

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 516<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 25.7.2014**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr K. K. Ling

Chairman

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Vice-chairman

Professor P.P. Ho

Mr Laurence L.J. Li

Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Ms Julia M.K. Lau

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H. B. Yau

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

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

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

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

Assistant Director (R1), Lands Department  
Ms Doris M.Y. Chow

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Francis T.K. Ip

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Miss Floria Y.T. Tsang

**Agenda Item 1**

**Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 515<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 11.7.2014**

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 515<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 11.7.2014 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

**Matters Arising**

[Open Meeting]

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

**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H5/402                      Proposed Hotel in “Residential (Group A)” zone, 209-219 Wan Chai Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H5/402)

---

3. The Secretary reported that Lanbase Surveyors Ltd. (Lanbase) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with Lanbase. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.
4. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 8.7.2014 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address the comments from relevant government departments. This was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

5. 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. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. 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.

[Ms Irene W.S. Lai, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 4**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H8/422                      Shop and Services in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Pier" zone, Part of Ground Floor, North Point (East) Ferry Pier, North Point, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H8/422)

---

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

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) shop and services;

[Professor P.P. Ho arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in

paragraph 8 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no comment on the application;

- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection was received by the District Officer (Eastern); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper.

7. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

8. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 25.1.2015; and
- (b) if the above planning condition (a) 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.”

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

- “(a) to note the comments of the Assistant Director (Property Services) and the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department that the applicant should ensure that the layout would comply with building regulations requirements, including the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 and the requirements in Design Manual: Barrier Free Access 2008; and

- (b) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection that the applicant should implement measures to tackle potential air quality nuisance e.g. by installation of air conditioning system with fresh air intakes at the northern end of the site so as to be away from potential air pollution sources and confinement.”

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

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

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 5**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K11/216            Proposed Hotel in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone,  
210-212 Choi Hung Road and 15-17 Ng Fong Street, San Po Kong,  
Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K11/216)

---

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

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in

paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no comment on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a public comment from Designing Hong Kong Limited was received. It objected to the application mainly on the grounds of incompatibility with the nearby existing industrial area, adverse traffic impact, and setting an undesirable precedent if the application was approved. No local objection was received by the District Officer (Wong Tai Sin); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Regarding the public comment on land use incompatibility and adverse traffic impact, the proposed hotel use was considered in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone to transform the San Po Kong Business Area (SPKBA) to business use and the Commissioner for Transport had no comment from the traffic perspective. In respect of the concern on undesirable precedent, all 11 similar applications for hotel use in the SPKBA had been approved since 2002, and a previous application for hotel use at the site was also approved on 15.10.2010.

11. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Richard Y.L. Siu confirmed that the previous approved s.16 application No. A/K11/199 was for in-situ conversion of the existing industrial building to a hotel. This application was for a redevelopment into a 34-storey hotel (including 1 storey of basement). Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

12. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 25.7.2018, 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 implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

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

- “(a) the approval of the application does not imply that any proposal on building design elements to fulfill the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, and any proposal on bonus plot ratio and/or gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development will be approved/granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. If the building design elements and the GFA concession are not approved/granted by the Building Authority and major changes to the current scheme are required, a fresh planning application to the TPB may be required;
- (b) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department for lease modification/land exchange for the proposed hotel use;
- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that detailed fire services requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans and the arrangement of emergency vehicular access shall comply with the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Building which is administered by the Buildings Department;



- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department that:
- (i) an Authorized Person should be appointed to submit building plans to the Buildings Department for approval and demonstration of full compliance with the Buildings Ordinance (BO);
  - (ii) application for hotel concession under Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) 23A will be considered upon formal submission of building plans subject to the compliance with criteria under Practice Notes for Authorized Persons (PNAP) APP-40;
  - (iii) PNAP APP-151 on Building Design to Foster a Quality and Sustainable Built Environment and PNAP APP-152 on Sustainable Building Design Guidelines are applicable to the proposed development on the subject site;
  - (iv) in accordance with the Government's committed policy to implement building design to foster a quality and sustainable built environment, the sustainable building design requirements (including building separation, building setback and site coverage of greenery) should be included, where possible, in the condition in the planning approval;
  - (v) under PNAP APP-2, 100% GFA concession may be granted for underground private carpark while only 50% GFA concession may be granted for above ground private carpark;
  - (vi) all hotel guestrooms should comply with the lighting and ventilation requirements under B(P)R 30 and 31;
  - (vii) the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 should be complied with;
  - (viii) detailed comments under the BO can only be provided at the building

plan submission stage; and

- (ix) the proposed operation of the hotel shall be subject to the licensing requirements under the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance (HAGAO) (Cap. 349);
  
- (e) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection that the applicant should consult the Drainage Services Department for further details and agreement for the local sewer condition with respect to the new proposed sewer pipe joining Choi Hung Road;
  
- (f) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, Planning Department that the applicant should provide roadside planting at the setback areas at Choi Hung Road and Ng Fong Street and maximize the provision of greening, especially at-grade planting to enhance the pedestrian environment and to improve the landscape and visual amenity of the proposed hotel. The applicant should provide sufficient soil depth and volume especially to planting areas on the podium and over the basement, to improve the landscape and visual amenity of the proposed hotel development; and
  
- (g) to note the comments of the Chief Officer (Licensing Authority), Office of the Licensing Authority, Home Affairs Department that the applicant should submit a copy of the occupation permit for the proposed hotel when making an application under HAGAO; the proposed licensed area should be physically connected; the Fire Service Installations provisions should comply with paragraph 4.28 of Code of Practice for Minimum Fire Service Installations and Equipment; and the licensing requirements will be formulated after inspections by the Building Safety Unit and Fire Safety Team of his office upon receipt of a license application under HAGAO.”

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 6**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K13/291            Proposed Religious Institution (Extension of Temple) in “Green Belt”  
zone, Government Land adjoining 3 Shun Lee Tsuen Road, Kwun Tong,  
Kowloon  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/K13/291)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a)    background to the application;
  
- (b)    the proposed religious institution (extension of temple);

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

- (c)    departmental comments – the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had reservation on the application as the integrity and effectiveness of the landscape buffer had been damaged and no landscape proposal had been submitted to mitigate the adverse impact on the damaged landscape buffer. Furthermore, no landscape proposal had been submitted to mitigate the landscape impact. District Officer (Kwun Tong), Home Affairs Department (DO/KT, HAD) advised that environmental nuisance caused by burning of incense and paper offerings might be of concern to the community. However, Director of Environmental Protection advised that provided that a planning approval condition to disallow burning of joss paper in the application site and the existing Chiu Lei Saint Kwun Old Temple was incorporated, he had no objection to this application from environmental perspective.

[Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a public comment was received. The commenter was of the view that no justification was provided for the proposed extension and the Temple should apply to the Chinese Temples Committee for registration before any extension could be considered. No local objection was received by the DO/KT; and
- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments made in paragraph 11 of the Paper and were summarised as follows:
  - (i) the existing temple was the subject of a planning application No. A/K13/190 which was previously approved by the Committee in 2005 on sympathetic ground;
  - (ii) a previous application No. A/K13/276 for extension of temple was rejected by the Committee in 2011. Although the scale of the extension in the current application had been reduced, there was no strong justification for the proposed increase of more than 50% in total site area of the Temple within “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone. The temple should be confined within the approved site boundary;
  - (iii) the proposed extension was considered not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone and did not comply with the “Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Development within “GB” zone” (TPB PG-No. 10) in that there is a general presumption against development and new development should only be considered under exceptional circumstances;
  - (iv) CTP/UD&L had reservation and DO/KT, HAD had concern on the application as highlighted in paragraph 14(c) above;
  - (v) regarding the registration issue raised by the commenter, the

Secretary for Home Affairs advised that the fact that the temple was not registered with the Chinese Temples Committee might not be a significant factor when the merits of the case were considered; and

- (vi) the integrity and effectiveness of the landscape buffer had damaged and no landscape proposal was submitted. Approval of the application will set an undesirable precedent for further deterioration of the green buffer.

15. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Richard Y.L. Siu explained the sympathetic consideration of the Committee in approving the application No. A/K13/190 in 2005. He said that the original Chiu Lei Saint Kwun Old Temple (the temple) at Sau Mau Ping had to be relocated due to the redevelopment of Sau Mau Ping Estate. In view of the local need for worshipping, the Committee approved the application on 14.1.2005 mainly based on sympathetic ground to allow for relocation of the temple to the existing location. The temple use at the existing location, covering an area of about 33m<sup>2</sup>, comprised a temple, a joss paper furnace and some open area.

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

16. He continued to say that in 2011, the applicant submitted another application (No. A/K13/276) for proposed religious institution (extension of temple) on a larger site, i.e. about 136.5m<sup>2</sup>, which was four times larger than that of the approved application No. A/K13/190. The application was rejected by the Committee on 2.9.2011 for the reasons that the proposed extension was not in line with the planning intention of the "GB" zone and the application did not comply with TPB PG-No. 10 in that clearance of natural vegetation was involved, creating adverse landscape impact on the surrounding area.

17. In response to the Chairman's further question on the scale of the original temple in Sau Mau Ping, Mr Richard Y.L. Siu said that the site area of the temple approved under application No. A/K13/190 was about 33m<sup>2</sup>, which was already larger than the site area submitted by the applicant to the Lands Department (about 28m<sup>2</sup>) for relocation of the original temple in Sau Mau Ping.

18. In response to a Member's question, Mr Richard Y.L. Siu said that the joss paper furnace shown in the photos in Plans A-4 and A-5 of the Paper was within the site boundary of the approved application No. A/K13/190. The same Member considered that the applicant could consider making better use of the existing site.

19. In response to a Member's question on Plan A-3 of the Paper, Mr Richard Y.L. Siu explained that the orange-dotted area indicated the location of the existing temple, the green line indicated the site boundary of the approved application No. A/K13/190, the blue line indicated the site boundary of rejected application No. A/K13/276 and the red line indicated the site boundary of the current application site. He further explained that the temple was shifted from the site boundary of approved application No. A/K13/190 to the existing location to fulfill an approval condition, which aimed to avoid encroachment on a junction improvement works implemented by the Government. The site was let on a Short Term Tenancy (STT) (i.e. orange-dotted area) with non-exclusive right of way for pedestrian use in front of the existing temple to the applicant.

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

20. A Member asked about the justifications provided by the applicant for the expansion of the temple. In response, Mr Richard Y.L. Siu said that the applicant considered that the three structures, i.e. the Bliss and Moral Terrace, Healthy Pavilion and Memorial Stone were essential for the temple to serve their worshippers. In response to the same Member's query, Mr Richard Y.L. Siu said that according to his understanding, those three structures were not part of the original temple in Sau Mau Ping.

#### Deliberation Session

21. A Member opined that the applicant could consider to construct the Bliss and Moral Terrace, Healthy Pavilion and Memorial Stone within the site of the existing temple. Another Member concurred.

22. A Member did not support the application and considered that it was better to limit the temple to the existing site boundary as the temple was near a road and was only on government land under STT.

23. Another Member also did not support the application and was of the view that the land in front of the temple was created because the existing temple was setback from the application site boundary of application No. A/K13/190. If the temple had not been setback, those three proposed structures had to be accommodated within the existing site boundary. There was no strong justification to approve the application.

24. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. Members then went through the reasons for rejection as stated in paragraph 12 of the Paper and considered that they were appropriate. The reasons were :

- “(a) the proposed temple extension is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zoning for the area which is primarily for the conservation of the existing natural environment amid the built-up areas/at the urban fringe, to safeguard it from encroachment by urban type development, and to provide additional outlets for passive recreational activities. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from this planning intention;
- (b) the application does not comply with the “Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Development within “GB” zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance” in that clearance of natural vegetation was involved and existing natural landscape has been affected; and
- (c) approval of the application will set an undesirable precedent for further deterioration of the green buffer.”

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

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

**Agenda Item 7**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/702            Proposed Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated  
“Business” zone, Workshops D and E, G/F, Blocks G & H, East Sun  
Industrial Centre, 16 Shing Yip Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/702)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

25.            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 shop and services;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, five public comments were received. A supportive comment was received from the Chairman of Kwun Tong Central Area Committee, Mr. Chong Yam-ming, without giving reasons. The remaining four commenters, including some owners/occupants of the subject building, raised objection mainly on the grounds that (i) there were concerns on building and fire safety, and capacity of electricity supply; (ii) the proposed use would aggravate traffic congestion problem and the conflicts between pedestrian and loading and unloading (L/LU) activities at Shing Yip Street; (iii) the units should remain as workshop/factory use as approval of proposed use would lead to increase in rent of other workshop units; and (iv) the demand for new shops in the area was in doubt. No local objection was received by the District Officer (Kwun Tong); and



- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application on the assessments as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Regarding the public comments on the building safety and traffic aspects, the Buildings Department and Transport Department had no adverse comment. Regarding the fire safety concern, relevant approval condition was recommended. Regarding the view that the Premises should be reserved for industrial use, the planning intention was to provide greater flexibility in the use of the existing industrial building. The views on the capacity of electricity supply and raising of rental in other workshop units were not relevant in consideration of the application.

26. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

27. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 25.7.2016, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission and implementation of the proposal for fire safety measures, including the provision of a means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion and fire service installations in the Premises to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB before operation of the use; and
- (b) if the above planning condition is not complied with before the operation of the use, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

- “(a) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department for lease modification or temporary waiver for the proposed ‘Shop and Services’ use at the application premises;
- (b) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services to comply with the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 administered by the Buildings Department, and to observe the Guidance Note on Compliance with Planning Condition on Provision of Fire Safety Measures for Commercial Uses in Industrial Premises; and
- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department (BD) that the applicant should engage an Authorized Person to assess the feasibility of the proposal and implement the proposed change in use/alterations and additions works in compliance with the Buildings Ordinance (BO), including but not limited to, adequate means of escape should be provided, access and facilities for persons with a disability should be provided, and the Premises should be separated from the remaining portion of the building by fire barriers; for unauthorized building works (UBW) erected on private lands/buildings, enforcement action may be taken by the Building Authority to effect their removal in accordance with BD’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 formulated at the building plan submission stage.”

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

**Agenda Item 8**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K14/703                      Proposed Shop and Services (Bank) and Office (involving Direct Provision of Customer Services) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone, Units B1, B2 and B3 (Portion) on G/F and 1/F (excluding common area), Camelpaint Buildings Block 1, 62 Hoi Yuen Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/703)

---

29.                      The Secretary reported that Raymond Chan Surveyors Ltd. was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with Raymond Chan Surveyors Ltd. As the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application, and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

30.                      The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 11.7.2014 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow additional time to address the comments from the Fire Services Department on the application. This was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

31.                      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. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. 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 9**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K15/112 Proposed Comprehensive Development (including Residential, Commercial, Hotel, Government, Institution or Community Uses, Public Vehicle Park and Pier (Landing Steps)) and Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction in “Comprehensive Development Area” zone, Various Marine / Private Lots and Adjoining Government Land at Yau Tong Bay, Yau Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No.A/K15/112B)

---

32. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Main Wealth Development Ltd., which was a joint venture of owners of the application site comprising Sun Hung Kai Properties Ltd. (SHKP), Henderson Land Development Ltd. (HLD), Hang Lung Development Ltd., Swire Properties Ltd. (Swire), Wheelock Properties Ltd. (Wheelock), Central Development Ltd., Moreland Ltd., Fu Fai Enterprises Ltd. and Hong Kong and China Gas Company Ltd., with Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Ove Arup), Urbis Ltd. (Urbis), AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM), Dennis Lau & Ng Chun Man Architects & Engineers (Hong Kong) Ltd. (DLNCM) and MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) as the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - having current business dealings with SHKP, HLD, Wheelock, Ove Arup, Urbis, AECOM and MVA        |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - having current business dealings with SHKP, HLD, Swire, Wheelock, Ove Arup, AECOM, DLNCM and MVA |
| Ms Julia M.K. Lau   | - having current business dealings with SHKP, AECOM and MVA  |

- Professor P.P. Ho - having current business dealings with AECOM; Wheelock and DLNCM had given donations to the School of Architecture of the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK), of which he was the Director; and being an employee of CUHK which received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD
- Mr Clarence W.C. Leung - being the director of a non-government organization that received a private donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD
- Mr Roger K.H. Luk - being a member of the Council of CUHK which received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD
- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok - being an employee of the University of Hong Kong which received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD

33. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application, and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, Ms Julia M.K. Lau, Professor P.P. Ho, Mr Clarence W.C. Leung, Mr Roger K.H. Luk and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting but Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Ms Julia M.K. Lau, having business dealings with the companies in the joint venture of the applicant, should refrain from participating in the discussion.

34. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 11.7.2014 for further deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to undertake further study to refine the Master Layout Plan (MLP) to address the comments of

various Government departments. This was the third time that the applicant had requested for deferment. According to the applicant's letter at Appendix II of the Paper, since the first deferment in March 2014, the applicant had explored various refinement options and had worked out a revised MLP. The applicant requested second deferment in April 2014 to undertake various technical assessments for the revised MLP. However, it was found that the revised MLP was still subject to various technical challenges. As a result, more time was required by the applicant to undertake further studies to refine the MLP and liaise with relevant government departments on it.

35. 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. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. 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 requested by the applicant and the Committee had already allowed a total of six months for preparation of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

### **Agenda Item 10**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K18/310                      Proposed Temporary School (Kindergarten) for a Period of 3 Years in  
"Residential (Group C)4" zone, 31 Cambridge Road, Kowloon Tong,  
Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/310)

---

36. The Secretary reported that Lawson David & Sung Surveyors Ltd. (Lawson), LLA Consultancy Ltd. (LLA) and Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ) were the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

- Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan - having current business dealings with Lawson
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having current business dealings with LLA and Environ
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with LLA
- Ms Julia M.K. Lau - having current business dealings with Environ

37. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application, and Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Ms Julia M.K. Lau had no involvement in this application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

38. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 9.7.2014 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow sufficient time for the applicant to address comments from various Government departments. This was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

39. 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. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. 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 11**

Any Other Business

40.           There being no other business, the meeting closed at 9:40 a.m.