

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 485th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 15.3.2013

Present

Director of Planning
Mr. K. K. Ling

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Professor P.P. Ho

Professor Eddie C.M. Hui

Ms. Julia M.K. Lau

Mr. Laurence L.J. Li

Mr. Roger K.H. Luk

Ms. Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr. Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr. Stephen H. B. Yau

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),
Transport Department
Mr. W. B. Lee

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr. K. F. Tang

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

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr. Clarence W.C. Leung

Mr. H.W. Cheung

Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms. Christine K.C. Tse

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss H.Y. Chu

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms. Karen K.W. Chan

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 484th MPC Meeting held on 1.3.2013

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 484th MPC meeting held on 1.3.2013 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

2. The Secretary reported that there were no matters arising.

General

[Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK), Ms. Ginger K. Y. Kiang, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), Mrs. Alice K.F. Mak, Senior Town Planner/Metro and Urban Renewal (STP/M&UR) and Mr. Timothy Y.M. Lui, Senior Town Planner/Special Duties (STP/SD), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting]

Review of Sites Designated “Comprehensive Development Area” on Statutory Plans in the Metro Area for the Year 2012/2013

(MPC Paper No.6/13)

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. Mrs. Alice K.F. Mak, STP/M&UR said that it had been the Committee’s practice to review, on an annual basis, the sites that had been zoned “Comprehensive Development

Area” (“CDA”) on the statutory plans in the Metro Area for more than three years with or without an approved Master Layout Plan (MLP). The review would assist the Committee in considering whether the zoning of individual “CDA” sites should be retained/amended and in monitoring the progress of the “CDA” developments. With the aid of a powerpoint, Mrs. Mak then presented the results of the latest review as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points:

- (a) the subject review covered a total of 45 “CDA” sites. 23 of them did not have approved MLP and the remaining 22 had approved MLP;

23 “CDA” Sites with No Approved MLP

- (b) among the 23 “CDA” sites which were zoned “CDA” for more than 3 years and did not have approved MLP, 21 of them were proposed to retain the “CDA” zoning. The details were set out in Appendix I of the Paper. The reasons for retaining the “CDA” zoning of these sites were: (i) the MLPs were being prepared; (ii) the sites were recently sold; (iii) planning briefs were recently approved, under preparation or to be prepared; (iv) some sites were subject to traffic, environmental and/or visual impacts, which had to be properly addressed; (v) some sites would be soon disposed of; and (vi) a site was related to preservation of historical building. The “CDA” designation was essential for providing guidance on the proposed development of these sites;
- (c) regarding the two remaining “CDA” sites which did not have approved MLP, they were agreed by the Committee for rezoning to the appropriate zonings in the last round of review. The details were set out in Appendix II of the Paper. One of these “CDA” sites was located in the Yau Tong Industrial Area (YTIA). A planning review was conducted in 2011, and the site was proposed to be sub-divided into smaller sites with appropriate zonings to facilitate comprehensive redevelopment of the area. The other “CDA” site was located in the Mok Cheong Street, Ma Tau Kok. The site was currently occupied by six factory buildings, two GIC facilities and the Hong Kong Society for the Blind Factory cum Sheltered Workshop. Given its size, the number of private lots and government land involved, the

developer had encountered land assembly problem which had impeded redevelopment of the site. To enhance the prospect of implementation, consideration would be given to sub-dividing it into smaller “CDA” sites and to rezone the government land portion into smaller sub-areas for residential use. The proposal was now being followed up by concerned government bureaux/departments. The proposed amendments to the OZPs which covered the above two sites would be submitted to the Committee for consideration upon finalization of the proposals;

22 “CDA” Sites with Approved MLP

- (d) as detailed in Appendix III of the Paper, it was proposed to retain the “CDA” zoning of 15 “CDA” sites which had approved MLPs as these sites were either had some progress in construction works or were at various stages of building construction and implementation. Retention of the “CDA” designation for the these sites was considered necessary to ensure that they would be implemented in accordance with the approved MLPs and approval conditions;
- (e) as detailed in Appendix IV of the Paper, the “CDA” site at 23 Oil Street, North Point had an approved MLP. It was agreed by the Committee in the last review that the site was suitable for rezoning as the hotel development at the site had been completed. The site would be rezoned to “Commercial” to reflect the planning intention of the site and the hotel use in the next round of OZP amendment;
- (f) as detailed in Appendix V of the Paper, the development on the “CDA” site covering the Airport Railway Kowloon Station and the “CDA” site covering the former Marine Police Headquarters in Salisbury Road had been completed. It was proposed to rezone them from “CDA” to other appropriate zonings;
- (g) as detailed in Appendix VI of the Paper, four “CDA” sites with approved MLPs were considered to have potential for rezoning as the developments on these sites had been completed and most of the approval conditions had

been complied with. The four “CDA” sites covered the following developments: (i) the residential development i.e. “Manhattan Hill” and the Kowloon Motor Bus Headquarters Building in Lai Chi Kok, (ii) a residential development at the junction to the south of the proposed Inverness Road Extension and West of Junction Road, Kowloon Tong; (iii) a site at the junction of Hung Luen Road and Kin Wan Street, Hung Hom; and (iv) the hotel development at Ting Kau, Tsuen Wan; and

- (h) to sum up, out of the 45 “CDA” sites reviewed, 36 sites were proposed for retention, three sites were agreed by the Committee for rezoning; two sites were proposed for rezoning; and four sites were considered having potential for rezoning. PlanD would progressively submit the zoning amendments of the respective “CDA” sites to the Committee for consideration.

4. In response to a Member’s enquiry, the Chairman said that for the three sites which were agreed for rezoning by the Committee, the detailed rezoning proposals with development parameters would be submitted to the Committee for consideration.

5. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Mrs. Alice Mak explained that the “CDA” sites categorized as “agreed for rezoning” referred to the three sites that were agreed by the Committee for rezoning to other appropriate zonings in the last round of the “CDA” sites review in March 2012. The “CDA” sites categorized as “proposed for rezoning” mainly referred to those sites where the proposed developments had been completed. These “CDA” sites would be rezoned to appropriate zonings to reflect their existing developments when opportunity arose. The “CDA” sites categorized as “with potential for rezoning”, were sites covered by planning permissions but the approval conditions had yet to be fully complied with. Mrs. Alice Mak added that detailed rezoning proposals of the “CDA” sites with development restrictions would be submitted to the Committee for consideration at a later stage.

6. The Secretary explained that in the last round of review of the “CDA” sites in March 2012, the Committee agreed to rezone three “CDA” sites to appropriate zonings. However, due to various reasons, these three “CDA” sites had yet to be rezoned. She invited DPO/HK and DPO/K to explain to Members about the progress of these three “CDA”

sites.

7. Ms. Ginger Kiang, DPO/HK, briefed Members that the “CDA” site at 23 Oil Street was currently occupied by a hotel development, i.e. Harbour Grand Hong Kong. Due to resumption of the northern part of the site for the Central-Wanchai Bypass project, the Committee on 4.3.2011 agreed to delete/vary the approval conditions relating to the resumed area. As all approval conditions had been fully complied with, the site would be rezoned to “Commercial” to reflect completed development in the next round of OZP amendment.

8. Miss Fiona Lung, DPO/K, briefed Members that two “CDA” sites in Kowloon area were previously agreed by the Committee for rezoning in the last round of review. The planning review of the “CDA” site at YTIA was conducted in 2011 and the site was proposed to be sub-divided into smaller sites with appropriate zonings. As there were other amendments to the OZP including the proposed rezoning of the “Government, Institution or Community” sites for residential uses which were being processed, the proposed amendments to the “CDA” zone would be submitted together with other amendments to the Committee for consideration in one go. Another “CDA” site at Mok Cheong Street, Ma Tau Kok was under multiple-ownership and included government land. To enhance the prospect of implementation, the Committee agreed in the last round of review to sub-divide it into smaller “CDA” sites and to rezone the government land portion into smaller sub-areas for residential use. The proposal was now being followed up by concerned government bureaux/departments. This involved the relocation of the Kowloon Animal Management Centre and undertaking of a hazard assessment as the Gas Works was located to the south of the “CDA” site. Proposed amendments to these two “CDA” zones with development parameters would be submitted to the Committee for consideration in due course.

[Ms. Julia M.K. Lau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

9. A Member noted that some “CDA” sites had not been developed after they had been zoned “CDA” on the OZPs for more than ten years. This Member enquired the following: (i) whether the designation of “CDA” sites had speeded up or delayed developments in the territory; and (ii) would the proposal by the PlanD i.e. to sub-divide some “CDA” sites into smaller sites defeat the primary objective of setting up “CDA” zone, which was for comprehensive development.

10. In response, the Secretary explained that the “CDA” zoning had been an effective planning tool in facilitating urban renewal/restructuring and ensuring proper control on the overall scale and design of the development. The designation of “CDA” zoning provided an incentive for developers to assemble land large enough to enable comprehensive developments. It also provided a means for achieving coordinated development in areas subject to traffic, environmental and infrastructure capacity constraints, and in areas with interface problems. The Board had previously agreed that the PlanD would conduct annual review of “CDA” zones which were designated on the statutory plans for more than three years. This would assist the Committee to closely monitor the progress of the “CDA” developments. In the review exercise, the PlanD would consult the developers or their agents for the “CDA” sites designated for more than three years with approved MLP in order to have a better understanding on the implementation of the sites. Should there be any outstanding issues causing delay to the developments, the developers or their agents could approach PlanD for advice. The results of the review of the “CDA” sites would be submitted to the Committee for consideration in March every year.

11. The same Member opined that if a site was very small, it might not be appropriate to zone it as “CDA”. Furthermore, for a large “CDA” site with fragmented ownership, the PlanD might consider to sub-divide it into smaller sites with other appropriate zonings.

12. In response, the Secretary said that most of the “CDA” sites were large in site area. Those smaller “CDA” sites were usually with technical constraints, and the developers were required to demonstrate to the Board in the form of MLP with the support of technical assessments showing that the technical constraints could be addressed and mitigated as appropriate. The Secretary also pointed out that apart from the “CDA” zoning, “Residential (Group E)” was another appropriate zoning for the sites, which could be developed for residential use provided that the technical constraints of the sites would be addressed by appropriate measures.

13. The Secretary further explained that after the annual reviews of the “CDA” sites, the Committee had decided to sub-divide some large “CDA” sites under multiple-ownerships into smaller sites and rezone them to other appropriate zonings. In coming to this decision, the Committee would pay heed to ensure that the objective for comprehensive development

would not be unduly compromised. If there was implementation problem of the “CDA” sites, the Urban Renewal Authority might be invited to become an implementation agent of the development of these sites. Nevertheless, the implementation programmes of the development would be subject to URA’s schedule and resources.

14. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) note the findings of the review of the sites designated “CDA” on statutory plans in the Metro Area;
- (b) agree to the retention of the “CDA” designation for the sites mentioned in paragraphs 4.1.1 and 4.2.2 and detailed at Appendices I and III of the Paper;
- (c) note the agreement of the Committee to rezone the sites mentioned in paragraphs 4.1.3, 4.1.4 and 4.2.3 and detailed at Appendices II and IV of the Paper;
- (d) agree in-principle to the proposed rezoning of the “CDA” sites in paragraph 4.2.4 and detailed at Appendix V of the Paper; and
- (e) note the sites with potential for rezoning in paragraph 4.2.5 and details at Appendix VI of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked Ms. Ginger K. Y. Kiang, DPO/HK, Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung, DPO/K, Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan, DPO/TWK, Mrs. Alice K.F. Mak, STP/M&UR, and Mr. Timothy Y.M. Lui, STP/SD, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. Ms. Ginger K. Y. Kiang, DPO/HK, Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung, DPO/K, Mrs. Alice K.F. Mak, STP/M&UR, and Mr. Timothy Y.M. Lui, STP/SD, left the meeting at this point.]

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

[Mr. Philip Y.L. Chum, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Cheung Sha Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K5/33
(MPC Paper No.7/13)

15. The Secretary said that the item involved the proposed amendments to the approved Cheung Sha Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). One of the proposed amendments was to rezone an “Open Space” (“O”) site at Lai Chi Kok Road/Tonkin Street to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) to facilitate the public rental housing development by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declare interests in this item:

- Mr. K.K. Ling - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA
- Mr. Frankie Chou - being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA
- Ms. Doris Chow - being an alternate member for the Director of Lands who was a member of HKHA
- Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam - had current business dealings with HKHA
- Ms. Julia M.K. Lau - being a member of HKHA and Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA

16. The Committee considered that the interests of the above Members were direct and they should leave the meeting temporarily for this item. As the Chairman had to leave the meeting temporarily, the Vice-chairman took up the chairmanship of the meeting at this point.

[Mr. K.K. Ling, Ms. Doris Chow, Ms. Julia M.K. Lau, Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr. Frankie Chou left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

17. Mr. Philip Y.L. Chum, STP/TWK, referred to pages 5 and 9 of the Paper and said that there were typing errors in paragraphs 7 and 13 of the Paper. In this regard, two replacement pages for pages 5 and 9 were tabled for Members' reference. With the aid of a powerpoint, Mr. Philip Chum presented the proposed amendments to the approved Cheung Sha Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K5/33 as detailed in the Paper, which were summarized below:

Background

- (a) the Government was committed to expanding land resources for Hong Kong through a multi-pronged approach to build up land reserve with a view to meeting housing, social and economic developments;
- (b) on 30.8.2012, the Government announced a package of short and medium-term measures to expedite the supply of housing units. Amongst these measures was the rezoning of an "Open Space" ("O") site at Lai Chi Kok Road/Tonkin Street, which had no development programme, for public housing development. It was targeted that construction works would be completed in 2019 and about 2,300 public rental housing flats could be produced. To ensure that there would be no net loss of open space in the Sham Shui Po District, the proposal would necessitate a land swap arrangement. Under this arrangement, a replacement site of approximately the same site area at Lai Chi Kok/Hing Wah Street, which was currently zoned "R(A)" and reserved for residential development and a primary school, would be rezoned for open space development;

Proposed Amendments to the OZP

Amendment Item A: To rezone a site at Lai Chi Kok Road/Tonkin Street from "O" to "R(A)"

- (c) the site was currently zoned “O” on the OZP. It was located to the north of Lai Chi Kok Road between Fat Tseung Street and Tonkin Street. It was currently occupied by a temporary golf driving range under short term tenancy (on a quarterly basis) and had a net site area of 2.3 ha, after excluding the area occupied by the pavement and footbridge landing;
- (d) public housing development on the site was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas mainly comprising residential and school developments. Besides, according to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department, there was no immediate need for implementation of the proposed open space, taking into account the overall district provision of open space in Sham Shui Po;
- (e) technical assessments including visual impact, air ventilation, traffic, environmental and infrastructural assessments had been conducted. Concerned government departments, including the Environmental Protection Department (EPD), Transport Department, Drainage Services Department and Water Supplies Department, confirmed that there were no insurmountable environmental, traffic and infrastructure problems. Moreover, noise impact assessment, traffic impact assessment and air ventilation assessment would be conducted at the detailed design stage of the public housing development. EPD also required the undertaking of a comprehensive noise assessment to address the noise nuisance from the traffic noise in Tonkin Street and West Kowloon Corridor and the operation of the nearby wholesale vegetable market, and to work out effective noise mitigation measures;
- (f) taking into account the building height restriction of the neighbouring Lai Kok Estate and the stepped building height profile planned for the Cheung Sha Wan area, it was proposed that the site would be subject to a maximum building height of 100mPD. Moreover, in accordance with the established administrative procedure, the future public housing development on the site would be guided by a planning brief and a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 6

should be adopted;

Items B and C: To rezone a site at Lai Chi Kok Road/Hing Wah Street from “R(A)” to “O” and “G/IC”

- (g) the site was currently zoned “R(A)” on the OZP. It was located to the south of Lai Chi Kok Road and Hing Wah Street. It was currently occupied by part of Cheung Sha Wan Temporary Wholesale Poultry Market, Wang Cheong Building and Wang Cheong Factory Building and had a total area of about 2.9ha. The site was originally reserved for residential development and the provision of a primary school;
- (h) to facilitate the proposed public housing development at the Lai Chi Kok Road/Tonkin Street site i.e. the proposed site under Amendment Item A and to ensure that there would be no net loss of open space provision in the area, a replacement site for reprovisioning the affected amount of open space was required. The “R(A)” site at Lai Chi Kok Road/Hing Wah Street, with a site area of 2.9ha would meet the site swap requirement. It was proposed to rezone 2.3 ha of the site from “R(A)” to “O” for open space use, and the remaining 0.62ha at the northern portion of the site from “R(A)” to “G/IC” for a primary school;
- (i) technical assessments including visual impact assessment and air ventilation assessment had been conducted. The rezoning of the major portion of the Lai Chi Kok Road/Hing Wah Street site from “R(A)” to “O” would further protect the wind environment along these paths. Concerned government departments considered that the proposed rezoning of the Lai Chi Kok Road/Hing Wah Street site for open space use and school use would not create any adverse impact on the traffic, environment and infrastructure of the area;
- (j) the proposed “G/IC” site would be subject to a maximum building height restriction of 8 storeys, which met the standard requirement for a school development;

Item D : To rezone a strip of land at Tonkin Street (between Cheung Sha Wan Road and Lai Chi Kok Road) from “R(A)”, “G/IC” and “O” to an area shown as ‘Road’

- (k) in order to reflect the as-built/intended pavement and footbridge landing at Tonkin Street between Cheung Sha Wan Road and Lai Chi Kok Road, it was proposed to rezone a strip of area along the current zoning boundaries of “R(A)”, “G/IC” and “O” to an area shown as ‘Road’ on the OZP;

Item E : To rezone a strip of land from an area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC” at King Lam Street

- (l) the “G/IC” zone to the north of King Lam Street was bisected by the road reserve, which was currently shown as ‘Road’ on the OZP. It was used for the maintenance access to the stilling basin of the Lai Chi Kok Drainage Tunnel. The western portion of the “G/IC” site was occupied by a stilling basin, which was subject to a maximum building height restriction of 20mPD. The eastern portion of the “G/IC” site was reserved for the development of a proposed international school, which was subject to a maximum building height of 8 storeys;
- (m) as a more direct vehicular access to the decked drainage channel for maintenance and operation of the Drainage Services Department’s (DSD) facilities would be provided right beneath the Lai Chi Kok Viaduct of Tsing Sha Highway, DSD had recently confirmed that the road reserve was no longer required. In view of the above, the site was proposed to be rezoned from an area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC”, subject to the maximum building height restrictions of 20mPD and 8 storeys respectively;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP

- (n) the user term ‘Helicopter Filling Station’ was revised to read ‘Helicopter Fuelling Station’ for the Notes of the “G/IC” zone;

- (o) the ES was revised to take into account the proposed amendments as mentioned above. Opportunity had also been taken to update the general information for the various land use zones to reflect the latest status and planning circumstances of the OZP; and

Departmental Consultation and Public Consultation

- (p) the proposed amendments had been circulated to relevant government bureaux/departments for comments. They had no objection to or adverse comments on the proposed amendments. The comments of the government bureaux/departments had been incorporated, where appropriate; and
- (q) on 15.1.2013, the Sham Shui Po District Council (SSPDC) was consulted on the rezoning proposals, including Amendment Items A and B. Members of the SSPDC were generally supportive of the proposals. There were suggestions for lifting up the building height restriction for the proposed public housing site so as to free up more street-level public space. There were also questions raised as to the rationale of selecting the Lai Chi Kok Road/Hing Wah Street site as the replacement site over other sites such as the ex-abattoir site for the swap arrangement, and when the replacement open space would be provided.

18. Noting that the building height restrictions of Un Chau Estate and Fortune Estate were 120mPD and 110mPD respectively, a Member asked whether the proposed building height restriction of the site at Lai Chi Kok Road/Tonkin Street, i.e. the site under Amendment Item A, could be increased from 100mPD to 110mPD. In response, Mr. Wilson Chan said that the proposed building height restriction of 100mPD was compatible with the building height restriction of the neighbouring Lai Kok Estate. This was also in line with the stepped building height profile planned for Cheung Sha Wan, which gradually increased from the southern part of the Planning Area to the inland area in the northern part. The HD would also be required to undertake relevant assessments including visual impact assessment and air ventilation assessment during the detailed design stage. Moreover, as

there was a minor relaxation clause in the Notes of the “R(A)” zone, the HD could apply for a minor relaxation of building height restriction under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).

19. A Member noted that the wholesale vegetable market along Lai Chi Kok Road was in close proximity to the existing temporary golf driving range site which was proposed for public housing development. This Member asked about the operation hours of the wholesale vegetable market and whether its operation would adversely affect the future residents of the proposed public housing development. In response, Mr. Wilson Chan said that the same question had been raised by the Sham Shui Po District Council. The wholesale vegetable market started its operation at about 3 to 4 a.m. and it might cause noise nuisance to the future residents of the proposed public housing development. In this regard, the HD was required to undertake a noise assessment to address the noise nuisance from the operation of the wholesale vegetable market as well as from the traffic noise of Tonkin Street and West Kowloon Corridor, and to work out effective noise mitigation measures. Mr. Wilson Chan also pointed out that the wholesale vegetable market site was zoned “R(A)” on the OZP and it was planned for residential use. The Planning Department (PlanD) and the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) had been identifying a suitable site for relocating the wholesale vegetable market. Upon its relocation, the site could be used for housing development.

20. A Member noted that part of the site at Lai Chi Kok Road/Hing Wah Street i.e. the site under Amendment Item B was occupied by part of the Cheung Sha Wan temporary wholesale poultry market. This Member asked whether there was a relocation programme for the temporary wholesale poultry market. In response, Mr. Wilson Chan said that the Food and Health Bureau was undertaking a study regarding the relocation of the temporary wholesale poultry market.

21. A Member enquired which government department was/would be responsible for the management of the existing temporary golf driving range site and the proposed replacement “O” site at Lai Chi Kok Road/Hing Wah Street. This Member also asked when the existing temporary wholesale poultry market and the two factory buildings would be relocated for the implementation of the proposed open space.

22. In response, Mr. Wilson Chan said that the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) was responsible for the management of open space, including the existing temporary golf driving range site and the proposed replacement “O” site at Lai Chi Kok Road/Hing Wah Street. Mr. Wilson Chan also pointed out that LCSD had yet to work out the implementation programme of the proposed open space on the replacement site. Nevertheless, there were some existing open spaces, including the Cheung Sha Wan Playground and Shum Shui Po Park, serving the neighbourhood. Regarding the relocation of the existing temporary wholesale poultry market and the two buildings, namely, Wang Cheong Building and Wang Cheong Factory Building, on the proposed “O” site, concerned government departments had been actively identifying suitable relocation sites.

23. A Member commented that as LCSD had no definite programme in implementing the proposed open space on the replacement site, the existing uses including the temporary wholesale poultry market would continue to occupy the site. Another Member also asked if there was any time requirement for LCSD to implement the proposed open space. In response, Mr. Wilson Chan said that there was no specific time requirement for LCSD to implement the open space. However, concerned government departments had been actively identifying suitable sites for relocating the existing uses on the site.

24. A Member said that the relocation of the wholesale vegetable market had been considered by the government departments for a long time, but there was still no relocation programme. Noting that the site was zoned “R(A)” on the OZP and that the operation of the wholesale vegetable market would cause adverse noise impact on the planned residential developments in the neighbourhood, this Member opined that it would serve the planning intention better for the wholesale vegetable market to be relocated as early as possible to give way for residential developments as planned on the OZP.

25. In response, Mr. Wilson Chan said that the AFCD and PlanD had been identifying a suitable site for relocating the wholesale vegetable market, which was not an easy task. Continuous effort would be made to identify a suitable relocation site.

26. The Vice-chairman opined that as the Lai Chi Kok Road/Hing Wah Street site was close to the West Kowloon Corridor and subject to severe traffic noise, it would be better to use it for open space rather than residential development.

27. The Vice-chairman concluded that Members generally agreed to the proposed amendments to the approved Cheung Sha Wan OZP and that they would be published under statutory procedure.

28. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Cheung Sha Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K5/33 mentioned in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Paper and that the Cheung Sha Wan OZP No. S/K5/33A at Attachment I of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/K5/34 upon gazetting) and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement at Attachment III as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Town Planning Board for the various land use zones of the OZP, and was suitable for exhibition together with the OZP and its Notes.

[The Vice-chairman thanked Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan, DPO/TWK, and Mr. Philip Y.L. Shum, STP/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TWK/7 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary 'Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle)' Use for a Period of 3 Years for Letting of Vacant Monthly Vehicle Parking Spaces to Non-Residents in "Residential (Group A)" zone, (a) Car Park in Chak On Estate, (b) Car Park in Nam Shan Estate, (c) Car Park in Pak Tin Estate, (d) Car Park in Shek Kip Mei Estate, Shek Kip Mei
(MPC Paper No. A/TWK/7)

29. The Secretary said that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests in this item:

- Mr. K.K. Ling - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA
- Mr. Frankie Chou - being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA
- Ms. Doris Chow - being an alternate member for the Director of Lands who was a member of HKHA
- Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam - had current business dealings with HKHA
- Ms. Julia M.K. Lau - being a member of HKHA and Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA

30. The Committee noted that the above Members had temporarily left the meeting. As the Chairman was not at the meeting, the Vice-chairman had to take up the chairmanship of the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

31. With the aid of a visualizer, Mr. Philip Y.L. Chum, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary ‘public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle)’ (vacant vehicle parking spaces only) under Application No. A/TWK/5 for a period of three years to facilitate the letting of the vacant monthly vehicle parking spaces at the application premises to non-residents;
- (c) departmental comments – concerned government departments had no

objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 9 of the Paper;

- (d) during the first three-week of the statutory publication period, one public comment from Designing Hong Kong Limited was received. The commenter appreciated that the letting out of the vacant monthly vehicle parking spaces to non-residents could better utilize the vacant parking spaces. However, the commenter considered that this should only be allowed when the demand of the residents of the concerned estates was fully satisfied at an affordable fee; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. With regard to the public comment expressing concern on the parking need of the residents, the applicant indicated that (i) allocation priority would continue to be given to the residents of the concerned estates, (ii) the monthly charges for both residents and non-residents in renting the parking spaces would be the same and (iii) only vacant monthly car parking spaces would be let out to non-residents. In this connection, an approval condition was stipulated in paragraph 12.2 of the Paper requiring the applicant to accord priority to the residents of the concerned estates in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and to seek agreement with the Commissioner for Transport on the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be letting out to the non-residents.

32. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

33. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 16.4.2016, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition :

Priority should be accorded to the residents of Chak On Estate, Nam Shan Estate,

Pak Tin Estate and Shek Kip Mei Estate in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.

34. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant of the following :
- (a) to review and keep a record of the conditions of the use of parking spaces regularly so as to ensure good management in utilizing the public resources and avoid exploiting the right of the residents in renting monthly vehicle parking spaces in the car park; and
 - (b) consideration might be given to letting the vacant vehicle parking spaces to non-governmental organizations for other uses so as to fully utilize the vacant vehicle parking spaces in the subject housing estate.

[The Vice-chairman thanked Mr. Philip Y.L. Chum, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. K.K. Ling, Ms. Doris Chow, Ms. Julia M.K. Lau, Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr. Frankie Chou returned to join the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Tom C.K. Yip, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K1/236 Proposed Massage Establishment in “Commercial (6)” zone,
15/F (Portion), Langham Hotel, 8 Peking Road, Tsim Sha Tsui
(MPC Paper No. A/K1/236)

Presentation and Question Sessions

35. With the aid of a powerpoint, Mr. Tom C.K. Yip, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed massage establishment with a total floor area of 466.6m² at a portion of 15/F of Langham Hotel;
- (c) departmental comments – concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three-week statutory publication period and no local objection was received by the District Officer (Yau Tsim Mong); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

36. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr. Tom Yip said that the proposed massage establishment formed part of the existing fitness centre in the Langham Hotel. The hotel operator would run the proposed massage establishment to serve both the hotel guests and the general public.

Deliberation Session

37. 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 15.3.2017, 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 :

the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning

Board;

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

- (a) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection that the operator of the proposed use should ensure compliance with the requirement under relevant environmental pollution control ordinances, including Water Pollution Control Ordinance;
- (b) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department that the proposed change of use/A&A works should comply with the Buildings Ordinance (BO) and its allied regulations and the relevant practice notes, including the Building (Planning) Regulation 23A and PNAP APP-40 regarding hotel concession;
- (c) to note the comment of the Commissioner of Police that the applicant should later submit a formal application for the proposed massage establishment to the appropriate licensing authority; and
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Officer (Licensing Authority), Home Affairs Department that:
 - (i) the applicant should submit documentary evidence showing that the Building Authority had granted prior approval for the proposed change in use when making an application under the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance (HAGAO);
 - (ii) the proposed license area should be physically connected;
 - (iii) the licensed area should be separated from other areas which were not to be licensed under HAGAO with 1 hour fire-resistance-period construction;
 - (iv) the siting of the proposal was considered acceptable from licensing point of view. As no information in relation to the fire service

installations (FSI) had been provided, comment on the aspect of the FSI provision could not be made. The applicant should note the fire safety standard for massage establishment; and

- (v) the licensing requirements would be formulated after inspections by his Building Safety Unit and Fire Safety Team upon receipt of an application under HAGAO.

[The Chairman thanked Mr. Tom C.K. Yip, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. K.T. Ng, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TW/443 Proposed Private Club in "Other Specified Uses" annotated
"Business(1)" zone, Workshop Nos. 1-3, 5-13 & Flat Roof, 20/F,
One Midtown, 11 Hoi Shing Road, Tsuen Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/443)

Presentation and Question Sessions

39. With the aid of a visualizer, Mr. K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed private club with a total floor area of about 798.442m² at workshop nos. 1-3, 5-13 and flat roof, 20/F of an existing industrial building, i.e. One Midtown;

- (c) departmental comments – the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department (CBS/NTW, BD) advised that based on the information provided by the applicant, he had reservation on the application on the following: (i) adequate separation between the proposed private club and other workshop uses on the same floor, and also upper and lower floors of adequate fire resistance period was demonstrated, and (ii) adequate provision of sanitary fitments under the Building (Standards of Sanitary Fitments, Plumbing, Drainage Works & Latrines) Regulation 5 was demonstrated. The Director of Fire Services (D of FS) did not support the application from the fire safety point of view as the relatives and friends of the regular workers might not be aware that they would be exposed to fire risks. Moreover, the applicant had not submitted fire service installation proposals. The Chief Officer (Licensing Authority), Home Affairs Department (CO(Licensing Authority, HAD) commented that the Licensing Authority normally would not issue Certificate of Compliance (CoC) to club houses situated in an industrial building (except on the ground floor). In this connection, the proposed club house, which was located on the 20/F of an industrial building, was considered not suitable for the use due to the high potential of fire risk;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection was received by the District Officer (Tsuen Wan); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The subject industrial building was mainly for workshop uses. The proposed private club was not related to any industrial use and was considered not compatible with the industrial uses of the subject building. Moreover, the D of FS did not support the application from the fire safety point of view as the relatives and friends of the regular workers might not be aware that they might be exposed to fire risk. The CO(Licensing Authority), HAD had advised that normally the CoC would not be issued to club houses situated in an industrial building. The application premises

which was situated on the 20/F of an industrial building, was considered not suitable for use as a private club due to the high potential of fire risk. CBS/NTW, BD also had reservation on the application under the Buildings Ordinances.

40. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr. K.T. Ng said that the subject industrial building mainly comprised industrial uses and the provision of sprinkler system for these industrial uses had to meet the fire safety requirements under the Buildings Ordinance. Regarding the comments made by D of FS in paragraph 9.1.3(a) of the Paper, Mr. K.T. Ng explained that according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines for 'Development within "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone' (TPB PG-No. 22D), the FSD should be satisfied on the risks likely to arise or increase from the proposed commercial use under application. Owing to fire safety concern, the aggregate commercial floor areas on the ground floor of an existing industrial/industrial-office building with and without sprinkler systems should not exceed 460m² and 230m² respectively. However, as the application premises was located on the 20/F of the industrial building, such requirement did not apply to the subject application.

41. Noting that the proposed kitchen and the private club were not physically connected, a Member enquired why there was no information about the operation of the private club at the application premises. In response, Mr. K.T. Ng said that the applicant had only submitted a conceptual layout plan to illustrate the proposed uses at the application premises. According to the applicant, the existing workshops would be converted into three VIP rooms, a kitchen and sitting area. The corridor would be shared by other workshop users on the same floor.

Deliberation Session

42. A Member asked whether the PlanD was aware of the intention of the applicant to operate a private club at the application premises. In response, Mr. K.T. Ng said that according to the applicant, the proposed private club could provide a convenient place for the occupiers /users of the subject building and the surrounding industrial buildings to take rest, gather around and have lunch/dinner.

43. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. Members then went through the reasons for rejection as stated in paragraph 12.1 of the Paper and considered that they were appropriate. The reasons were :

- (a) the proposed private club was not compatible with the industrial uses in the subject industrial building; and
- (b) the proposed private club was considered not acceptable in an industrial building from the fire and building safety points of view.

[The Chairman thanked Mr. K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/444 Columbarium in "Government, Institution or Community (7)" zone,
Lot Nos.1235 R.P. (Part) and 1196 R.P. (Part) in D.D.453, Tsuen Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/444)

44. The Secretary reported that on 27.2.2013, the applicant's representative requested for a deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow more time for the applicant to prepare additional information in support of the application.

45. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further 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

Agenda Items 9 and 10

Section 12A Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/H21/3 Application for Amendment to the Approved Quarry Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H21/28 from “Government, Institution or Community (1)” and an Area Shown as ‘Road’ to “Green Belt”, Government Land, Mount Parker Road and Hong Pak Path, Mount Parker, Quarry Bay
(MPC Paper No. Y/H21/3)

Y/H21/4 Application for Amendment to the Approved Quarry Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H21/28 from “Government, Institution or Community (1)”, “Government, Institution or Community” and an Area Shown as 'Road' to “Green Belt”, Government Land, Mount Parker Road, Quarry Bay Salt Water Service Reservoir and Hong Pak Path, Mount Parker, Quarry Bay
(MPC Paper No. Y/H21/4)

46. Professor S.C. Wong had declared an interest in this item as he owned a flat at Kornhill Garden, which was near to the application site. The Committee considered that the interest of Professor Wong was direct and he should leave the meeting temporarily for this item.

[Professor Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

47. The Secretary said that three similar rezoning applications No. Y/H21/3, Y/H21/4 and Y/H21/5, which involved a “G/IC” site and a road reserve at Woodside, Quarry Bay, were received by the Secretariat of the Board on 31.12.2012, 24.1.2013 and 28.2.2013 respectively. As the Committee’s decisions on any of the three applications would have implications on the Committee’s consideration of the other two, the PlanD recommended the Committee to consider the three applications collectively. Taking account of the scheduled meeting date of Application No. Y/H21/5, which was on 24.5.2013, PlanD recommended to defer the consideration of applications (No. Y/H21/3 and Y/H21/4) to 24.5.2013.

48. The Secretary informed Members that on 11.3.2013 and 12.3.2013, the Secretariat of the Board had received email/letter from Green Sense (the applicant of Application No. Y/H21/3) and the Hong Kong Quarry Bay Residents Association (the applicant of Application No. Y/H21/4), objecting to PlanD's recommendation to defer the consideration of the two applications to 24.5.2013. The email/letter from Green Sense and the Hong Kong Quarry Bay Residents Associations had been tabled for Members' information. The Secretary also informed Members that the applicant of Application No. Y/H21/4 would attend the meeting to explain their reasons of objection to the PlanD's deferral request.

49. With the above background, the Secretary proposed and Members agreed that the PlanD's deferral requests for the two applications be considered together. After having presentation and question sessions for each application, the Committee would deliberate the two deferral requests collectively.

[Ms. Ginger K. Y. Kiang, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, and Ms. Irene Lai, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Application No. Y/H21/3 (MPC Paper No. Y/H21/3)

50. The Chairman then invited Ms. Irene Lai, STP/HK, to brief Members on the background to the application No. Y/H21/3. With the aid of a visualizer, Ms. Lai presented the applications as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points :

Background of the Planning Application No. Y/H21/3

- (a) on 31.12.2013, an application No. Y/H21/3 was submitted by Green Sense to rezone the application site near Woodside, Quarry Bay from "Government, Institution or Community (1)" ("G/IC(1)") and an area shown as 'Road' on the approved Quarry Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) to "Green Belt" ("GB"). The "G/IC(1)" portion of the site was reserved for school development, and the 'Road' portion was a road reserve for extension of Greig Road to serve the future development in the "G/IC(1)" zone. According to the applicant, its proposal to rezone the site to "GB" was to reflect the present land use and conserve the ecological environment of the application site;

- (b) on 24.1.2013, the Board received a similar application (No. Y/H21/4) from a local concern group (the Hong Kong Quarry Bay Residents Association Limited) proposing to rezone a larger area including the subject application site and the nearby “G/IC” site currently occupied by the Quarry Bay Salt Water Service Reservoir with a sitting out area on its roof from “G/IC(1)”, “G/IC” and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “GB”. The application was tentatively scheduled for consideration by the Committee on 19.4.2013;

- (c) on 28.2.2013, the Board received another similar application (No. Y/H21/5) from an individual proposing to rezone the same site as the subject application from “G/IC(1)” and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “GB” and to amend the Notes for the “GB” zone by deleting the provision for ‘School’ use from Column 2. The application was tentatively scheduled for the Committee’s consideration on 24.5.2013;

Planning Department’s Views

- (a) the subject application involved the long-term use of the “G/IC(1)” site near Woodside, Quarry Bay, which was now reserved for school development. Two similar applications (No. Y/H21/4 and Y/H21/5) of essentially the same nature had been received. As the Committee’s decision on any of the three applications would have implications on the Committee’s consideration of the other two, it would be more appropriate for the Committee to consider the three applications collectively;

- (b) taking account of the statutory process of Application No. Y/H21/5, which was received at the end of February 2013, the PlanD proposed to defer the consideration of the Applications No. Y/H21/3 and Y/H21/4 to 24/5/2013, i.e. the scheduled meeting date of Application No. Y/H21/5, so as to enable the Committee to consider the three applications together; and

- (c) the proposed deferment generally met the criteria as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the

Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No.33) in that the decision of any of the three applications would have implications on the Committee's consideration of the other two, the deferment period was not indefinite, and the deferment would not affect the interest of other relevant parties;

51. The Secretary pointed out that on 11.3.2013, the Secretariat had received an email from Green Sense, the applicant of Application No. Y/H21/3, objecting to PlanD's recommendation to defer the consideration of the application to 24.5.2013.

52. Ms. Irene Lai said that the applicant would like to know the reasons and standards for considering applications collectively, in particular:

- (a) whether such arrangement was due to the reason that the applicants of these applications had the same view on the future use of a site or was it because these applications involved the same application site?
- (b) whether the Board had considered applications collectively when the applicants of three applications shared the same view on the future use of a site; and
- (c) would the Board consider applications collectively if the applicants had different views on the future use of a site?

53. Regarding these enquiries, Ms. Irene Lai said that PlanD would make reference to the criteria as set out in the TPB PG-No. 33 in considering whether to recommend the Committee to defer the consideration of an application. In the subject case, the proposed deferment met TPB PG-No. 33 in that the decision of any of the three applications would have implications on the Committee's consideration of the other two applications.

54. The Secretary also pointed out that in the past, the Board had considered similar applications (which involved same application site and were of the same nature) together, taking into account that the decision of the Board on one application would have implication on the consideration of the other similar applications. The collective consideration of applications was not due to the reason that the applicants of these applications shared the

same view about the future use of the site. The Board had considered similar applications collectively irrespective whether or not the applicants of these applications had the same view about the future use of a site.

55. Members had no question to raise. The Chairman and Members agreed to proceed with Agenda Item 10 i.e. the rezoning Application No. Y/H21/4.

Application No. Y/H21/4 (MPC Paper No. Y/H21/4)

56. The following applicant and its representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Mr. Wong Kin Pan | - | The Chairman of the Eastern District Council and the Chairman of the Hong Kong Quarry Bay Residents Association Limited |
| Ms. Lee Ching Har | - | The Secretary of the Hong Kong Quarry Bay Residents Association Limited |
| Mr. Lo Chung Wah | - | The Chairman of 關注林邊建校大聯盟 |
| Mr. Wong Chic Chung | | |

57. The Chairman extended a welcome to all attended the meeting and invited Ms. Irene Lai, STP/HK, to brief Members on the background to the application. With the aid of a visualizer, Ms. Irene Lai presented the application as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points :

Background of the Planning Application No. Y/H21/4

- (a) on 24.1.2013, the applicant (The Hong Kong Quarry Bay Residents Association Limited) submitted a rezoning application proposing to rezone the application site near Woodside, Quarry Bay from “G/IC(1)”, “G/IC” and an area shown as ‘Road’ on the approved Quarry Bay OZP to “GB”. The “G/IC(1)” portion of the site was reserved for school development, with the ‘Road’ portion being a road reserve for extension of Greig Road to serve the future development in the “G/IC(1)” zone. The “G/IC” portion was currently occupied by the Quarry Bay Salt Water Service Reservoir

with a sitting out area on its roof. The applicant's proposal to rezone the site to "GB" was to maintain the existing traffic flow in the vicinity of Greig Road and to protect the environment of the application site and its surrounding area near Woodside. The application was originally scheduled for consideration by the Committee on 19.4.2013;

- (b) before the receipt of the subject application, the Board on 31.12.2012 received a similar Application No. Y/H21/3 from Green Sense proposing to rezone the "G/IC(1)" site and an area shown as 'Road' portions of the subject application site to "GB", which would be considered by the Committee at this meeting;
- (c) on 28.2.2013, the Board received another similar application (No. Y/H21/5) from an individual, who proposed to rezone the same site from "G/IC(1)" and an area shown as 'Road' portions of the subject application site to "GB" and to amend the Notes for the "GB" zone by deleting the provision for 'School' use from Column 2. The application was tentatively scheduled for the Committee's consideration on 24.5.2013;

Planning Department's Views

- (d) the subject application involved the long-term use of the "G/IC(1)" site near Woodside, Quarry Bay, which was now reserved for school development. Two similar applications (No. Y/H21/3 and Y/H21/5) of essentially the same nature had been received. As the Committee's decision on any of the three applications would have implications on the Committee's consideration of the other two, it would be more appropriate for the Committee to consider the three applications collectively;
- (e) taking account of the statutory process of Application No. Y/H21/5, which was received in end February 2013, the PlanD proposed to defer the consideration of the Applications No. Y/H21/3 and No.Y/H21/4 to the scheduled meeting date of Application No. Y/H21/5 (i.e. 24.5.2013) so as to enable the Committee to consider the three applications together; and

- (f) the proposed deferment generally met the criteria as set out in the TPB PG-No.33 in that the decision of any of the three applications would have implications on the Committee's consideration of the other two, the deferment period was not indefinite, and the deferment would not affect the interest of other relevant parties.

58. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to explain the reasons for the objecting to PlanD's deferral request.

59. Mr. Wong Kin Pan and Ms. Lee Ching Har made the following main points:

- (a) when the Application No. Y/H21/4 was submitted in January 2013, the applicant (The Hong Kong Quarry Bay Residents Association Limited) already knew that there was another application (No. Y/H21/3) which would be considered by the Committee on 15.3.2013. The applicant had made a request to the Secretariat of the Board to arrange the planning application to be considered together with Application No. Y/H21/3 on 15.3.2013. However, the Secretariat of the Board advised that as the application was received on 24.1.2013, it would be considered by the Board within three months of its receipt so as to allow sufficient time for the application to go through the statutory procedures, including the public consultation procedures. Hence, the Application No. Y/H21/4 would be considered by the Committee on 19.4.2013. In this regard, the applicant had already informed its members (with more than 2000 in number) that the application would be considered by the Committee on 19.4.2013;
- (b) the PlanD now requested that as there was another similar application (No. Y/H21/5) to be considered on 24.5.2013, the consideration of Application No. Y/H21/4 should be deferred to 24.5.2013 so that the three rezoning applications (No. Y/H21/3, Y/H21/4 and Y/H21/5) would be collectively considered on the same day. The applicant considered that the PlanD's deferral request was unreasonable;
- (c) concerned government departments including AFCD and EPD had no

objection to rezone the area to “GB”. It was unreasonable to defer the consideration of the subject application so that the three applications would be considered collectively. If the Board received some other similar rezoning applications before 24.5.2013, it had to defer the consideration of the application again so that all similar rezoning applications would be considered collectively. Under such arrangement, the deferment period would become indefinite;

- (d) the applicant had already sent out letters informing its members that the subject application (No. Y/H21/4) would be considered by the TPB on 19.4.2013. The deferment of the consideration of the application to 24.5.2013 would adversely affect the interest and the creditability of the applicant; and
- (e) 1,800 comments on the application and 4,000 signatures had already been collected from the local residents and submitted to the Board. It was hoped that the Board could have a fair treatment to the rezoning application.

60. Mr. Lo Chung Wa also pointed out that there were grave concerns from the local residents on any proposed developments in the application site.

61. As the applicant’s representatives had no further points to make and Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairman informed them that the hearing procedures for the application had been completed and the Committee would further deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicants of the Committee’s decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representatives of the applicant and PlanD for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

62. In view of the similar nature of the three Applications (No. Y/H21/3, Y/H21/4 and Y/H21/5) and the Committee’s decisions on any of the three applications would have implications on the Committee’s consideration of the other two, a Member agreed that the

Committee should consider the three planning applications collectively.

63. Regarding the argument of the applicant of Application No. Y/H21/4 that its interest and creditability would be affected as it had already informed its members about the scheduled date of consideration of the application, a Member opined that the justification was not strong enough to persuade the Committee to depart from its guidelines. Taking into account the criteria set out in TPB PG-No.33 for deferring consideration of application, this Member considered that the two applications (No. Y/H21/3 and Y/H21/4) should be deferred to 24.5.2013 so as to enable the Committee to consider these two planning applications with Application No. Y/H21/5 collectively. Other Members agreed.

64. A Member said that until now, three similar rezoning applications of the same nature had been received and the Committee considered that they should be considered collectively. If further similar rezoning application were received, the Committee would consider their nature and decide whether they should be considered with the three rezoning applications collectively, taking into account the TPB PG-No. 33. Another Member shared the above views.

Application No. Y/H21/3

65. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as proposed by the Planning Department. The Committee agreed that the application would be submitted for its consideration on 24.5.2013 so that it would be considered collectively with Application No. Y/H21/4 and Application No. Y/H21/5 on that day.

Application No. Y/H21/4

66. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as proposed by the PlanD. The Committee agreed that the application would be submitted for its consideration on 24.5.2013 so that it would be considered collectively with Application No. Y/H21/3 and Application No. Y/H21/5 on that day.

[Professor S.C. Wong returned to join the meeting at this point.]

[Ms. Bonnie J.Y. Chan arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H8/417 Proposed Office Development with Eating Place, Shops and Services in
“Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zone, 14-30 King Wah Road,
North Point
(MPC Paper No. A/H8/417B)

67. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Glory United Development Ltd., a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd. with Dennis Lau & Ng Chun Man Architects & Engineers (Hong Kong) Ltd., Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (ARUP) and CKM Asia Ltd. as the consultants. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in this item:

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| Professor S. C. Wong |] | had current business dealings with ARUP |
| Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam | | |
| Professor P.P. Ho | - | had current business dealings with Dennis Lau & Ng Chun Man Architects & Engineers (HK) Ltd. and CKM Asia Ltd. |
| Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau | - | had current business dealings with Dennis Lau & Ng Chun Man Architects & Engineers (HK) Ltd. and ARUP |
| Mr. Clarence W.C. Leung | - | was the director of a Non-government organization (NGO) that had recently received a private donation from a family member of the chairman of HLD. |

68. The Committee noted that Messrs. Patrick H.T. Lau and Clarence W.C. Leung

had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Professor S.C. Wong, Professor P.P. Ho and Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam had no direct involvement in the subject application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

69. With the aid of a powerpoint, Ms. Irene W.S. Lai, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed office development with eating place and shop and services;
- (c) departmental comments – concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three-week statutory publication period on the application and the further information submitted by the applicant, a total of 459 public comments were received from one Legislative Council member, two Eastern District Council members, the Eastern Branch of Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong, Harbour Heights (Management) Limited, a concern group of Harbour Heights, local residents and members of the public. Out of the 459 public comments, 457 public comments objected to the application and the remaining two provided comments only without stating support/objection to the application. The major views were detailed in paragraph 11.2 of the Paper and were summarized below:
 - (i) the proposed office development with a plot ratio of 11 and building height of 117mPD at the harbourfront would create wall effect in the area and would have permanent adverse impact on the surrounding areas in terms of air quality, day-light, visual, air ventilation and fire safety;

- (ii) the building height of the proposed office development should be 80mPD which would be the same as the building height restriction stipulated at the ex-North Point Estate site;
 - (iii) the demand for eating place in the area was saturated. Besides, the proposed eating place would have fume emission and cause health problem and affect living quality;
 - (iv) traffic congestion was always found in Fook Yam Road, King Wah Road, Wang On Road, Electric Road and Oil Street. The road network in the area could not accommodate additional traffic and pedestrian flow generated by the proposed office development. Heavy traffic along these roads would cause delay to the response time of fire and emergency ambulance services;
 - (v) the proposed office development would have adverse sewerage impacts on the surrounding areas; and
 - (vi) building setback requirement conforming with the building line of the existing developments in the area such as City Garden should be stipulated in the site. The proposed office development should not extend to the harbour area;
- (e) on 30.10.2012, the applicant briefed the Harbourfront Commission's Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (HC Task Force) on the proposed office development. Members of the HC Task Force were generally supportive of the proposal and agreed that the proposal had met the requirements set out in the Harbour Planning Principles. Some members of the HC Task Force had the following suggestions: (i) improving the visual permeability of ground level at the eastern boundary; (ii) providing pedestrian linkage between the proposed office development and the future public open space underneath Island Eastern Corridor ;and (iii) locating the proposed café to the roof floor; and

- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Regarding the public comments on the plot ratio, building height, visual and air ventilation impacts and the setback requirements of the proposed development, these aspects were assessed in paragraphs 12.1, 12.3 and 12.4 of the Paper. Regarding the public comments on the adverse traffic, air quality and sewerage impacts brought by the proposed development, relevant government departments including the Commissioner for Transport and Director of Environmental Protection had no objection or adverse comments on the Traffic Impact Assessment, Environmental Impact Assessment and Sewerage Impact Assessment as submitted by the applicant. As for the public comments in relation to fire safety and emergency vehicular access of the proposed development, the Director of Fire Services had no in-principle objection to the application. Further, an approval condition requiring the applicant to provide fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting was stipulated in paragraph 13.2 (h) of the Paper.

70. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

71. 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 15.3.2017, 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 Master Layout Plan (MLP) to take into account the approval conditions (b) to (d), (f) and (g) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the provision of non-building areas with a minimum width of 15m, 10m and 9.4m along the north-western, south-western and south-eastern

boundaries of the site respectively, and a further setback of the proposed development on the ground level with a minimum width of 3.6m and a minimum height of 12.375m from the non-building area along the south-western boundary of the site;

- (c) the provision of a setback of at least 3m from the lot boundary of the adjacent Harbour Grand Hong Kong hotel;
- (d) the design and provision of a 10m-wide at-grade public landscaped walkway along the south-western boundary of the site to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (e) the public landscaped walkway should be open to the public 24 hours a day;
- (f) the submission and implementation of a revised Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (g) the design and provision of ingress/egress point, 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 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
- (i) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading works identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.

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

- (a) that 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 4A(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 fulfill the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, and 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 Board might be required;
- (c) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong East as stated in paragraphs 9.1.1(d) and (e) of the Paper in respect of the need for a lease modification to implement the proposed development;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong East & Heritage, Buildings Department as stated in paragraph 9.1.2(c) of the Paper in respect of GFA concessions;
- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Major Works, Major Works Project Management Office, Highways Department as stated in Appendix V of the Paper regarding the Trunk Road project;
- (f) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection as stated in paragraph 9.1.5(d) of the Paper in respect of basement car park;
- (g) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands Division, Drainage Services Department as stated in paragraph 9.1.6(b) of the Paper in respect of the undertaking to upgrade the sewerage pipe along Fook Yum Road; and
- (h) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services as stated in paragraph

9.1.12(b) of the Paper in respect of emergency vehicular access.

Agenda Item 12

Section 16A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H21/132-2 Proposed Class B Amendments to the Approved Application for
Proposed Office Development and Minor Relaxation of the Non-building
Area

(MPC Paper No. A/H21/132-2)

73. The Secretary reported that MVA was the consultant for the application. Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau and Ms. Julia M.K. Lau had declared interests in this item as they had current business dealings with the consultant. The Committee noted that Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As Ms. Julia M.K. Lau had no direct involvement in the subject application, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

74. Professor S.C. Wong had declared an interest in this item as he owned a flat in Kornhill Garden. The Committee considered that the interest of Professor S.C. Wong was indirect and agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

75. Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam also declared an interest in this item as his office was located in Taikoo Place. The Committee considered that the interest of Mr. Lam was direct and agreed that he should leave the meeting temporarily for this item.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

76. With the aid of a powerpoint, Ms. Irene W.S. Lai, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application for the proposed Class B amendments to the scheme under Application No. A/H21/132 (approved scheme/approved

application);

- (i) according to the approved scheme for office development and minor relaxation of non-building area (NBA), the section of NBA across the existing Somerset House was proposed to be built over with a headroom of 25m from ground level under Building 2A and a set back of the building on ground level by about 13.5m (i.e. 10m-wide NBA plus 3.5m to its north) to facilitate air ventilation between Taikoo Wan Road and Tong Chong Street. The applicant had proposed to integrate the design of the setback under Building 2A with the proposed open space on the ground level. About 6,400m² of open space, including the section of NBA across the existing Somerset House, would be provided by the applicant, and it would be open and available to the public at all reasonable hours. In terms of development programme, Building 2A would be developed first and be self-contained in relation to car parking requirements. Besides, a total of 2,000m² of open space to be open for public access would be provided when Building 2A was developed. Implementation of Building 2B would depend on the completion of land ownership consolidation for Cornwall House;
- (ii) in the current application, the applicant proposed to realign the internal road layout by extending the existing landscaped pedestrian priority area (PPA) in Tong Chong Street to the open space in front of Building 2A to link up with Westlands Road so as to improve the traffic flow in the area. The proposed Tong Chong Street PPA extension would operate in one-way eastbound direction. The open space area at the section of NBA was redesigned as the extended PPA of Tong Chong Street to provide a mixed pedestrian/traffic environment with pedestrian priority similar to the area in front of the existing Dorset House in Phase 1 development. An additional landscaped area was proposed at the north-eastern corner of the existing Dorset House in Phase 1 development;

- (iii) according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Class A and Class B Amendments to Approved Development Proposals’ (TPB PG-No. 36A), changes falling within Class A amendments did not require further application to the Board, whereas Class B amendments required application to the Board and were subject to the approval of the Director of Planning under the delegated authority of the Board. However, application for Class B amendments which were considered unacceptable by the concerned government departments would need to be submitted to the Board for consideration. As the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had adverse comments on the application, the application was submitted to the Committee for consideration at this meeting;
- (b) the proposed Class B amendments to the approved application and the applicant’s justifications for these amendments;
- (c) departmental comments – the CTP/UD& L, PlanD commented that the approved scheme for the “CDA” site allowed for integration between the Building 2A and the adjoining open space and provided between them a vehicular free environment conducive to pedestrian safety and comfort. According to the planning statement of the approved scheme, the NBA was landscaped and served as a transitional area between the interior of the Building 2A and the outdoor open space. Such juxtaposition helped to increase the overall amenity of the NBA space and the total area of integrated open space. However, under the currently proposed scheme, the PPA of Tong Chong Street would be extended into the NBA and segregate Building 2A and the open space. As a result, the NBA would be changed from a vehicular free environment to a space to be shared between pedestrians and vehicles. The proposed scheme represented a significant departure from the original design intent for the NBA and was considered inferior to the approved scheme in terms of amenity and pedestrian-friendliness. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) commented that the proposed Tong Chong Street PPA extension was

beneficial to both vehicular and pedestrian traffic. It would be beneficial to the Taikoo Place area as a whole, and this in turn bring improvements to the public road network in the surrounding area. Hence, the proposed PPA extension was supported;

- (d) the District Officer (Eastern) had no comment on the application; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – the current application related to the use of the NBA/setback space under Building 2A. As no change in the dimension of the building setback (13.5m (wide) and 25m (headroom)) was proposed, the current applicant had no air ventilation implication as compared to the approved scheme. As advised by C for T, the proposed extension of the Tong Chong Street PPA was supported from the traffic point of view. The proposed Class B amendments in respect of soft/hard landscape design under the current application should be considered in relation to the design concept of the open space. The proposed extension of PPA allowing through vehicular traffic would segregate Building 2A and the open space, and the original vehicular-free environment would be shared use by pedestrians and vehicles. The CTP/UD&L, PlanD considered that the proposed scheme represented a significant departure from the original design intent for the NBA/setback and was inferior to the approved scheme in terms of amenity and pedestrian-friendliness. The CTP/UD&L, PlanD also raised concern on the potential use of the NBA/setback area as a layby or drop-off area attracting frequent vehicular traffic, and this would significantly reduce the amenity of the area and disturb the pedestrian movement towards the open space to the south of Building 2A. In view of the above, the CTP/UD&L, PlanD had reservation on the application from the landscape planning point of view. Hence, the current scheme was essentially a choice between an improved traffic environment in the Taikoo Place area and that for a vehicular-free and integrated open space environment at the 13.5m NBA/setback area. Nevertheless, the Committee might wish to note that the local traffic without allowing vehicular traffic through the NBA/setback area in the approved scheme was also acceptable in traffic terms;

77. The Chairman enquired about the management of the existing PPA in front of Dorset House. In response, Ms. Irene Lai referred to the photos at Plan AA-4 of the Paper and the applicant's submission (Appendix Ie of the Paper) and said that the existing PPA in front of the Dorset House was patrolled by the traffic management staff of the applicant. According to PlanD's observation, taxis without any passenger would not be allowed to enter the existing PPA, and there was not much vehicular traffic entering the existing PPA at this moment. However, if the NBA in front of Building 2A was turned into an extended PPA linking up Tong Chong Street and Westlands Road, the amount of vehicular traffic going through the "CDA" site might be increased.

78. Noting that currently all vehicles were allowed to enter the existing PPA in front of Dorset House, a Member enquired whether the applicant had submitted any proposal regarding the traffic management control of the extended PPA in front of Building 2A. In response, Ms. Irene Lai referred Members to Appendix Ie of the Paper, in which the applicant stated that 'the extended PPA would be properly controlled similar to the existing PPA in front of Dorset House to manage the vehicular and pedestrian traffic demand'. The applicant also stated that 'in terms of the actual traffic volume, the proposed PPA would have very similar volume of traffic in the morning peak hour and significantly less traffic volume in the evening peak hour if compared with the existing PPA in front of Dorset House'.

79. The same Member enquired whether there were any changing planning circumstances which led the applicant to amend its approved scheme. Ms. Irene Lai said that the applicant did not provide such information.

Deliberation Session

80. A Member said that PPA was carried out by the private sector in their developments on a voluntarily basis. This Member also opined that under the approved scheme for the "CDA" site, the NBA to the south of Building 2A would be used as an open space, providing a vehicular free environment conducive to pedestrian safety and comfort. However, under the proposed scheme, the proposed open space in the NBA would become an extended PPA which would allow vehicles to pass through. This would defeat the original design intent for the NBA. This Member also opined that by allowing the extended PPA, there was a tendency for drivers to pass through the extended PPA as it provided a direct

route for traffic going to Tai Koo Shing. This might affect the other part of the PPA. Taking into account the above, this Member did not support the application. The above views were shared by other Members.

81. A Member also raised objection to the proposed scheme, taking into account that (i) since the Committee approved the previous scheme, there was no change in the planning circumstances that warrant favourable consideration be given to the proposed scheme; (ii) any piecemeal amendment to an approved scheme in a “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone which was not supported by strong justification and planning merit should not be encouraged. Otherwise, it would defeat the planning objective of designating a “CDA” zone which was for comprehensive development; and (iii) the proposed extended PPA was not required on traffic ground as the previous approved scheme, which had the NBA proposed for an open space rather than an extended PPA, was considered acceptable in traffic terms.

82. Upon the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Albert Lee, the Assistant Commissioner for Transport, explained that the proposed extended PPA was supported from a traffic point of view as it would minimize unnecessary traffic detouring from Tong Chong Street via Hoi Tai Street/Westlands Road junction. With the reduced right turn traffic from Hoi Tai Street eastbound direction to Westlands Road southbound direction, it could improve the junction performance of Hoi Tai Street/Westlands Road junction. The proposed extended PPA would be beneficial to the Taikoo Place area as a whole, which would in turn bring improvements to the public road network in the surrounding area. Notwithstanding, it would attract frequent vehicular traffic and disturb the pedestrian movement in the area. Mr. Lee also pointed out that the local traffic without allowing vehicular going through the NBA in the approved scheme were also acceptable in traffic terms.

83. The Chairman said that Members had a thorough discussion of the application and generally agreed that the application should be rejected.

84. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. Members then went through the reason for rejection as stated in paragraph 10.3 of the Paper and considered that it was appropriate. The reason was:

the current layout would adversely affect the integration of the Non-building area (NBA)/setback area with the design of the open space on ground level, which was a key design feature proposed by the applicant to support the minor relaxation of NBA under the original application (No. A/H21/132). The proposed Pedestrian Priority Area allowing through vehicular traffic represented a significant departure from the original design intent for the NBA/setback area and was inferior to the approved scheme in terms of amenity and pedestrian-friendliness.

[The Chairman thanked Ms. Irene W.S. Lai, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[A short break of 5 minutes was taken at this point.]

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H17/129 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted House Development in "Residential (Group C) 5" zone,
35 South Bay Road, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H17/129)

85. The Secretary reported that on 4.3.2013, the applicant's representative requested for a deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow sufficient time for the applicant to address the comments from concerned government departments.

86. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further 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.

[Miss Isabel Y. Yiu, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H18/71 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Site Coverage Restriction to Not More Than 36% for Proposed House Redevelopment, and Proposed Utility Installation and Adjustment of the Existing Right of Way for Related Proposed House in “Residential (Group C) 4” zone, 17 Shek O Road, Adjoining Government Land and Part of Garden Lot No. 153, Shek O
(MPC Paper No. A/H18/71)

87. The Secretary reported that Townland Consultants Ltd. and Adrian L. Normal Ltd. were the consultants for this application. Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam had declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with the consultants. The Committee noted that Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam had already left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

88. With the aid of a powerpoint, Miss Isabel Y. Yiu, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of site coverage restriction from 22.5% to not more than 36% for a proposed house redevelopment, proposed utility installation and adjustment of the existing right of way for related proposed house;
- (c) departmental comments – concerned government departments had no

objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 9 of the Paper;

- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory first three-week publication periods on the application and the further information submitted by the applicants and no local objection was received by the District Officer (Southern); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

89. In response to a Member's enquiry, Miss Isabel Yiu, STP/HK, said that in 2000, the Board had undertaken a review of domestic site coverage restriction for "Residential (Group)" zones on statutory plans. To provide flexibility for innovative design adapted to the characteristics of particular sites, the owner could apply to the Board for minor relaxation of the site coverage restriction and the Board would consider the applications on an individual merits. The proposed minor relaxation of site coverage had design merit in that as compared to the OZP compliant scheme (i.e. 4 storeys including carports), the proposed development under the current application would have a lower building height above ground. Hence, it would be less visible, compatible with the surroundings and the visual impacts on the surrounding areas would be less. In this regard, concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application.

90. In response to a Member's question, Miss Isabel Yiu said that according to the application form attached in Appendix I of the Paper, the applicants were two individuals, namely, Mr. Chang Wa Shan and Ms. Cheung Wing Har.

Deliberation Session

91. 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 15.3.2017, 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 building height of the proposed development should not exceed 58mPD (main roof);
- (b) 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
- (c) the submission and implementation of tree preservation and landscape proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

92. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants of the following :

- (a) the approval of the application did not imply that any proposal on building design elements to fulfill the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, and gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development would be approved/granted by the Building Authority. The applicants 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 Board might be required;
- (b) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South, Lands Department for approval/consent under the lease of government land No. 153 to implement the proposed utility installation;
- (c) to note the comments of the Commissioner for Transport as stated in

paragraph 9.1.2 of the Paper regarding the compliance of Practice Notes for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers APP-111;

- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department as stated in paragraph 9.1.3 of the Paper regarding the submission of detailed drainage plans with supporting hydraulic calculations at the building plan submission stage;
- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong East and Heritage, Buildings Department as stated in Paragraph 9.1.5 of the Paper regarding the submission of ownership proof, justification on the provision of plant rooms and provision of emergency vehicular access in accordance with the Code of Practice for Fire Safety at the building plan submission stage; and
- (f) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services as stated in paragraph 9.1.6 of the Paper regarding the compliance of the Code of Practice for Minimum Fire Service Installations and Equipment and Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Building 2011.

[The Chairman thanked Miss Isabel Y. Yiu, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. K.S. Ng, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK) and Miss Tracy C.Y. Wong , Assistant Town Planner/Hong Kong (ATP/HK) were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 15

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HK/8 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary ‘Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle)’ (Letting of Surplus Monthly Vehicle Parking Spaces to Non-residents) under Application No. A/HK/6 for a Period of 3 Years from 17.4.2013 to 16.4.2016 in “Residential (Group A)” zone, at (a) Car Park in Wah Fu (I) Estate, (b) Car Park in Wah Fu (II) Estate, (c) Car Park in Yue Fai Court, Aberdeen
(MPC Paper No. A/HK/8)

93. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests in this item:

- Mr. K.K. Ling - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA

- Mr. Frankie Chou - being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA

- Ms. Doris Chow - being an alternate member for the Director of Lands who was a member of HKHA

- Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam - had current business dealings with HKHA

- Ms. Julia M.K. Lau - being a member of HKHA and Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA

94. The Committee noted that Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam had already left the meeting. The Committee considered that the interests of other Members were direct and they should leave the meeting temporarily for this item. As the Chairman had to leave the meeting, the Vice-chairman took up the chairmanship of the meeting at this point.

[Mr. K.K. Ling, Ms. Doris Chow, and Mr. Frankie Chou left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms. Julia M.K. Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

95. Mr. K.S. Ng, STP/HK, referred to page 10 of the Paper and said that there were typing errors in paragraph 11.5. In addition, two pages in Appendix 4 of the Paper had been left out. In this regard, a replacement page for page 10 and two missing pages in Appendix 4 of the Paper were tabled for Members' reference. With the aid of a powerpoint, Mr. K.S. Ng presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary 'public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle)' (surplus vehicle parking spaces only) under Application No. A/HK/6 for a period of three years i.e. from 17.4.2013 to 16.4.2016 to facilitate the letting of the surplus monthly vehicle parking spaces at the application premises to non-residents;
- (c) departmental comments – concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three-week of the statutory publication period, two public comments were received. They were submitted by the Owners' Corporation (OC) of Yue Fai Court and Designing Hong Kong Limited. Their comments were detailed in paragraph 10 and were summarized below:
 - (i) the OC of Yue Fai Court objected to the application and stated that the priority of the surplus vehicle parking spaces should be accorded to the residents of Yue Fai Court;
 - (ii) Designing Hong Kong Limited appreciated the benefits of utilising vacant parking spaces. However, letting parking spaces to

non-residents should only be allowed when the demand of the residents was fully satisfied at an affordable fee. Designing Hong Kong Limited also commented that unauthorized parking by the residents on the pavements along Victoria Road and other unauthorized areas in the vicinity should be avoided; and

- (iii) the applicant had made the responses to the public comments which were detailed in Appendix Ib of the Paper and were summarized below:
- the system of offering vacant monthly parking spaces to non-residents had already been operating in Yue Fai Court since April 2004. The application was a continuation of existing practice. Residents of Yue Fai Court would continue to be accorded with the highest priority in the letting of the monthly vehicle parking spaces;
 - vacancy rates of the monthly parking spaces of the subject car parks in a 12-month period from December 2011 to November 2012 were about 50-60%. The need from residents for car parking spaces had been satisfied; and
 - car parking charges were determined with reference to the market level including car park charges of other public bodies and comparable private sector irrespective whether they were let to residents or non-residents; and
- (iv) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The concerns of the OC of Yue Fai Court and Designing Hong Kong Limited were noted. To ensure that sufficient car parking spaces would be reserved for the residents of the concerned estates/ courts, it was recommended to stipulate an approval condition requiring ‘priority should be accorded to the residents of Wah Fu (I) Estate, Wah Fu (II) Estate and Yue Fai Court

in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the amount of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport” as set out in paragraph 12.2 of the Paper.

96. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the unauthorized parking along Victoria Road, Mr. K.S. Ng said that the Commissioner for Transport and Commissioner of Police had no comment on this aspect.

Deliberation Session

97. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 17.4.2013 to 16.4.2016, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition :

Priority should be accorded to the residents of Wah Fu (I) Estate, Wah Fu (II) Estate and Yue Fai Court in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.

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

- (a) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South, Lands Development for temporary waivers to permit the proposed use at Wah Fu (II) Estate and Yue Fai Court;
- (b) to review and keep a record of the conditions of the use of parking spaces regularly so as to ensure good management in utilizing the public resources and avoid exploiting the right of letting of monthly vehicle parking spaces in the vehicle park by the residents; and
- (c) consideration might be given to letting the vacant vehicle parking spaces to non-governmental organizations for other uses so as to fully utilize the

vacant vehicle parking spaces in the subject housing estate.

[The Vice-chairman thanked Mr. K.S. Ng, STP/HK, and Miss Tracy C.Y. Wong, ATP/HK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms. Julia M.K. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 16

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H7/161 Shop and Services (Motor-vehicle Showroom) in
 "Residential (Group C) 2" zone, Basement Floor,
 Fairville Garden, 63 Blue Pool Road,
 Happy Valley
 (MPC Paper No. A/H7/161A)

99. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (ARUP) was the consultant for this application. Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau had declared interests in this item as they had current business dealings with ARUP. Professor S.C. Wong also declared an interest in this item since ARUP had financially sponsored some activities of the Institute of Transport Studies of the University of Hong Kong, of which he was the Director. The Committee noted that Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam had already left the meeting. As the applicant had requested to defer a consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Professor S.C. Wong could stay in the meeting.

100. The Secretary continued that on 8.3.2013, the applicant's representative requested for a further deferment of the consideration of the application for one month so as to allow more time for the applicant to provide further information to address the further comments raised by the Transport Department regarding the provision of visitor parking spaces.

101. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application

as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that a further period of one month, i.e. a total of 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.

Agenda Item 17

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H7/164 Proposed Hotel Development in “Residential (Group A)” zone,
1-15 (Odd Numbers), Lun Hing Street, Happy Valley
(MPC Paper No. A/H7/164)

102. The Secretary said that on 18.1.2008, the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/14, incorporating amendments to impose building height restrictions for various development zones and some zoning amendments, was exhibited under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance. After giving consideration to the representations, the Board decided to partially uphold some of the representations by amending, among others, the building height restriction for the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”), “R(B)” and “R(B)10” sites to the south of Village Road/Cheong Ming Street and to the east of Shan Kwong Road, covering the application site) from 100mPD to 115mPD. Adverse further representations were received on the amended building height restriction of 115mPD. After giving consideration to the further representations, the Board decided not to uphold them. Since then, the OZP had been amended twice mainly involving amendments to “Government, Institution or Community” sites (not covering the application site) in 2010 and 2011 respectively. Adverse representations/further representations were received on these amendments. After giving consideration to these representations and further representations, the Board decided not to uphold them.

103. The Secretary continued that on 9.7.2012, the Chief Executive approved an extension of the time limit for the submission of the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/16 to the CE in C for a further period of six months to 26.1.2013, so as to allow

sufficient time to complete the representation consideration process in respect of the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/15. The draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/16 together with representations, comments on representations and further representations had been submitted to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval within the statutory time limit (i.e. 26.1.2013). It was yet to be considered due to a judicial review lodged against the Board's decision on the representation in respect of the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/15.

104. The Secretary said that according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the Ordinance (TPB PG- No. 33), a decision on a section 16 application should be deferred if the application site was still subject to outstanding adverse representations yet to be submitted by the CE in C and the substance of the representations was relevant to the subject application. As such, it was recommended to defer a decision on the subject application taking into account the fact that the revised building height restriction of 115mPD for the "R(A)" zone covering the application site was the subject of adverse further representations; and the draft OZP together with the representations and further representations including the adverse further representations relevant to the application site, were yet to be considered by CE in C.

105. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the Planning Department pending the submission of the draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan to the Chief Executive in Council and its final decision.

[Mr. Maurice Lee arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 18

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H7/165 Proposed Residential Institution in "Government, Institution or Community (1)" zone, 17A and 17B Ventris Road, Happy Valley
(MPC Paper No. A/H7/165)

106. The Secretary said that MVA Hong Kong Ltd. and Environ Hong Kong Ltd. were

the consultants for this application. Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam had current business dealings with MVA Hong Kong Ltd. and Ms. Julia M.K. Lau had current business dealings with MVA Hong Kong Ltd. and Environ Hong Kong Ltd.. The Committee noted that Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam had already left the meeting. As the Planning Department (PlanD) requested for a deferment of consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Ms. Julia M.K. Lau could stay in the meeting.

107. The Secretary said that on 30.9.2010, the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/15 incorporating amendments to the building height restriction for the “G/IC” zone covering the Hong Kong Sanatorium & Hospital site was exhibited. Adverse representations and further representations were received. After giving consideration to representations and further representations, the Board decided not to uphold them. On 26.8.2011, the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/16, incorporating amendments mainly to rezone the application site from “G/IC” to “G/IC(1)”, to amend the building height restrictions and stipulate plot ratio and site coverage restrictions and building gap requirement for the “G/IC(1)” zone, was exhibited under section 7 of the Ordinance. Adverse representations were received. In 2012, after giving consideration to the representations, the Board decided not to uphold them.

108. The Secretary said that on 9.7.2012, the Chief Executive approved an extension of the time limit for the submission of the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/16 to the CE in C for a further period of six months to 26.1.2013, so as to allow sufficient time to complete the representation consideration process in respect of the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/15. The draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/16 together with representations, comments on representations and further representations had been submitted to the CE in C for approval within the statutory time limit (i.e. 26.1.2013). It was yet to be considered due to a judicial review lodged against the Board’s decision on the representation in respect of the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/15.

109. The Secretary continued that according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the Ordinance (TPB PG- No. 33), a decision on a section 16 application should be deferred if the application site was still subject to outstanding adverse representations yet to be submitted by the CE in C and the substance of the representations

was relevant to the subject application. As such, it was recommended to defer a decision on the subject application taking into account the fact that the revised building height restriction of 5 storeys and 90mPD for the “G/IC(1)” zone were the subjects of adverse representations; and the draft OZP together with the representations and further representations including the adverse representations relevant to the application site, were yet to be considered by CE in C.

110. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the Planning Department pending the submission of the draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan to the Chief Executive in Council and its final decision.

[Ms. Ginger K. Y.Kiang, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), Ms. Kitty S.T. Lam, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 19

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H9/69 Further Consideration of Proposed Comprehensive Redevelopment of Ming Wah Dai Ha (Including Flats, Shop and Services and Social Welfare Facilities) in “Comprehensive Development Area” zone, Ming Wah Dai Ha, 1-25 A Kung Ngam Road, Shau Kei Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/H9/69B)

111. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) with AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM), BMT Asia Pacific Ltd. (BMT) and LLA Consultancy Ltd. (LLA) as the consultants. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr. K.K. Ling as the Director of Planning	-	being an Ex-officio member of HKHS Supervisory Board
Ms. Doris Chow as the Assistant Director of	-	being an assistant to the Director of Lands who was an Ex-officio member of

Lands Department	HKHS Supervisory Board
Mr. H.W. Cheung	- being a member of the Task Force on Construction of HKHS
Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam	- had current business dealings with HKHS, AECOM, BMT and LLA
Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau	- had current business dealings with AECOM, BMT and LLA
Prof. S.C. Wong and Ms. Julia M.K.Lau	- had current business dealings with AECOM

112. The Committee noted that Mr. H.W. Cheung and Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee also noted that Ms. Doris Chow, Mr. K.K. Ling, Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam had already left the meeting. As Professor S.C. Wong and Ms. Julia M.K. Lau had no direct involvement in the subject application, the Committee agreed that Professor S.C. Wong and Ms. Julia M.K. Lau could stay in the meeting. As the Chairman had already left the meeting, the Vice-chairman continued to take up the chairmanship of the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

113. With a powerpoint presentation, Ms. Kitty S.T. Lam, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

Background to the application

- (a) the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) seeking planning permission for a proposed comprehensive residential development with supporting commercial uses and social welfare facilities on the application site, which was zoned “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) on the approved Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H9/16;

- (b) a Planning Brief (PB) setting out the development parameters as well as the planning and design requirements to guide future development on the site was endorsed by the Committee on 23.9.2011. The site characteristics and the PB were detailed in the Paper and F-Appendix I of the Paper;
- (c) on 21.9.2012, the Committee considered the application. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application pending further information provided by HKHS on the feasibility of preserving Block M or another suitable block as well as the constraints and difficulties if it was not possible to do so. Besides, HKHS was requested to provide information on the building design, facilities and management of the two elderly housing blocks within the redevelopment in taking care of the special needs of the elderly residents;
- (d) redevelopment of Ming Wah Dai Ha was an on-going follow-up item on the agenda of the Planning, Works and Housing Committee (PWHC) of the Eastern District Council (EDC). On 14.12.2012, PWHC and EDC discussed the redevelopment of Ming Wah Dai Ha. EDC members objected to preserving an existing block within Ming Wah Dai Ha and urged for early implementation of the redevelopment;
- (e) in response to the Committee's request, the HKHS had submitted further information to support the application as set out below:

Three Options to preserve MWDH

- (f) in addressing the comments on preservation, HKHS had examined three options relating to different perspectives of preservation. In formulating the options, emphasis had been given to the following key principles and considerations:
 - (i) timely provision of affordable housing, society welfare and elderly care facilities to the society;
 - (ii) meeting the needs of local residents and the community;

- (iii) meeting the objectives and planning, design and technical requirements as set out in the endorsed Planning Brief (PB);
- (iv) the balance between social, environmental and financial considerations; and
- (v) improving the environment through provision of green spaces and barrier-free environment;

(g) The three preservation options were:

<u>Option 1</u>		<u>Option 2</u>	<u>Option 3</u>
Preservation of an entire existing block		Creation of a replicate block	Preservation of 'Collective Memory'
Preservation of Block M			
<u>Scenario 1A</u> Increasing the building height	<u>Scenario 1B</u> Expanding the building mass		
		Preservation of another block	

Option 1 – Preservation of an entire existing block

Preservation of Block M

- (h) in general, HKHS advised that Block M was not suitable for domestic use due to the traffic noise and air quality impact of Chai Wan Road. Furthermore, due to its distant location from the main entrance and the lack of lift facilities and spatial configuration, Block M did not offer a suitable location to house the elderly hub;
- (i) if Block M was to be retained, it could only be used for GIC uses not originally intended for the MWDH redevelopment;
- (j) preserving Block M for other GIC use would result in the deletion of one entire public rental housing block (Block 1) with 480 units, which would need to be redistributed to other blocks. Two scenarios had been examined by HKHS:

Scenario 1A

- under Scenario 1A, an additional five storeys would be required to each new block (except the two elderly blocks) to absorb the forgone public rental housing units. This would result in an overall increase in building height from 120mPD to 134.25mPD for blocks in the southern portion of the site, and from 100mPD to 114.25mPD for blocks in the northern part;

Scenario 1B

- under Scenario 1B, the forgone public rental housing units could be absorbed by other blocks by expanding the building mass through enlargement of building footprint to accommodate additional units on each floor of the new buildings;
- (k) HKHS pointed out that the increased building height under the Scenario 1A had exceeded the building height restrictions permitted under the OZP and PB, and would have adverse visual impact on the area. The expansion of footprint of the building blocks so as to increase the number of units per floor under Scenario 1B would pose an undesirable living density. It would also have a possible implication on air ventilation performance due to the wind blockage by Block M and reduction of width of building gaps and air and visual corridor resulting from expansion of building mass;
- (l) if Block M had to be retained and the proposed units in the planned Block 1 could not be absorbed by other blocks, there would be a forgone of 480 public rental housing units in the development to meet the housing need. Further as Block M was located within Phase 1 of the redevelopment programme, some residents from Phase 1 decanting would need to wait for almost 13 years, (i.e. 7 years longer than the original programme) as they could only be relocated to the estate after completion of Phase 2 development (i.e. in end 2025);

Preserving other block

- (m) HKHS also pointed out that preserving any one of the existing blocks

would have similar design consideration and constraints as in the proposal of preserving Block M;

Option 2 – Creation of a replicate block

- (n) this option was to retain some original materials to re-create a replica block as a “building relic” to reflect the architectural merit and historical value of MWDH. However, according to HKHS, the exteriors of the buildings had been altered over the years and the original features of the building’s façade had been lost or covered by renovations. Thus, this option could hardly achieve preservation as envisaged by the Committee. HKHS also considered this option less worthwhile to pursue;

Option 3 – Preservation of ‘collective memory’ in the form of a memorial garden

- (o) Option 3 was recommended by HKHS as an alternative to preserving an existing block as suggested by the Committee. It was proposed to incorporate the linear building façades and stepping design of the existing communal open space with feature walls in the future central open space such that the physical characteristics of MWDH could be commemorated and the collective memory and social significance would be preserved. The key considerations were:
 - (i) on planning and design aspect, incorporation of the proposed memorial garden in the Landscape Master Plan would unlikely trigger major technical concerns;
 - (ii) the MLP already submitted by HKHS, which was in line with the PB and considered acceptable by government departments in terms of urban design and building height profile, air ventilation, landscape, transport and pedestrian arrangement, provision of GIC facilities and open space and other relevant technical aspects (as detailed in paragraph 12 of F-Appendix I of the Paper), could be kept.

Elderly housing and elderly hub

- (p) in response to the Committee's comments on concentration of elderly housing blocks, HKHS had provided further information to set out the rationale for the current design and arrangement. In brief:
- (i) the arrangement for concentrating the elderly housing and elderly care facilities had taken into consideration the special need of the elderly that would be different from other MWDH residents;
 - (ii) the arrangement was intended to achieve a cost-effective and efficient provision of elderly care services based on a "universal design" concept; and
 - (iii) in this regard, the Director of Social Welfare had no comment on the current submission relating to the provision of elderly facilities and location of elderly housing blocks;
- (q) departmental comments – concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 3 of the Paper and summarized below:

Visual Aspect

- (i) CTP/UD&L advised that Scenario 1A would exceed the maximum building height under the OZP and cause significant impact on the visual amenity from the Lei Yue Mun Holiday Village. Under Scenario 1B, while the width of some building gaps in the original scheme would be reduced, it was possible to improve the situation by adjusting the building disposition and building footprint. Under Option 2, according to the applicant, the original features of the building's façade had been lost or covered by renovations. Hence, Option 2 might not be worthwhile to pursue. Option 3 utilized the central open space of the site as a landscaped garden to commemorate MWDH. It did not affect the height, bulk and disposition of the residential blocks, and hence it did not constitute a

significant change to the original scheme;

Air Ventilation Aspect

- (ii) Preservation of Block M would affect the non-building area at the southern corner of the site, which was designated to enhance the air path along Chai Wan Road;

Environmental Aspect

- (iii) for Option 1 and Option 2, the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) pointed out there was a need to re-establish the environmental acceptability of the two options, particularly on air quality and traffic noise aspects. For Option 3, as the block layout and building design remained unchanged, the previous Preliminary Environmental Review results would still be valid. Hence, DEP had no further comment on Option 3;
- (iv) the Director of Social Welfare and Antiquities and Monument Offices had no comments on the information submitted by the applicant;
- (v) the Antiquities and Monuments Office, Leisure and Cultural Services Department had no comment on the proposed preservation options as MWDH was neither a graded nor a proposed graded historic building;
- (r) local aspects- the District Officer (Eastern) (DO(Eastern)) did not have any comment on the application. DO(Eastern) would like to draw the Committee's attention that PWHC of EDC had several rounds of discussion on the redevelopment plan of MWDH. Members were of the view that the redevelopment plan should be implemented as scheduled so as to meet the strong demand on housing in Hong Kong;
- (s) views of Planning, Works and Housing Committee of EDC- PWHC of EDC raised objection to the preservation of an existing block of MWDH.

The views of EDC members were reflected in F-Appendix VII of the Paper. In brief, they were of the view that MWDH had limited preservation value. If an existing block was to be preserved, HKHS would need to revise the development parameters and redesign the entire scheme, causing delay to the redevelopment project. There was a shortage of land supply, with over 200,000 people now on the waiting list demonstrating the keen demand for public rental housing. Redevelopment of MWDH would help increase the housing supply and improve the living environment. The original redevelopment proposal had long been discussed in the district and supported by EDC and the local community. The project should commence as soon as possible; and

- (t) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – based on the planning assessments and considerations as indicated in paragraph 12 of the Paper, PlanD had no objection to Option 3 recommended by HKHS. As compared to the original scheme submitted by HKHS, Option 3 would only involve modification of the central open space design, while keeping the rest of the original scheme. PlanD also had no objection to the original scheme, which complied with the restrictions stipulated on the OZP and the planning and design requirements set out in the PB endorsed by the Committee on 23.9.2011.

114. A Member enquired about the background of selecting Block M for preservation. The Secretary said that MWDH was one of the oldest subsidized housing developed by HKHS. The suggestion of preserving Block M was raised when the draft planning brief of the subject site was considered by the Committee, but it had not been included into the planning brief as a requirement. The Secretary also pointed out that as advised by AMO, MWDH was neither a Declared Monument nor a graded/proposed graded historic building. In addition, the existing buildings of MWDH were not included in the list of 1,444 historic buildings being considered for grading by the Antiquities and Advisory Board (AAB). The Secretary further explained that on 21.9.2012, some Members of the Committee suggested that Block M could be preserved for adaptive reuse as it was a typical block of the first generation of housing estates built by HKHS and was creative in architectural design. Hence, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application, pending further

information provided by HKHS on the feasibility of preserving Block M or another suitable block as well as the constraints and difficulties if it was not possible to do so.

115. The same Member enquired about the existing plot ratio of MWDH. In response, Ms. Ginger Kiang, DPO/HK, said that the existing plot ratio of MWDH was about 4. According to the endorsed PB, the proposed redevelopment of MWDH would consist of nine blocks of residential towers and supporting facilities, including shops and social welfare facilities. The total plot ratio of the proposed redevelopment would not exceed 6.

116. In response to the same Member's question as to why the residents had to wait for almost 13 years if the Block M had to be preserved. Ms. Ginger Kiang said that the redevelopment of MWDH involved a comprehensive development programme, including in-situ re-housing and decanting arrangement of the existing residents. Block M was located within Phase 1 of the redevelopment programme and the 480 public housing units generated from the planned Block 1 were crucial in meeting the in-situ re-housing arrangement. Preservation of Block M would result in a shortfall of 199 units to meet the required number of units for re-housing upon completion of Phases 1 and 2. Some residents from Phase 1 (assuming decanting completed in 2013) would need to wait for almost 13 years, i.e. 7 years longer than the original programme, before re-housing back to new flats as they could only be relocated back to the estate after completion of Phase 2 development. Moreover, if there was a requirement to preserve any existing block, including Block M, additional time would be required to re-design the current scheme, undertake necessary technical assessment and re-submit the revised scheme under statutory procedures.

117. A Member doubted the accuracy of the photomontage in Drawing FA-4 of the Paper as the photomontage seemed to exaggerate the visual impacts brought by the additional 5-storeys, which were redistributed to other block, if Block M was preserved. In response, Ms. Ginger Kiang explained that the photo for the preparation of the photomontage was taken at Lei Yue Mun Holiday Village, which was a popular viewpoint visited by the public.

118. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms. Kitty Lam said that MWDH was one of the oldest type of subsidized housings developed by HKHS. Within MWDH, Block A was developed in 1970s and the remaining blocks including Block M were developed in 1960s. She did not have information in hand on the exact year when Block M was developed.

119. In response to another Member's follow-up question, the Secretary said that Yue Kwong Chuen in Aberdeen was another oldest type of subsidized housing developed by HKHS.

120. A Member enquired whether Block M, if preserved, could be used for habitation, and how many flats could be provided therein. In response, Ms. Ginger Kiang said that according to HKHS, if Block M was used for habitation, it could provide about 200 flats. However, as the site was in close proximity to the heavily trafficked Chai Wan Road, the future residents would be susceptible to traffic noise and air quality impacts. Hence, the applicant considered that future use of Block M for domestic purpose was considered not suitable.

Deliberation Session

121. A Member opined that preservation of MWDH in a form of 'Collective Memory', i.e. Option 3 was more preferable among the three options provided by HKHS. This Member considered that the physical characteristics of MWDH could be commemorated and the collective memory and social significance were worth preserving. As compared to Option 3, preservation of Block M would significantly affect the time for in-situ rehousing of the affected residents who had been urging for earlier implementation of the redevelopment of MWDH. This Member also suggested that should the MWDH be preserved in a form of 'Collective Memory', HKHS could consider retaining the name of MWDH for the future public housing estate, and exhibiting a physical model of the existing MWDH in the future 'Ming Wah Garden'. Moreover, this Member noted that bauhinia trees were typically found within MWDH, which was a signature of MWDH. This Member suggested that HKHS could consider planting more bauhinia trees within the future public housing estate.

122. A Member considered that Option 2 i.e. to re-create a replica block as a "building relic" was not preferable as the original features of the building had been lost and could hardly achieve preservation of MWDH. This Member also pointed out that although MWDH was neither a Declared Monument nor a graded/proposed historic building, it was one of the first generation of subsidized housing built by HKHS and was creative in architectural design. Its historical significance would showcase the role and contribution of

this type of building in the history of Hong Kong to the people. However, this Member also noted that the requirement of preserving the building block(s) of MWDH was strongly objected to by EDC.

123. Noting that Yue Kwong Chuen was another first-generation subsidized housing developed by the HKHS, the same Member enquired whether the HKHS had a plan to redevelop Yue Kwong Chuen. In response, Ms. Ginger Kiang said that according to the information provided by HKHS, there was redevelopment plan for Yue Kwong Chuen. However, as Yue Kwong Chuen was zoned “Residential (Group A)”, instead of a “CDA” zone, on the Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau OZP, there was no requirement for HKHS to submit a MLP to the Board.

124. A Member opined that if there was a plan to redevelop Yue Kwong Chuen, HKHS should consider at an early stage as to whether at least an existing block within the estate could be preserved, irrespective whether the estate was a graded historic building or not. Another Member suggested PlanD to convey the above message to HKHS. Three Members shared the same views.

125. The Vice-chairman concluded that Members in general agreed that Option 3 as recommended by HKHS, i.e. to preserve MWDH in a form of collective memory should be adopted. Members also agreed that HKHS should be requested to take note of the Committee’s suggestions in preserving the collective memory of MWDH, namely retaining the name of MWDH, exhibiting a physical model at the ‘Ming Wah Garden’ and planting more bauhinia trees within the future public housing estate. Moreover, when HKHS worked out the future redevelopment plan of Yue Kwong Chuen, HKHS should consider the feasibility of preserving its building block(s) at an early planning stage.

126. 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 15.3.2017, 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 Master Layout Plan, taking

into account the approval conditions (b) and (c) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;

- (b) the submission and implementation of a Landscape Master Plan with a tree preservation proposal, and provision of quarterly tree monitoring reports to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the design and provision of car parking spaces and loading/unloading facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) the setting back of the south-eastern corner of the site to provide a wider footpath to cater for possible future improvement at the junction of Chai Wan Road and A Kung Ngam Road to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (e) the feasibility of implementation of access connecting Phase 3 of the proposed redevelopment and the MTR Station should be further investigated. If such access was found to be feasible, it should be implemented with Phase 3 of the proposed redevelopment to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (f) the design and implementation of noise mitigation measures to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (g) 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;
- (h) the implementation of the proposed sewerage upgrading works at the cost of developer to the the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (i) the provision of picking up/drop-off points in close proximity to and at the same level of the Day Care Centre for the Elderly to the satisfaction of

Director of Social Welfare or of the TPB.

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

- (a) the approved Master Layout Plan, 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 4A(3) of the Town Planning Ordinance. Efforts should be made to incorporate the relevant approval conditions into a revised Master Layout Plan for deposition in the Land Registry as soon as possible;
- (b) the approval of the application did not imply that the proposed gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development would be granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. 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 TPB might be required;
- (c) apply to the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong East, Lands Department (DLO/HK, LandsD) for a modification to the lease. However, there was no guarantee that such application would be approved. If it was approved by LandsD acting in its capacity as the landlord at its absolute discretion, it would be subject to such terms and conditions, including, among others, payment of premium, as might be imposed by LandsD;
- (d) to note the comments of the DLO/HKE, LandsD as stated in paragraph 10.1.1(c) in F-Appendix I of the Paper regarding the identification of responsible parties and management details of each of the proposed GIC facilities and specification of the agreed arrangement;
- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong East & Heritage, Buildings Department as stated in paragraph 10.1.2(b) in F-Appendix I of the Paper regarding the new GFA concession policy under

PNAP APP-151 and 152;

- (f) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services as stated in paragraph 10.1.3(b) in F-Appendix I of the Paper that the arrangement of emergency vehicular access should comply with Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011;
- (g) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department in paragraph 10.1.10(b) in F-Appendix I of the Paper that the project proponent should ensure that the proposed development would not cause flooding in areas upstream of, adjacent to or downstream of the project site both during construction and upon completion;
- (h) to note the comments of the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS) in paragraph 10.1.13(a) in F-Appendix I of the Paper and to liaise with HKCG Co. Ltd. regarding safety requirement/protection measures for existing gas pipelines; and
- (i) to note the comments of the DEMS in paragraph 10.1.13(b) in F-Appendix I of the Paper regarding the requirements of the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department's "Code of Practice on Avoiding Danger from Gas Pipes".

[The Vice-chairman thanked Ms. Ginger K. Y. Kiang, DPO/HK, and Ms. Kitty S.T. Lam, STP/HK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Ms. Ginger K. Y. Kiang, DPO/HK, left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 20

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HK/7 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary ‘Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle)’ (Letting of Surplus Monthly Vehicle Parking Spaces to Non-residents) under Application No. A/HK/5 for a Period of 3 Years from 28.3.2013 to 27.3.2016 in “Residential (Group A)” zone, (a) Car Park in Model Housing Estate, North Point, (b) Car Park in Hong Tung Estate, Lei King Wan, Quarry Bay, (c) Car Park in Hing Wah (II) Estate, Chai Wan, (d) Car Park in Tsui Lok Estate, Chai Wan, (e) Car Park in Yue Wan Estate, Chai Wan, (f) Car Park in Shan Tsui Court, Chai Wan

(MPC Paper No. A/HK/7)

128. The Secretary said that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declare interests in this item:

- Mr. K.K. Ling - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA

- Mr. Frankie Chou - being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who is a member of the SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA

- Ms. Doris Chow - being an alternate member for the Director of Lands who is a member of HKHA

- Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam - had current business dealings with HKHA

- Ms. Julia M.K. Lau - being a member of HKHA and Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA

129. The Committee noted that Ms. Doris Chow, Mr. K.K. Ling, Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr. Frankie Chou had already left the meeting. As the interest of Ms. Julia M.K. Lau was direct, the Committee agreed that Ms. Julia M.K. Lau should leave the meeting temporarily. As the Chairman had already left the meeting, the Vice-chairman continued to

take up the chairmanship of the meeting.

[Ms. Julia M.K. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

130. With the aid of a powerpoint, Ms. Kitty S.T. Lam, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary ‘public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle)’ (surplus vehicle parking spaces only) under Application No. A/HK/5 for a period of three years i.e. from 28.3.2013 to 27.3.2016 to facilitate the letting of surplus monthly vehicle parking spaces at the application premises to non-residents;
- (c) departmental comments – concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three-week of the statutory publication period, one public comment from a resident of Shan Tsui Court was received. The commenter objected to the application and pointed out that the proposal would compromise the residents’ rights in renting the parking spaces and would bring about safety, security and hygiene issues. In addition, the commenter mentioned that the application notice was posted at the location which was not noticeable for non-driving residents; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. As regards the concerns raised by the public commenter on safety and security issue in Shan Tsui Court, the applicant had advised that various measures including the separation of entrances of the car park building and

residential blocks and that of vehicular access and pedestrian footpath, the deployment of security guards on 24-hours duty and the installation of CCTVs had been put in place to address the issues. Regarding the concerns on public notification, the applicant had provided notices to the Owners' Corporation for posting within the court. Site notices had also been posted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority at prominent places of the carpark.

131. A Member noted that according to the lease conditions, the car parking provision in Model Housing Estate was not more than 1 car parking space per 12.5 flats, while that for Shan Tsui Court was not less than 1 space per 5 flats. This Member enquired why there was such a difference in the car parking provision for the two estates. In response, Ms. Kitty Lam explained that the Model Housing Estate and Shan Tsui Court were developed in different era of time and the car parking provision requirement in public housing estates had changed over time.

Deliberation Session

132. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 28.3.2013 to 27.3.2016, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition :

Priority should be accorded to the residents of Model Housing Estate, Hong Tung Estate, Hing Wah (II) Estate, Tsui Lok Estate, Yue Wan Estate and Shan Tsui Court in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.

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

- (a) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong East, Lands Department for a temporary waiver to permit the proposed use at Model Housing Estate;

- (b) to review and keep a record of the conditions of the use of parking spaces regularly so as to ensure good management in utilizing the public resources and avoid exploiting the right of letting of monthly vehicle parking spaces by the residents; and
- (c) consideration might be given to letting the vacant vehicle parking spaces to non-governmental organizations for other uses so as to fully utilize the vacant vehicle parking spaces in the subject housing estates.

[The Vice-chairman thanked Ms. Kitty S.T. Lam, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

[Mr. Richard Y.L. Siu, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 21

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K13/287 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary 'Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle)' (Vacant Car Parking Spaces only) under Application No. A/K13/253 for a Period of 3 Years in "Residential (Group A)" zone, Choi Ying Estate, Ngau Tau Kok
(MPC Paper No. A/K13/287)

134. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declare interest in this item:

Mr. K.K. Ling - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA

- Mr. Frankie Chou - being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who is a member of the SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA
- Ms. Doris Chow - being an alternate member for the Director of Lands who is a member of HKHA
- Mr. Dominic Lam - had current business dealings with HKHA
- Ms. Julia M.K. Lau - being a member of HKHA and Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA

135. The Committee noted that Ms. Doris Chow, Ms. Julia M.K. Lau, Mr. K.K. Ling, Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr. Frankie Chou had already left the meeting. As the Chairman had already left the meeting, the Vice-chairman continued to take up the chairmanship of the meeting

Presentation and Question Sessions

136. With the aid of a powerpoint, Mr. Richard Y.L. Siu, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary ‘public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle)’ (vacant vehicle parking spaces only) under Application No. A/K13/253 for a period of three years to facilitate the letting of the vacant monthly vehicle parking spaces at the application premises to non-residents;
- (c) departmental comments – concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three-week of the statutory publication period, two public comments were received. The public commenters had no objection to the

application; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The comments received were noted.

137. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

138. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 9.4.2016, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition :

Priority should be accorded to the residents of Choi Ying Estate in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.

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

- (a) to review and keep a record of the conditions of the use of parking spaces regularly so as to ensure well management in utilizing the public resources and avoid exploiting the right of letting of monthly vehicle parking spaces in the vehicle park by the residents; and
- (b) consideration might be given to letting the vacant vehicle parking spaces to non-governmental organizations for other uses so as to fully utilize the vacant vehicle parking spaces in the subject housing estate.

Agenda Item 22

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K15/108 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary ‘Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicles)’ (Vacant Vehicle Parking Spaces only) under Application No.A/K15/92 for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group A)” zone, Vehicle Parks at Ko Cheung Court and Yau Mei Court, Yau Tong
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/108)

140. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declare interests in this item:

- Mr. K.K. Ling - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA
- Mr. Frankie Chou - being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who is a member of the SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA
- Ms. Doris Chow - being an alternate member for the Director of Lands who is a member of HKHA
- Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam - had current business dealings with HKHA
- Ms. Julia M.K. Lau - being a member of HKHA and Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA

141. The Committee noted that Ms. Doris Chow, Ms. Julia M.K. Lau, Mr. K.K. Ling, Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr. Frankie Chow had already left the meeting. As the Chairman had already left the meeting, the Vice-chairman continued to take up the chairmanship of the meeting

Presentation and Question Sessions

142. With the aid of a powerpoint, Mr. Richard Y.L. Siu, STP/K, presented the

application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary ‘public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle)’ (vacant vehicle parking spaces only) under Application No. A/K15/92 for a period of three years to facilitate the letting of the vacant monthly vehicle parking spaces at the application premises to non-residents;
- (c) departmental comments –concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three-week statutory publication period and no local objection was received by the District Officer (Kwun Tong); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

143. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

144. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 23.3.2016, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition :

Priority should be accorded to the residents of Ko Cheung Court and Yau Mei Court in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.

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

- (a) to review and keep a record of the conditions of the use of parking spaces regularly so as to ensure well management in utilizing the public resources and avoid exploiting the right of letting of monthly vehicle parking spaces in the vehicle park by the residents; and
- (b) consideration might be given to letting the vacant vehicle parking spaces to non-governmental organizations for other uses so as to fully utilize the vacant vehicle parking spaces in the subject housing estate.

[The Vice-Chairman thanked Mr. Richard Y.L. Siu, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 23

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K14/679 Proposed Shop and Services in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone, Workshop No. 2 on Ground Floor, Apec Plaza, No. 49 Hoi Yuen Road, Kwun Tong
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/679A)

146. The Secretary reported that Knight Frank Petty Ltd. was the consultant for this application. Ms. Julia M.K. Lau had declared an interest in this item as she had current business dealings with Knight Frank Petty Ltd.. The Committee noted that Ms. Julia M.K. Lau had already left the meeting.

147. The Secretary said that on 8.3.2013, the applicant's representative requested for a further deferment of the consideration of the application for one month so as to allow more time for the applicant to provide further information to address government departments' concern on the gross floor area implication of the proposed means of escape (MOE) to the subject building.

148. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that a further period of one month, i.e. a total of 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.

Agenda Item 24

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K18/297

Proposed Hotel Development and Proposed Minor Relaxation of the Building Height Restriction to Allow for One storey of Basement for Two Car Parking Spaces, One Loading/Unloading Bay and Ancillary Plant Room Use in “Residential (Group C) 1” zone and an Area Shown as ‘Road’, 147 Waterloo Road and Adjoining Government Land, Kowloon Tong

(MPC Paper No. A/K18/297A)

149. The Secretary said that on 11.1.2013, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant to address government departments’ comments. On 5.3.2013 and 8.3.2013, the applicant submitted further information providing responses to the comments of the Commissioner for Transport and the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (PlanD) respectively. As the latest further information was only received on 8.3.2013, i.e. four working days before this meeting, comments from the government departments on the landscaping issues were still being sought. Besides, Transport Department’s comments on the applicant’s submission on 5.3.2013 were still pending, Hence, PlanD requested to defer a consideration on the application to the next meeting in order to allow time for concerned government departments to provide comments on the applicant’s further information.

150. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the Planning Department to the next meeting, i.e. 5.4.2013.

Agenda Item 25

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K9/256 Proposed Hotel with Eating Place/Shop and Services, and Public Transport Interchange in “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zone, Kowloon Inland Lot No. 11205, Junction of Hung Luen Road and Wa Shun Street, Hung Hom
(MPC Paper No. A/K9/256)

151. The Secretary reported that Townland Consultants Ltd, Adrian L. Norman Ltd. and MVA Hong Kong Ltd. were the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam - had current business dealings with Townland Consultants Ltd., MVA Hong Kong Ltd. and Adrian L. Norman Ltd.

Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau

] had current business dealings with MVA Hong Kong Ltd. Ltd.
Ms. Julia M.K. Lau

152. The Committee noted that Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Ms. Julia M.K. Lau and Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam had already left the meeting.

153. The Secretary reported that on 27.2.2013, the applicant’s representative requested for a deferment of the consideration of the application for a period of two months in order to allow more time for the applicant to address the comments of the relevant government departments and the public.

154. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further 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.

Agenda Item 26

Any Other Business

155. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 1:15 p.m..