

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 464th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 20.4.2012

Present

Director of Planning
Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairman

Professor Eddie C.M. Hui

Ms. Julia M.K. Lau

Mr. Clarence W.C. Leung

Mr. Laurence L.J. Li

Ms. Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr. Stephen H. B. Yau

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),
Transport Department
Mr. David To

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr. Frankie Chou

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr. Ken Wong

Assistant Director (Hong Kong), Lands Department
Ms. Doris Chow

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr. Roger K.H. Luk

Mr. H.W. Cheung

Mr. Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Professor P.P. Ho

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Mr. C.T. Ling

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms. Christine K.C. Tse

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss Hannah H.N. Yick

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 463rd MPC Meeting held on 30.3.2012

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 463rd MPC meeting held on 30.3.2012 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

2. The Secretary reported that there were no matters arising from the last meeting.

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/370 Proposed Hotel in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone,
No. 30-34 Kwai Wing Road, Kwai Chung
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/370C)

3. The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTAL) was the consultant of the applicant. Mr. Dominic Lam and Mr. Patrick Lau who had current business dealings with KTAL had declared interests in this item. The Committee noted that Mr. Lau had not arrived to join the meeting yet. As the applicant had requested a deferral of the consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Mr. Lam could stay in the meeting.
4. The Secretary reported that Mr. Clarence W.C. Leung had declared an interest in

this item as he owned an office in the vicinity of the application site. The Committee considered the interest of Mr. Leung was direct but noted that he had not arrived to join the meeting yet.

5. The Secretary reported that the Committee agreed in the last meeting on 30.3.2012 to defer the subject application to this meeting as Transport Department(TD)'s comments on the applicant's further information submitted on 27.3.2012 were outstanding. On 5.4.2012, TD offered his comments and the applicant submitted further information in response to TD's comments on 16.4.2012, i.e. four days before this meeting. As TD's comments on the further information were relevant to the consideration of the application but were still awaited, Planning Department (PlanD) requested for a deferment of the consideration of the application pending TD's comments.

6. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by PlanD. The Committee agreed that the consideration of the application should be deferred by one or two meetings.

[Ms. Fannie F.L. Hung, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/KC/388 Shop and Services (Real Estate Agency) for a Temporary Period of 3 Years and 1 Month in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone, Unit 1 (Part), G/F, Well Fung Industrial Centre, 68 Ta Chuen Ping Street, Kwai Chung
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/388)

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. With the aid of a powerpoint, Ms. Fannie Hung, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application highlighting that the draft Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/KC/26 was gazetted today. When compared with the approved Kwai Chung OZP No. S/KC/25, the only difference in development restriction of the subject “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone on the draft Kwai Chung OZP No. S/KC/26 was the imposition of a building height restriction of 130mPD. The Premises was the subject of a previous application (No. A/KC/372) submitted by another applicant for temporary shop and services (real estate agency) use for a period of 3 years and 7 months, which was approved with conditions by the Committee on 19.8.2011. The planning permission was revoked on 19.2.2012 due to non-compliance with the approval condition on fire service installations;
- (b) the shop and services (real estate agency) for a temporary period of 37 months (3 years and 1 month);

[Mr. Patrick Lau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) departmental comments – no objection/adverse comment from concerned government departments was received;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection was received by the District Officer (Kwai Tsing); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The shop and services use under application at the Premises was considered not incompatible with the uses of the subject industrial building which mainly comprised two vehicle repair workshops, a furniture retail shop, a metal hardware shop with storage area, two factory canteens, a newspaper stand and an express delivery on the G/F, and industrial-related offices and trading companies on the upper floors. Since the approval of the previous

application, there was no change in the planning circumstances. The use under application complied with the relevant considerations in the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Development within “OU(B)” Zone (TPB PG-No. 22D) in that it would not induce adverse fire safety, traffic, environmental and infrastructural impacts to the developments within the subject building and the adjacent area. As confirmed by the Director of Fire Services (D of FS), the subject industrial building, which was sprinkler protected, was subject to a maximum permissible limit of 460m² for aggregate commercial floor area on G/F and the gross floor area (GFA) under the subject application was accountable towards the aggregate commercial floor area. The total GFA of previously approved applications (about 95.2m²) together with the proposed GFA (about 24m²) under the subject application was 119.2m² which was still within the maximum permissible limit of 460m². In this connection, D of FS had no objection to the application subject to approval condition on the provision of fire service installations.

8. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

9. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years and 1 month until 20.5.2015, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- (a) the submission and implementation of fire safety measures, including the provision of a means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion and fire service installations in the subject premises within six months from the date of the approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.10.2012; and
- (b) if the above planning condition was not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the

same date be revoked without further notice.

10. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant of the following:
- (a) prior planning permission should have been obtained before commencing the development at the subject premises;
 - (b) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Tsuen Wan & Kwai Tsing, Lands Department that if the application was approved by the TPB, the owner should apply to his office for a temporary waiver. The temporary waiver application would be considered by Lands Department acting in the capacity as landlord at its sole discretion. Any approval, if given, would be subject to such terms and conditions including, inter alia, payment of waiver fee and administrative fee as might be approved by Lands Department;
 - (c) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department on the compliance with the provisions of the Buildings Ordinance: (i) the Premises should be separated from the remainder of the building with fire resistance period of not less than 2 hours; and (ii) under Buildings Ordinance Section 4(1)(a), an Authorised Person should be appointed to coordinate building works except those exempted works as defined in Buildings Ordinance Section 41; and
 - (d) to note the TPB's 'Guidance Note on Compliance with Planning Condition on Provision of Fire Safety Measures for Commercial Uses in Industrial Premises' for further information on the fulfilment of the approval conditions herein.

[The Chairman thanked Ms. Fannie F.L. Hung, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/431 Proposed Office, Shop and Services in "Industrial" zone, 150-164 Texaco Road, Tsuen Wan (The Remaining Portion of Lot No. 285 in D.D. 446)
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/431)

11. The Secretary reported that Townland Consultants Ltd. (Townland) and Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ) were the consultants of the applicant. Mr. Dominic Lam who had current business dealings with Townland and Ms. Julia Lau who had current business dealings with Environ had declared interests in this item. As the applicant had requested a deferral of the consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Mr. Lam and Ms. Lau could stay in the meeting.

12. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 28.3.2012 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to comprehensively review and address the comments from government departments and the public.

13. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within two months from the date of receipt of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Hong Kong District

[Ms. April K.Y. Kun, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H4/87 Proposed Place of Recreation, Sports and Culture (Arts Centre, Arts Gallery) with ancillary Office, Eating Place and Shop and Services Uses in an area shown as 'Road', Land beneath flyover at the junction of Connaught Road Central, Rumsey Street and Man Kat Street
(MPC Paper No. A/H4/87)

14. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Hong Kong Architecture Centre (HKAC). Mr. Dominic Lam declared an interest in this item for being a voting member of HKAC and the President of Hong Kong Institute of Architects who was one of the founders of HKAC. Members agreed that Mr. Lam's interest was direct and should leave the meeting temporarily.

[Mr. Dominic Lam left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

15. With the aid of a powerpoint, Ms. April Kun, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) the proposed place of recreation, sports and culture (arts centre, arts gallery) with ancillary office, eating place and shop and services uses;

[Mr. Clarence Leung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) departmental comments –the Works Branch of Development Bureau supported in principle the application because it would enhance public awareness and understanding of good architecture, enhance the quality of the built environment, optimized utilization of land resources, revitalize the area and provide an attraction for local and overseas tourism. The Harbourfront Commission’s Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island supported the proposed Centre and appreciated HKAC’s creativity and innovative use of idle space. The Land and Development Advisory Committee also advised the Government to provide support to the proposed Centre. Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) advised that the application site was under a flyover and surrounded by roads which was not a location with good environmental qualities. However, the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) stipulated that “Offices of non-government organisations and associations providing convenient public service e.g. charity centres, offices of voluntary organisations, tourism information offices” were acceptable uses under flyovers and footbridges. The proposed uses were considered a kind of acceptable land uses under flyovers under the HKPSG. There was generally no adverse comment on the application except that DEP requested for the provision of an air-conditioning system to address the air quality concern. The Commissioner for Transport had no objection in principle from traffic viewpoint and commented that the proposed development should not affect sightline to motorists or pedestrians, cause glare or obstruct pedestrian flow. Access for disabled people should be provided. At-grade crossings across Connaught Road Central, Rumsey Street and Man Kat Street to the site and on-site parking were not permitted. Loading/unloading activities should be carried out outside peak hours in the vicinity and traffic signs and directional signs in the vicinity should not be affected. Other government departments had no objection/adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, 23 public comments were received. Of the public comments received, 20 (members of the public) were in support of the application while three (Central and

Western Development Concern Association and District Councillors of the Central & Western District Council (C&W DC)) had reservation on or objection to the application. The supporters commented that the Centre could promote education, design and cultural activities. It was in line with the government policy to promote innovation, cultural and creative industries and environmental industry. The proposed development was innovative in utilising left-over space, and the design of the building was aesthetically pleasing. The objectors commented that the proposed site was not in a convenient location with easy pedestrian access. The proposed development would hamper traffic thereby bringing about congestions and would add burden to existing pedestrian footbridges in Central which were already congested. The location was already in a cramped environment. The addition of a building block was undesirable from an aesthetical point of view. There were no need for the proposed uses and the proposed development was too small to be effectively used for the intended purposes. Other comments included that the Government should dispose the site on a fair and open basis so that other people could have the opportunity to apply the site for development. The C&W DC suggested using the subject site for car parking;

- (e) the District Officer (Central & Western), Home Affairs Department advised that the C&W DC's Members considered that the Government should dispose the site on a fair and open basis; the Government should respond to DC's previous suggestion of using the subject site for car parking; site constraints including vicinity to a refuse collection point, air quality and accessibility should be properly addressed; and the site could not accommodate large number of pedestrian and was not suitable for a public venue. The proposed development might affect drivers' attention; and
- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The proposed development was for the HKAC building to provide venue mainly for exhibition and arts gallery. The proposed development was not incompatible with the surrounding developments which are predominantly

commercial buildings mixed with government, institution or community uses. While the application site was located under flyover, the proposed uses were within the list of acceptable uses beneath flyovers and footbridges in Chapter 12 of the HKPSG. With respect to the concern on air quality, the proposed development would be equipped with central air-conditioning system with fixed windows and fresh air-intake that would be located away from the most heavily trafficked roads and all incoming air would be pre-filtered. A condition requesting the provision of an air conditioning system to the satisfaction of the DEP was suggested. As the proposed building was underneath a flyover and small in scale, adverse visual and landscape impacts were not anticipated. With regard to the traffic aspect, the proposal did not involve any car park or loading/unloading spaces. The application site was completely surrounded by carriageways and no access for pedestrians was available on the ground level. Pedestrian access to the proposed development would be from the existing elevated footbridge and the proposed development would be integrated with the existing footbridge to create an elevated plaza. In case of special delivery, separate application would be made to the concerned departments including Transport Department (TD). Regarding the public comment on a fair and open disposal of the subject site, it was a land administration matter rather than a land use issue. As regards the use of the site for car parking, TD advised that the site was not suitable for car parking use because of the limited space available for such use, the impact on the already very heavy traffic flow of the nearby roads and no proper pedestrian access for the users of the car park.

16. A Member asked how long the site would be leased to the applicant and whether the site was restricted to the proposed uses under application. Ms. April Kun replied that according to Lands Department (LandsD), the applicant had to apply for a short term tenancy (STT) for occupation of the site and if approved, would be subject to the terms and conditions that the Government considered appropriate including the payment of rent. However, there was no guarantee that the Government would approve the application for STT. Ms. Kun replied that according to LandsD, each application for use of the government land would be handled based on its own circumstances and the applicant had not applied for a STT yet.

Ms. Doris Chow said that for STT applications submitted by non-government organizations (NGO), LandsD would consult the relevant bureaux and departments before granting approval. If there were more than one applicant competing for the same site, the approval would have to take account of comments of bureaux and government departments. As the planning permission was granted on the terms as submitted, the uses at the site would be bound by the proposal under application should the Committee approve the application.

17. Noting the comments from C&W DC that the site should be disposed on a fair and open basis, a Member asked PlanD to explain the situation. As regards TD's views that the site was not suitable for carparking use, the same Member asked whether C&W DC had been informed. Ms. Kun responded that C&W DC had been clearly informed of TD's view that the site was not suitable for carparking use. Mr. David To supplemented that the site was small and was surrounded by heavily trafficked carriageways. It was difficult to provide a proper access to the site along the busy roads. Therefore, the site was considered not suitable for carparking purpose.

Deliberation Session

18. A Member opined that the proposed development might not be a good use of land resources as it would make the area more congested and would create glare impact to the drivers. This Member was also concerned that approval of the application might result in more uses underneath flyover. The Chairman explained that the use of land underneath flyover was regarded as an efficient use of the scarce land resources. Chapter 12 of the HKPSG had included a list of acceptable uses beneath flyovers. There was no need to worry about the increase in such uses as the use of land underneath flyover would be strictly controlled under the planning and lands administrative system. Ms. Kun added that according to the applicant's proposal, the materials used for external finishes of the proposed building would allow transmission of light from inside but would not create glare effect to the drivers.

19. In response to a Member's question, Ms. Kun replied that the proposed development had been submitted to the Harbourfront Commission's Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island and the Land and Development Advisory Committee. Both supported the proposed development.

20. The Chairman asked whether the proposed advisory clause (g) under paragraph 10.2 of the Paper should be changed to an approval condition noting TD's comment on the loading/unloading (L/UL) activities for the proposed development. Ms. Kun said that there was no need to impose a condition to that respect as the proposed development did not include any L/UL facilities. If there was a need for special delivery, separate application would be made to TD for approval. Mr. David To supplemented that the inclusion of an advisory clause was considered acceptable as TD would scrutinize the traffic arrangement at the building plans submission stage so as to ensure that no L/UL space would be provided within the proposed development. If there was a need for L/UL activities, the applicant might apply to use the L/UL bay at the side streets on a short term basis. Given the site constraints, L/UL activities had to be carried out via the pedestrian access to the site.

21. In response to a Member's question, the Secretary supplemented that most of the land underneath flyover were for carparking or NGO use.

22. 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 20.4.2016, 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 and implementation of a diversion proposal for affected water mains to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a diversion proposal for affected road drains to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of a Drainage Impact Assessment and implementation of the proposals identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;

- (e) the provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (f) the provision of an air-conditioning system to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB.

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

- (a) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/ Hong Kong West and South, Lands Department that there was no guarantee that the Government would approve the subject site for a short term tenancy upon the applicant's application for occupation of the site;
- (b) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department (BD) that the acceptability of the scheme would be subject to the Building Committee's consideration upon formal building plans submission, and to submit fire engineering report to the Fire Safety Committee of BD for assessment;
- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) that the applicant should provide DEP the Authorised Person's self certification on the provision of an air-conditioning system, strictly follow the guidelines in Table 3.1, Chapter 9 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines that only passive use was allowed at the "outdoor plaza/activity area" of the application site, and liaise with the Drainage Services Department on the sewer connection;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Highways Engineer/ Hong Kong, Highways Department to consult the relevant utility owners on the proposal and carry out diversion works if necessary;
- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Development(2), Water Supplies Department (WSD) that the diversion of government water mains

should be carried out by WSD term contractors but at the cost of the project proponent;

- (f) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that the emergency vehicular access provision in the site should comply with the standard as stipulated in Part VI of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue under the Building (Planning) Regulations 41D;
- (g) to note the comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) on the traffic issues to be addressed during the building layout design as stated in paragraph 7.1.10 of the Paper; and
- (h) to note the comments of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene to obtain temporary Places of Public Entertainment License if public entertainment activities were involved and to obtain food licences/permits should food business activities be conducted.

[The Chairman thanked Ms. April K.Y. Kun, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Dominic Lam returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H17/127 Proposed Flat (Staff Quarters) in "Government, Institution or Community" zone, 23 South Bay Close, Repulse Bay
(MPC Paper No. A/H17/127)

24. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd (Ove Arup), AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM), LLA Consultancy Ltd. (LLA), BMT Asia Pacific Ltd. (BMT) and J. Roger Preston Ltd. (JRP) were the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

- Professor S.C. Wong - having current business dealings with Ove Arup and AECOM
- Mr. Dominic Lam - having current business dealings with Ove Arup, AECOM, LLA, BMT and JRP
- Mr. Patrick Lau - having current business dealings with Ove Arup, AECOM, LLA, BMT and JRP

As the applicant has requested a deferral of consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Professor Wong, Mr. Lam and Mr. Lau could stay in the meeting.

25. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 16.4.2012 for deferment of the consideration of the application for one month to the meeting scheduled for 1.6.2012, to allow sufficient time for the applicant to prepare further improvement measures and submit further information to address the community's views on the proposed development as well as to address the various departmental comments, and to allow time for the concerned departments to consider the further information.

26. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration at the meeting on 1.6.2012 as requested by the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and since a total of about 4 months had been allowed, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H6/69 Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Composite Development in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” zone, 33-39 Tung Lo Wan Road and 19-21 Shelter Street
(MPC Paper No. A/H6/69)

27. The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTAL), MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) and Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ) were the consultants of the applicant. Mr. Dominic Lam and Mr. Patrick Lau who had current business dealings with KTAL and MVA and Ms. Julia Lau who had current business dealings with Environ had declared interests in this item. As the applicant had requested a deferral of consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Mr. Lam, Mr. Lau and Ms. Lau could stay in the meeting.

28. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 30.3.2012 for deferment of the consideration of the application for one month as the further information on the application could only be ready at the end of April 2012 in view of the complexity of the environmental assessment.

29. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within two months from the date of receipt of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and since a total of three months had been allowed, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K10/242 Proposed Flat, Shop and Services in "Residential (Group E)" zone, 84 To
Kwa Wan Road, Ma Tau Kok
(MPC Paper No. A/K10/242B)

30. The Secretary reported that AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM), LD Asia (LD) and Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ) were the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Professor S.C. Wong - having current business dealings with AECOM

Mr. Dominic Lam and - having current business dealings with AECOM and LD
Mr. Patrick Lau

Ms. Julia Lau - having current business dealings with Environ

As the applicant had requested a deferral of consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Professor Wong, Mr. Lam, Mr. Lau and Ms. Lau could stay in the meeting.

31. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 10.4.2012 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to address departmental comments related to noise and traffic issues as well as the visual aspect of the building façade.

32. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within two months from the date of receipt of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and since a total of six months had been allowed, this would be the last deferment granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K11/208 Proposed Hotel in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone,
20-24 Tai Yau Street, San Po Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/K11/208)

33. The Secretary reported that Glorymount Holdings Ltd. was the consultant of the applicant. Mr. Dominic Lam who had current business dealings with this company had declared an interest in this item. As the applicant had requested a deferral of the consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Mr. Lam could stay in the meeting.

34. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 12.4.2012 for deferment of the consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time to address comments from the Planning Department.

35. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within two months from the date of receipt of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K15/96 Proposed Comprehensive Development including Residential, Commercial, Hotel and Government, Institution or Community Uses and Minor Relaxation of Building Height and Plot Ratio Restrictions in “Comprehensive Development Area” zone, various Yau Tong Marine Lots and adjoining government land at Yau Tong Bay, Yau Tong
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/96H)

36. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Main Wealth Development Ltd. which was a joint venture of owners of Yau Tong Marine Lots comprising Sun Hung Kai Properties Ltd. (SHK), Henderson Land Development Ltd. (Henderson), Hang Lung Properties Ltd., Swire Properties Ltd. (Swire), Wheelock Properties Ltd. (Wheelock), Central Development Ltd., Moreland Ltd. and Fu Fai Enterprises Ltd.. Dennis Lau & Ng Chun Man Architects & Engineers (Hong Kong) Ltd. (DL&NCM), Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd (Ove Arup), AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM), Townland Consultants Ltd. (Townland), Urbis Ltd. (Urbis), MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA), and Westwood Hong & Associates Ltd. (Westwood) were the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

- Mr. Clarence Leung - being the Director of an non-government organisation that had recently received a private donation from a family member of the Chairman of Henderson

- Mr. Roger Luk - being the ex-member of the Board of Directors of Wheelock

- Professor S.C. Wong - having current business dealings with Ove Arup and AECOM

- Mr. Dominic Lam - having current business dealings with SHK, Henderson, Wheelock, Ove Arup, AECOM, Townland, Urbis,

MVA and Westwood

Mr. Patrick Lau - having current business dealings with SHK, Henderson, Swire, Wheelock, DL&NCM, Ove Arup, AECOM and MVA

The Committee agreed that Mr. Leung's interest was indirect and could stay in the meeting. For Mr. Luk, the Committee noted that he had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the applicant had requested a deferral of consideration of the application, Members agreed that Professor Wong, Mr. Lam and Mr. Lau could stay in the meeting.

37. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 11.4.2012 for deferment of the consideration of the application for three months in order to allow time to prepare a preliminary technical feasibility study for the potential yacht centre and a revised architectural scheme to address departmental comments and concerns. The Secretary said that this was the ninth request for deferment of consideration of the application. In view of the large-scale of the development and the complicated issues involved, the Committee had been sympathetic to the request of deferment of the application.

38. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within two months from the date of receipt of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that three months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Ms. S.H. Lam, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K18/292 Proposed Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) in "Residential (Group C) 1" zone, 11 Suffolk Road, Kowloon Tong
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/292)

Presentation and Question Sessions

39. With the aid of a visualiser, Ms. S.H. Lam, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed social welfare facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) (RCHE);
- (c) departmental comments – no objection/adverse comment from concerned government departments was received;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period. The District Officer (Kowloon City) advised that Planning Department (PlanD) had consulted the interested Kowloon City District Council members, the Chairman of Lung Tong Area Committee as well as the Owners' Committees, Mutual Aid Committees, management committees and residents of buildings near the site concerned direct regarding this planning application. PlanD and the Board should take into account all the comments, if any, gathered in the consultation exercise in the decision-making process; and
- (e) the PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The application was to convert the existing buildings within the site for a RCHE comprising 42

beds. The proposed development intensity was in line with the maximum permitted for “Residential (Group C)1” (“R(C)1”) zone under the Outline Zoning Plan. The proposed RCHE was residential in nature and was in line with the planning intention of the “R(C)1” zone which was primarily for low-rise, low-density residential developments. Uses in the vicinity were predominantly residential in nature intermixed with schools, religious institution, elderly home, hotel and government, institution or community facilities. The proposed conversion of the existing buildings at the site for RCHE was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Only minor alteration works would be involved to meet the up-to-date building standards. There would not be any tree felling or disruption to the existing landscape features. In this regard, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD had no adverse comment on the application from urban design and landscape point of view. On traffic aspect, given the small scale of the proposed RCHE, the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) considered that there would not be any adverse impact on traffic. Moreover, the site was located close to Mass Transit Railway station, both the C for T and the Commissioner of Police had no objection to the nil provision of parking and loading/unloading facilities. The proposed development was unlikely to generate any adverse environmental, drainage and infrastructural impacts on the locality.

40. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

41. After 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 20.4.2016, 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 condition:

- submission and implementation of a landscape and tree preservation proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

42. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant of the following:
- (a) to note the comments of the Commissioner for Transport that the proposed visiting time of 5pm-8pm would coincide with the afternoon peak hours of Kowloon Tong Area and to avoid pick-up/drop-off activities at the loading/unloading lay-by fronting the subject site during that time period if possible;
 - (b) the approval of the application did not imply any compliance with the Buildings Ordinance and Regulations. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval;
 - (c) Lands Department should be consulted on the lease matters relating to the proposed development;
 - (d) to provide fire service installations, which might include but not be limited to a sprinkler system, to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services. Detailed fire services requirement would be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plan or referral from the licensing authority; and
 - (e) to approach the Social Welfare Department on granting of licence under the Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) Ordinance.

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K9/247 Proposed Comprehensive Office, Eating Place and Shop and Services
Development in "Comprehensive Development Area (2)" zone, Kowloon
Inland Lot No. 11111, Hung Luen Road, Hung Hom
(MPC Paper No. A/K9/247B)

43. The Secretary reported that the application was related to Wheelock Properties Ltd. (Wheelock). Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd (Ove Arup), Parsons Brinckerhoff (Parsons), LLA Consultants Ltd. (LLA), Urbis Ltd. (Urbis) and Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ) were the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

- Mr. Roger Luk - being the ex-member of the Board of Directors of Wheelock
- Professor S.C. Wong - having current business dealings with Ove Arup
- Mr. Dominic Lam - having current business dealings with Wheelock, Ove Arup, Parsons, LLA and Urbis
- Mr. Patrick Lau - having current business dealings with Wheelock, Ove Arup and LLA
- Ms. Julia Lau - having current business dealings with Environ

44. The Committee noted that Mr. Luk had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Professor Wong and Ms. Lau had no direct involvement in the application, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting. For Mr. Lam and Mr. Lau, as their interests' were direct, the Committee agreed that they should leave the meeting temporarily.

[Mr. Dominic Lam and Mr. Patrick Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

45. With the aid of a powerpoint, Ms. S.H. Lam, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

The proposal

- (a) the proposed comprehensive office, eating place and shop and services development comprises four building blocks on top of a common basement of two storeys for parking and loading/unloading (L/UL). The four blocks were arranged in two tiers with a “stepped height” building profile stepping down from Hung Luen Road towards the waterfront. The two high blocks along Hung Luen Road with a building height of 75mPD (15 storeys above basement) was mainly for office use with eating place and shop and services on G/F. The two low blocks at the front near the waterfront with a building height of 16mPD (2 storeys above basement) was for eating place and shop and services uses. No podium was proposed. The ingress/egress point of the proposed development was at Kin Wan Street;

Planning brief (PB)

- (b) the PB setting out the planning parameters and various requirements was endorsed by the Committee on 19.6.2009 to guide the development of the site and to facilitate the preparation of Master Layout Plan (MLP) by the prospective developer. Major development parameters and requirements in the PB were set out in paragraph 1.6 of the Paper and details were in Appendix II of the Paper. They mainly included the following:
- (i) maximum plot ratio (PR) of 4
 - (ii) maximum gross floor area (GFA) not exceeding 54,788m² comprising office GFA not exceeding 41,091m² (equivalent to plot ratio of 3); and retail GFA not exceeding 13,697m² (equivalent to plot ratio of 1)
 - (iii) maximum site coverage of 60%
 - (iv) maximum building height restrictions (on main roof level) from 40mPD near the harbour to 75mPD in the inner part of the site
 - (v) a green coverage of a minimum 20% of the site area
 - (vi) a minimum 30m-wide non-building area (NBA) at the eastern boundary of the site (i.e. NBA(1))
 - (vii) a minimum 10m-wide NBA at the central part of the site (i.e. NBA(2))
 - (viii) a minimum 10-wide NBA at the southern boundary along the

waterfront promenade (i.e. NBA(3))

- (ix) a footbridge should be provided for connecting to the “R(A)2” site across Hung Luen Road. Pedestrian walkways should be made available within the development for public use on a 24-hour basis, which should connect with the footbridge and NBA(1)

Departmental comments

- (c) concerned government departments have no objection/adverse comments on the application;

Comments from Task Force on Harbourfront Development in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing, Harbourfront Commission (Task Force)

- (d) the Task Force noted that more GFA had been designated for office use and less for retail use as compared with the maximum allowed in the PB. Members expressed concern that more at-grade retail and food and beverage facilities would be instrumental in supporting the vitality of the waterfront. The proponent should justify the proposed distribution of office and retail GFA;
- (e) the Task Force considered that opportunity should be taken to ensure a better integration of the waterfront promenade with the proposed development. The project proponent was requested to consider improving the pedestrian circulation amongst the development blocks as well as connectivity between the hinterland and the waterfront promenade;

Local Views

- (f) the District Officer (Kowloon City) noted that Planning Department (PlanD) had consulted the interested Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) members, Hung Hom Area Committee and the Owners Committees (OC)/Mutual Aid Committees (MAC)/management committees and residents of buildings near to the site. PlanD and the Board should take into

account all the comments gathered in the consultation exercise in the decision-making process. Should the application be approved, the applicant should take appropriate measures to address the residents' concerns;

Public comments

- (g) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a total of 22 public comments on the application were received with one objecting to and 19 supporting/had no objection to the application. The remaining two provided comments with one suggesting more retail GFA to meet increasing demand while both of them raised concern on the vehicular access point that might cause pollution problems on the nearby open space;
- (h) the 19 comments from local residents and members of the public supported/had no objection to the application mainly on the grounds that the proposed development would enhance the attractiveness, vibrancy, and visual and air permeability in the waterfront area, improve the local environment, image and economy, create job opportunities, increase office land supply, and provide footbridge and pedestrian walkway connection to the waterfront promenade. The low retail blocks would provide street shopping experience and integrate with the waterfront promenade;
- (i) the public comment objecting to the application was submitted by the Designing Hong Kong Limited mainly for the reasons that the proposed development should be oriented towards creating a vibrant ground level in the waterfront area. The proposed footbridge across Hung Luen Road was suggested to be deleted because of inadequate pedestrian volume and the lack of a comprehensive elevated pedestrian network connecting the adjacent sites. Development should be oriented towards street levels. If the footbridge was included, both the ground and elevated levels should include public access and retail facilities;
- (j) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period of the further information of the application, a total of 22 public comments were received

including 19 comments from local residents and members of the public in support of the application on similar grounds to those received on the application. One comment from a member of Kowloon City District Council indicated no comment on the application while another comment raised concern about the nuisance arising from the proposed eating place to the nearby residents. The remaining one raised concerns about excessive building height as compared with the existing buildings in Whampoa Garden, adverse visual, air ventilation, natural lighting and traffic impacts, and inadequate open space and government, institution or community facilities in the area; and

PlanD's views

- (k) PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 12 of the Paper and the following grounds:
 - (i) the application for a comprehensive office, eating place and shop and services development in the form of two high office blocks and two low retail blocks on the site was in line with the planning intention of the subject “Comprehensive Development Area (2)” (“CDA(2)”) zone which was for retail and office uses. The proposed plot ratio of 4, building height of 16mPD-75mPD stepping down towards the waterfront and site coverage of 60% complied with the development restrictions under the “CDA(2)” zone. As required under the Notes for the “CDA(2)” zone, ancillary car parking was proposed at basement;

Office and retail GFA

- (ii) the applicant proposed an office GFA of 48,612m² (plot ratio about 3.55) which was more than the PB restriction by 7,521m² (+18.3%). As a result, less retail GFA was proposed (plot ratio of 0.45, i.e. 6,200m² GFA). According to the Market Research Report Study submitted by the applicant, there was abundant supply for retail

GFA in the district to serve local residents and no large scale shopping mall was required at the waterfront area. On the other hand, the low vacancy rate of office development in the vicinity had shown a strong demand for office use in the district. The whole ground floor, except the area for office entrance lobby, driveway and ancillary E&M facilities, was proposed for eating place and shop and services uses. PlanD had no strong view on the proposed office and retail GFAs;

Landscaped NBAs

- (iii) three landscaped NBAs, required under the PB, were included in the MLP. The 30m-wide NBA(1), 15m-wide NBA(2) and 10m-wide NBA(3) would serve as air and visual corridors and important linkages from the hinterland to the waterfront promenade. The NBA(2) across the site was 5m wider than the requirement under the PB to better enhance the air permeability and visual connectivity to the hinterland. These facilities would be managed by the applicant and open 24 hours a day to the public. NBA(3) along the waterfront promenade might be used for alfresco dining. In addition to these three NBAs, the applicant had proposed an east-west corridor across the site which would serve as an east-west air and visual corridor to enhance the environmental quality, attractiveness and vibrancy of the waterfront area;

Urban design and visual impact

- (iv) as a result of the designation of the three NBAs and the additional east-west corridor, the site was divided into four parcels with four building blocks. The four building blocks were arranged in two tiers and designed in cubical built-form and small blocks to reduce the massing of development. The proposed NBA(2) and east-west corridor formed gaps between the four building blocks. Hence, wall-effect could be avoided and air permeability in the area could

be enhanced. A “stepped height” building profile with two high blocks and two low blocks, and the terraces treatment at ground level would provide stepping perception from Hung Luen Road towards the waterfront. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L), PlanD considered that the massing and disposition of the proposed development as well as the linkages with adjacent promenade were appropriate for the waterfront setting from urban design perspective. With the incorporation of an additional east-west corridor in the central part of the site, more street frontage were created for shops and eating places. This design would enhance the vibrancy within the site. To avoid monotonous flat-top building and harbourfront image, the applicant had also made efforts to refine the scheme with the incorporation of slanting roof-top features, staggered façade design and façade treatments;

Landscaped Master Plan

- (v) a greenery coverage of not less than 20% of the site in accordance with the PB was proposed at pedestrian level. Soft and hard landscaping would be provided in various NBAs and the roof of the low blocks;

Interface with public waterfront promenade

- (vi) with regard to the comment of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services on the 1.5m level difference between the ground levels of the public promenade and the proposed development, the applicant explained that the level difference was to create stepped terrace to form a gradual transition to the waterfront promenade. It was considered that the detailed design of the connection between the promenade and the proposed development could be worked out at detailed design stage;

Corner splay

- (vii) according to the PB, corner splays of building blocks should be provided to improve the pedestrian circulation. Corner splays were proposed at the two blocks fronting the waterfront promenade and at the junction of Hung Luen Road and Kin Wan Street. Since there were wide corridors available at NBA(1) and NBA(2), there was no need to provide corner splays at other facades along the NBAs to improve the pedestrian circulation. The Commissioner for Transport considered the proposed corner splays acceptable;

Footbridge connection and pedestrian walkway

- (viii) according to the submission, a footbridge at 1/F and pedestrian walkway at G/F would be provided to complete the pedestrian walkway network from the hinterland through the site to reach the waterfront areas. Under the proposed scheme, a section of the proposed walkway was on the public footpath, the proposed walkway at the ground level was not covered, and pedestrian link among the four blocks was proposed at basement level. PlanD considered that the requirement for a covered pedestrian walkway at the ground level and the alignment of the pedestrian walkway and pedestrian link could be improved at detailed design stage. An approval condition on the design and provision of footbridge, pedestrian linkage and covered pedestrian walkway was therefore recommended;

Traffic, environmental, drainage and other technical aspects

- (ix) according to the submission, carparking and loading/unloading facilities would be provided in the 2-storey basement while taxi and vehicle lay-bys would be provided at G/F of the high blocks. The proposal complied with the requirements of the PB. Concerned government departments had no adverse comments on traffic, environmental, drainage and other technical aspects. Appropriate

approval conditions relating to traffic, drainage and sewerage facilities and fire services installations were recommended; and

Public comments

- (x) most of the public comments received were supportive or not objecting to the application while one objected and three raise concern/suggestion. The objecting comment raised that the proposed development should be oriented towards creating a vibrant ground level in the waterfront area and the proposed footbridge should be deleted. According to the proposed scheme, the ground level was mainly proposed for retail and eating place uses and the NBA fronting the public waterfront promenade might be used for alfresco dining. These would enhance vibrancy in the waterfront. With the introduction of the east-west corridor with shop frontage, the vibrancy within the site would also be enhanced. Regarding the proposed footbridge, it formed a part of the planned comprehensive footbridge/walkway system linking the hinterland in Hung Hom and waterfront. For the proposed building height, it did not exceed the restrictions under the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). CTP/UD&L, PlanD did not consider that the proposed development would generate significant adverse visual impact. For other technical aspects, having considered the proposed scheme and technical assessments, concerned departments considered that the proposed scheme was acceptable from various aspects. Besides, adequate land had been reserved in the OZP for development of open space and government, institution or community facilities to meet the district requirement.

46. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

47. The Chairman asked what the area of a typical floor plate for the office

development was and a Member asked whether the high block would look bulky. In response, Ms. S.H. Lam said that the applicant had not provided the area of typical floor plate for the proposed office blocks. However, with four building blocks proposed within the site with an area of about 1.3 ha, the footprint of each building block would be about 2,000m² after discounting the proposed three non-building areas within the site. The bulk of each building would not be too big.

48. The same Member asked whether the design requirements for the site were common requirements to other development at the waterfront. The Secretary explained that the Harbour Vision Statement of the Town Planning Board and the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines of the ex-Harbour-front Enhancement Committee had laid down the general principles for waterfront development. As there was concern over the design of the subject site located at the waterfront, it was zoned “CDA” such that planning application in the form of a master layout plan had to be submitted to the Board for approval. A PB had been prepared for the CDA site to guide the future development. In preparing the PB, the afore-mentioned relevant principles and guidelines on waterfront development would be followed, together with requirements specific to the site. The PB for each individual site would be different and the PB would be submitted to the TPB for endorsement. The endorsed PB would be attached to the lease for developers to follow. The Chairman added that Planning Department had conducted the Hung Hom District Study which had involved extensive public engagement. The recommendations of the Study had formed a basis for the formulation of the subject PB. The proposed development under application was in line with the PB and was compatible with the surrounding environment.

49. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application and the Master Layout Plan (MLP), under sections 4A and 16 of the Ordinance, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 20.4.2016, 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 and implementation of a revised MLP, taking into account the approval conditions (b) to (h) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;

- (b) the two low blocks fronting the public promenade should not exceed 16mPD as proposed by the applicant;
- (c) the gross floor area for eating place and shop and services should be not less than 6,200m² as proposed by the applicant;
- (d) the submission and implementation of the revised building design (including roof-top structure design) to incorporate the proposed building design enhancement measures to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (e) the submission and implementation of a revised Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (f) the design and provision of footbridge, pedestrian linkage and covered pedestrian walkway to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (g) the design and provision of vehicular access, parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces and lay-bys for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (h) the submission and implementation of the design of the pedestrian connection between the public promenade and the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB;
- (i) the implementation of the proposed drainage and sewerage connection works and sewerage mitigation measures identified in the revised sewerage and drainage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (j) the provision of water supply for firefighting and fire service installations

to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

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

- (a) the approved MLP, together with the set of approval conditions, would be certified by the Chairman of the TPB and deposited in the Land Registry in accordance with section 4(A)(3) of the Town Planning Ordinance. Efforts should be made to incorporate the relevant approval conditions into a revised MLP for deposition in the Land Registry as soon as practicable;
- (b) the approval of the application did not imply that any proposal on building design elements to fulfil the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, and any proposal on bonus plot ratio and/or gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development would be approved/granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. If the building design elements and the GFA concession were not approved/granted by the Building Authority and major changes to the current scheme were required, a fresh planning application to the TPB might be required;
- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department that the requirements for GFA concession and the sustainable building design guidelines under Practice Notes for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers APP-151 and APP-152 were applicable;
- (d) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West, Lands Department in paragraph 10.1.1 (f) to (h) of the Paper that detailed design of the proposed development should be further scrutinized through the future submissions as required under lease. Any approval given by the TPB should not prejudice the right reserved by the Government under lease including the right to reject any future building submissions or landscaping submissions etc. which were considered not in compliance with the lease

conditions;

- (e) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that the arrangement of emergency vehicular access should comply with Part VI of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue; and
- (f) to note the comments of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services and the Chief Project Manager 302, Architectural Services Department on the interface with the waterfront promenade in paragraphs 10.1.12 and 10.1.13 of the Paper respectively.

[The Chairman thanked Ms. S.H. Lam, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 14

Any Other Business

51. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 10:20 a.m..