

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 535th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 5.6.2015**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr K. K. Ling

Chairman

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Vice-chairman

Ms Julia M.K. Lau

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung

Mr Laurence L.J. Li

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Stephen H. B. Yau

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),  
Transport Department  
Mr W.L. Tang

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department  
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Johnson M.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**

Professor P.P. Ho

Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

**In Attendance**

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Louis K.H. Kau

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr William W.L. Chan

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 534th MPC Meeting held on 22.5.2015

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 534th MPC meeting held on 22.5.2015 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

2. The Secretary reported that on 22.5.2015, the Committee approved with conditions the application No. A/K3/564 for proposed eating place, shop and services, office in “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) zone, 18 Bute Street, Mong Kok. At the deliberation, a Member enquired the latest progress of an application in Mong Kok with similar site characteristics. It was agreed that the relevant information would be reported back to the Committee.

3. The Committee noted that the application (No. A/K3/535) with similar site characteristic for redevelopment of an industrial building at No. 7 Arran Street for residential development was approved with conditions by the Committee on 28.1.2011. A set of building plans for the approved scheme was submitted in 2012 but was disapproved by the Building Authority on 19.2.2013. The planning permission expired on 28.1.2015. The approved scheme had not commenced and the site was now still occupied by the 9-storey industrial building (i.e. Lin Shing House). Basic development parameters of the proposal were also tabled at the meeting for Members’ reference.

[Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Ms Doris M.Y. Chow arrived to join the meeting at this point.]



- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, eight public comments were received from Tsim Sha Tsui Residents Concern Group, Designing Hong Kong Limited, the owners of 28 Kwun Chung Street and individuals objecting to the application mainly on the grounds of housing land supply, traffic, pedestrian safety, noise and air pollution, development intensity and undesirable precedent, etc.;
- (e) no local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Yau Tsim Mong); and
- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper, which were summarised as follows:
  - (i) C of P had reservation on the proposed development from the traffic policing point of view, in particular the foreseeable worsening of the on-street pick-up/drop-off activities which would exacerbate the existing traffic congestion in the area despite the provision of one loading/unloading bay within the site;
  - (ii) in view of the current shortage of housing land in meeting the pressing housing demand of the community, applications for non-residential uses including hotel and office in a predominant residential area would in general not be supported unless the site was very conducive for hotel development and with very strong justifications;
  - (iii) the applicant failed to provide strong justifications to demonstrate that the site was very conducive for hotel development or the proposed development would meet a specific planning objective. Similar applications quoted by the applicant within “R(A)” zones were either approved before 2013, or of different nature (i.e. wholesale/partial conversion cases or within areas of dominantly industrial character);

- (iv) the proposed relaxation of PR by 24.78% (from 9 to 11.23) would significantly increase the building bulk and development density. No planning or design merits or strong justification had been provided to support the proposed minor relaxation of PR; and
- (v) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for hotel use and minor relaxation of the PR restriction in the area, the cumulative effect of approving such applications would aggravate the shortfall in housing land supply and jeopardise the intended PR control for the “Residential (Group A)” zone.

[Ms Julia M.K. Lau and Mr Clarence W.C. Leung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

5. In response to the Vice-chairman’s question, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen, STP/TWK, said that the gross floor area of the back-of-house facilities (i.e. 264.169m<sup>2</sup>) was not included in the PR calculation of the proposed development.

6. In response to a Member’s question, Ms Yuen said that since May 2013, the Committee had agreed that applications for non-residential uses including hotel and office in a predominant residential area would in general be not supported unless the site was very conducive for hotel development and with very strong justifications. Such a decision was recorded in the minutes of the relevant meetings.

7. A Member noted that traffic impact was not one of the recommended rejection reasons despite C of P had reservation on the application from traffic policing point of view. The Member asked whether there was any significant difference between the traffic impact of a hotel and that of a residential development. In response, Ms Yuen said that the Transport Department (TD) had no objection to the application on traffic ground and C of P’s reservation was from traffic management point of view. Mr W.L. Tang, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), TD supplemented that TD had no objection since the proposed hotel with small floor area and number of rooms would generate insignificant traffic impact. The Chairman said that C of P was more concerned on the traffic pattern rather than the traffic flow arising from the hotel use. As compared with residential use,

hotel use would have more pick-up/drop-off activities by taxis and coaches which might exacerbate the existing traffic condition.

### Deliberation Session

8. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. Members then went through the reasons for rejection as stated in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper and considered that they were appropriate. The reasons were :

- “(a) the site is located in a predominant residential neighbourhood. Given the current shortfall in housing supply, the site should be developed for its zoned use. The proposed hotel development would result in reduction of sites for residential developments, which would affect the supply of housing land in meeting the pressing housing demand over the territory;
- (b) the applicant has not demonstrated that there are planning/design merits to justify the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio restriction for the proposed development; and
- (c) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would aggravate the shortfall in the supply of housing land, and undermine the intended plot ratio control of the “Residential (Group A)” zone.”

[The Chairman thanked Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

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

**Agenda Item 4**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TW/470            Shop and Services (Retail Shop for Selling Computer Products) in  
"Industrial" Zone, Workshop B5, G/F, Superluck Industrial Centre  
(Phase 2), No. 57 Sha Tsui Road and Nos. 30-38 Tai Chung Road, Tsuen  
Wan  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/470)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

9.            With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms M.L. Leung, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the shop and services (retail shop for selling computer products);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period and no local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Tsuen Wan); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years based on the assessments as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper. A temporary approval of three years, instead of a permanent approval, was recommended in order not to jeopardize the long term planning intention of industrial use for the application premises and to allow the Committee to monitor the supply and demand of industrial floor space in the area. Approval of the application on a temporary basis of three years was



consistent with the Committee's previous decisions.

10. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

11. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years until 5.6.2018, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission of the fire service installations in the application premises within 3 months from the date of approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 5.9.2015;
- (b) the implementation of the fire service installations in the application premises within 6 months from the date of approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 5.12.2015; and
- (c) if any of the above planning conditions (a) or (b) 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.”

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

- “(a) a temporary approval of three years is given in order to allow the TPB to monitor the compliance of the approval conditions and the supply and demand of industrial floor space in the area to ensure that the long term planning intention of industrial use for the subject premises will not be jeopardized;
- (b) to note that a shorter compliance period is granted in order to monitor the fulfilment of the approval condition. Should the applicant fail to comply with the approval conditions again resulting in the revocation of the planning permission, sympathetic consideration may not be given by the

TPB to any further application;

- (c) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing, Lands Department (LandsD) that the proposed ‘shop and services (retail shop for selling computer products)’ use is not permissible under the New Grants. If the application is approved by the TPB, the owner should apply to his office for a temporary waiver. The temporary waiver application will be considered by LandsD acting in the capacity as landlord at its sole discretion. Any approval, if given, will be subject to such terms and conditions including payment of waiver fee and administrative fee and such other terms as considered appropriate by the Government;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department that, under the Buildings Ordinance (BO), no person shall commence or carry out any building works without having first obtained approval and consent from the Building Authority before commencement of works unless they are exempted under section 41 of BO, or fall within minor works under the Building (Minor Works) Regulation;
- (e) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion should be available and detailed fire services requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans. ‘Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings’ should be complied with for fire resisting construction of the premises; and
- (f) to refer to the ‘Guidance Note on Compliance with Planning Condition on Provision of Fire Safety Measures for Commercial Uses in Industrial Premises’ for the information on the steps required to be followed in order to comply with the approval conditions on the provision of fire service installations.”

[The Chairman thanked Ms M.L. Leung, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Irene W.S. Lai, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), Mr H.K. Li and Mr T.Y. Lau, Senior Project Co-ordination Managers of the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) and Mr Jimmy G.T. Yuen, Landscape Architect of ArchSD were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Hong Kong District**

#### **Agenda Item 5**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H6/74                      Submission for Compliance with Approval Condition (a) of Application No. A/H6/74, Proposed Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Performance and Activity Venue) in "Open Space" Zone, Government Land at Moreton Terrace, Wan Chai  
(MPC Paper No. A/H6/74)

---

13.                      The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Home Affairs Department (HAD) with Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTA), Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ) and LLA Consultancy Ltd. (LLA) as the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan                      - being the Chief Engineer (Works), HAD;

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau                      - having current business dealings with HAD, KTA and LLA;

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

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau                      - working in an organisation which had a project funded by HAD;

- Mr Roger K.H. Luk - his spouse owned a flat at Illumination Terrace, Tai Hang;
- Ms Julia M.K. Lau - having current business dealings with Environ; and
- St. John Ambulance Brigade Hong Kong Island Command Headquarters was to the near south of the site. Ms Lau was the council member of Hong Kong St. John's Ambulance.

14. As the interests of Mr Martin W.C. Kwan and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau were direct, the Committee agreed that they should leave the meeting temporarily for this item. As Mr Stephen H.B. Yau had no involvement in this application and the flat of Mr Roger K.H. Luk's spouse did not have a direct view on the site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. As the interest of Ms Julia M.K. Lau was indirect, the Committee agreed that she could also stay in the meeting. The Committee noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

15. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of ArchSD to join the meeting. The Committee noted that a building model of the proposed development was deposited in the meeting room for Members' reference. The Committee also noted that a replacement drawing AA-5 of the Paper had been tabled at the meeting.

16. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms Irene W.S. Lai, STP/HK, presented the applicant's submission as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

- (a) the Committee was to consider whether the submission made by the applicant, HAD, on the revised design of the proposed development was

acceptable for compliance with approval condition (a) of application No. A/H6/74 for the proposed place of recreation, sports or culture (performance and activity venue) (PAV);

- (b) application No. A/H6/74 was approved by the Committee on 6.2.2015. During the meeting, Members raised concerns on the design and building efficiency of the proposed PAV. In particular, Members considered that the design of G/F should be reviewed to enhance its efficiency and permeability, and the spatial arrangement of the proposed development should be optimised to allow other sports and recreational uses to maximise its utilisation by rearranging the staircases and loading/unloading (L/UL) bay, putting some plant rooms into basements, and reducing the size of some water tanks. It was also suggested that a usable covered open space could be provided to enhance connectivity with the adjacent football pitch. The applicant should also maximise the provision of vertical greening. To take into account Members' comments above, the Committee decided to impose the approval condition requiring the submission of a revised design of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) on 13.5.2015, 14.5.2015 and 28.5.2015, the applicant submitted a revised building design for compliance with approval condition (a). Major changes made as compared with the original scheme included the following:
  - (i) increasing efficiency of the site by relocation of some plant rooms to the basement;
  - (ii) maximising utilisation of the proposed development by provision of a covered open space on G/F with an opening to the adjoining football pitch which could be combined with the multi-purpose function room on G/F forming larger space, replacement of solid wall at the loading/unloading (L/UL) bay at G/F by a row of bollards to enable the use of the L/UL bay as an extension to the covered

- open space, provision of additional loose facilities such as benches on different floors, as well as the increase in circulation space in the proposed community garden cum roof garden by reducing the number of planting pots;
- (iii) enhancing the permeability of the proposed development by the provision of a covered open space allowing cross-ventilation, and replacement of the solid wall by a row of bollards; and
  - (iv) provision of more vertical greening (e.g. planters for cascading climbers) at the south-western façade (facing Moreton Terrace) and north-eastern façade (facing the adjacent football pitch) of the proposed development;
- (d) compared with the original scheme, the total floor area of public facilities had increased from 1,088.6m<sup>2</sup> to 1,186.31m<sup>2</sup> (+97.71m<sup>2</sup> or + 8.98%), with G/F alone amounting to an increase of 57.15% (from 189.7m<sup>2</sup> to 298.109m<sup>2</sup>). The supporting plant rooms had also increased from 633.6m<sup>2</sup> to 712.2m<sup>2</sup> (+12.4%) mainly due to an additional rainwater recycling pump room on B/F, and additional circulation area after relocation of plant rooms to B/F;
- (e) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 5 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the applicant’s submission; and
- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered the applicant’s current scheme acceptable for compliance with approval condition (a) based on the assessments made in paragraph 6 of the Paper. The applicant had reviewed the design of the proposed development, in particular the G/F layout by relocating plant rooms to basement to free up space on G/F to enhance the building efficiency. After the reshuffling of uses, there was a net gain of about 100m<sup>2</sup> floor area for public use. A covered open space was provided on G/F to improve the permeability of

the proposed PAV and its pedestrian connectivity with the adjacent football pitch and the Hong Kong Central Library. Apart from improving the building permeability, the newly added public space on G/F provided more opportunities for community use. Additional seating areas and loose facilities such as benches were provided on various floors for public use, even when no event was taking place. The external staircase could be considered as a design feature inviting public to the community garden cum roof garden. Landscaping opportunities particularly vertical greening, had been maximised. The additional vertical greening on the south-western façade allowed a better integration with the existing trees along Moreton Terrace.

17. A Member suggested shifting the management office and store at G/F to the location near Lifts 1 and 2 so as to allow a more integrated covered open space with the multi-purpose function room. The opening of Lift 2 would also need to be adjusted accordingly. In response, Mr H.K. Li, Senior Project Co-ordination Manager of ArchSD, said that such suggestion could be considered and assessed at the detailed design stage.

[The Chairman thanked Ms Irene W.S. Lai, STP/HK, Mr H.K. Li and Mr T.Y. Lau, Senior Project Co-ordination Managers of ArchSD and Mr Jimmy G.T. Yuen, Landscape Architect of ArchSD for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

#### Deliberation Session

18. After deliberation, the Committee agreed that the applicant's current scheme was acceptable for compliance with approval condition (a) of application No. A/H6/74. The applicant should consider further refining the G/F layout during the detailed design stage. The Committee also agreed to impose an additional approval condition and an advisory clause to ensure implementation of the current scheme as follows :

Approval Condition

“(a1) the implementation of the revised design to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board (TPB).”

Advisory Clause

“the applicant is reminded to take note of the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape that to minimise the impact on existing trees, further revision to the pruning proposal should be included in the submission under approval condition (b), i.e. the submission and implementation of landscape proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

[Mr Jerry J. Austin, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 6**

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H11/105            Proposed Residential Institution (Hostel Expansion) in "Government, Institution or Community" Zone, St. John's College, University of Hong Kong, 82 Pok Fu Lam Road, Mid-Levels West  
(MPC Paper No. A/H11/105A)

---

19.            The Secretary reported that the applicant was St. John's College which was a hostel in the University of Hong Kong (HKU). Urbis Ltd. (Urbis) and Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ) were the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item:



- Mr Roger K.H. Luk - having a close relationship with the Master of St. John's College
- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok - being an employee of HKU
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having current business dealings with HKU, Urbis and Environ
- Ms Julia M.K. Lau - having current business dealings with Environ
- Mr Laurence L.J. Li - co-owning with his spouse a flat on Smithfield Road and two flats on To Li Terrace, Kennedy Town

20. As the interest of Mr Roger K.H. Luk was direct, the Committee agreed that he should leave the meeting temporarily for this item. As Ms Julia M.K. Lau had no involvement in this application and the flats of Mr Laurence L.J. Li and his spouse did not have direct views on the site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. The Committee noted that Dr Wilton W.T. Fok and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

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

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

21. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Jerry J. Austin, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed residential institution (hostel expansion);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. The Secretary for Education (SED) advised that

policy support was given to the planning application as the proposed hostel expansion would meet the shortage of hostel places, provided that the hostels and the supporting facilities would solely be used by HKU's students and counted towards HKU's hostel inventory. Other concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application; and

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, 27 comments were received. One commenter supported the proposal with no reasons provided, while 15 objected to (including the Incorporated Owners of Fulham Garden) and 11 provided comments on the application. The objecting comments were mainly on grounds of short publication period, development intensity, visual, noise, air ventilation, traffic, pedestrian safety, slope and structural safety, tree and natural environment, property value of Fulham Garden nearby, use of a government, institution or community site for development and setting of undesirable precedent;
- (e) the District Officer (Central & Western) advised that the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) had convened a special meeting on 18.3.2015 to discuss the proposal. During the meeting, members as well as the resident representative of the nearby building raised concern on the development intensity of the area, slope safety and the adverse traffic and visual impact associated with the proposal; and
- (f) 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. The proposed student hostel expansion was required to meet the residential needs of HKU's students and hence was in line with the planning intention of "Government, Institution or Community" zone. As advised by SED, the proposed hostel expansion would help alleviate the shortfall in publicly-funded hostel places. SED provided his policy support to this application. While the public comments raised concerns on the slope and structural safety of the proposed development in relation to Fulham Garden and the adverse impact generated in terms of traffic,

pedestrian safety, landscape, visual, air ventilation, noise, tree felling and the natural environment, the concerned departments indicated that these issues had been appropriately addressed and they had no in-principle objection to the application. Regarding the public's concern on the publication period of the subject application, relevant provisions under the Town Planning Ordinance and the Town Planning Board Guidelines had been followed. It was also noted that the applicant had responded to C&WDC's concerns at the special meeting held on 18.3.2015.

22. In response to a Member's question, Mr Jerry J. Austin, STP/HK, said that the proposed access road to the new hostel building would mainly serve as an emergency vehicular access (EVA) for firefighting purpose. The Chairman supplemented that construction of such EVA was to comply with the requirements of the Buildings Ordinance.

23. In response to a Member's question, Mr Austin said that there was already one existing loading/unloading (L/UL) bay near Pok Fu Lam Road which would be retained to serve the hostels. Mr W.L. Tang, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), Transport Department, said that an additional L/UL bay would be required to serve the proposed new hostel since the existing L/UL bay was relatively far away from the proposed hostel and would be inadequate to serve the additional 553 rooms. In response, Mr Austin said that there might be available space along the proposed access road to provide a L/UL bay and an additional approval condition could be imposed on the provision of the L/UL bay to TD's satisfaction.

#### Deliberation Session

24. The Committee agreed to impose an additional approval condition requiring the applicant to provide L/UL facilities to serve the proposed new hostel to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport.

25. 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 5.6.2019, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the

permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission of a revised Drainage Impact Assessment and implementation measures to be carried out, if any, to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (c) the implementation of the recommendations of the SIA, if any, to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of a Water Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB;
- (e) the submission of a revised Geotechnical Planning Review Report to the satisfaction of the Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department or of the TPB;
- (f) the submission and implementation of a Landscape Master Plan including a tree preservation proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (g) the provision of loading/unloading facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (h) 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.”

26. 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 fulfill the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines and the relevant requirements under the lease,

and that the proposed bonus plot ratio and/or gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development will be approved/ granted by the Building Authority (BA). The Applicant should approach the Buildings Department (BD) and the Lands Department (LandsD) direct to obtain the necessary approval. If the building design elements, bonus plot ratio and/or GFA concession are not approved/granted by the BA and the Lands Authority and major changes to the current scheme are required, a fresh planning application to the TPB may be required;

- (b) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South, LandsD that the relevant bureau should be consulted on whether the proposed scale and extent of the new development, and the non-domestic elements such as chapel and kitchen extension proposed are compatible to the nature of the subject land grant and acceptable from policy angle and with reference to the permitted user of “a university hostel”. In view of the proposed development, a lease modification will be required to implement the proposal and an application for additional government land may be required. However, the Applicant should be reminded that there is no guarantee that the application shall be approved; and if approved, may be subject to such terms and conditions as the Director of Lands may see fit;
- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department that the applicant should be advised to explore ways to further break down the perceived mass of the proposed tower, especially along the longest western and eastern façade;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Architect/Advisory & Statutory Compliance, Architectural Services Department that the proposed hostel building appears to be over 60m in length. The Applicant should consider adopting a sustainable building design under PNAP APP152 to further reduce the possible visual impact and enhance air permeability of the proposed development at the detail design stage;

- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, BD that the sustainable building design requirements on building separation, building setback and site coverage of greenery should be included, where possible, as conditions to the planning approvals. For the structural safety of Fulham Garden in the vicinity, pursuant to the Buildings Ordinance (BO) (Cap. 123), any person who intends to carry out building works, e.g. new building works or alternations and additions works, within a private lot, he/she is required to appoint an Authorized Person and, where necessary a Registered Structural Engineer/ Registered Geotechnical Engineer to prepare relevant plans for submission to the BD for approval. Consent shall be obtained from the BD prior to the carrying out of the building works and a Registered Contractor shall be appointed to carry out the approved works. For lighting and ventilation, the design and construction of the building development should comply with the BO and subsidiary regulations on lighting and ventilation. In particular, Buildings (Planning) Regulation (B(P)R) 37 stipulates that no building shall be erected in such a manner as to reduce the quantity of light and air available to any other building, which has been erected in accordance with these regulations, below that required under these regulations. For the safety of pedestrians during the construction period, prior to and during the carrying out of the works for the building development, adequate precautionary and other protective measure should be provided for the protection of workers, occupiers and passers-by and the stability of any adjoining or other building, land and street. Application for a hoarding permit is necessary if a hoarding is to be erected under the B(P)Rs;
  
- (f) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that the applicant is advised to observe the requirements of emergency vehicular access as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Building 2011 which is administered by BD;
  
- (g) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection that the scale of the project is similar to a tertiary teaching institute such that standard noise control measures would suffice. The Applicant shall

implement the standard noise pollution control measures during construction. Short term noise impact from construction is also controlled under Noise Control Ordinance Cap.400 (NCO). Regarding noise generated from the students in hostel, it is also controlled under NCO. Such noise can be dealt with effectively by the management of the student hostel through administrative measures;

- (h) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Development (2), Water Supplies Department (WSD) that there is a no-blasting limit for the WSD Conduit Tunnel which falls partly within the proposed site. No blasting is permitted within the limit. The project proponent is required to conduct a water impact assessment (WIA) according to WSD's Departmental Instruction No. DI1038 and make a submission in due course which should include WSD's comments for consideration which are attached at Appendix II of the Paper. The project proponent is required to comply with the "Conditions of Working in the Vicinity of Waterworks Installations" and make sure that the maximum particle velocity and vibration amplitude caused by the proposed works at the conduit shall be 13mm/sec and 0.1mm respectively; and
  
- (i) to note the comments of the Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department that should this planning application be approved, the relevant plans for the proposed development would need to be submitted to the BD for approval. The Applicant will be required to assess the effects of the works on the stability of the slopes/retaining walls. If found necessary, the Applicant will be required to propose and carry out appropriate slope upgrading works as part of the development to the satisfaction of the BA. It is noted from the Geotechnical Planning Review Report that a natural terrain hazard assessment will be carried out to the natural slope in the south-eastern part of the site area and works will be proposed at the Geotechnical Assessment Report submission stage."

[The Chairman thanked Mr Jerry J. Austin, STP/HK for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Roger K.H. Luk returned to join the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 7**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H14/80                      Proposed Upgrading of Existing Access Road for Residential Development in "Green Belt" Zone, Government Land adjoining 46 Stubbs Road, The Peak  
(MPC Paper No. A/H14/80B)

---

27.            The Secretary reported that Rider Levett Bucknall Development Consultants Ltd. (Rider) was the consultant of the applicant. Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Ms Julia M.K. Lau had declared interests in this item as they had current business dealings with Rider. As the applicant had requested for a deferment of consideration of the application, and Mr Lau and Ms Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. The Committee noted that Mr Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

28.            The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 28.5.2015 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow more time to improve the scheme due to geotechnical constraints. This was the applicant's third request for deferment.

29.            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. Since this was the third deferment of the



application, the Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that a total of six months including the previous deferments were allowed for preparation of submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Mr Tom C.K. Yip, District Planning Officer/ Kowloon (DPO/K) and Mr K.W. Ng, Senior Town Planner/Housing & Office Land Supply (STP/HOLS), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 8**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Kwun Tong (North) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K14N/13

(MPC Paper No. 6/15)

---

30. The Secretary reported that one of the proposed amendments to the Kwun Tong (North) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) was for a proposed Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) development by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests in this item:

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

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan as the Chief Engineer (Works) of Home Affairs Department	- being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA
---	--

- Ms Julia M.K. Lau - being a member of the Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA
- Professor P.P. Ho - being a member of the Building Committee of HKHA
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having current business dealings with HKHA
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with HKHA
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his wife being an employee of HD

31. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (TPB), as the proposed HOS development was the subject of an amendment to the OZP proposed by the Planning Department, the Committee agreed that the interests of the Chairman, Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Ms Julia M.K. Lau, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon on this item only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting. The Committee noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Professor P.P. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

32. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. K. W. Ng, STP/HOLS, presented the proposed amendments to the approved Kwun Tong (North) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K14N/13 as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

#### Background

- (a) the Kwun Tong (North) OZP covered uphill Kwun Tong north, development at Anderson Road (DAR) under construction and Anderson Road Quarry (ARQ) development under planning. Quarrying operation at ARQ would cease with rehabilitation contract to be completed in 2016. A site of about 86 ha would be handed back to the Government including

platforms of a total area of about 40 ha. The 'Planning Study on Future Land Use at Anderson Road Quarry – Feasibility Study' (Planning Study) was commissioned by the Planning Department (PlanD) and completed in early 2014. A Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP) with a planned population of 25,000 and a housing supply of 9,410 flats for the ARQ site was prepared. Based on the RODP, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) subsequently commissioned further feasibility studies, with the environmental impact assessment (EIA) on the RODP approved under EIA Ordinance in July 2014. The proposed OZP amendments were to take forward the land use proposals of the RODP;

#### Planning and Urban Design Concepts for ARQ Site

- (b) the proposed development at ARQ site generally included the following four key land use proposals :
  - (i) Quarry Park – the park (about 17.5 ha) comprising a platform portion and a rock face portion would become a green focus. A quarry museum in rock cavern(s) might be included;
  - (ii) Residential Communities – two residential communities would be developed in north and south. A stepped building height (BH) profile was adopted mainly to respect the Tai Sheung Tok ridgeline and the proposed Quarry Park as well as preserve existing view corridors;
  - (iii) Civic Core – it would become the community focus for residents. It would mainly include commercial and government facilities with open spaces and plazas. The low-rise setting was mainly intended to preserve the existing view corridors; and
  - (iv) Rock Face – lookouts/viewing decks would be provided at different levels. Hiking trail network would also be provided to link up the lookouts/viewing decks with possible connection(s) with the Wilson

Trail Stage 3. Commercial facilities would be provided in caverns;

The Proposed Amendments to the OZP

*Amendment Item A – Rezoning the ARQ site from “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotating “Mining and Quarrying” to “Commercial (1)” (“C(1)”), “C(2)”, “Residential(Group A)8” (“R(A)8”), “Residential (Group B)1” (“R(B)1”) to “R(B)4”, “Government, Institution or Community (2)” (“G/IC(2)”), “Open Space” (“O”), “OU” annotated “Commercial Development and Vertical Transport Facility”, “OU” annotated “Landscaped Elevated Walkway”, “OU” annotated “Service Reservoir”, “OU” annotated “Pumping Station”, “Green Belt” (“GB”) and areas shown as ‘Road’*

- (c) the ARQ site would be mainly for residential developments with supporting commercial and government, institution and community (GIC) facilities, and public open spaces in accordance with the RODP;
- (d) Commercial Zones – three sites were proposed to be rezoned to “C(1)” and “C(2)” for commercial developments to serve the local/district residents and visitors to the area. Two “C(1)” sites subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 2.2 and a maximum BH of 200mPD and 205mPD respectively were proposed in the Civic Core. One “C(2)” site subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 500m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum BH of 205mPD was proposed in the Northern Community;
- (e) Residential Zones – one site in ARQ was proposed to be rezoned to “R(A)8” for high-density HOS development providing about 1,880 units for accommodating 5,000 population. The “R(A)8” site would be subject to a maximum PR of 6.3 for domestic building and 6.5 for partly domestic and partly non-domestic building, as well as a maximum BH of 290mPD. Besides, 10 sites were proposed to be rezoned to “R(B)1” to “R(B)4” for medium-density private housing developments providing about 7,530 units accommodating 20,000 population. These zones would be subject to maximum PRs from 3.5 to 5.5 and maximum BHs from 225mPD to

280mPD. High-rise residential blocks (255 to 290mPD) were proposed close to the rock face. BH would step down towards Jordan Valley with medium-rise blocks (225 to 250mPD) fronting the Quarry Park. In the Northern Community, residential blocks on both sides of the green pedestrian corridor were also proposed to be medium rise so as to create a human-scale environment along the corridor;

- (f) “G/IC(2)” Zones – six sites were proposed to be rezoned to “G/IC(2)”, with three of them in the Southern Community, two in the Northern Community and one in the Civic Core. BH restrictions in mPD or number of storeys were imposed to the six “G/IC(2)” sites;
- (g) “O” Zone - four sites in the Quarry Park, the Northern Community and the Southern Community were proposed to be rezoned to “O”;
- (h) one site of about 3.69 ha was proposed to be rezoned to “OU” annotated “Commercial Development and Vertical Transport Facility” for commercial development mainly within caverns with public viewing deck at 310mPD and lookout at 250mPD and provision of vertical transport facility. The lower portion of the site would be connected with the Civic Core via a landscaped elevated walkway, and the upper portion connected with a viewing deck at about 310mPD on the rock face. To further enhance the public accessibility to the proposed commercial developments and public viewing deck, a vertical transport facility such as a funicular and an inclined lift was also proposed. To allow more flexibility for future development at the site, no development restriction was imposed for this zone. Any development at the site would require planning approval from the TPB;
- (i) two sites across Road F and Road G respectively were proposed to be rezoned to “OU” annotated “Landscaped Elevated Walkway”. The former site linked up central and southern portions of the Quarry Park while the latter site would connect the platform in Civic Core with the commercial facilities at “OU” annotated “Commercial Development and

Vertical Transport Facility” site which was mainly on the rock face;

- (j) two sites were proposed to be rezoned to “OU” zones which were reserved for the use of service reservoir and a fresh and salt water pumping station. These sites would be subject to maximum BHs of 2 and 3 storeys respectively;
- (k) “GB” zone – efforts had been made to restore the rock face with approximately 14,000 trees planted at the landscape berms. It was proposed to rezone a large part of the rock face in ARQ to “GB” to continue facilitating the conservation of the existing natural environment. A hiking trail network would be provided to link up lookouts at different levels on the rock face with possible connection(s) with the Wilson Trail Stage 3;

*Amendment Items B to E*

- (l) a number of sites beyond the existing “OU” annotated “Mining and Quarrying” zone were also proposed to be rezoned to reflect other land use proposals of the RODP prepared under the Planning Study. They included the rezoning of a “GB” site in southeast at Po Lam Road to an area shown as ‘Road’ (Amendment Item B); the rezoning of a strip of undeveloped “O” site along Anderson Road in southeast to an area shown as ‘Road’ (Amendment Item C); rezoning of two strips of land along Road C from “OU” annotated “Amenity Area” to areas shown as ‘Road’ (Amendment Item D); and rezoning of Road D from areas shown as ‘Road’ to “OU” annotated “Amenity Area” based on the latest layout of DAR (Amendment Item E);
- (m) as advised by the Transport Department (TD) after the issue of the Paper, part of the amendment Item E (with an area of about 520m<sup>2</sup>) would be public road and should be excluded from the amendment site. The revised boundary of amendment item E would be reflected on the draft OZP for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the

Ordinance);

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

- (n) the proposed amendments to the Notes of the OZP included the incorporation of a new set of Notes in relation to the newly proposed subzones (i.e. “C(1)”, “C(2)”, “R(A)8”, “R(B)1 to “R(B)4” and “G/IC(2)”) and stipulation of PR, GFA and BH restrictions, deletion of the Notes for “OU” annotated “Mining and Quarrying” zone, incorporation of a new set of Notes for the new “OU” zones annotated “Commercial Development and Vertical Transport Facility”, “Landscaped Elevated Walkway”, “Service Reservoir” and “Pumping Station” zones, and other technical amendments to the Notes for various zones;
- (o) the ES of the OZP had been revised to take into account the proposed amendments. Opportunity had also been taken to update the general information for various land use zones to reflect the latest status and planning circumstances of the OZP;

Technical Considerations

- (p) traffic impact assessments concluded that with the implementation of four road/junction improvement measures outside the Planning Area, there should be sufficient road capacity to handle the cumulative traffic to be generated by DAR and the proposed development at ARQ site. More extensive pedestrian connection facilities, including escalators and footbridges with lift towers, would be provided to enhance pedestrian routes among ARQ development, DAR, downhill estates, MTR Kwun Tong Station and a proposed bus-bus interchange near the toll plaza of Tsueng Kwan O Tunnel;
- (q) the environmental acceptability of the proposed development at ARQ under the RODP had already been confirmed by the approval of its EIA under EIA Ordinance in July 2014;

- (r) a visual impact assessment had been conducted. Photomontages showed that the proposed developments at ARQ were generally compatible with the surroundings. Views to Tai Sheung Tok ridgeline could still be protected;
- (s) an air ventilation assessment by wind tunnel test had been conducted. The overall annual and summer air ventilation performance within ARQ and the adjacent developments were unlikely to be problematic;
- (t) the proposed development at ARQ would not have adverse impact on community facilities and open space provision within the Planning Area;

#### Consultations

- (u) all concerned bureaux/departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed amendments to the OZP; and
- (v) the proposed OZP amendments were to take forward the land use proposals of the RODP prepared under the Planning Study. The Planning Study included two stages of Community Engagement in which different stakeholders (including TPB) had been consulted. The RODP was reported back to Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) and Sai Kung District Council (SKDC) in March 2013. Both of them had no in-principle objection to the proposed development. KTDC and SKDC would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition period of the draft OZP under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO).

33. Mr W.L. Tang, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), TD, asked whether any cycle track or cycle parking facilities were proposed in the ARQ development. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, said that a cycle track network along the road network had been proposed in the Planning Study. Cycle parking facilities would also be provided at the Civic Core. However, the alignment of the cycle track was subject to further study at the detailed design stage.

34. A Member welcomed the provision of a comprehensive cycle track network



within the AQR development and asked whether the alignment of the cycle track would be shown on the OZP. In response, the Chairman said that cycle track was always permitted in all zones as stated in the covering Notes of the OZP, and its alignment was normally not shown on the OZP. The Member further said that in the detailed design stage of the cycle track, in particular when it was to be integrated with the public open space, consideration should be given to the management requirements of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department.

35. In response to a Member's question, Mr Yip said that a public transport interchange at a "G/IC" site would be provided at the Northern Community and some bus and minibus roadside lay-bys would also be provided at the southwestern part of the ARQ development adjoining the DAR. Major access roads to the ARQ development would be via the proposed road connecting to DAR to the west and the proposed tunnel connecting to Po Lam Road to the east.

36. In response to the Chairman's question on the pedestrian connection from the ARQ development to the developments and facilities downhill, Mr Yip said that CEDD had planned to construct a number of pedestrian facilities such as lift towers and escalators to form a pedestrian network connecting the ARQ development with other parts of Kwun Tong. The ARQ development would also be connected to the bus-to-bus interchange near the toll plaza of Tseung Kwan O Tunnel by the proposed pedestrian facilities via Po Tat Estate.

37. In response to a Member's question, Mr Yip said that the "OU" annotated "Commercial Development and Vertical Transport Facility" zone was intended primarily for commercial development inside caverns with public viewing deck on different platforms and provision of vertical transport facility. The sites within this zone would not be suitable for residential development since there were very steep slopes along the rock face. Given that the proposed commercial developments inside caverns and vertical transport facility were new to Hong Kong and further studies would be required to establish their technical feasibilities, no development restrictions were proposed for this zone such that more flexibility could be allowed. However, since the site was at a prominent location easily seen from other parts of Hong Kong, planning permission was required for any development in this zone so as to ensure the development would be well-integrated with the surroundings and be acceptable in visual, technical and infrastructural terms.

38. In response to the Vice-chairman's question, Mr Yip said that the planned Route 6, which provided a direct connection between Tseung Kwan O and West Kowloon, could alleviate the traffic congestion problem at Tseung Kwan O Tunnel and the associated roads. It could free up some capacity of these roads to serve the ARQ development. Route 6 would tentatively be completed in 2022 which was around the target completion time of the first phase of ARQ development.

39. The Committee agreed that the boundary of amendment item E should be revised as per TD's request and the revised boundary should be reflected on the draft OZP for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance.

40. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Kwun Tong (North) and that the draft Kwun Tong (North) OZP No. S/K14N/13A (to be renumbered to S/K14N/14 upon exhibition) and its Notes were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance, subject to revision of the boundary of amendment item E; and
- (b) agree that the revised ES for the draft Kwun Tong (North) OZP No. S/K14N/13A (to be renumbered to S/K14N/14 upon exhibition) was as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP, and was suitable for exhibition together with the OZP and its Notes.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K and Mr K.W. Ng, STP/HOLS, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

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

**Agenda Item 9**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K15/115            Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Institutional Use for a  
Period of 5 Years in "Village Type Development" Zone, Hoi Bun School,  
45 Hoi Pong Road Central, Lei Yue Mun, Kwun Tong  
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/115)

---

41.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Home Affairs Department (HAD). The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - being the Chief Engineer (Works), HAD

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

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau - working in an organisation which had a project funded by HAD

42.            As the interests of Mr Martin W.C. Kwan and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau were direct, the Committee agreed that they should leave the meeting temporarily for this item. As Mr Stephen H.B. Yau had no involvement in this application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

43.            With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms Joyce Y.S. So, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

(a) background to the application;

(b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary institutional use under previous application No. A/K15/97 for a period of five years;

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two supportive public comments were received. One comment was submitted by Mr Lau Ting On, a member of Kwun Tong District Council without giving reasons. Another comment was submitted by an individual who suggested the Government to improve the pedestrian environment and streetscape of the area to speed up its transformation; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a further period of five years based on the assessments made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The renewal application generally complied with the relevant assessment criteria in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Renewal of Planning Approval and Extension of Time for Compliance with Planning Conditions for Temporary Use or Development (TPB PG-No. 34B).

44. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

45. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years from 12.6.2015 to 11.6.2020, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission and implementation of fire service installations proposal in the application site within 6 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 12.12.2015; and
- (b) if the above planning condition 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.”

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

“to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Development (2), Water Supplies Department that existing fresh water mains will be affected by the proposed development and the project proponent shall bear all cost associated with the necessary diversion, connection, protection, extension and capping off of the existing water mains.”

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

**Agenda Item 10**

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

47. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 10:40 a.m..