Architect/Advisory and Statutory Compliance, Architectural Services Department (CA/ASC, ArchSD) had no adverse comment on the modern design approach which was to provide distinctive and high contrasting icons amongst the historical building groups. In terms of the scale and BH, the proposed new buildings blocks might not be incompatible with the surrounding context and the existing low-rise buildings within the site. As building designs in heritage renovation/re-vitalization projects might sometimes be debatable within the community, it was understood that views had been sought from the public for TPB's consideration;
- (l) no objection/adverse comment was received from other government departments;

Public Comments

- (m) the District Officer (Central & Western), Home Affairs Department (DO(C&W), HAD) advised that the HKJC Charities Trust presented a revised design plan for the CPS Compound to the Central & Western District Council (C&WDC) on 6.1.2011. At the meeting, most of the C&WDC members welcomed the revised proposal and suggested that works be commenced as soon as possible to ensure early enjoyment of the facilities therein by the public;

- (n) a total of 231 comments were received during the statutory publication period. Of the public comments received, 152 (Designing Hong Kong Limited and members of the public) were in support of or had no objection to the application, 65 (Democratic Party, 3 District Councillors of the C&WDC, Green Sense, Central & Western Concern Group, the Incorporated Owners of Tim Po Court Phase II and members of the public) objected to or expressed grave concerns on the application, with 53 in standard letters. The remaining 14 (Civic Party, The Conservancy Association, Heritage Hong Kong Foundation, the Incorporated Owners of Carfield Commercial Building and members of the public) provided comments on the application;

- (o) the major public views supporting the application included that the site would become a key tourism attraction in HK; the project would provide space and opportunity for cultural and art activities; the design of the new buildings was innovative but compatible with the existing developments; the reduction in BH of the two new buildings, as compared with the previous scheme, was supported; the proposed footbridge would make the site easier to access; the project should be implemented early to avoid the condition of the site to further deteriorate; the applicant would be an appropriate partner, as the site should be run by a non-profit making operation with cultural conservation experience instead of a private property developer; and the project could help stimulate other conservation projects in the Central & Western District;

- (p) the major public views opposing to the application included that the development of the new buildings contravened the principles of heritage conservation; there was insufficient justification/“overriding need” for the development of the two proposed new buildings; there was insufficient open space and green space within the site; the design of the two proposed new buildings was incompatible with the existing buildings; the BH of the proposed new buildings should not be higher than the surrounding walls and the buildings were overly bulky; over 30% of area was proposed for commercial (eating place or shop) use and that was not in line with the planning intention of the site. There was no clear justification to explain whether using 1/3 of the area of the new buildings for arts and culture use was appropriate; the proposal would have adverse impact on the surrounding catering business; the proposal would generate adverse environmental, noise and glare impacts; the TIA was inadequate and failed to identify the cumulative traffic impact in the already congested Central area; the proposed footbridge was ugly and would obstruct the view to the CPS Compound; the proposed public viewing areas at Old Bailey Wing would affect the privacy of the residents in the surroundings; there was inadequate public consultation or discussion in the community about the scheme; and there was a lack of open and detailed financial model and analysis, as well as the future programming and management and operating arrangements;

Response to Public Comments

- (q) in response to the public comments received, relevant government departments and the applicant had the following responses:
- (i) regarding the public comment on heritage conservation principles, AMO pointed out that the CHIA prepared by the applicant had fully complied with the relevant heritage conservation principles. All the 16 historic buildings including the F Hall would be preserved. The 3 buildings to be demolished were of low historical significance;

[Mr. Laurence L.J. Li arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (ii) regarding the public comments on the need for and design of the new buildings, the applicant had explained that they were essential and critical to the overall function of the CPS Compound and the facilities could not be provided within the existing historic buildings without causing substantial and irreversible damage. In addition, the location of the electrical and mechanical (E&M) facilities had been carefully located and would not be perceivable to the public so they would not affect or detract the heritage value of the site;
- (iii) the design of the new buildings, which complied with the BH restriction and based on a modern design approach, was considered acceptable;
- (iv) as for the concern on the lack of open space, the CPS Compound consisted of two courtyards, i.e. the Parade Ground and the Prison Yard (amount to about 2,770m²) and 2 covered open areas were proposed under the two new buildings (amount to about 600m²);
- (v) regarding the public concerns on the amount of commercial facilities, the commercial facilities were intended to serve the basic needs of future visitors and tenants as well as to support the project financially. The C for H supported the provision of commercial facilities and pointed out that the proposed floor area for commercial use was relatively modest in comparison with the international norm thus reflecting due respect had been paid to heritage conservation of the CPS Compound;
- (vi) regarding the public comments concerning the traffic condition in the area, the proposal would unlikely cause adverse traffic impact on the surrounding areas. The C for T and the Commissioner of Police had no objection to the application from traffic point of view;

- (vii) on the concern of adverse impact on the local residents, the applicant had confirmed that the noise during construction and implementation would be monitored to ensure compliance with relevant noise criteria. Besides, the environmental issues would be controlled through the EP issued under EIAO; and
- (viii) regarding the public concerns on operation and management arrangements, C of H advised that the HKJC Charities Trust had set up a special project company to undertake the project. Details were stipulated in para. 11.23 and appendix II of the Paper.

Planning Department (PlanD)'s views

- (r) PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper;

Planning Intention

- (s) the proposal was in line with the planning intention of the “OU (Historical Site Preserved for Cultural, Recreational and Commercial Uses)” zone which was to preserve, restore and convert the historic site into a heritage tourism attraction which would provide a wide range of cultural, recreational and commercial facilities for the enjoyment of local residents and tourists. The existing buildings within the CPS Compound together with the two new buildings would provide venues for cultural and recreational uses (art gallery, multipurpose spaces and interpretation rooms), as well as commercial spaces (cafés/restaurants and shops) on the site;

Preservation Aspect

- (t) all the 16 historic buildings including the F Hall would be preserved. The existing structures of the General Office, the Laundry and the Garage, which were proposed to be removed for the development of Old Bailey Wing, Arbuthnot Wing and open area respectively, were of low historical significance. AMO, LCSO considered the application acceptable from heritage conservation point of view while C for H supported the project and

considered it to have achieved both conservation and revitalization of the heritage site;

- (u) as regards the archaeological remains and artifacts found within the site, the applicant was required to submit the archaeological investigation (AI) report for AMO's consideration in accordance with the approved EIA and the EP. Based on the preliminary findings, the sub-surface areas of the sites for the new buildings would not be occupied by any antiquities. In the event that archaeological materials were found during removal of the existing buildings and/or subsequent archaeological monitoring during excavation, appropriate mitigation measures would be recommended under the AI report;

Visual Aspect

- (v) the two proposed new buildings were within the relevant BHR (i.e. 80mPD) stipulated under the OZP. The design of the new buildings was based on a modern design approach. CA/ASC, ArchSD advised that there was no adverse comment to the design approach. CTP/UD&L, PlanD considered that whether the proposed new developments were 'compatible' with the historical setting of the CPS Compound could be subjective and was a matter of public perception. It was noted that of the public comments received, over half of them supported the application. Comments from C&WDC had also been sought and most of the C&WDC Members had expressed general support to the application;

Landscape Aspect and Private Open Space Provision

- (w) the CPS Compound consisted of two existing courtyards and 2 covered open areas under the two new buildings. According to AMO, the hard-paved Parade Ground, where many remarkable events had taken place throughout the history of the police station, should be generally kept open as of today and any grassing or tree planting at the Parade Ground would defeat the purpose of heritage conservation, jeopardize the openness of the Ground and efface its appearance as a gathering square of disciplinary forces. In addition, the design and intention of the Prison Yard to

preserve openness and re-activate it for public use would echo with the uses in the old days, i.e. a common gathering area for functions and activities for the prisoners. To strike a balance between conserving the character of the area and the requirement for landscape mitigation, vertical greening in form of green wall at the Prison Yard was proposed;

- (x) as for the new buildings, the applicant had explained that the space below the Old Bailey Wing was limited and the provision of landscaping might disrupt pedestrian circulation. The grand stairs below the Arbuthnot Wing might act as a semi-open space for cultural events, and the provision of landscaping was also considered not appropriate;

Other Technical Aspects

- (y) with regard to the traffic aspect, the proposal did not involve any car parking spaces, while the proposed loading/unloading bay provided within the site would unlikely cause adverse traffic impact on the surrounding areas. C for T had no objection to the application subject to the design and provision of improvement measures proposed by the applicant. Relevant approval conditions were suggested to be imposed should the application be approved; and
- (z) the environmental impacts during the construction and operation stages, would be controlled through the EP issued under EIAO. As such, there should not be adverse environmental and sewerage impacts on the surrounding areas.

33. Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK said that a letter submitted by the Central and Western Concern Group (CWCG) to the Town Planning Board was received on 5.5.2011 and tabled at the meeting. CWCG was concerned with the recent archaeological relics discovered within the CPS Compound as reported in the media and also confirmed by HKJC. They were concerned that the proposed new buildings and the underground structures underneath the Compound would have impact on the archaeological relics. CWCG said that TPB should only consider the application after HKJC had released the AI report and comprehensive mitigation measures which could include alteration of design had been submitted for public

comments and discussion by relevant antiquities bodies. They also had strong reservation on the EIA report which was approved on 18.4.2011 without prior consideration of the archaeological findings.

34. A Member asked if more information on the archaeological findings could be provided. Mr. Tom K. C. Ming, ES, AMO, LCSD responded that HKJC had conducted archaeological investigation (AI) in accordance with the requirement of the Environmental Permit (EP). Based on the initial study, no important archaeological relics were found at the sites of the two proposed new buildings. If important archaeological relics were subsequently discovered, appropriate mitigation measures would have to be proposed by the project proponent for the agreement of AMO.

35. Another Member asked if the three buildings proposed to be demolished were important historical buildings. Mr. Ming replied that according to the previous assessment on the historical value of the buildings within the application site conducted by AMO in consultation with Antiquities Advisory Board, which was done at the time when the CPS Compound was designated as Declared Monument and well before HKJC's current proposal, the concerned buildings were of low historical significance and were not required to be preserved.

36. A Member asked whether the architectural design concept of the two buildings was to contrast with the existing buildings in the CPS Compound and whether there was a need for additional space for the art, cultural and commercial activities. Ms. Brenda Au, DPO/HK responded that when the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) was amended to incorporate the building height restriction (BHR) for the CPS Compound site, a detailed visual assessment had been conducted to demonstrate that the stepped BH profile was appropriate for the site. The proposed new buildings on the Upper Platform with a height not exceeding 80mPD followed the stepped height concept of the OZP, i.e. 60mPD and 70mPD on the Lower and Upper Platform Areas and 80mPD for new buildings on the Upper Platform Area. The facilities to be included in the two new buildings were also in line with the planning intention of the subject zone. Mr. Robin, K.B. Lee, Ch AS (Works)2, C for H's Office, DEVB, added that there were 16 historic buildings within the CPS Compound site of more than 100 years old. Noting the need to meet current fire safety, building services and design standards and to provide certain facilities such as exhibition hall or art performance venue

which required high headroom, HKJC had proposed to use two new buildings to provide the necessary space for exhibition /performance activities and to accommodate the centralised E&M facilities to support the whole site, so as to save the need for major alteration of the historical buildings.

37. A Member asked whether the recent AI would have impact on the approved EIA. Mr. Brenda Au explained that under the EIAO, a Cultural and Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) had been conducted and submitted to EPD and hence the parties concerned should have knowledge about the presence of some historic relics such as tunnel, pottery, opium containers, copper coins within the application site. According to the Environment Permit (EP) granted, an AI was required to be carried out by HKJC and HKJC had to submit the AI report together with appropriate mitigation measures to AMO for consideration.

38. The same Member asked if the AI should be conducted after the EIA was approved and whether such a procedure complied with the EIA Ordinance requirement. Mr. Tom Ming replied that the EIA submitted by HKJC had included details on how the 16 buildings within the CPS Compound would be preserved for adaptive-reuse. However, during the course of site investigation and excavation, relics below ground might be discovered. If the relics found were of important archaeological value, appropriate mitigation measures would have to be recommended and agreed with AMO. It was therefore proper for the AI to be conducted after the EP was granted. The same Member further asked if there was any mechanism to ensure that the archaeological materials found would be properly handled given that the EIA was already approved. Mr. Ken Wong, PEPO(MA), EPD explained that the EIA of the CPS project was approved on the basis of the CHIA accepted by AMO. The EIA Report approved by EPD indicated that the proposed scheme would not have unacceptable impact on the materials below ground which were considered to be of low or fairly low archaeological potential. However, in accordance with the approved EIA and the EP, HKJC was required to submit AI report together with appropriate mitigation measures for the approval of AMO during the detailed design stage of the project. In fact, the AI would be carried out under AMO's monitoring throughout the course of site investigation and if any important archaeological materials were found, the design of the scheme might need to be revised. Mr. Tom Ming supplemented that the AI conducted by HKJC recently was intended to comply with the EP condition.

39. The same Member asked why the proposed scheme at the former Police Married Quarters (PMQ) at Hollywood Road had its archaeological investigation completed before submitting the application to the TPB for consideration. Mr. Robin Lee explained that according to the technical circular on “Heritage Impact Assessment Mechanism for Capital Works Projects” promulgated by DEVB on 1.1.2008, if heritage sites were within or in the vicinity of the project boundary of any government works, heritage impact assessment (HIA) might be required by AMO. As Government would finance the essential structural and building services works for the revitalization of PMQ, it was regarded as a government project and HIA had been conducted. The CPS Compound was a declared monument and hence CHIA had been done as a requirement under the EIA Ordinance. According to the CHIA, the buildings above-ground would be preserved while relics found below ground during site investigation or excavation would be monitored by AMO. In the PMQ project, detailed site investigation had confirmed that the locations of piling and foundation work were acceptable while the locations of drains and lifts had to be further confirmed nearer the time of such works. AMO would monitor the situation and in some special circumstances, the design of the project might have to be revised to avoid affecting the relics found. Mr. Tom Ming added that it was a common practice for AI to be conducted after approval of HIA and CHIA.

40. A Member asked whether HKJC had found archaeological remains or artifacts within the CPS Compound. Mr. Tom Ming responded that both archaeological remains or artifacts were found according to HKJC. There were foundation remains of demolished buildings, copper coins and pottery. The heritage value of which would have to be further assessed. Unlike the PMQ where the heritage importance was the Central College foundation found below ground, the heritage value of the CPS Compound was the historical building structures existed within the Compound. Up to this moment, the archaeological relics found at the locations of the two new buildings at the application site were not of important archaeological value.

41. A Member asked whether the government representatives considered it appropriate for TPB to approve the application without waiting for the AI to complete. Mr. Robin Lee explained that site investigation would be carried out progressively following the sequence of construction works. If important archaeological relics were discovered, appropriate mitigation measures had to be proposed. It was under very exceptional

circumstance that the design of the proposed scheme had to be revised substantially to avoid affect archaeological relics. Mr. Tom Ming said that HKJC had to submit AI report for the approval of AMO in order to comply the relevant EP condition. If the AI report concluded that there were relics worthy to be preserved, mitigation measures had to be proposed and it would take time to work out between HKJC and AMO the acceptable mitigation measures. Ms. Brenda Au added that there was an existing mechanism under the EP to ensure that AMO would be consulted in case important archaeological relics were found. If the proposed mitigation measures would result in major changes to the currently proposed scheme, a fresh planning application would be required. Mr. Ken Wong said that if the design of the proposed scheme would need to be revised substantially, a variation of EP or a fresh EP had to be obtained from EPD before commencement of the revised scheme.

Deliberation Session

42. A Member supported the current application and considered that the proposal had struck a balance between revitalisation and preservation. This Member also appreciated the combination of new and old elements in the scheme as proposed by an internationally renowned architect and considered it as a good approach in preservation. That Member and another Member believed that the government departments had a mechanism to ensure archaeological relics found would be properly handled and urged for an early implementation of the scheme.

43. Another Member supported the application but considered that the applicant should explain more on the concept behind the proposed scheme, in particular the integration/contrast between the new buildings and the historic buildings and adoption of the stepped height concept of the whole CPS Compound, so as to get wider public support. The Chairman said that according to “Venice Charter”, historic buildings should be preserved as far as possible. If there was a need to include new building, the contemporary approach was to build it in a different style so as to contrast with the existing buildings. Mr. Robin Lee explained that according to overseas experience in preservation of historical building, there had been criticism that new buildings built as a replica of the old ones would cause confusion to the public. In the modern approach, there should be contrast between the new and the old buildings so that the public would easily distinguish the difference. The example of the Pyramid at Louvre Museum in Paris had attracted much criticism at the time when it was first

built but it had become a masterpiece. HKJC previously introduced a ‘bamboo’ based scheme, BH of which was not supported by the public. After several rounds of consultation, HKJC had adopted the current design for the art gallery and exhibition hall and a public observation deck at Old Bailey Wing and a centralised E&M area at Arbuthnot Wing. Whilst the outlook of the proposed new buildings was different from the existing buildings, the façade using aluminium moulded with the texture of masonry block would help echo with the surrounding historical buildings mainly built with masonry rock. The Secretary supplemented that HKJC had introduced the philosophy of the design concept of the proposed scheme in the planning statement submitted to the Board. Moreover, an Executive Summary of the EIA report which included a summary on the visual impact assessment done under the EIA Ordinance had also been submitted together with the planning application for Member’s information.

44. Another Member opined that there were different approaches in revitalisation and different people might have different views on what the best approach should be. From the town planning point of view, while there was a mechanism to ensure archaeological relics found within the site would be suitably handled and the technical aspects of the proposed scheme were acceptable, there was no reason not to support the application.

45. The Vice-Chairman noted that though there were different public views on the applications, the Central and Western District Council had urged for an early implementation of the revitalisation of CPS Compound. As regards the merits of the design concept of the proposed scheme, it was the responsibility of HKJC to explain clearly to the public. In response to the concerns of the media and CWCG on the discovery of archaeological relics within the site, it was noted that a relevant advisory clause (b) was proposed to remind the applicant to note the comment of AMO regarding the AI report. He suggested that the minutes should clearly record that the Members were concerned with the preservation of the archaeological materials found within the CPS Compound and had ensured that there was a mechanism to ensure archaeological relics found would be properly handled.

46. The Chairman suggested that an approval condition could be imposed requiring the submission of AI report and implementation of the mitigation measures proposed therein to the satisfaction of AMO or the TPB. Members agreed.

47. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 6.5.2015, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the submission of archaeological investigation report and implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Antiquities and Monuments Office, Leisure and Cultural Services Department, or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and provision of vehicular access to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the design and provision of traffic improvement measures, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) the design, provision and maintenance of the footbridge extension, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (e) the submission and implementation of tree preservation proposal and landscape proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (f) the provision of water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

48. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant of the following :

- (a) the approval of the application did not imply that the proposed gross floor area (GFA) exemption would be granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department (BD) direct to obtain

the necessary approval. In addition, if GFA concession was not granted by the Building Authority and major changes to the current scheme were required, a fresh planning application to the Board might be required;

- (b) to note the comments of the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO), Leisure and Cultural Services Department regarding the Archaeological Investigation report. In addition, should there be any significant architectural features and artifacts discovered necessitating major changes to the current scheme, a fresh planning application to the Board might be required;
- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department regarding the compliance of the Practice Note for Authorized Persons and Registered Structural Engineers APP-87 and 151, Code of Practice for the Provision of Means of Escape in case of Fire 1996, as well as the proposed footbridge;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department with regard to the applicant's responsibility to bear the costs and undertake improvement and upgrading works to the existing public drainage systems for handling additional discharge due to the proposed development;
- (e) to note the comments of the Commissioner for Transport regarding the proposed traffic improvement measures and the applicant's responsibility to fund all improvement works;
- (f) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department on the pedestrian environment underneath the proposed footbridge, as well as the provision of more greenery/landscape plantings at the two courtyards and two new buildings;
- (g) to note the comments of the Chief Architect/Advisory and Statutory Compliance, Architectural Services Department on the provision of

adequate separation between the new buildings and the design of the footbridge to be further reviewed so that it might be visually more compatible with the surrounding context;

- (h) to note the comments of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services on the need to approach the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West & South, Lands Department for formal approval of transplanting/felling of trees;
- (i) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services regarding the Preliminary Fire Safety Strategy Report and the compliance of Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue; and
- (j) to note the comments of the Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department on the need to submit any upgrading works to the masonry walls to AMO for comments; and a detailed program showing the master construction sequences for interfacing work to BD for approval.