

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 504<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 17.1.2014**

#### **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 H.W. Cheung

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Stephen H. B. Yau

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),  
Transport Department

Mr W. B. Lee

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department

Mr Ken Y.K. Wong

for Items 1-16

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department

Mr H. M. Wong

for Item 17

Assistant Director (Kowloon), Lands Department

Ms Sophia C. W. Chiang

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung

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

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Brenda K.Y. Au

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr Terence Leung

**Agenda Item 1**

**Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 503<sup>rd</sup> MPC Meeting held on 3.1.2014**

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 503<sup>rd</sup> MPC meeting held on 3.1.2014 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

**Matters Arising**

[Open Meeting]

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

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

- Y/K22/2                      Application for Amendment to the Approved Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/4, to rezone an area at the North Apron of Kai Tak Development from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Stadium”, “Open Space”, “Open Space (2)”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Waterfront Related Commercial, Cultural and Leisure Uses” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group B)4”, “Residential (Group B)5”, “Government, Institution or Community”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Stadium” and “Open Space”; and to rezone an area at the Ex-Kai Tak Runway of Kai Tak Development from “Commercial (4)” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Integrated Elevated Green Space with Commercial/Community Space

Underneath” and “Open Space”, Government Land at the North Apron  
and Ex-Kai Tak Runway of Kai Tak Development  
(MPC Paper No. Y/K22/2 )

---

3. The Secretary reported that Mr K. K. Ling and Mr Patrick Lau had declared interests in this item as they were members of the Harbourfront Commission which had been consulted on the rezoning proposal. As the Harbourfront Commission had not passed any motion on the rezoning proposal, Members agreed that Mr Ling and Mr Lau should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

4. Mr Tom Yip, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), Mr Stephen Chan, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), Mr Anthony Lo, Chief Engineer/Kowloon, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), Mr Jonathan McKinley, Deputy Secretary(2), Home Affairs Bureau (HAB), Ms Linda Law, Assistant Secretary/Recreation and Sport, HAB, Mr Wong Lop Fai, Chief Project Manager/303, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD), Mr Raymond Lau, Senior Project Manager/332, ArchSD, and the following representatives of the applicants were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr Stanley Ng  
Ms Camille Lam  
Mr Ian Brownlee  
Mr Albert Lai  
Ms Erica Chui  
Ms Bridget Lee

5. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. Mr Stephen Chan, STP/K, was then invited to brief Members on the background to the application. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Chan presented the application as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points:

*Proposed Amendments for the North Apron of Kai Tak Development (KTD)*

(a) the applicants proposed to rezone an area at the North Apron of KTD from

“Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Stadium”, “Open Space” (“O”), “O(2)”, “OU” annotated “Waterfront Related Commercial, Cultural and Leisure Uses” and areas shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group B)4” (“R(B)4”), “R(B)5”, “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”), “OU(Stadium)” and “O”;

- (b) the applicants proposed an alternative layout for the Multi-Purpose Sports Complex (MPSC) so that additional sites could be released for the development of public rental housing (PRH), Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) and schools. Under the alternative layout for the MPSC, the secondary stadium would be relocated from the north-western part of the “OU(Stadium)” zone to the south of the Main Stadium which was currently zoned as “O” as part of the Metro Park. The Indoor Sports Arena was proposed to be relocated south-eastwards on the deck level of Road D2 which was mainly zoned as “O(2)” and partly shown as ‘Road’ on the OZP. As a result of the alternative layout for the MPSC, the area of the “O” zone would be reduced by 4.6 hectares;
- (c) the alternative layout for MPSC would release about 9.3 hectares of land to the north of the Main Stadium which was proposed to be rezoned to “R(B)4” (about 4.13 hectares), “R(B)5” (about 3.93 hectares) and “G/IC” (about 1.3 hectares) for PRH, HOS and two primary school developments respectively. In line with the building height and plot ratio of the existing residential developments to the immediate northwest of “OU(Stadium)” zone, the proposed “R(B)4” and “R(B)5” zones would be restricted to a maximum building height of 85mPD and a maximum plot ratio of 5 and 4.8 respectively. The residential developments in these two zones would provide a total of 9,879 flats which could accommodate about 29,547 persons;

*Proposed Amendments for the South-western Portion of the Ex-Runway*

- (d) the applicants also proposed to rezone an area at the south-western portion of the Kai Tak Runway from “Commercial (4)” (“C(4)”) and areas shown

as 'Road' to "OU" annotated "Integrated Elevated Green Space with Commercial/Community Space underneath" and "O". The proposal was to convert the commercial areas reserved for hotel belt development along the south-western portion of the ex-Kai Tak Runway into an extension of the Metro Park which would include one storey of elevated green area with commercial/community space underneath. The commercial/community development would be restricted to a maximum plot ratio of 0.2. A strip of land at the tip of the hotel belt adjacent to the cruise terminal was also proposed to be rezoned from "C(4)" to "O";

*Comparison of the Changes in Land Uses*

- (e) compared with the layout as shown on the OZP, the rezoning proposals would mainly result in a loss of 6.35 hectares of "C" zone, 1.9 hectares of "OU(Stadium)" zone and 4.91 hectares of "O" zone. However, the rezoning proposals would also lead to an increase in the area of the "R(B)" and the "G/IC" zones, which would be increased by 8.06 hectares and 1.24 hectares respectively. There would also be a new "OU" annotated "Integrated Elevated Green Space with Commercial/Community Space underneath" zone which would be 6.54 hectares in size;

*The Justifications Provided by the Applicants*

- (f) the justifications provided by the applicants included: (i) the rezoning proposals would respond to the surging demand for affordable housing supply in the Metro area and would provide more decanting housing to facilitate redevelopment of To Kwa Wan/Ma Tau Wai; (ii) the rezoning proposals would not result in any increase in plot ratio and development density in other residential zones, and the stepped height profile and key breezeways could be maintained; (iii) the rezoning proposals could promote integration among the community, schools and indoor sports arena; (iv) there could be opportunity to increase the ratio of public/private housing mix; (v) the rezoning proposals were consistent with the Government's planning guidelines; (vi) the proposed Metro Park Extension

would be used by both tourists and local citizens; and (vii) the rezoning proposals were conceptual in nature and most of the concerned technical issues should be subject to detailed study and design;

*Planning History of Kai Tak*

- (g) the planning history of Kai Tak had lasted for more than 20 years. The South East Kowloon Development Study (SEKDS) and the Feasibility Study for South East Kowloon Development were commissioned in 1992 and 1995 respectively. Based on these studies, the first statutory OZPs for the area, i.e. the draft Kai Tak (North) OZP No. S/K19/1 and the draft Kai Tak (South) OZP No. S/K21/1 were published in September 1998 but strong objections were received from the public mainly on the extent of reclamation. To address the objections, a revised development scheme was formulated in 2001 with a reduced scale of reclamation. A set of revised OZPs was subsequently approved in June 2002;
- (h) in 2004 the Court of Final Appeal handed down its judgment on the draft Wan Chai North OZP. The judgment stated that the presumption against reclamation in the harbour could only be rebutted when a reclamation scheme passed the “over-riding public need” test. As a result of the court’s judgment, a revision to the planning of Kai Tak was required. The Government commissioned the Kai Tak Planning Review (KTPR) in 2004 to formulate a new development scheme for Kai Tak with “zero reclamation” as a starting point;
- (i) the Kai Tak Planning Review (KTPR) had gone through three stages of extensive public engagement activities from 2004 to 2006 and the feasibility of land use proposals was supported by relevant technical assessments. A new Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/1 covering mainly the apron and runway of the former Kai Tak Airport was formulated based on the findings of KTPR. The implementation stage for KTD had already commenced and the community had also urged for the early implementation of KTD;

Planning Vision and Planning Intention of KTD

- (j) the planning vision for Kai Tak was to develop the area as the “Heritage, Green, Sports and Tourism Hub of Hong Kong”. Specifically, the “C(4)” zone was intended to form a hotel belt along the waterfront of the Runway Precinct so as to support the nearby cruise terminal development and other tourism-related facilities. The “O(2)” zone was intended to provide open space in the form of a landscaped deck. The “OU(Stadium)” zone was intended primarily for the provision of MPSC. The “OU” annotated “Waterfront Related Commercial, Cultural and Leisure Uses” was intended for the provision of commercial, cultural and leisure uses in a one-storey development at the waterfront area so as to provide a dining cove. The area shown as ‘Road’ zone was intended primarily for the provision of Road D2, Central Kowloon Route (CKR) and Road L12A;

Comments from Government Bureaux and Departments

- (k) with regard to the changes to the sports facilities, a number of Government bureaux and departments, including HAB, Leisure and Culture Services Department (LCSD), ArchSD, CEDD and Hong Kong Police Force, were concerned that as the area of the “OU(Stadium)” zone would be reduced by 9%, the facilities to be provided in the zone would be undersized, resulting in constraints in technical and design flexibilities. The reduction in area of the “OU(Stadium)” zone would also weaken the synergy effect created by the integrated sports precinct. The relocation of the Secondary Stadium precinct would also give rise to crowd dispersal problems. Furthermore, the vista from the Metro Park towards the Lion Rock would be blocked by the relocated Secondary Stadium. The width of the waterfront promenade near the relocated Secondary Stadium would also be reduced. The proposed decking over of Road D2 for the construction of the indoor sports arena also meant that substantial design changes and diversion works for underground utilities would be required. The proposed rezoning would affect the implementation and timely delivery of



MPSC;

- (l) as for the changes to the Metro Park, relevant Government departments including CEDD, ArchSD and LCSD commented that the revised design could not accommodate the facilities proposed for the Metro Park. It was considered not desirable or practicable to provide open space on top of commercial sites along the ex-runway as it would reduce the amenity value of the park. The revised design of the park would affect the pedestrian streets along Road D3 at the ex-runway, and would also affect the design of adjacent waterfront promenade and the location of the station proposed for the environmentally friendly linkage system (EFLS) at the Metro Park. The revised design would also affect the implementation of the Metro Park;
- (m) regarding the deletion of the “C(4)” zone intended for hotel developments, the Development Bureau (DEVB) and the Tourism Commission considered that the removal of six hotel sites, resulting in a loss of 3,600 hotel rooms, would affect the intention to develop a tourist hub at Kai Tak;
- (n) concerning the proposed PRH and HOS developments, the Housing Department (HD) supported the proposal to increase housing supply to meet the acute shortage of land for PRH. While DEVB welcomed the applicants’ initiative to increase housing supply in principle, it also commented that the proposed additional housing land, if found feasible, should be weighed against the proposed relocation of the Secondary Stadium which would pose constraints to the proposed facilities, in particular the Main Stadium. However, this concern had not been addressed by the applicants. Furthermore, the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) commented that the proposed residential and school developments close to the Main Stadium and Road D2 would be subject to adverse environmental impacts. EPD, together with CEDD, TD and the Water Supplies Department, also considered that the additional demand on infrastructure and the impacts on traffic noise and vehicular emission due to the additional traffic could not be ascertained;

- (o) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department considered that the proposed building height of 85mPD, which was the same as that of the row of “R(B)1” zones to the north of the “OU(Stadium)” zone, would result in a monotonous building height profile in the area. The views towards the ridgeline of the Lion Rock would also be partially blocked. Replacing the MPSC with two clusters of high-rise residential developments might have implications on the air ventilation conditions. Furthermore, compared with an at-grade open space, the proposed rooftop open space might not perform in a similar manner in terms of greenery provision and the creation of a pedestrian friendly environment;

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

Public Comments

- (p) the rezoning application attracted 1,949 public comments. Among them, 181 public comments were in support of the application. Those supported the application mainly considered that the MPSC could be adjusted to provide more affordable housing and other land uses in Kai Tak. There was a limited capacity for Hong Kong to absorb tourists, and it was not necessary to build hotels next to the cruise terminal. The rezoning proposals could also facilitate redevelopment in the neighboring areas. It was not envisaged that the rezoning proposals would have adverse impacts on traffic and the environment. In addition, a commenter (Designing Hong Kong Limited) supported a rethink of the density of Kai Tak by slightly relocating the stadium. It proposed a further increase in commercial space with a large floor plate and the development of a band of commercial or retail facilities along the Kai Tak Approach Channel to create an area like Marina Bay and Darling Harbour. The land designated for road and supporting facilities should also be reduced and multi-use of road corridors should be promoted;
- (q) 1,757 public commenters objected to the application. They were mainly

submitted by the Kai Tak Concern Group and residents of nearby residential developments. They were concerned about the possible overloading of infrastructural capacities and the various adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. They also considered that the development of PRH and HOS on the prime land in Kai Tak was a waste of land resource. Kai Tak was an international landmark and it should be well planned. However, the rezoning proposals contravened the planning intention of the OZP and would undermine the consensus built in the previous public engagement process. The applicants had also underestimated the complexity of the project and the application was not supported by technical assessments. In this regard, they considered that the original layout of the MPSC and the current location of the proposed Metro Park should be retained. Another 10 public comments have not indicated their stances on the application;

[Mr W. B. Lee left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

*Comments from the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development of the Harbourfront Commission*

- (r) On 12.5.2013, the Harbourfront Commission's Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (the Task Force) was briefed by the applicants on their proposal. The members of the Task Force had the following main views on the application:
  - (i) the Task Force agreed that it was not in the position to comment on the social merits or needs of the proposal;
  - (ii) the Task Force considered that it was not in a position to support or object to the proposal from the harbourfront enhancement perspective, given that not much account from that perspective had been made; and
  - (iii) members of the Task Force queried whether the proposal had merits which would justify a new round of lengthy planning process, and the

implications on those infrastructure projects completed or in the pipeline, noting the years of involvement and the public consensus built on the current Kai Tak plan.

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

- (s) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper, which were summarised as follows:

*Fundamental Changes to the Land Use Layout of Kai Tak*

- (i) the Kai Tak area had a long planning history with several rounds of public consultation and OZP preparation. In particular, extensive public consultation/engagement activities including a 3-stage public participation programme in the KTPR was conducted from 2004 to 2006. All relevant planning issues had been taken into account in the preparation of the OZP in realising the planning intention to develop Kai Tak into the “Heritage, Green, Sports and Tourism Hub of Hong Kong”;
- (ii) however, the applicants proposed significant changes in the location, size, layout and form of the MPSC. It was considered that the alternative layout for MPSC was less desirable as it fell short of achieving the “Stadium in the Park” concept envisaged under the current OZP. There would be a reduction in the area of the “OU(Stadium)” zone by 1.9 hectares. The proposed MPSC was also further away from the planned railway stations, and as the width of the promenade to the southwest of the MPSC would be reduced, the rezoning proposals might result in a bottleneck for pedestrian circulation particularly during the dispersal of spectators. The proposed layout was considered by the concerned departments as not technically feasible and unable to satisfy the user requirements;

- (iii) the proposed reprovisioning of the Metro Park by the applicants in the form of elevated green space would deviate from the at-grade green network adopted for the entire Kai Tak. The elevated open space was not a like-to-like reprovisioning of the at-grade open space, and would also affect the design and connectivity of the waterfront promenades and obstruct the harbour view along the ex-runway. According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), open space should be accessible, suitable, functional and usable and should not merely be an area included as open space just to meet the required standards. The proposed reprovisioning of the Metro Park on the roof of the commercial/community development did not meet the requirements under the HKPSG. The applicants' proposal would also impose constraints on the design of the Metro Park in accommodating the planned sports and leisure facilities. The proposed rezoning of the "OU" annotated "Waterfront Related Commercial, Cultural and Leisure Uses" zone to "O" would also undermine the planning intention to develop a dining cove on the Ma Tau Kok waterfront;
- (iv) the deletion of the entire hotel belt in the tourism node would undermine the planning intention to develop Kai Tak as a tourism hub of Hong Kong and would inevitably reduce the number of potential sites for hotel development. This would adversely affect the overall tourism development in Hong Kong;

*Lack of Assessment of Technical Feasibility*

- (v) although the applicants indicated that the rezoning proposal was at a conceptual level and the concerned technical issues should be subject to detailed study and design, there were fundamental issues in the feasibility/viability of the proposal. The possible impacts/interface problems had also not been addressed by the applicants. The planning of infrastructure in KTD was at an advanced stage or already completed. The construction works of some infrastructure would

commence in the near future;

(vi) no detailed information and technical assessments had been provided in the application to demonstrate whether the additional traffic flow would result in adverse traffic noise/vehicular emission impact and the additional sewage would cause adverse sewerage impact;

(vii) the proposed developments at the “R(B)4” and “R(B)5” sites were close to the proposed sports facilities including the Main Stadium and would be subject to possible noise and air nuisance. Enlargement in the decking of Road D2 as proposed by the applicants for the construction of the Indoor Sports Arena would also bring about environmental issues related to mechanical ventilation. Furthermore, the proposed residential sites might have implications on air ventilation given that the area originally planned for open sports grounds allowing wind penetration to the inland area would be replaced by clusters of high-rise residential developments. However, no air ventilation assessment had been included in the submission;

#### Visual Impacts

(viii) the proposed building height of the residential developments would result in a monotonous building height profile. Besides, with the relocation of the Secondary Stadium to the northern part of the ex-runway, the views towards Lion Rock would be partially blocked; and

#### Possible Delay in Implementing KTD

(ix) significant time would be required for any re-planning/major land use changes in the area. The rezoning proposals would affect the timely delivery and implementation of KTD.

6. The Chairman then invited the applicants’ representatives to elaborate on the

application. Mr Stanley Ng made the following main points:

- (a) the rezoning proposals had been under preparation for quite some time. They had liaised with various Government bureaux and departments for a number of times and had revised their proposals based on the comments from the Government. They have secured the support of the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB), and even though DEVB was concerned about some aspects of the proposals, it welcomed their initiative to put forward the rezoning proposals with a view to increasing housing land supply;
- (b) due to the proposed development of MPSC, the planned population for KTD was reduced from over 200,000 persons to less than 100,000 persons. In view of the housing shortage problem and given that Kai Tak largely consisted of formed land which provided a rare opportunity for new housing development in the urban area, it was considered that additional sites in Kai Tak should be released for housing development to accommodate more residents;
- (c) the proposed sports facilities proposed by the Government would all be retained in the rezoning proposals. These facilities would enrich the lifestyle of the residents in the urban area;
- (d) a greater population in Kai Tak would improve the viability of the proposed elevated rail-based EFLS that would run through Kowloon East including Kai Tak;
- (e) the rezoning proposal only provided a conceptual framework for the consideration of the Town Planning Board (the Board). The details of the proposals, such as the proposed housing mix, could be adjusted if needed;
- (f) as it was too costly for the applicants, which were non-governmental organisations, to conduct the relevant technical assessments, it was hoped that when considering the rezoning application, the Board would focus on the concept of the rezoning proposal rather than the technical details such as

the lack of an air ventilation assessment. If the Board agreed to the concept of the rezoning proposal, the relevant Government departments should follow up on the proposals and undertake the relevant assessments;

- (g) one of the reasons why PlanD did not support the rezoning application was that the rezoning proposals would bring fundamental changes to the planning of Kai Tak which was formulated after years of extensive public engagement. However, it was noted that the Government had intended to increase the development intensity of the residential developments in Kai Tak. Therefore, irrespective of whether the rezoning application was agreed to by the Board, the planning process would have to be restarted by the Government;
- (h) one of the strengths of the rezoning proposals was the increase in the width of the open space at the ex-runway through the deletion of the proposed hotel belt. A greater variety of activities could be carried out at the proposed open space than at the one proposed by the Government which was more like a waterfront promenade. The proposed elevated green space with commercial/community space underneath also enriched the landscape of the open space; and
- (i) the applicants were very sincere in submitting an alternative layout proposal for Kai Tak and the Harbourfront Commission had not objected to the rezoning proposals. It was hoped that the Board would consider the rezoning proposal favourably.

[Mr W. B. Lee returned to join the meeting at this point.]

7. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms Camille Lam made the following main points:

*Key Issues*

- (a) although the development of Kai Tak had gone through a long planning



process and the construction works for some facilities were about to commence, it did not mean that the planning of Kai Tak could not be further improved to better meet the challenges facing our society today. Considering that only about 36 hectares of land (11% of the area of Kai Tak) were proposed for residential development, and only about 9.25 hectares of land (25% of all residential sites) were intended for public housing, there might be room to further increase the proportion of affordable housing in Kai Tak;

- (b) as regards the proposed sports facilities, the relevant Government departments had commented that there might not be enough room for the Secondary Stadium to be relocated to the south of the Main Stadium. However, it was considered that the relocation of the Secondary Stadium was feasible if the footprint of the stadia could be slightly reduced;
- (c) the KTD had not benefited the old areas in Kowloon City, where a lot of people lived in subdivided flats. Many landlords of those subdivided flats had increased the rents in anticipation of the promulgation of the Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City to be prepared by the Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum. Many tenants were affected and they would welcome an opportunity to move to a public housing development proposed in the rezoning application. More than 1,000 signatures supporting the rezoning application had been collected and they were shown in Annex Ie of the Paper;

Planning Principles

- (d) the general principles of the rezoning proposals included: (i) increasing housing supply without diminishing environmental quality; (ii) maintaining the original development themes and regional functions; (iii) maintaining the MPSC and the Metro Park in the rezoning proposals; and (iv) increasing the indoor space primarily for arts and community use which was to be integrated with the Metro Park;

Key Points in the Proposed Amendments

- (e) in the rezoning proposals, about 9.3 hectares of land would be developed for subsidised housing and two schools. The maximum plot ratio and building height of the proposed PRH and HOS developments were considered acceptable and compatible with the nearby residential developments. If there were concerns that the proposed PRH and HOS developments would result in a monotonous building profile, a range of maximum building height, for example, from 85mPD to 100mPD, could be adopted to introduce a more interesting building profile. The proposed building height was acceptable especially when compared with Sky Tower in Kowloon City which was about 50 storeys in height. The layout of the PRH and HOS developments could also be rearranged so that the wind corridors could be preserved;
- (f) the size of each planned facility of the MPSC would remain unchanged, and the profile, integrity and visual quality of the MPSC would remain intact. Even though there were queries on the technical feasibility of building the indoor sports arena on top of Road D2, it was considered that more technical studies would be required before a conclusion could be drawn on the technical feasibility of the proposal. Furthermore, after the Secondary Stadium had been relocated to the south of the Main Stadium, there would still be enough pedestrian accesses connecting the Secondary Stadium to the nearby MTR stations for crowd dispersion;
- (g) the Metro Park would be extended to the south-western portion of the ex-runway to replace the proposed hotel belt. Some of the open space area could be elevated to accommodate dining or community facilities such as exhibition halls or communal arts space underneath. The elevated open space would be in the inland portion of the ex-runway, so that much of the open space near the waterfront would be at grade;
- (h) with the proposed amendments, the number of PRH and HOS flats in Kai Tak would be increased by about 5,000, and the population could be

increased by over 30,000 persons. The ratio of subsidised housing to private housing would also be increased from 4:6 to 6:4. Even with these changes, the integrity of the MPSC and the Metro Park could be maintained. Furthermore, more community facilities and arts space could be introduced to the south-western portion of the ex-runway; and

- (i) with regard to the comments from Government bureaux and departments, it should be noted HD supported the rezoning proposals but considered that planning and engineering review should be conducted to confirm the technical feasibility. It was hoped that the Board would also consider the merits of the rezoning proposals first and leave the technical feasibility of the proposals to the relevant Government departments for further study.

8. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee made the following main points:

- (a) the applicants worked on the rezoning proposals in their spare time and hoped to achieve better planning for Kai Tak. Their commitment to do something good for the people of Hong Kong was worth supporting. The rezoning proposals aimed to achieve the same objectives as those of the Government's scheme but the proposed distribution and proportion of land uses were different. Although some Government bureaux and departments did not support the rezoning proposals for the reason that there was a lack of technical assessments, it was considered that community groups submitting a rezoning proposal to the Board should not be expected to undertake the costly technical studies. The planning process should be flexible enough to accommodate the amendments proposed either by the Government or the community even at a late stage of the development process;
- (b) he would like to talk about the tourism component of KTD and the cultural impacts of the tourism industry on the local community. At the southern part of the ex-runway, a large area of land was zoned as "OU(Tourism Related Uses to Include Commercial, Hotel and Entertainment)" and "C(4)"

intended for hotel development. These proposed uses lacked vitality and were intended for tourists rather than the people of Hong Kong. In the rezoning proposals, it was suggested that the hotel belt be replaced by an open space that would include commercial and community uses so that the open space would provide vitality and interest for the people of Hong Kong;

- (c) the development of the cruise terminal at Kai Tak was not a consensus reached during the public engagement exercise but was a decision made by the Government. During the hearing process of the draft OZP, he represented the tourism operators and the developers who considered that the cruise terminal should not be located at Kai Tak as there was a lack of tourist attraction in the area. After the decision was made to build the cruise terminal at Kai Tak, the hotel belt was added to provide more facilities for the tourists. However, it was considered that the proposed “Kai Tak Fantasy” at the “OU(Tourism Related Uses to Include Commercial, Hotel and Entertainment)” zone alone was sufficient to serve the function of a tourism node at Kai Tak;
- (d) Hong Kong would receive about 50 million tourists this year, but the tourism industry provided employment for only 200,000 persons. In commenting on the application, C for Tourism did not talk about the principles of cultural capacity and sustainable tourism, and seemed to assume that the growth in tourism was always good for Hong Kong. With further increase in the number of tourists, it would come to a point where the tourism industry was no longer viable. The traffic congestion at Salisbury Road, the Peak Tram terminus and Repulse Bay were all signs that the infrastructure was already overwhelmed. If the number of tourists was to increase to 100 million, the situation would become far worse;
- (e) in his comments on the application which was at Appendix IIc of the Paper, he talked about the issue of sustainable tourism. With about 50 million tourists a year, Hong Kong needed, on average, to accommodate the needs of one million tourists every day. In this respect, the ratio of tourist visits

relative to the total population of Hong Kong was far greater than that of the other major cities in the world. This had driven up prices of services, accommodations and properties, and therefore the working poor did not benefit from the growth of the tourism industry. The negative impacts of tourism were significant even though it only contributed to about 5% of the gross domestic product of Hong Kong. It might be better if the Government could focus on developing the creative industries which had a comparable economic contribution to Hong Kong;

- (f) there were four components in sustainable tourism, including economic sustainability, ecological sustainability, cultural sustainability and local sustainability. Sustainable tourism was particularly important to Hong Kong because of its small size and the fact that the local residents could not really escape from the negative impacts of tourism;
- (g) the Government had to build the cruise terminal alone because the private sector was not interested in the project. The private sector considered that there was little economic benefit in having the cruise terminal at Kai Tak. Therefore, there was no reason to use the land adjacent to the cruise terminal for hotel development. This piece of land should be used for better purposes such as open space development. Alternatively, the Government could also consider rezoning some of the “C(4)” sites for residential development to meet the pressing housing needs; and
- (h) although C for Tourism considered that there was a need to accommodate every growth in the tourism industry, the 2014 Policy Address indicated a change in policy as the Government now considered that appropriate and effective steps should be taken to ensure that the daily lives of our people would not be affected. It was therefore opportune for the Board to re-examine whether the “C(4)” sites should be rezoned for more appropriate uses to meet the current needs of Hong Kong.

9. Mr Stanley Ng said that the measures introduced in the 2014 Policy Address were not reflected in the Paper. It was considered that the objectives of the rezoning request were

comparable to some of the main themes of the Policy Address.

10. Ms Erica Tsui made the following main points:

- (a) some Government bureaux and departments were concerned that if the size of the “OU(Stadium)” zone was reduced, the “Stadium in the Park” concept could not be implemented. However, the concept of the rezoning proposals should be considered comprehensively. Rather than giving up the “Stadium in the Park” concept, the rezoning proposals actually proposed to extend the concept to the south-western part of the ex-runway. The rezoning proposals allowed a better integration between the land uses in the northern and southern parts of Kai Tak; and
- (b) if the Government’s scheme for Kai Tak was implemented, the harbourfront along the south-western part of the ex-runway would not be accessible to the ordinary residents of Hong Kong, as the area would mostly be occupied by the proposed hotels and their associated upmarket shopping malls. In the rezoning proposals, the emphasis was on providing housing flats and open space to the ordinary residents of Hong Kong. The rezoning proposals were worth supporting as they provided an opportunity to help Hong Kong address its current shortage in housing and public open space.

11. Ms Bridget Lee said that she was a social worker with the Caritas Community Centre – Kowloon, and she was mainly responsible for helping the residents in the old areas in Kowloon City and To Kwa Wan. Many residents in these areas lived in poor conditions and had been waiting for five or even seven years to live in a public housing flat. Some of those affected by urban redevelopment had moved from Kwun Tong or Shum Shui Po in the hope of settling in To Kwa Wan. However, with the launch of the Stage 2 Public Engagement for the Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City, many landlords feared that they would receive much less compensation if their properties were rented out. In many cases, the tenants were evicted from their subdivided flats. The problem was so serious that even the Social Welfare Department could not cope with the large number of requests for assistance. In some other cases, the rent for subdivided flats was increased to such an extent

that the tenants were no longer qualified to apply for assistance under the Community Care Fund. For some other people who had a place to live, their living conditions were so poor that they had been injured by blocks of concrete falling from the ceiling. Some of these people were old homeowners who could not afford to repair their flats. These residents knew that they might not benefit directly from the approval of the rezoning application, but they supported the application because they thought that building more subsidised housing at Kai Tak was a step in the right direction. As a result, more than 1,000 signatures supporting the application were collected in a short time. It was hoped that the Board could think more for the poor and help them to live a better life.

12. Mr Stanley Ng said that their discussions with the relevant Government bureaux and departments were not entirely successful as each Government bureau and department had their own policies. As the Board was independent from the Government, it was hoped that the Board would approve the rezoning application and instruct the Government to undertake relevant studies that would help the poor.

13. Mr Albert Lai made the following main points:

- (a) the applicants had spent about 15 months on the preparation of the application. Discussions had been held with most of the relevant Government bureaux and departments regarding the proposed amendments and the rezoning proposals were revised a few times to incorporate their comments. The application was submitted as a public service and the applicants would not benefit from the approval of the application;
- (b) the application had received the policy support of THB and HD and the support of the public. It was hoped that the Board would consider the rezoning proposals favourably;
- (c) the applicants understood and respected the planning history of Kai Tak, and therefore the major components of the Government's scheme, including the MPSC and the Metro Park, were retained in the rezoning proposals. The rezoning proposals would unlikely lead to a significant delay in the implementation schedule of Kai Tak, as the Government had not yet sought

funding for the stadia from the Legislative Council, and the Government had not yet conducted the tender exercise with regard to the design and operation of the MPSC;

- (d) the relevant Government bureaux and departments mostly expressed concerns rather than raised objection to the rezoning application. It was considered that the concerns could be addressed through detailed studies. For example, the concern of the Water Supplies Department that the water supply facilities for Kai Tak might not be able to cope with the additional water demand could be easily resolved. As regards the traffic concern, the two MTR stations serving Kai Tak would have enough capacity to accommodate the traffic needs of the additional population suggested in the rezoning proposals. However, the applicants could not obtain the relevant data from the Government or the MTR Corporation Limited to address their concerns. As these data were not available to the applicants, it would be unreasonable if the rezoning application was rejected simply because these data were not presented to the Board. It would also be impractical to expect the applicants to prepare the costly assessments to support the application. It was considered that the costly assessments could be prepared by the relevant Government departments at a later stage;
- (e) given that the footprints of the stadia occupied less than 40% of the total area of the “OU(Stadium)” zone, there was room to adjust the Government’s proposal for the MPSC. As the rezoning proposal only suggested that the area of the “OU(Stadium)” zone be reduced by 9%, the required sports facilities could all be retained in the revised “OU(Stadium)” zone through more creative design; and
- (f) significant public interest was involved in the rezoning application, as the additional subsidised housing not only provided accommodations for about 30,000 residents, but would also serve as a “decanting site” to facilitate the redevelopment of Kowloon City and To Kwa Wan and older public housing estates such as Choi Hung Estate. In view of this, it was hoped that the Board would agree to the rezoning application.



14. In response to a question from the Chairman, Mr Tom Yip said that while the submission of a rezoning application with the objective to increase the housing supply in Kai Tak was welcomed, he was of the view that the planning of Kai Tak had to be considered comprehensively. Kai Tak had a long planning history and the layout as shown on the OZP was arrived at only after an extensive public engagement exercise. To revise the planning of Kai Tak at the present stage, strong justifications had to be provided and the revised scheme had to be significantly better than the original one. The main reason that PlanD did not support the application was not because the applicant had not submitted the relevant technical assessments, but because the applicants' proposals represented an inferior layout which failed to achieve the objectives that the original scheme was intended to attain. In the original scheme, a "Stadium in the Park" concept was adopted, with the three stadia located relatively close together so as to create a synergy effect for the sports facilities and supporting services. However, in the rezoning proposals, the north-western part of the "OU(Stadium)" zone was proposed for residential uses, and the Secondary Stadium was relocated to the area originally planned for the Metro Park. The proposed layout suffered from three major problems. First, the indoor sports arena would be too close to the residential developments and the "Stadium in the Park" concept was no longer achievable. Second, as a large portion of the Metro Park was replaced by the Secondary Stadium, the Metro Park could no longer serve as a visual gateway for the visitors when they approached the elongated ex-runway area from the much wider ex-apron area. Furthermore, the relocation of the Secondary Stadium could also significantly reduce the width of the waterfront promenade and interrupt the east-west connections within the Metro Park. Third, although the "C(4)" zone was rezoned to "O" to compensate for the loss of the area of the Metro Park, the proposed Metro Park extension was elongated in shape which would pose constraints to the overall design of the Metro Park.

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

15. In response to a question from the Chairman, Mr Jonathan Mckinley, Deputy Secretary (2), HAB, said that HAB's views had already been recorded in the Paper. The MPSC was a social infrastructure funded by the Government. The general concept of the MPSC was that it should be a lively and accessible sports park for the Hong Kong community as a whole. It was expected that the MPSC would play a major role in regenerating and energising Kowloon East. To this end, a generous amount of free open

space would be provided within the sports precinct. Taking away 1.9 hectares from the “OU(Stadium)” zone would adversely affect the implementation of the general concept for the MPSC. The provision of some of the proposed facilities such as cycle tracks, jogging tracks, children’s playgrounds, facilities for the elderly and areas for picnic might no longer be feasible. Most importantly, by putting the three monolithic stadia in a linear fashion, the rezoning proposals had departed substantially from what was envisaged for the MPSC.

16. In response to a question from the Chairman, Mr Wong Lop Fai, Chief Project Manager/303, ArchSD, said that the Secondary Stadium, besides being a supporting facility for the main stadium, was also a community facility to be used by the public. In the rezoning proposals, the Secondary Stadium would be about 1 km away from the proposed MTR To Kwa Wan Station and would be even further from the proposed Kai Tak Station. It would be too far a walking distance for school children who were some of the intended users of the Secondary Stadium. As for crowd dispersal, the Government had commissioned a few consultancy studies on this issue and it was concluded that the existing layout for the MPSC would allow the dispersal of 50,000 spectators from the Main Stadium in about 20 minutes’ time. As the proposed pedestrian accesses in the rezoning proposals were narrower than those in the existing layout, it was doubtful whether the spectators could be dispersed in an equally efficient manner if the rezoning proposals were agreed to.

17. A Member said that the quality of the rezoning application was high and better than some other applications submitted by the private sector. There were some aspects of the rezoning proposals which were better than the existing layout. The Member considered that when considering the rezoning application, the planning history of Kai Tak should not dictate the decision of the Board. The Member asked whether there would be any impacts on the implementation of KTD if the Board agreed to the rezoning application. Mr Tom Yip said that if the rezoning application was agreed to, the OZP would have to be amended. Furthermore, as the rezoning proposals involved major changes to the MPSC and the Metro Park, an extensive public engagement exercise similar to the previous one might have to be conducted. In addition, as the Government had already commissioned a lot of feasibility studies and technical assessments with regard to the different components of KTD, an agreement to the rezoning application would mean that those studies and assessments would have to be started over again. It was expected that the implementation of KTD would be delayed by several years as a result. This would not be in line with the general aspiration of

the public who mostly thought that after years of planning and consultations, it was the right time to start implementing KTD. Furthering revising the scheme for KTD at the present stage would also mean that the roads and developments that were already being built might be affected.

18. The same Member asked whether the Government had any intention to revise the planning of Kai Tak so as to increase the development intensity of the area. Mr Tom Yip said that the 2013 and 2014 Policy Addresses stated that arising from the transformation of Kowloon East, there was room to increase the development intensity of the residential and commercial developments in Kai Tak. In this regard, a study had already been commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department and PlanD to investigate the relevant issues. Unlike the applicants' proposals, the study aimed to increase the development intensity of the area without substantially changing the existing layout and the planning principles for the area. The study would also make sure that the proposed increase in development intensity would not overload the existing or planned infrastructure or lead to any adverse impacts on the environment. Under this approach, the implementation of the planned facilities in Kai Tak would not be delayed.

19. Mr Ian Brownlee said that the public had not been informed of the basis of the Government's study, but if the development intensity of the area was going to be increased, then the OZP should be amended. If the Government's proposal on increasing the development intensity was not satisfactory, the Board should request the Government to look into other proposals that could better achieve the planning objectives. The Board could also request the Government to incorporate into its study an investigation of the feasibility of some aspects of the subject rezoning proposals, such as the relocation of the Secondary Stadium, the changes to the Metro Park and the deletion of the hotel belt.

20. In response to a question from a Member, Mr Anthony Lo, Chief Engineer/Kowloon, CEDD, said that the roads and other infrastructure in Kai Tak were planned and designed in accordance with the layout as shown on the current OZP. As the construction of some of the infrastructure had already begun, any major changes to the planned population would affect the construction works and this could lead to a delay in their implementation schedule. Furthermore, KTD was a designated project under the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Ordinance and therefore an EIA had been

undertaken for the KTD. If there were significant changes to the planned population and the proposed infrastructure, a new EIA might have to be undertaken.

21. In response to questions from two Members, Mr Anthony Lo said that when the OZP was under preparation, the MTR alignment for the Shatin to Central Link had not been finalised and therefore the alignment as shown on the OZP was for information only. Since then, the alignment had been revised and approved by the Chief Executive in Council. The new MTR To Kwa Wan Station would be located near Sung Wong Toi Garden. It should be noted that the applicants' rezoning proposals would have no impact on the MTR alignment. However, they might have an impact on the Kai Tak Tunnel, which was designed with the assumption that there would be no buildings above. More studies would be required to determine the extent of the impact on the Kai Tak Tunnel if the rezoning application was agreed to.

22. Mr Stanley Ng made the following main points:

- (a) as the area of the MPSC was very large, the relatively narrow pedestrian accesses would not be a major problem for crowd dispersal. If necessary, the location of the stadia could be adjusted to ensure that there would be adequate pedestrian accesses for crowd dispersal. Furthermore, the proposed elevated rail-based EFLS could help transport the spectators to the MTR stations;
- (b) the applicants had been very careful in ensuring that the rezoning proposals would not lead to any delay in the land sale programme;
- (c) the applicants were not alone in proposing to restart the planning process for Kai Tak. The Government also intended to increase the development intensity of the residential and commercial developments in Kai Tak. The rezoning proposals were better than the Government's scheme as the proposed Metro Park extension would provide a wider open space along the waterfront. The Government should consider incorporating the rezoning proposals into their study; and

(d) the rezoning proposals would have no impacts on the MTR alignment.

23. Mr Ian Brownlee said that among all the proposed land uses in Kai Tak, the hotel belt ranked the lowest in terms of priority for meeting the needs of Hong Kong people. There were proposed hotel developments in West Kowloon, Hong Kong Disneyland and the Ocean Park as well as other proposed hotel developments that could provide alternatives for tourists. Therefore, the waterfront area should not be used for hotels but should be rezoned to other more appropriate uses.

24. Mr Albert Lai said that it appeared that the plan showing the stadia in PlanD's Powerpoint was misleading as the footprint of the Main Stadium in the rezoning proposals was irregular in shape and was larger than the one shown in the Government's scheme. Mr Tom Yip said that the plan was prepared based on the drawing submitted by the applicants which was shown in Drawing Z-1 in the Paper.

25. Mr Albert Lai said that the technical problems of the rezoning proposals could be sorted out in the detailed design stage. Regarding the issue of crowd dispersal from the MPSC, a longer distance from the Secondary Stadium to the MTR stations would actually be helpful as spectators with different walking paces would not rush to the MTR stations at the same time. As for the concern on the delay in the implementation of KTD, the agreement to the rezoning application would obviously lead to additional work for the Government, but if the additional work did not fall on the critical path in project scheduling, there might not be any delay in the implementation of the KTD. It appeared that the Government did not know exactly how long the implementation of KTD would be delayed at this stage. In this regard, the Board should consider the public benefits that could be gained through the agreement to the rezoning proposals which would outweigh the concern of the additional work to be incurred by the Government.

26. In response to a question from the Vice-Chairman, Mr Stanley Ng said that the residential and tourism components of KTD could be further balanced if necessary. For example, if the rezoning application was agreed to, some of the residential sites at the north-eastern portion of the ex-runway area could be rezoned to "C" in case there was a need for more hotel developments. However, considering that the cruise terminal was underutilised, there would be no need for more hotel developments at Kai Tak.

27. A Member asked whether the applicants had submitted their proposals to the Government during the public engagement exercise for Kai Tak. Mr Stanley Ng said that the rezoning application was submitted in response to the current shortage of land for PRH and HOS developments and the demand for a high quality park on the waterfront. The implications of the rezoning proposals on the implementation of KTD would be similar to those of the Government's recent proposal to increase the development intensity of Kai Tak.

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

#### Deliberation Session

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

29. A Member said that it was unsure if the Government's proposed population increase for Kai Tak would be comparable with that proposed by the applicants. If the proposed population increase of the two schemes were broadly similar, then the Government's approach should be preferred as it would result in fewer changes to the existing layout. It was considered that the proposed arrangement of the stadia in a linear fashion was not satisfactory from an urban design point of view. The proposed addition of residential sites to the north of the MPSC was also not supported as there was a lack of relevant technical assessments. However, there were merits in the proposed change to the hotel belt and its feasibility could be further looked into.

30. A Member did not support the application as it had already taken a long time to implement KTD. However, there were some merits in the rezoning proposals. Even though most of the Government bureaux and departments did not support the application, their comments were mostly technical in nature which could be addressed upon further assessment. The Member would like to know more information concerning the

Government's study on increasing the planned population for Kai Tak.

31. A Member said that the cruise terminal was not yet fully developed because it would take a few years for the cruise lines to redeploy their ships to Hong Kong. However, the number of cruise calls at the cruise terminal was gradually increasing and there was a clear trend that the demand for cruise travel was growing. A major problem concerning the cruise terminal was that there were not enough supporting facilities in its immediate vicinity. Many cruise passengers would have to travel to other parts of Kowloon to look for tourist attractions. It was therefore not appropriate to take away the tourist component from KTD at this stage.

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

32. A Member did not support the application and said that although there were some merits in the applicants' proposal concerning the hotel belt, the rezoning proposals were generally piecemeal in nature. The current "Stadium in the Park" concept was well thought-out and there could be unforeseen implications if the layout of the MPSC was revised at this stage. The example of the Hong Kong Stadium indicated that the traffic impacts of a major sports facility could be extended to a wide area. Therefore, without a detailed analysis of the implications of the proposed revision to the layout of the MPSC and the addition of 30,000 residents to its immediate north, the rezoning application could not be supported.

33. A Member did not support the application and said that Kai Tak was proposed as a sports and tourism hub after years of studies and public engagement. It was therefore not appropriate to agree to the rezoning application which was piecemeal in nature and was without the support of relevant technical assessments. Furthermore, if the northern part of the "OU(Stadium)" zone was rezoned to residential use, the planning concept of Kai Tak as a sports and tourism hub would not be able to stand out and the area would be no different from the nearby residential districts such as To Kwa Wan and Kowloon City.

34. A Member shared the comments made by another Member as recorded in the preceding paragraph and said that there were insufficient merits in the applicants' submission to warrant agreement to the rezoning application.

35. The Chairman said that one of the problems of the rezoning proposals was, if the Secondary Stadium was relocated to what was originally occupied by the Metro Park, the Metro Park could no longer serve as a connection point between the ex-apron area and the ex-runway area. Furthermore, the deletion of the hotel belt would mean that there would be no synergy between the cruise terminal and the surrounding areas.

36. The Secretary said that the “Stadium in the Park” concept was part of a larger concept which envisaged that a green network would be linking up the entire Kai Tak district. Visitors could walk from the proposed Kai Tak Station in the north, passing through the MPSC and the Metro Park in the central part of Kai Tak, and arrive at the tourism node in the south, all in a green setting. In the rezoning proposals, the applicants proposed to relocate the Secondary Stadium to the northern part of the ex-runway area to make way for the proposed residential development. However, the ex-runway area was just wide enough to accommodate the Secondary Stadium and visitors would have to pass through a very narrow waterfront promenade in order to get to the southern part of the ex-runway area.

37. The Secretary continued to say that a study was being undertaken by the Government to investigate the feasibility of increasing the development intensity of KTD without substantially changing the existing layout and the urban design framework for the area. The study would investigate the feasibility of increasing the development intensity of the existing residential zones. It would also consider rezoning the southern apron area into commercial uses to tie in with the planning concept of energising Kowloon East. As regards the southern part of the ex-runway, the cruise terminal might be expanded to include a third berth. To better support the cruise terminal and the tourism node, the hotel belt at the harbourfront would be retained, although the feasibility of increasing its maximum development intensity would be investigated in the study. In terms of timeframe, it was expected that the amendments proposed in the study would not lead to any major delay in the implementation of KTD. The study was scheduled to be completed in mid-2014 and would be submitted to the Board for consideration in due course. The Committee had also previously approved a number of planning applications for minor relaxation of development intensity of proposed residential and commercial developments in Kai Tak. It was considered that the objectives of the rezoning application were broadly in line with those of the Government, although the approach adopted by the applicants was different from that of



the Government.

38. A Member said that consideration could be given to incorporate the concept of mixed-use developments in Kai Tak by, for example, incorporating residential use and hotel use in a single building vertically instead of ordinary horizontal integration. The Secretary said that the Kai Tak OZP was the first OZP to adopt the “OU(Mixed Use)” zone which envisaged a vertical mix of land uses. The “OU(Mixed Use)” zone could also be found on other OZPs such as the South West Kowloon OZP. The Board would continue to adopt the “OU(Mixed Use)” zone on other OZPs where appropriate.

39. After further deliberation, the Committee decided not to agree to the application for the following reasons :

- “(a) the Kai Tak OZP has set out the planning, land use and urban design framework for guiding developments in the area. Extensive planning process and public engagement were conducted before public consensus on the land uses in the OZP has been reached. The proposed changes in the planning of Kai Tak are considered undesirable as they contravene the original planning concept of the MPSC, Metro Park and hotel belt. The applicants fail to demonstrate that the proposals are superior than the proposals on the current OZP while at same time can achieve the same planning objective;
- (b) the revised layout for the proposed MPSC is considered undesirable in that it falls short of achieving the “Stadium in the Park” concept envisaged under the OZP. The proposed relocation of the secondary stadium to the northern part of the ex-runway planned for the Metro Park may create a bottleneck for pedestrian circulation particularly during the crowd dispersal of the MPSC. With the proposed reduction in site area for MPSC and relocation of sports facilities in a linear arrangement, it would give rise to serious logistic and security concerns and adversely affect the potential for public enjoyment of the proposed sports facilities;
- (c) the proposed provision of one storey of elevated green space with commercial/community space underneath at the south-western part of the

runway area as a replacement of the affected Metro Park is considered not desirable as it will be separated from the at-grade green network. It will affect the design and connectivity of the waterfront promenades and obstruct the harbour view along the ex-runway. Also, elevated open space is considered not a like-to-like reprovisioning of the at-grade open space at the Metro Park;

- (d) the proposed rezoning of “C(4)” sites originally earmarked for hotel belt development would reduce the supply of the potential sites for hotel development in meeting the increasing demand for hotel rooms and adversely affect the planning intention to develop Kai Tak as a tourism hub of Hong Kong, and the overall tourism development in Hong Kong;
- (e) no assessments have been provided in the submission to demonstrate the overall impacts on the traffic, noise, air quality, sewerage, water supply, air ventilation and infrastructural capacity in the area arising from the proposed changes. The proposed residential developments are subject to potential road traffic noise, emissions and nuisance from the relocated sports facilities and no assessment or mitigation measures have been provided in the submission to ascertain the environmental acceptability and address the related environmental issues; and
- (f) the proposed zoning amendments would affect the timely delivery and implementation of KTD, which is not in line with public aspirations for early implementation of KTD.”

[Mr Laurence L.J. Li and Professor C.M. Hui left the meeting at this point.]

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of 5 minutes.]

**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Item 4**

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/H8/6                      Application for Amendment to the Approved North Point Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H8/24, To rezone the application site from “Government, Institution or Community” to “Open Space”, Hau Yuen Path, Braemar Hill, North Point  
(MPC Paper No. Y/H8/6)

---

40.            The Secretary reported that Mr Laurence L.J. Li had declared an interest in this item as his close relatives lived near the application site. Members noted that he had already left the meeting. Mr Stephen H.B. Yau also declared an interest in this item as he had properties in the neighbourhood of the application site. As the application site was not directly visible from his properties, Members agreed that he should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

41.            The Secretary reported that the applicants had submitted a document concerning the usage of the sports ground that morning. The document had been tabled at the meeting for Members’ information.

42.            Ms Ginger Kiang, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK) and Ms Irene Lai, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), and the following representatives of the applicants were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr Ian Brownlee  
Ms Cynthia Chan  
Ms Lindy Chang  
Mrs Kellie Alexander  
Ms Tonya Porter

Mr Kashimura Fujio  
Mr Toru Sato  
Ms Jessie Choi  
Mr Niall Bennie  
Ms Lee Wah Oi  
Mr Zan Anastovski  
Mr Brandon Huang  
Ms Rebecca Roth-Biester  
Ms Cindy Chen  
Mr Aaron Choi Koon Wai  
Mr Zhang Qun Yang  
Ms Chuang Li Hua  
Mr Colin Wong

43. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. Ms Irene Lai, STP/HK, was then invited to brief Members on the background to the application. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms Lai presented the application as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points:

*The Proposed Amendments*

- (a) the applicants proposed to rezone the application site from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) on the approved North Point OZP to “Open Space” (“O”) so that the temporary sports ground at the application site would be turned into a permanent development;

*Justifications Provided by the Applicants*

- (b) the cluster of schools on Hau Yuen Path and Braemar Hill Road effectively formed a school village. The sports ground was financed, maintained and managed by the school village and served both the schools and the general public. Since 2007, a lot of students, individuals and third party groups had used the sports ground. The shared use of the sports ground by the school village and the general public was considered consistent with

Chapters 3 and 4 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) in respect of the clustering of schools, shared use of facilities with the community, and the provision of recreational facilities and open space. There was no other sports ground in the area which was suitable to serve the school village;

- (c) over 9,000 trees and vegetations had been planted to beautify the area. A permanent sports ground at the site would preserve the visual amenity and would have positive impacts on air ventilation in the surrounding environment;
- (d) under the “G/IC” zoning for the site, a maximum building height of 8 storeys was allowed. This would bring about adverse visual, air ventilation and traffic impacts on the surrounding environment. The proposed “O” zone was considered more appropriate as it would retain the open character of the area;
- (e) the sports ground had become an integral part of the operation of Chinese International School (CIS) and other schools in the school village. The proposed permanent sports ground would be beneficial to the schools’ long-term financial budgeting and curriculum planning;
- (f) the applicants developed the application site at a considerable cost of more than \$20 million in 2007 and would reasonably anticipate that the school village would be able to continue to enjoy the use of the sports ground;
- (g) the “O” sites in the immediate vicinity of the application site, including Choi Sai Woo Park, the “O” zone along the southern boundary of Braemar Hill Mansion, the “O” zone at the intersection of Braemar Hill Road and Wai Tsui Crescent, Braemar Hill Road Playground, and the “O” strip at the eastern side of Hau Yuen Path, were difficult to be developed into substantial open spaces in view of their dimensions and/or topography;

- (h) the Secretary for Education (SED) commented that the subject site was originally reserved as a school site for the construction of a primary school. Preliminary works including the project feasibility study began in 1998 but was met with opposition from the Eastern District Board/Council members, members from the relevant Area Committee, and the principals of the schools at Braemar Hill. The then Education Department eventually decided to suspend the development in 2001. In 2002, the then Education and Manpower Bureau gave in-principle policy support to CIS to use the site as a sports ground under a Short Term Tenancy (STT) on the understanding that the use of the site was on a temporary basis. It was considered that the sports ground was essential for the applicants and the nearby schools to provide physical education. As far as the application was concerned, he had no comment on the application insofar as the existing mode of operation could be maintained, i.e. a sports ground of reasonable size available for physical education of the schools, leased under a STT arrangement, and maintained by the tenant(s)/users at their own cost. It appeared that the existing “G/IC” zoning could achieve such educational purpose. As the long-term use of the site was subject to review, he did not consider it appropriate to give policy support for granting of the site to CIS or the applicants by Private Treaty Grant (PTG);
- (i) the Secretary for Development (SDEV) and the Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands), Civil Engineering and Development Department (PM(HKI&I), CEDD) did not support the application and commented that the current use of the site was a short-term use by STT only. The long term use of the site was currently under review by the Government;
- (j) the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong East, Lands Department (DLO/HKE, LandsD) commented that the application site was under STT restricted for the purpose of a school sports ground with ancillary facilities and the sports ground was to be shared by nearby schools. The site was also required to be open for public use every day in the morning and during certain specified hours on weekends when required. In 2012, the existing

tenant of the site, CIS, applied for a PTG for a permanent school sports ground use at the application site. The application was rejected in the absence of policy support from the Education Bureau (EDB);

- (k) the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS) had no comment on the rezoning proposal but stated that there was no current or forecast shortfall of open space in the district according to the HKPSG. If the rezoning proposal was agreed to, extra provision of open space in the district would be resulted;
- (l) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L), PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application from a landscape point of view. The proposed open space was not incompatible with the existing sports ground and the surrounding landscape character. Significant disturbance to the existing landscape resources and character was not anticipated;

Public Comments

- (m) the rezoning application attracted 558 public comments. They were submitted by the incorporated owners of the nearby residential developments, the Chairman of Junior Soccer Programme, Hong Kong Football Club, students and their parents of the nearby schools, local residents and members of the public. Except two commenters which had no comments, all public commenters shared the views of the applicants. They considered that the sports facilities and open space at the site should be maintained. The sports ground was a valuable breathing space for the area. The shared-use arrangement was a successful form of management and it was popular for sports activities. A permanent sports ground would enable the surrounding schools to commit to long-term investment and would facilitate interactions between students of different schools. They considered that the proposed rezoning would ensure that the sports ground would continue to benefit the public. There was no other suitable open space in the area that could serve the public and the schools. If the site

was developed for other uses, there would be disruptions to the local community and would lead to traffic congestion. The commenters also suggested that the opening hours of the sports ground should be extended to allow the public to make better use of the open space;

- (n) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper, which were summarised as follows:
  - (i) the subject site was a piece of Government land developed by CIS into a temporary school sports ground under STT since 2007. CIS had applied to LandsD for a PTG for sports ground use at the site on a permanent basis. However, there was no policy support from EDB on the granting of the site by PTG;
  - (ii) the site was zoned as “G/IC” which was intended primarily for the provision of GIC facilities serving the needs of the local residents in the area and, where appropriate, residents in the adjoining districts. Temporary sports ground as an ancillary use to school use was allowed under the current “G/IC” zoning. Although the existing temporary sports ground was open for public use at certain time slots, it was primarily a temporary school facility for the adjoining schools. The proposed “O” zoning was not appropriate for a school facility; and
  - (iii) there was an overall surplus of 3.8 hectares of open space in the North Point area, and there was also a number of existing active and passive open spaces in the Braemar Hill area. There was no strong justification for the proposed rezoning.

44. The Chairman then invited the applicants' representatives to elaborate on the application. Mr Ian Brownlee made the following main points:

- (a) representatives of CIS, Hong Kong Japanese School, Quarry Bay School,



St Joan of Arc School, Shue Yan University, Kiangsu-Chekiang College, Hong Kong Rugby Football Union, Little Tigers Football Club, Braemar Hill Heights Residents' Association and the Morning Tai Chi Group were present at the meeting;

- (b) since November 2012, the site had been held under a STT valid for one year and thereafter quarterly. If the Government gave a three months' notice to the applicants, the tenancy would cease and the site would have to be vacated. Therefore, there was always a threat that the schools would be forced to give up the sports ground. This was one of the reasons why the applicants sought to turn the temporary sports ground into a permanent one; and
- (c) PlanD had apparently misunderstood the purpose of the application. Rather than seeking to turn the temporary sports ground site into a permanent school facility, the application actually sought to rezone the application site into a public open space for public recreational purposes. This was made clear in paragraph 6 of the planning statement. The reasons for not supporting the application as stated in paragraph 11.1 (a) and (b) of the Paper were therefore not relevant.

45. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms Cynthia Chan made the following main points:

- (a) the current "G/IC" zoning permitted a wide range of developments and buildings of up to 8 storeys in height. In contrast, the proposed "O" zoning would give priority to the development of the proposed permanent sports ground at the application site;
- (b) the sports ground at the application site was effectively an open space use that was efficiently shared by the school village, relevant organisations and the local residents. From a planning point of view, the sports ground brought visual relief to the surrounding area, and had a positive effect on air ventilation and the traffic conditions. Therefore, the temporary sports

ground should be turned into a permanent development. The issue of STT and the relevant land administrative matter should not be a relevant consideration of the Board;

- (c) the applicants had invested a considerable sum of more than 20 million dollars on the infrastructure and plantings at the site. They would not have anticipated that the sports ground would only be used for a period of six years. The applicants currently managed the time slots for various users of the sports ground, and they were prepared to continue to manage and maintain the sports ground, until such time as the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) took over;
- (d) there was a genuine demand for the sports ground, which was not only used by the school village, but also by other schools, such as Kiangsu-Chekiang College and Shue Yan University, which were located further away from the application site. It should be noted that Kiangsu-Chekiang College was adjacent to a soccer field and basketball courts managed by LCSD. However, it preferred to use the sports ground at the application site instead, showing that not any open space could serve the function of a sports ground or replace the sports ground at the application site;
- (e) over the past six years, the sports ground had benefited many students, local residents and organisation users. Many members of the public were in support of the application;
- (f) the EDB supported the sports ground at the application site. It considered that the sports ground was essential for the operational needs of the concerned schools. The CTP/UD&L, PlanD also considered that the proposed open space was an acceptable use at the site;
- (g) with regard to LCSD's comments that there would be extra provision of open space in the district if the rezoning proposal was agreed to, it was considered that the proposed rezoning would maintain the total area of open space in the district. According to the HKPSG, an open space should be

functional and usable and be accessible to the people it meant to serve. It should also take account of the slope gradient and be planned in the right location. Most importantly, an area should not be counted as an open space just because there was a need to meet the open space requirements for a district. These stringent criteria in the HKPSG should be adhered to when planning for an open space;

- (h) however, many open spaces in the areas surrounding the application site fell short of meeting the criteria in the HKPSG. The problems of each of these open spaces were described as follows:
  - (i) a large part of Choi Sai Woo Park was not accessible to the public. The part that was accessible to the public was paved for passive recreation, or was vegetated steep slopes;
  - (ii) the “O” strip behind Braemar Hill Mansion was mostly used for a nursery, driveways, manmade slopes and a nullah. It was not for public recreation and was under private use;
  - (iii) there was a vertical slope at the “O” site to the immediate east of the application site;
  - (iv) at the “O” site to the further south of the application site, there was a narrow land strip which was more like an amenity area; and
- (i) the application site was one of the very rare proper open spaces in the neighbourhood. Furthermore, noting that the ball courts, football/rugby pitch and jogging track at the application site were facilities for “core activities” identified in the HKPSG, it was considered that the application site was the only open space suitable to serve as a proper sports ground for the local residents.

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

46. Mr Toru Sato said that he was the Principal of the Secondary Section of the Hong Kong Japanese School, which was an international school providing education to any nationalities in Hong Kong, although the majority of the students were of Japanese nationality. Although the school did not have much contribution to the local community, the general support provided by the Hong Kong SAR Government and the local community was always appreciated. To the school, the joint operation of the sports ground with CIS was a way of giving back to the local community. By providing financial support to the construction and operation of the sports ground, many local schools, sports clubs and the local community could enjoy the sports facilities. It was considered that the sports ground was essential to the local community and the school would continue to cooperate with CIS in the future.

[Mr H.W. Cheung left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

47. Mrs Kellie Alexander said she was the Director of Sports and Activities and the Sports Field Manager of CIS. She made the following main points:

- (a) the document tabled at the meeting provided detailed data on the usage of the sports ground. It could be seen that the total time that the sports ground had been used by schools other than CIS and the Hong Kong Japanese School in 2013 was 19,650 minutes, which meant that, on average, these other schools spent about 1 hour and 25 minutes per school day on the sports ground. This figure represented a ten-fold increase over a five-year period from 2009 to 2013;
- (b) there was also a significant increase in the usage of the sports ground over the weekends. In 2009, the sports ground was opened on Saturdays only. By 2013, the sports ground was opened on both Saturdays and Sundays. Community groups had used the sports ground for 182 times during the weekends in 2013. In comparison, the sports ground was only used six times during the weekends in 2009. This indicated that there was increasing demand for the use of the sports ground. If the sports ground was not available for use by the public, they would have to find another place to host their events, causing extra pressure on other LCSD facilities;

and

- (c) according to paragraph 10.4 of the Paper, the “O” zone was not an appropriate zoning for a school facility. However, if it were not for the sports ground, there would not be any suitable open space for the 9,140 students in the school village and local residents to participate in physical education and community activities. Students would have to travel to Victoria Park or Happy Valley by bus for physical education. This would lead to three major problems. First, LCSD facilities were usually hard to book. Second, the travel distance would cause pollution and add to the traffic congestion. Third, students would lose valuable time during their travel to the sports facilities. In view of the above, it was considered that the “O” zone was an appropriate zoning for the application site.

48. Ms Tonya Porter was the Head of Primary at the CIS. She made the following main points:

- (a) the sports ground provided students with an opportunity to practise and compete in organised sports and to host teams from other schools. These organised sports benefited students for a lifetime and helped them to develop the 21<sup>st</sup> Century skills in collaboration, teamwork, problem-solving and empathy. The sports ground also offered an opportunity for unstructured play, which was enjoyed by school students both in the morning and in the afternoon;
- (b) although many Hong Kong people were active in sports, according to a recent newspaper article, Hong Kong children were less fit than their western counterparts. Furthermore, today’s children were in general less fit than the youths of 30 years ago, and in Asia, the decline in fitness was twice as severe. It should be noted that regular exercise would make the students healthier. It would also help improve their concentration and academic performance. Furthermore, as students played, they developed creativity through independent thought and collaboration with one another. It was considered that the sports ground would offer Hong Kong people an

opportunity for both structured and unstructured play, both of which would serve them for a lifetime; and

- (c) another concern of the CIS was safety. Resurfacing of the sports ground was needed after years of use. However, further investment was difficult without a commitment that the schools would be able to continue to use the sports ground in the long run. Furthermore, schools usually planned their curriculum and timetables a year ahead. Without the certainty that the sports ground would continue to be available for their use, it would be difficult to commit to a safe, well-planned organisation of physical education, sports events and unstructured play. It was hoped that when the Board considered the application, it would take into account the benefits of structured and unstructured play that the sports ground would bring to the students and the public as they build healthy habits that would last a lifetime.

49. Mr Ian Brownlee made the following main points:

- (a) there was a huge demand for the sports facilities at the application site and the demand was permanent and on-going. There were significant public benefits in retaining the sports ground on a permanent basis. The question was how best to meet the demand;
- (b) as regards PlanD's reason (a) for not supporting the application, although there was no policy support from EDB on the granting of the site by PTG, EDB had mentioned that the sports ground was essential for CIS and the nearby schools. It should be noted that the rezoning application sought to rezone the application site from "G/IC" to "O" for the development of a public open space, which was the responsibility not of the EDB, but of the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB). However, the HAB had not provided any comment on the application from a policy perspective;
- (c) regarding the review of the long term use of the application site currently being undertaken by DEVB and CEDD, it should be noted that the

applicants had not been informed of the purpose of the review, even though it was the reason why the application of permanent land grant was rejected and why a longer lease term was not granted to the applicants. The review by the Government implied that the application site was being considered for land uses other than GIC facilities. As the review was still ongoing, favourable consideration to the PTG application had not been forthcoming and EDB was unable to give policy support to the permanent sports ground. This had resulted in a circular argument which could only be broken by the rezoning of the application site from “G/IC” to “O” which would reflect the permanent need for a public open space at the application site;

- (d) the proposed “O” zone was consistent with Chapter 3 of the HKPSG regarding the shared use of school facilities with other schools and with the community. It was also in line with the preamble of the Town Planning Ordinance as it would promote the health, safety, convenience and the general welfare of the community. The rezoning proposal also tied in with paragraphs 180 and 184 of the 2014 Policy Address regarding the improvement of sports facilities and the promotion of sports in the community respectively;
- (e) the proposal to rezone the application site from “G/IC” to “O” was to better reflect the current use of the site and the long-term public need for a permanent sports ground. There was no alternative site in the area that could serve the same purpose as the application site. There were two other “O” sites to the immediate east and to the further south of the application site which were not suitable for open space development and LCSD had no intention to develop them into permanent open space. If necessary, the Board could consider rezoning those two sites to “G/IC” or some other more appropriate zonings, in exchange for rezoning the application site to “O” for public active recreational purposes;
- (f) as for PlanD’s reason (c) for not supporting the application, it should be noted that the provision of open space in a district should not simply be based on the size of the existing and planned open spaces. Rather, the

stringent requirements on open space provision in Chapter 4 of the HKPSG should be followed. For example, the HKPSG stated that recreation was essential to the well-being of the community and land had to be allocated for its use. It was also an essential land use element in urban design. HKPSG also talked about the quantity needed for core recreational activities, the quality of open space, and the good practice and vision required for planning an open space. There was no real vision if one was only counting the areas of open spaces and not looking at the actual situation such as the level of existing facilities and their use;

- (g) many “O” sites on the North Point OZP did not meet the stringent criteria as stated in the HKPSG. For example, the area of Choi Sai Woo Park should be discounted by about 60%, as about half of the park was for private use and there were also steep slopes in the park. Victoria Park was too far away from the Braemar Hill area. Besides, it was a regional park and was often used for non-recreational activities such as markets and gatherings. The reclamation formed by the project in Causeway Bay was also too far away from the schools. Its location near a major road meant that it was not suitable for active recreational activities. After a careful analysis, it was considered that there was actually a deficit of about 10 hectares of open space in North Point District. The proposed open space at the application site, with a size of 0.726 hectares, was the only flat and usable public open space in the vicinity;
  
- (h) in relation to PlanD’s reason (b) for not supporting the application, PlanD stated in paragraph 10.5 of the Paper that the specific type of open space to be provided in the “O” zone should be determined by LCSD. However, this view was not correct. It was a planning matter to examine the site characteristics and the local context of the “O” zone to determine if the proposed open space was able to meet the planning criteria and the design requirements for core recreational activities. From this perspective, the subject sports ground was in conformity with the planning criteria and the design requirements for core recreational activities, and therefore there were strong justifications for the proposed rezoning;



- (i) the schools had offered to continue to manage and maintain the sports ground under the proposed “O” zoning for as long as the site was not required by LCSD. In this respect, there was already a similar precedent at King’s Park Sports Ground where the Hong Kong Rugby Football Union (HKRFU) was responsible for managing the “O” site. This arrangement allowed the HKRFU to manage King’s Park Sports Ground in a flexible and innovative manner for a seven-year period. There were also strict rules requiring shared use and public access to its facilities. For the subject sports ground, the same approach could be adopted until LCSD decided to take over the management of the site. In that case, the schools and the public could use the facilities at the sports ground under LCSD’s booking system;
- (j) there was public support for the application. If the proposal was for other land uses such as residential development, a lot of public objections were to be expected; and
- (k) to conclude, he would like to quote from a recent article from the South China Morning Post which said, “the abysmal standards of fitness of young people, as revealed by recent studies, is as much due to the lack of facilities as parental obsession with book learning and fears that sport leads to injuries. Public needs are not met by building a showpiece stadium... Endless Government expressions of worry about the costs of health care are nothing but hypocrisy until it invests in the prevention of disease – starting with clean air and opportunities for physical activity.” For the subject application, the applicants were not asking for additional Government expenditure, but simply the correct zoning to ensure that a public recreational facility was retained, so that thousands of students and adults would benefit from the use of the sports ground for a long time into the future.

50. In response to a question from the Chairman, Mr Ian Brownlee said that the application site was the only sports ground of its type in the North Point area. The extent to

which it could be used by the public was determined by the requirements set by the Government.

51. Considering that the applicants should apply to LandsD for a permanent land allocation instead, a Member asked whether the rezoning application was misplaced. Mr Ian Brownlee said that when the five-year tenancy was about to end, the school was shocked to learn that the Government would only renew the tenancy on a monthly basis. After some further negotiations with the Government, the tenancy was renewed for one more year and thereafter quarterly. As the schools had a long-term need for the sports ground, they had applied for a permanent land allocation. However, the application was rejected by LandsD. Although LCSD had the responsibility to provide sports grounds for the use of the public, it could not cope with the demand and it was unlikely that LCSD would build an alternative sports ground at the sites zoned as "O" in the vicinity of the application site. In this regard, the schools had offered to build and manage the sports ground as a public open space. The schools were willing to accept the same terms for the STT as those offered to HKRFU with regard to King's Park Sports Ground and allow the public to use the sports ground as required by the Government. The schools were also willing to return the sports ground to the Government if it wanted to take up the management of the facility after the termination of the STT. However, to ensure that the schools and the public would be able to use the sports ground in the long term, a rezoning of the site from "G/IC" to "O" to turn it into a permanent public open space was necessary. Therefore, the application was not misplaced but would help the schools to get some certainty of the future use of the sports ground.

[Mr Roger K.H. Luk left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

52. In response to a question from a Member, Ms Kellie Alexander said that the sports ground was used by the local community rather than by CIS and the Hong Kong Japanese School during weekends. According to the terms of the STT, the priority of the public use of the sports ground should be given to the community groups based in the Eastern District. However, they had also received many requests from groups that were based in other parts of Hong Kong. Therefore, the sports ground had all along been serving the wider Hong Kong community. As for the feasibility to use an indoor sports facility, it should be noted that most of the requests for use of the sports ground were for football and rugby, which were outdoor games. Therefore, there was a need for an outdoor sports

ground to serve the schools and the public.

53. Ms Ginger Kiang, DPO/HK, said that as North Point was an area that was developed a long time ago, the distribution of open spaces was not as even as that in new development areas. However, the Government had tried to incorporate as many open spaces as possible along the harbourfront and in the ex-North Point Estate site.

54. In response to a question from a Member, Ms Ginger Kiang said that whether a North Point resident would use the open space facilities in the Braemar Hill area would depend on his/her personal preference. It was noted that some local residents preferred to use the open spaces in Quarry Bay or Causeway Bay.

55. In response to a question from a Member, Mr Ian Brownlee said that the STT had been renewed for one year and thereafter quarterly. The one-year period had already ended in November 2013. The Government could now issue a notice to the applicants at any time and the tenancy would be terminated in three months' time. This was a major problem to the schools and the public.

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

#### Deliberation Session

57. A Member said that the sports ground was primarily being used by the schools rather than by the public, and the current "G/IC" zoning for the application site was appropriate. Although the applicants' need for a permanent sports ground was genuine and there was a general lack of sports facilities in North Point, a public open space at the application site would benefit a relatively small number of local residents.

58. A Member said that the current "G/IC" zoning was appropriate for the site. The

applicants should have continued to liaise with LandsD regarding their application for PTG.

59. A Member said that although some of the planned open spaces in the vicinity of the application site were not readily usable, it might not be appropriate to rezone the application site to “O” as the permanent sports ground would primarily be used by the schools rather than by members of the public. A “G/IC” zoning would be more appropriate for the application site as it could give priority of the use of the sports ground to the schools.

60. In response to a question from a Member, the Secretary said that if there was policy support from EDB, the application site might be granted to the schools. However, as there was no policy support for granting the site to the applicants by PTG, the site had been held under a STT instead. If the site was rezoned to “O”, it would be developed by LCSD into a public open space to be used by the general public.

61. In response to a question from a Member, the Chairman said that the open space in the centre of Happy Valley Racecourse was zoned as “O” and was open to the public. The subject sports ground was different from that open space as based on the applicants’ intention, it would be primarily used by the schools and would only be open to the public when the sports ground was not in use by the schools.

62. The Chairman continued to say that there were two large recreational grounds with active recreational facilities in the Braemar Hill area that were not mentioned in the applicants’ presentation. They were North Point Service Reservoir Playground at Tin Hau Temple Road and Cloud View Road Service Reservoir Playground. They were zoned “O” and “G/IC” respectively. Each of them had a 7-side mini soccer pitch and a basketball court.

63. A Member suggested that DPO/HK could be requested to explain to the applicants that they could continue to liaise with LandsD on the land matters. The Chairman also suggested that DPO/HK could be asked to explain to the applicants about the differences between an “O” zone which was to be used as a public open space and a “G/IC” zone which was used primarily as a school facility. Members agreed to the suggestions.

64. After further deliberation, the Committee decided not to agree to the application

for the following reasons :

- “(a) there is no policy support for the provision of a permanent sports ground as a school facility at the site;
- (b) using the site as a sports ground, which is primarily a school facility, is always permitted under the “G/IC” zoning. The proposed “O” zoning is not an appropriate zoning for a school facility; and
- (c) there is no shortfall in the open space provision in the district based on the standards under Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. There are also existing/planned open spaces in the vicinity of the application site to serve the locals. There is no strong justification for the proposed rezoning of the application site from “G/IC” to “O”.”

[Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

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

### **Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Submission for Partial Fulfillment of Approval Conditions (a) and (b) in Application No. A/H15/232-2, Proposed Hotels in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Ocean Park” Zone, Ocean Park

(MPC Paper No. 2/14)

---

65. The Secretary reported that the submission to partially discharge approval conditions (a) and (b) was submitted by the Ocean Park Corporation on behalf of the Tourism Commission. Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with the Ocean Park Corporation. Members noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

66. The Secretary reported that a replacement page of page 13 of the Paper had been tabled at the meeting for Members' information.

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

Background

(a) application No. A/H15/232 for three proposed hotels (i.e. Ocean Hotel, Fisherman's Wharf Hotel and Spa Hotel) within Ocean Peak was approved by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) on 19.12.2008;

(b) in view of its prominent location at the Entry Plaza, Members were concerned about the design of the proposed Ocean Hotel, particularly its integration with the Entry Plaza, visual permeability and adverse visual impacts on the Shouson Hill residential area. Members also considered that the building height of the proposed Ocean Hotel should be lowered. The Committee generally considered that there was scope for improvement and the final design should be subject to the scrutiny of the Committee. The following approval conditions, among others, had been imposed:

(i) Approval condition (a)

the building form, layout, design, disposition and building height of the proposed hotel developments to the satisfaction of the Committee or of the Board;

(ii) Approval condition (b)

the submission of a revised visual impact assessment (VIA) taking into account approval condition (a) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Board;

(c) subsequently, the applicant submitted application No. A/H15/232-1 to amend the approved development parameters related to the proposed Ocean

Hotel only. The proposed amendments were primarily to reduce the overall hotel mass through a reduction of the total GFA, building height and the number of guestrooms, and to increase the average guestroom size. The application was approved by the Director of Planning under the delegated authority of the Board on 9.3.2010 with the same approval conditions as those in the original planning permission;

- (d) in 2012, the applicant applied for extension of time for commencement of development under Application No. A/H15/232-1 by a further period of 4 years. The application (No. A/H15/232-2) was approved by the Director of Planning under the delegated authority of the Board on 30.11.2012 with the same approval conditions as those in original planning permission;
- (e) the Ocean Park Corporation had conducted a tender exercise for the proposed Ocean Hotel in early 2013. To seek partial fulfillment of approval conditions (a) and (b), the applicant had submitted a revised master layout plan (MLP) and a VIA for the proposed Ocean Hotel;

Submission under Approval Condition (a)

- (f) the development parameters in the revised MLP were generally the same as those in the scheme approved under application No. A/H15/232-1. However, compared with the scheme approved under application No. A/H15/232, the GFA in the latest scheme had been reduced from 40,000m<sup>2</sup> to 34,000m<sup>2</sup>. The building height had been reduced from 53mPD to 45mPD, or from 8 storeys to 6 storeys excluding basement car park. The number of guestrooms had also been reduced from 660 to 495;
- (g) the scheme in the revised MLP was different from the approved schemes in the following aspects: (i) the number of building blocks was changed from one to three; (ii) the form of building was changed from one single block enclosed with a central courtyard to three building blocks at the periphery of the site with a central lagoon; (iii) the disposition of building blocks was changed due to the relocation of the original single block at the western part of the site to three building blocks at the periphery of the site; (iv) the

internal layout, disposition of premises and the distribution of proposed uses were changed; (v) the ingress/egress point was changed from the eastern part of the site to the northern part of the site adjacent to the Ocean Park entrance; and (vi) the tree preservation scheme, soft/hard landscape design and the landscape master plan (LMP) were changed;

- (h) according to the applicant, the changes to the building form in the revised MLP were to fulfill the latest building separation requirements. The revised scheme allowed the three hotel blocks to spread apart as far as possible. The gaps facing Shouson Hill and Entry Plaza between 24m to 27m were greater than the minimum separation requirement of 15m to allow greater visual permeability through the site. The hotel block with the lowest building height was to front Wong Chuk Hang Road so as to minimise the visual impact on the Shouson Hill residential area;

Submission under Approval Condition (b)

- (i) VIA had been conducted generally based on the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO) Technical Memorandum and EIAO Guidance Notes No. 8/2002. For the proposed Ocean Hotel, five viewpoints had been selected which represented the key Visually Sensitive Receivers (VSRs). They were the residents of Shouson Hill, residents of Manly Villa, patients, visitors and workers of Grantham Hospital, residents and visitors to Black's Link and visitors to the Entry Plaza;
- (j) the VIA concluded that the impact during operation stage of the hotel development was from insignificant to moderate without mitigation measures, and from insignificant to slight with mitigation measures;

Departmental Comments

- (k) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, Plan D) commented that the proposed scheme had shown improvements over the previous scheme (No. A/H15/232) in terms of building height, building bulk and permeability. While the proposed building disposition might intensify the visual bulk when viewing from the



northeast and southeast, the north-eastern side of the proposed hotel would be substantially screened by the existing trees along Wong Chuk Hang Road whereas the south-eastern side of the proposed hotel was adjacent to the rear of the cable car terminal of Ocean Park. As such, the proposal was not expected to have significant visual impacts. The VIA was also considered acceptable;

- (l) other relevant departments, including the Architectural Services Department and Transport Department, had no adverse comment on or no objection to the submission; and

PlanD's Views

- (m) PlanD had no objection to the building form, layout, design, disposition and BH in the revised MLP together with the VIA for the proposed Ocean Hotel for partial fulfillment of conditions (a) and (b) based on the assessment made in paragraph 7 of the Paper. In accordance with TPB Guidelines No. 36A, unless the changes to the approved scheme were considered major, no separate planning permission was required for amendments made to the approved scheme as a result of fulfilling the conditions of the approved planning permission. It should be noted that when imposing the approval condition (a), the Committee, in approving the original application, considered that there was scope for further improvements and expected changes to the building design and disposition. The applicant had made an effort to reduce the overall building bulk through the reduction of the GFA and the building height of the proposed Ocean Hotel. The two wider building gaps facing the Entry Plaza and Shouson Hill would result in a more permeable view. The smaller hotel blocks were also visually more compatible with the surrounding low-rise developments. The present submission was a follow-up to address the Committee's concerns and to fulfill the conditions imposed by the Committee. The key development parameters of the proposed Ocean Hotel had remained the same. Overall speaking, the proposed revised scheme was an improvement to the approved schemes.

68. In response to a question from a Member, Ms Ginger Kiang said that as the layouts of the approved schemes and the current scheme were different, it was difficult to compare the landscape impacts of the schemes. According to CTP/UD&L, Plan D, the landscape impacts of the current scheme was acceptable.

69. In response to a question from another Member, Ms Ginger Kiang said that the areas surrounding Ocean Park were generally occupied by low-rise Government, institution or community facilities and residential developments. Developments of higher density could be found further away in Wong Chuk Hang. It was hoped that the design of the proposed hotels within Ocean Park would be in keeping with the ambience of a theme park.

### Deliberation Session

70. After deliberation, the Committee agreed that the submission had satisfactorily fulfilled part of approval conditions (a) and (b) for the proposed Ocean Hotel. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant of the following:

- “(a) the applicant should comply with the remaining parts of approval conditions (a) and (b) for the other two hotels and other approval conditions attached to the approval letter of planning application No. A/H15/232-2; and
- (b) to note the comments of the Commissioner for Transport in paragraph 6.1.4 of the Paper in respect of the submission of a construction Traffic Impact Assessment report.”

[The Chairman thanked Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang, DPO/HK, and Ms Isabel Y. Yiu, STP/HK, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Professor S.C. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Wilson W.S. Chan, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK) and Mr K.T. Ng, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Draft Planning Brief for the “Comprehensive Development Area (7)” Site at Tsuen Wan Town Lot 393, Tsuen Wan

(MPC Paper No.1/14 )

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

71. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, presented the draft planning brief for the “Comprehensive Development Area (7)” (“CDA(7)”) site at Tsuen Wan Town Lot (TWTL) 393 as detailed in the Paper :

**Background**

- (a) the subject site, with a site area of about 14,160m<sup>2</sup>, was located to the west of the junction of Yeung Uk Road and Ma Tau Pa Road, Tsuen Wan;
- (b) the subject site was originally zoned “Commercial” (“C”) and subject to a maximum plot ratio of 9.5 on the Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/19. Since 2008, PlanD had consulted the Tsuen Wan District Council (TWDC) a few times on the development parameters of the proposed development at the subject site. The zoning of the site and the development parameters of the proposed development had been amended in response to the comments of the TWDC;
- (c) considering the strategic location of the subject site and TWDC’s comments on air ventilation, development intensity and open space provision, PlanD had proposed to rezone the site to “CDA(7)”. Restrictions on building height, gross floor area and the requirement for a non-building area (NBA) were also stipulated in the Notes of the OZP;
- (d) on 16.5.2013, the draft Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No.

S/TW/30, incorporating the relevant zoning amendments, was exhibited under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). On 7.1.2014, the Chief Executive in Council, under section 9(1)(a) of the Ordinance, approved the draft Tsuen Wan OZP. On 17.1.2014, the approved Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/31 was notified in the Gazette under section 9(5) of the Ordinance;

The Proposed Development

- (e) the “CDA(7)” zone was intended for comprehensive development/redevelopment of the area primarily for residential-cum-commercial uses with the provision of a public open space and other supporting facilities;
- (f) it was proposed that the eastern portion of the site was to be used for commercial development to help screen the adverse impacts of traffic noise and traffic emissions and to address the industrial/residential interface issue. The western portion of the site was to be used for residential development;

Development Parameters

- (g) development within the site was subject to a maximum GFA of 99,120m<sup>2</sup> (equivalent to an overall plot ratio of 7), of which a GFA of not less than 39,365m<sup>2</sup> should be for domestic use and a GFA of not less than 59,755m<sup>2</sup> should be for non-domestic use. Assuming an average flat size of 50m<sup>2</sup>, it was estimated that the site would provide some 788 units;
- (h) the site was subject to a 2-tier building height restriction. Developments at the eastern and western portions of the site were subject to a maximum building height of 150mPD and 100mPD respectively;

Urban Design and NBA Requirements

- (i) a number of urban design considerations should be adopted for the proposed development on the site. These included variation in the building height profile, a no-podium design and the provision of sensitive layout and disposition of buildings to achieve better air ventilation and

avoid creating 'wall effect';

- (j) a 38m-wide landscaped NBA in between the two portions of the site and aligned with Chung On Street should be provided to facilitate wind penetration. It should not be counted as a public open space and should be provided by the developer and managed and maintained by the owner of the commercial portion of the development at their own cost. It should be open to the public free of charge at reasonable hours;
- (k) a 25m-wide wind corridor in the form of NBA at the southern part of the site near Tsuen Wan Park should be provided. No building structure should be erected thereon. However, subject to the findings of the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) to be conducted by the prospective developer and the Board's approval at the MLP submission stage, the exact alignment and width of the wind corridor might be varied;
- (l) a setback of 5m from Yeung Uk Road and Ma Tau Pa Road and a setback of 10m along the north-western site boundary adjoining The Dynasty (TWTL 394) should be provided to enhance air ventilation;
- (m) a Visual Impact Assessment and an AVA should be included in the MLP submission to ensure better visual permeability and air ventilation;

*Open Space and Landscape Requirements*

- (n) an at-grade public open space of not less than 1,300m<sup>2</sup> should be provided in the commercial portion of the site. The public open space should be provided by the developer and managed and maintained by the owner of the commercial portion of the development at their own cost, and open to the public free of charge at reasonable hours;
- (o) private open space of 1m<sup>2</sup> per person should be provided for the residents of the proposed residential development. A greening ratio at a minimum of 30% should be adopted for the site. At least half of the greening should be provided at grade or at levels easily accessible to pedestrians;

- (p) a Landscape Master Plan incorporating various landscaping requirements should be included in the MLP submission. The future developer should pay special attention to the interface between the proposed developments and the 38m-wide NBA as well as the public open space;

*Pedestrian Connection and Transport Requirements*

- (q) footbridge(s) connecting the existing footbridge at the junction of Yeung Uk Road and Ma Tau Pa Road via the subject site to The Dynasty (TWTL 394) should be provided, managed and maintained by the future developer at their own cost. The footbridge(s) should be open to the public at all times. A direct barrier-free pedestrian walkway which would link up with the footbridge/walkway system and the public footpath along Yeung Uk Road via the commercial portion of the site should also be provided;
- (r) all parking and loading/unloading facilities should be provided in the basement in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T). A comprehensive traffic impact assessment should also be submitted by the applicant to the satisfaction of the C for T; and

*Other Technical Assessment Requirements*

- (s) the applicant was also required to submit an environmental assessment and a drainage and sewerage impact assessment; and

*Way Forward*

- (t) subject to the Committee's agreement, PlanD would consult the TWDC on the draft planning brief. The views collected together with the revised planning brief incorporating the relevant comments, where appropriate, would be submitted to the Committee for further consideration and endorsement.

72. In response to a question from a Member, Mr Wilson Chan, DPO/HK, said that the requirement on the provision of a public open space was incorporated into the draft

planning brief in response to the comments of TWDC. TWDC was concerned that the proposed public open space would attract homeless people if it was open to the public 24 hours a day. Therefore, it suggested that the proposed public open space should only be open at reasonable hours.

73. In response to a question from a Member, Mr Wilson Chan said that the AVA study conducted in 2008 recommended that an air path at the southern part of the site be provided to improve air ventilation. Therefore, the requirement of a 25m-wide wind corridor in the form of a NBA at the southern part of the site was incorporated into the draft planning brief. The developer would be required to submit an AVA for the consideration of the Committee during the MLP submission stage. Subject to the findings of the AVA, the exact alignment and width of the wind corridor could be varied.

74. In response to a question from a Member, Mr Wilson Chan said that the subject site was originally zoned "C" for hotel development. However, in response to the comments of TWDC, it was rezoned to "Undetermined" pending a review of its land use and development parameters. After further assessments and taking into account the comments of TWDC, it was rezoned to "CDA(7)" primarily for residential-cum-commercial uses. He further said that the ratio between residential development and commercial development was determined based on the composite formula stipulated in the Building (Planning) Regulations and having regard to the maximum domestic and non-domestic plot ratios applicable to Tsuen Wan in general.

#### Deliberation Session

75. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree that the draft planning brief was suitable for consultation with TWDC. The views collected together with the revised Planning Brief incorporating the relevant comments, where appropriate, would be submitted to the Committee for further consideration and endorsement.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Wilson Chan, DPO/TWK, and Mr K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Professor P.P. Ho left the meeting at this

point.]

**Agenda Item 7**

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/TW/6

Application for Amendment to the Draft Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/29 from “Green Belt” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Columbarium”, Lots 613 RP (Part), 614 and 1229 in D.D. 453 and Adjoining Government Land, Lo Wai, Tsuen Wan (MPC Paper No.Y/TW/6B)

---

76. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Longest Profit (Hong Kong) Limited with BMT Asia Pacific Limited and CKM Asia Limited as consultants. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

- |                      |   |   |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Professor S. C. Wong | - | being the Director of the Institute of Transport Studies of the University of Hong Kong and CKM Asia Limited had sponsored some activities of the Institute |
| Professor P.P. Ho    | - | having current business dealings with CKM Asia Limited  |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau  | ) |   |
|                      | ) | having current business dealings with BMT Asia Pacific Limited  |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam  | ) |   |

77. Members noted that Professor S.C. Wong, Professor P.P. Ho, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had left the meeting.

78. The Secretary further reported that the application had been deferred twice for a total of three months at the request of the applicant. On 12.12.2013, the applicant requested for further deferment of the consideration of the application for two months as the applicant required additional time to further address the comments from the Transport Department.



The applicant needed to undertake additional traffic survey during non-festival days to assess the likely traffic implication on the extension of the operational hours during non-festival days, prepare a comprehensive Traffic Impact Assessment taking account of the results of the additional traffic survey and liaise with his land consultant and legal advisor to prepare some practical mechanisms to implement the proposed closure and visit-by-appointment arrangements.

79. 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 three 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. Since it was the third deferment of the application, the applicant should be advised that the Board had allowed a total of five months for preparation of submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

### **Agenda Item 8**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/452                      Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development in “Comprehensive Development Area (3)” zone, Tsuen Wan Town Lots No. 126, 137, 160 and 363 and the Adjoining Government Land, Tsuen Wan  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/452B)

---

80. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Tippon Investment Enterprises Limited, which was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK). Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD), AECOM and Environ Hong Kong Limited (Environ) served as consultants for the application. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau                      -                      having current business dealings with SHK, LD and

AECOM

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam     )

)     having current business dealings with SHK, AECOM  
)     and Environ

Ms Julia M.K. Lau     )

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

-     being the Director of the Institute of Transport  
      Studies of the University of Hong Kong and  
      AECOM has sponsored some activities of the  
      Institute

81.       Members noted that Professor S.C. Wong, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had left the meeting. As the applicant had requested to defer a decision on the application, Members agreed that Ms Julia Lau could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion.

82.       The Secretary further reported that the application had been deferred twice for a total of four months at the request of the applicant. On 2.1.2014, the applicant requested for further deferment of the consideration of the application for two months as the applicant required additional time to gather and verify relevant information, such as noise, air quality and traffic data, as well as making corresponding updates to relevant technical assessments including environmental assessment, traffic impact assessment and sewerage impact assessment so as to address the comments of various Government departments.

83.       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. Since this was the third

deferment of the application, the applicant should be advised that the Board had allowed a total of six months for preparation of submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very exceptional circumstances.

[Mr W.B. Lee left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 9**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K1/242                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for permitted Shop and Services/Eating Place and Hotel uses in “Commercial” zone, No. 38, 38A, 40 and 40A Hillwood Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon (MPC Paper No. A/K1/242A)

---

84.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by subsidiaries of Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD), with Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTA) and LLA Consultancy Ltd. (LLA) as consultants for the 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 HLD, KTA and LLA. Members noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had left the meeting.

85.            The Secretary further reported that the application had been deferred once for two months at the request of the applicants. On 30.12.2013, the applicants requested for further deferment of the consideration of the application for another two months as the applicants required additional time to prepare visual materials in response to the comments of Hong Kong Observatory and the Antiquities and Monuments Office.

86.            After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicants 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 applicants that two months were

allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information. Since this was the second deferment of the application, the applicants should be advised that the Board had allowed a total of four months for preparation of submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very exceptional circumstances.

### **Agenda Item 10**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K3/556                      Proposed Hotel in "Residential (Group A)" zone, No. 1166 to 1168  
Canton Road, Mong Kok  
(MPC Paper No. A/K3/556A)

---

87.            The Secretary reported that the application had been deferred once for two months at the request of the applicant. On 7.1.2014, the applicant requested for further deferment of the consideration of the application for another two months to allow time for the applicant to liaise with the Antiquities and Monuments Office on the proposal and prepare a structural engineering report to justify the portion of the building to be preserved.

88.            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. Since this was the second deferment of the application, the applicants should be advised that the Board had allowed a total of four months for preparation of submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

### **Agenda Item 11**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/741 Shop and Services (Showroom) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (2)” zone, Workshops A5 and A6, G/F, Block A, Hong Kong Industrial Centre, 489-491 Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/741A)

---

89. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by First Rise International Limited and City Ford (Hong Kong) Limited with Lawson David & Sung Surveyors Limited serving as a consultant for the application. Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan had declared an interest in this item as she had current business dealings with Lawson David & Sung Surveyors. Members noted that Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan had left the meeting.

90. The Secretary further reported that the application had been deferred once for two months at the request of the applicant. On 2.1.2014, the applicant requested for further deferment of the consideration of the application for another two months as the applicant required sufficient time to address the further comments from the Fire Services Department.

91. 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. Since this was the second deferment of the application, the applicants should be advised that the Board had allowed a total of four months for preparation of submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very exceptional circumstances.

## **Hong Kong District**

### **Agenda Item 12**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H8/421 Proposed Office with Shop and Services in “Residential (Group A)”  
zone, 1 and 1A Java Road, North Point, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H8/421)

---

92. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Fukien Chamber of Commerce Education Fund Limited with Environ Hong Kong Limited (Environ) and LLA Consultancy Limited (LLA) serving as consultants for the application. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having current business dealings with Environ and  
LLA

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with LLA

Ms Julia M.K. Lau - having current business dealings with Environ

93. Members noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had left the meeting. As the applicant had requested to defer a decision on the application and Ms Julia M.K. Lau had no involvement in the application, Members agreed that Ms Julia M.K. Lau could stay in the meeting.

94. The Secretary further reported that on 6.1.2014, the applicant requested for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow sufficient time to address the departmental comments. This was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment.

95. 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 13**

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H21/137                      Proposed Office with Eating Place, Shops and Services in “Residential (Group A)” zone, 21-39 Mansion Street and 852-858 King's Road, Quarry Bay, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H21/137A)

---

96.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Main Light Limited, which was a company related to Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD). LLA Consultancy Ltd. (LLA) was one of its consultants for the application. Mr Dominic Lam and Mr Patrick Lau had declared interests in this item as they had current business dealings with HLD and LLA. Members noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had left the meeting.

97.            The Secretary further reported that the application had been deferred once for two months at the request of the applicant. On 15.1.2014, the applicant requested for further deferment of the consideration of the application for another two months in order to allow sufficient time for the applicant to undertake further refinement of the air ventilation assessment.

98.            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. Since this was the second deferment of the application, the applicants should be advised that the Board had allowed a total of four months for preparation of submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Agenda Item 14**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H15/259            Hotel in “Residential (Group A) 3” zone, 150 Aberdeen Main Road,  
Aberdeen, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/259)

---

99.            The Secretary reported that on 2.1.2014, the applicant requested for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months to allow additional time for the applicant to prepare photomontages in response to the comments of the Architectural Services Department. This was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment.

100.           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 submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Agenda Item 15**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H20/179            Shop and Services (Money Exchange) in “Other Specified Uses”  
annotated “Business” zone, Workshop 2B, G/F, Cheung Tat Centre,  
No. 18 Cheung Lee Street, Chai Wan, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H20/179A)

---

101.           The Secretary reported that the application had been deferred once for two months at the request of the applicant. On 23.12.2013, the applicant requested for further



deferment of the consideration of the application for another two months to allow more time for the provision of fire service installations. The applicant mentioned that the required fire service equipment had been installed and more time would be required to liaise with Fire Services Department on whether the installation was acceptable.

102. 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 submission of the further information. Since this was the second deferment of the application, the applicants should be advised that the Board had allowed a total of four months for preparation of submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

### **Agenda Item 16**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H25/14                      Temporary Shop and Services (Motor-vehicle Showroom) for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” zone, Basement Level B1 of the Car Park Complex, Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (Phase 1), 1 Harbour Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H25/14)

---

103. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by The Automall Limited, which was a subsidiary of New World Development Company Limited (New World) and Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) was one of the consultants for the application. Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with New World and KTA. Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had also declared an interest as he had current business dealings with KTA. Members noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

104. The Secretary reported that a replacement page correcting some factual information on page 3 of the Paper was tabled at the meeting for Members' information.

105. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary shop and services (motor-vehicle showroom) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban, Transport Department (AC for T, TD) had no objection in principle to the application. However, in view of the on-going developments around the application premises, such as the Shatin-Central Link, he considered that if the application was approved, the approval period should be limited to two years to allow for flexibility for reviewing the car parking provision in the vicinity. He noted that members of the Development, Planning and Transport Committee (DPTC) of the Wan Chai District Council (WCDC) had commented on the application and had expressed their concern on the illegal parking of coaches near the Golden Bauhinia Square and the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC). He had given a reply to the DPTC Secretariat and had been following up on the issue with the members of DPTC. The Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development (S for CED) had no in-principle objection to the application. He agreed with AC for T, TD that if the application was approved, the period of approval should be limited to two years given that parking demand might change with the passage of time and the on-going developments around the application premises;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four public comments were received. A joint comment submitted by two WCDC

members were concerned about the adverse traffic conditions near the Golden Bauhinia Square adjacent to the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC). They had received complaints from the public about the traffic congestion and air pollution caused by the coaches being illegally parked on the roads in the area. To address the traffic problems, they were of the view that HKCEC should provide adequate parking spaces in support of the convention and exhibition facilities and consider converting the existing car park for coach parking instead of the proposed motor-vehicle showroom. The remaining three comments were submitted by two Legislative Council members and one WCDC member. They supported the application on the grounds that the temporary motor-vehicle showroom had been providing good services to customers. It had created job opportunities and had made better use of the under-utilised parking spaces at the subject car park and it would not cause any adverse traffic impact in the Wan Chai North area; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. As regards the adverse public comment submitted by two WCDC members, an approval period of one year instead of three years as sought by the applicant was recommended in order to monitor and have a better control of the future supply and demand for car parking spaces at HKCEC and its vicinity. TD could also be requested to closely monitor the supply and demand for car parking spaces in the area. Concerning the general traffic congestion in the area near the Golden Bauhinia Square and HKCEC, AC for T, TD advised that they had been following up the issue with WCDC. Any parking outside the designated parking areas would be illegal and subject to enforcement by police. On the air pollution issue, since the motor vehicles at the application premises were for display and would not move in and out frequently, the proposed use would not have adverse environmental impacts on the surrounding area. With regard to the suggestion on converting the parking spaces at HKCEC for coaches, the applicant had confirmed that the headroom limit for the car parks at Phase 1 and Phase 2 of HKCEC were 2m and 2.2m respectively, while the

headroom requirements for coaches/buses and light buses stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines were 3.8m and 3.3m respectively. Therefore, the car parks at HKCEC would not be able to accommodate coach parking.

106. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

107. A Member raised concern that there were not enough car parking spaces in the area. The Secretary said that as suggested in the Paper, TD could be requested to closely monitor the supply and demand for car parking spaces in the area. Members agreed.

108. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 1 year until 17.1.2015, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no motor shows or car fairs or any related events should be undertaken at the application premises;
- (b) the number of cars to be parked at the car parking area of the application premises shall not exceed 345 at any time;
- (c) the number of visitors allowed at the car parking area of the application premises shall not exceed 300 at any time;
- (d) to employ an independent professional to monitor the mechanical monitoring system to control the number of visitors to the car parking area of the application premises and prepare monitoring reports on a monthly basis;
- (e) to employ an Authorised Person to conduct audit checks on the monitoring system and the monitoring reports on the number of visitors to the car parking area of the application premises on a bi-monthly basis;

- (f) in relation to (e) above, to submit the audit reports every two months highlighting any non-compliance on the number of visitors to the car parking area of the application premises to the satisfaction of the Director of Buildings or of the Town Planning Board;
- (g) the provision of fire service installations within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 17.4.2014;
- (h) if any of the above planning conditions (a) to (f) is not complied with during the approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (i) if the above planning condition (g) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

- “(a) to note D of FS’s comments that detailed fire service requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans; and
- (b) to note the DEP’s comments that the operator should switch on vehicle engines only when necessary and switch off the engines immediate after use to minimise air pollutants in the proposed motor-vehicle showroom, and make reference to the Practice Note on “Control of Air Pollution in Car Park” (ProPECC No. 2/96).”

[The Chairman thanked Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Maurice W.M. Lee, Mr Sunny L.K. Ho, Ms Sophia C.W. Chiang and Mr Ken Y.K. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

[The meeting was adjourned for a lunch break and resumed at 2:30p.m.]

[Mr Roger K.H. Luk and Mr H.W. Cheung returned and Mr H. M. Wong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

### **Kowloon District**

[Ms Karen F.Y. Wong, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 17**

##### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/692            Proposed Hotel in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone,  
69 - 71 King Yip Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/692)

---

##### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

110.            With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Ms Karen F.Y. Wong, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel (wholesale conversion of an existing industrial building);
- (c) departmental comments – the Commissioner for Tourism (C for Tourism) supported the application as the proposed development would increase the number of hotel rooms, broaden the range of accommodations for visitors, and support the rapid development of convention and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had no

objection to the application. He noted that the private car parking space provision had exceeded the requirement of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). He was satisfied with the applicant's justifications and had no objection to the applicant's proposed provision of more ancillary car parking spaces in this hotel development;

- (d) during the statutory publication period, seven public comments were received. The Chairman of Kwun Tong Central Area Committee supported the application without giving reasons. Another individual also supported the application but considered that the proposed use should not affect the existing transport facilities and transport network in the area. The remaining five commenters, including four individuals and Designing Hong Kong Limited, objected to/had concern on the application mainly for the reasons that (i) the increase in traffic, on-street loading/unloading activities and patronage from the proposed hotel would aggravate traffic congestion in the area and also entail safety problems as it would worsen the conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles; (ii) the traffic to be generated from the proposed use would further deteriorate the air and noise pollution problems in the area; and (iii) more public car parking should be provided in the area to address the problems of traffic congestion and the lack of car parking spaces; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Regarding the traffic implications, C for T had no objection to the application and had no adverse comment on the traffic impact assessment (TIA). While the proposed provision of 13 ancillary car parking spaces exceeded the HKPSG requirement of three parking spaces, these 13 parking spaces were inherited from the existing building. The applicants considered it necessary to provide sufficient ancillary parking spaces so as to capture the high-end market sector, in particular for hosting banquets and festive functions at the hotel. In this regard, C for T had no objection to the applicants' proposed provision of more ancillary car parking spaces in this hotel development in order to meet the anticipated high demand for car

parking spaces. It was recommended that an approval condition be imposed to ensure that the parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces, lay-bys, vehicular access and internal driveway for the proposed development would be provided to the satisfaction of C for T. As regards the public concerns on traffic and noise and air pollution, it should be noted that the TIA submitted by the applicants indicated that the traffic generated by the proposed hotel development could be absorbed by the surrounding road network, and the proposed development was acceptable in traffic term. Furthermore, according to the Environmental Assessment submitted by the applicants, the proposed use would unlikely have significant adverse impacts on the environment. Relevant government departments including C for T and the Director of Environmental Protection had no objection to the application.

111. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

112. In response to a question from the Secretary, Ms Karen F.Y. Wong said that the proposed provision of 13 ancillary car parking spaces would exceed the HKPSG requirement. The applicants had explained that sufficient provision of ancillary car parking spaces was necessary to capture the high-end market sector, in particular for hosting banquets and festive functions at the proposed hotel development. Having noted the justifications provided by the applicants, C for T considered that the 13 car parking spaces could be regarded as ancillary to the proposed hotel development. She confirmed that the Transport Department was aware that if the proposed car parking spaces were regarded as ancillary facilities to the hotel development, they would not be accountable for gross floor area calculation.

113. 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 17.1.2018, 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 provision of parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces, lay-bys, vehicular access and internal driveway for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the provision of fire service installations and water supply for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board.”

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

- “(a) the approval of the application does not imply that the proposed building design elements could fulfil the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines and the relevant requirements under the lease, and that the proposed gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development will be approved/granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department and the Lands Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. If the building design elements and the GFA concession are not approved/granted by the Building Authority and the Lands Authority and major changes to the current scheme are required, a fresh planning application to the Board may be required;
- (b) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection that hotel developments are normally provided with central air conditioning system and the applicant/authorised persons should be able to select a proper location for fresh air-intake during design stage to avoid exposing future occupants under unacceptable environmental nuisance/impact;
- (c) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department for

lease modification or a special waiver to effect the conversion proposal;

- (d) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that arrangement on emergency vehicular access shall comply with Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Building 2011 which is administered by the Buildings Department;
- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department that the applicant should appoint an Authorised Person to submit building plans for the proposed change of use and/or alteration and addition works to demonstrate compliance with the Buildings Ordinance (BO) at the building plan submission stage, in particular, for the provision of natural lighting and ventilation, means of escape, emergency vehicular access, access and facilities for persons with a disability; the entrance lobby including the male and female lavatories should be separated from the car park and loading/unloading areas by fire barriers; people using one required staircase on 27/F should be able to gain access to at least one other required staircase at any time, without having to pass through other person's private premises; the Building Authority (BA) has no power to give retrospective approval or consent for any unauthorised building works (UBW); in deciding on the number of car parking spaces that could be disregarded from GFA calculation, the BA will make reference to the standards set out in the HKPSG and the advice of the C for T; for UBW erected on private buildings/leased land, enforcement action may be taken by the BA to effect their removal in accordance with Building Department's enforcement policy against UBW as and when necessary and that the granting of any planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of any UBW on the application site under the BO; and detailed comments under the BO can only be provided at the building plan submission stage; and
- (f) to consult the Chief Officer (Licensing Authority), Home Affairs Department on the licensing requirements for the proposed hotel.”

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

115. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 12:45 p.m.