

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 551st Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 5.2.2016**

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 H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

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

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

Assistant Director (R1), Lands Department
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Professor P.P. Ho

Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan

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 Dennis C.C. Tsang

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 550th MPC Meeting held on 22.1.2016

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 550th MPC meeting held on 22.1.2016 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Hong Kong District

[Mr Derek P.K. Tse, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan
No. S/H1/19

(MPC Paper No.1/16)

3. The Secretary reported that one of the proposed amendments to the Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) was for a proposed public rental housing (PRH) 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 the item:

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

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

Professor P.P. Ho - being a member of the BC of HKHA

Ms Julia M.K. Lau - being a member of the Commercial Properties Committee

and Tender Committee of HKHA

- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with HKHA
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with HKHA
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work
- Mr Laurence L.J. Li - co-owning with his spouse a flat in Smithfield Road and two flats at To Li Terrace, Kennedy Town

4. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the proposed PRH development was the subject of amendments to the OZP proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of Mr Ling, Mr Kwan, Professor Ho, Ms Lau, Mr Lam, Mr Lau and Dr Poon on the item only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting. The Committee noted that Professor Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Ms Lau and Mr Li had not yet arrived at the meeting.

5. The Secretary also reported that the Central and Western Branch of the Democratic Alliance for Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong had submitted a petition letter immediately before the meeting, providing views on the proposed amendments to the OZP, including the objection against the proposed high density development in the Kennedy Town area. Members noted that most of the views had been covered in the Paper. The petition letter was tabled at the meeting for Members' information.

Presentation and Question Sessions

6. Before presenting the background to the proposed amendments to the OZP, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, STP/HK, said that on 3.2.2016, the Chairman of the Central and Western District Council (C&W DC) submitted a letter to the Secretary for Development (SDEV) which was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference. It was mentioned in the letter that in the C&W DC meeting on 21.1.2016, the District Councillors and local residents were

against the proposed high density development and expressed their concerns on the traffic, environmental, landscape, and visual impacts, and the insufficient provision of community facilities. They requested to defer the submission of the proposed amendments to the draft OZP for consideration by the Board. Copies of the draft Minutes of the C&W DC meeting on 21.1.2016 were circulated at the meeting for Members' reference. On 28.1.2016, SDEV responded to the DC's concerns and explained that the proposed amendments to the OZP would be considered by the Board on 5.2.2016. SDEV's reply was at Attachment VII of the Paper. Besides, e-mails to the Chief Executive from the Concern Group for Protecting Kennedy Town and three members of the public were referred to PlanD for follow-up action on 2.2.2016. Concerns expressed in the e-mails were similar to those raised in the DC meeting on 21.1.2016.

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tse presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

Background

- (a) taking account of the commissioning of the MTR West Island Line in 2014 and the release of the Ex-Kennedy Town Incinerator, Ex-Abattoir sites, Ex-Mount Davis Cottage Area, the Ex-Police Married Officers Quarters and the Ex-Temporary School Site for the Hong Kong Academy to meet various community needs, PlanD had undertaken a comprehensive Land Use Review (the LUR) on the Western Part of Kennedy Town;
- (b) the study area of the LUR, covering about 14 ha of land area, was bounded by Victoria Harbour in the north, Cadogan Street and Ka Wai Man Road in the east, foothills of Mount Davis in the south and the Island West Refuse Transfer Station in the west;
- (c) extensive public consultation activities were carried out between 2013 and 2015 and the land use proposals had been refined to address public concerns. Taking into account the views of different stakeholders, the latest housing land supply target and different community and social facilities required by government departments, the Recommended Land Use Proposal was finalised. The LUR formed the basis for the proposed

amendments to the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis OZP No. S/H1/19.

The Proposed Amendments to Matters shown on the OZP

(d) the proposed amendments to the OZP were as follows :-

Items A1 to A3 – Rezoning for waterfront park and open space

- (i) Item A1 - to rezone a site (about 1.66 ha) fronting the harbour and west of Cadogan Street from “Undetermined” (“U”) into “Open Space(1)” (“O(1)”) to enhance the harbourfront environment and provide new open spaces;
- (ii) Item A2 – to rezone a site (about 0.08 ha) at the existing Kennedy Town Bus Terminus and part of the Kennedy Town Bus Terminus Sitting-out Area from “U” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “O” to enhance the visual and air permeability and to improve the living environment as well as protect two existing old and valuable trees;
- (iii) Item A3 – to rezone a site (about 0.57 ha) in the western end of Sai Ning Street from “U” to “O” for active recreational purpose;

Item B – Rezoning for commercial, leisure and tourism related uses at the waterfront

- (iv) to rezone a site (about 1.35 ha) at the China Merchants Group’s godowns and wharf together with its pier at Sai Ning Street from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pier” (“OU(Pier)”) and “Industrial” (“I”) to “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses” with restrictions on gross floor area (GFA), building height (BH) and width of promenade to make better use of the pier for marine access and the waterfront setting while promoting vibrancy and diversity to the harbourfront;

Items C1 to C4 – Rezoning for residential developments

- (v) Item C1 – to rezone a site (about 2.88 ha) south of Victoria Road from “U”, “OU(Petrol Filling Station)” (“OU(PFS)”), “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”), “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Residential (Group A)5” (“R(A)5”) for proposed public housing with a maximum GFA of 120,000m² (equivalent to plot ratio (PR) 6), maximum BH of 140mPD in the east to 65mPD in the west and to 100mPD and 70mPD to the north, for provision of about 2,340 housing units with 25 public light goods vehicle parking spaces;
- (vi) Item C2 – to rezone a site (about 0.91 ha) at the junction of Victoria Road and Cadogan Street from “U” and “O” to “R(A)6” for proposed private housing with a maximum GFA of 59,150m² (equivalent to PR 6.5), maximum BH of 120mPD and 40mPD for the eastern and western portions respectively, and maximum GFA of 7,000m² for public transport terminus at the ground floor;
- (vii) Item C3 – to rezone a site (about 0.23 ha) bounded by Sai Ning Street to the north and east, and Victoria Road to the south from “U” to “R(A)” for proposed private housing with a maximum BH of 70mPD and maximum PR subject to the Building (Planning) Regulations;
- (viii) Item C4 – to rezone a site (about 0.05 ha) between Kwong Ga Factory Building and Huncliff Court from “U” to “R(A)” for a proposed private housing with a maximum BH of 100mPD;

Items D1, D2 and E – Rezoning for government, institutional or community facilities

- (ix) Item D1 – to rezone a site (about 0.62 ha) at the junction of Sai Ning Street and Victoria Road from “U” to “G/IC” to facilitate the development of a primary school;
- (x) Item D2 – to rezone a site (about 0.09 ha) at the western end of the Kennedy Town Temporary Recreation Ground and to the east of the Island West Refuse Transfer Station from “U” and “OU(Uses Related to

Underground Refuse Transfer Station)” to “G/IC” for a proposed salt water pumping station;

- (xi) Item E – to rezone a site (about 0.85 ha) west of Victoria Road from “Residential (Group C)3” (“R(C)3”) and “GB” to “OU(Public Mortuary)” and “GB(2)” for reprovisioning of the Victoria Public Mortuary (VPM). The eastern portion of the site (0.56 ha) was an existing cavern (in a form of tunnel) zoned “GB” and the entrance to the cavern was located at the current “R(C)3” site, i.e. the western portion (0.29ha). The PR and BH of the proposed VPM building at the “R(C)3” portion were about 3.25 and 60mPD respectively;

Item F (part) – Rezoning for road and junction improvements

- (xii) Item F (part) – to rezone portions of the “U”, “O”, “OU(PFS)” and “G/IC” zones to areas shown as ‘Road’ mainly to reflect the proposed road works and traffic improvement measures as identified necessary in the Traffic Impact Assessment for the western part of Kennedy Town;

Items A4, F(part), G, H, J, K, L and M - Other Miscellaneous Amendments

- (xiii) Item A4 – to rezone an area (about 0.01 ha) within the public open space adjoining The Sail at Victoria from “OU(Uses Related to Underground Refuse Transfer Station)” to “O”;
- (xiv) Item F (part) – to rezone five strips of land (about 0.74 ha) along Cadogan Street, Victoria Road, Sai Ning Street and Ka Wai Man Road from “U”, “O”, “OU(PFS)” and “G/IC” to areas shown as ‘Road’;
- (xv) Item G – to excise two areas of sea fronting the waterfront (about 0.1 ha) in the western part of Kennedy Town from the planning scheme area;
- (xvi) Item H – the incorporation of an existing pier at the junction of the New Praya, Kennedy Town and Davis Street (about 0.004 ha) into the planning scheme area, and zoning of the pier to “OU(Pier)”;

- (xvii) Item J – to rezone four portions of land (about 1.84 ha) to the south of Victoria Road and at the foothills of Mount Davis from “U” to “GB”;
- (xviii) Item K – to rezone an area to the further south-west of Ka Wai Man Road (about 0.02 ha) from “U” to “OU(MTR Ventilation Building)”;
- (xix) Item L – to rezone an area located to the west of Kennedy Town Temporary Recreation Ground and to the western end of Sai Ning Street (about 0.02 ha) from “U” to “OU(Uses Related to Underground Refuse Transfer Station)”;
- (xx) Item M – to rezone an area to the south of the Island West Refuse Transfer Station (IWRTS) and Victoria Road (about 0.33 ha) from “U” to “GB(1)”.

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

- (e) the major proposed amendments to the Notes and ES were as follows :-
 - (i) to delete the provision of the “U” zone in the covering Notes and the Notes for the “I” zone;
 - (ii) to update the Notes of the “R(A)” zone to include specific uses for sub-zones “R(A)5” and “R(A)6”, remarks for sub-zone “R(A)5” and “R(A)6” with respective GFA and BH restrictions and corresponding amendments to the exemption clause on maximum GFA for the sub-zones “R(A)5” and “R(A)6”;
 - (iii) to add the GFA exemption clause in the remarks for “R(A)” zone for facilities as required by the government;
 - (iv) to update the Notes of the “O” zone to include ‘Pier’ as a Column 1 use for sub-zone “O(1)” and corresponding amendment to replace ‘Pier’ under Column 2 by ‘Pier (not elsewhere specified)’ and the planning intention for sub-zone “O(1)”;

- (v) to incorporate the Notes for “OU(Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses)” and “OU(Public Mortuary)” zones;
- (vi) to revise the ES to take into account the above proposed amendments, and the latest status and planning circumstances.

Consultation

- (f) relevant government bureaux and departments consulted had no objection to or no adverse comments on the proposed amendments;
- (g) on 22.1.2016, the C&W DC was consulted on the proposed amendments. The DC objected to the proposed amendments and requested the Government not to submit the proposed amendments to the Board for consideration and to meet the locals to agree on a scheme acceptable to the DC and local residents; and
- (h) the DC would be consulted again on the proposed amendments during the exhibition period of the draft OZP.

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

Waterfront Promenade

8. In response to the enquiries from the Chairman and a Member on the connection to the waterfront promenade and the use of the proposed “O(1)” zone, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, STP/HK, said that the areas marked “1a” and “1b” in the proposed “O(1)” zone on Plan B of the Paper were originally intended to provide single-storey buildings for alfresco dining. However, after consultation with the Harbour Commission, it was considered that more flexibility should be allowed for the use of the proposed “O(1)”. On connectivity to the waterfront promenade, Mr Tse said that two sets of footbridges across Victoria Road would be provided, including one connecting a residential area at Ka Wai Man Road, and another one connecting the proposed public rental housing site through the open space at Sai Ning Street. Mr Tse further explained that the pedestrian facilities would be provided to enhance

the connectivity to the proposed waterfront promenade.

9. On the integration of the promenade with other land uses, Mr Tse said that the Victoria Public Mortuary and Salt Water Pumping Station located in the central part of the proposed promenade would be relocated, and a 12m wide pedestrian linkage along the waterfront would be required to be provided at the China Merchants godowns site to form a continuous waterfront open space in future while the Water Supplies Department had indicated that the proposed pumping station at the western end of Sai Ning Street would be set back to allow waterfront space for public enjoyment. On the eastern end, the Transport Department (TD) had indicated that there would be improvement works at two road junctions and the footpath on the western side of Cadogan Street would be widened to 7m to facilitate the pedestrian connection to the waterfront promenade. The long-term planning intention was to connect the waterfront to area further east of Cadogan Street.

Open Space

10. In response to the Chairman's enquiries on the planned public transport facilities, Mr Tse said that a private residential development with the provision of a bus terminal and a temporary car park would be provided in the existing Cadogan Street temporary garden site, which was to replace the bus terminals in Sai Ning Street and Shing Sai Road. The site at Shing Sai Road would then be released for open space development. Mr Tse said that taking into account the rezoning of the existing open space at Cadogan Street to other use, an additional 1.7 ha of open space would be provided within the planning scheme area to meet the requirements of an estimated increase of about 8,500 new population in the area.

11. In response to a Member's questions, Mr Tse said that there was a current provision of about 56 ha open space in the Central and Western District (the District) which included about 39 ha of district open space and about 17 ha of local open space. The provision was sufficient to meet the open space demand of about 250,000 population in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. There would be a total provision of about 60 ha open space in the District (including both existing and planned open space) which would be sufficient to meet the demand for an estimated 260,000 population. Within the planning scheme area, there was a current deficit of about 6 ha open space which would be compensated by the overall surplus provision of open space in the District.

Estimated population

12. In response to a Member's question on the estimated population of about 8,500 persons, Mr Tse said that the figure was derived by multiplying 3,340 flats with the assumed average number of persons per flat of 2.7 and then deducting the forecasted population by 3% in the next 10 years.

Treatment of Soil Contamination

13. In response to a Member's questions on soil contamination of the existing open space at Cadogan Street, Mr K.F. Tang, Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), Environmental Protection Department (EPD), said that there were residual contaminants from the ex-incinerator and the slaughter house at the site. The contaminants under the existing temporary park were found largely at 4 m to 9 m below ground level and would not have any immediate impact on users of the park. However, for the long-term developments, the contaminants should be treated especially if site formation works were required for development. In response to the Chairman's further enquiry, Mr Tang said that soil contamination at the site including the existing open space was part and parcel of a designated project under the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Ordinance. He said that the EIA report was completed and approved by EPD in April 2015 and the Environmental Permit (EP) was granted in June 2015. A Member asked whether priority could be given to release the waterfront portion of the site earlier during the de-contamination works. In response, Mr Tang said that it would be subject to the development programme and other technical considerations and any variations to the programme might require a new EP.

Traffic Issues

14. A Member said that one of the main concerns of C&W DC was on the increased traffic arising from the proposed amendments. In response, Mr W.L. Tang, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), TD, said that the detailed Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) of the LUR had taken into account the pedestrian flow, provision of car parking facilities, road junction capacity, public transport services etc. Improvements of road

junctions and the provision of new road diverting the increased traffic away from the critical junction were recommended in the TIA. There would be a surplus of about 15% of the junction capacity after the improvement measures had been implemented. The traffic situation in future was considered acceptable. A Member said that the road network in the area was already very busy and asked whether a park-and-ride facility would be considered. In response, Mr Tang said that there was already a planned public transport terminus near the Kennedy Town Station to cater for the future needs. Besides, the TIA had already taken into consideration all the proposed new roads, including the Central-Wanchai Bypass and other road improvement measures up to 2027.

15. In response to the Chairman's concern on the capacity of the junction of Victoria Road, Cadogan Street and Belcher's Street, Mr Tang said that a new road had been proposed to divert the through traffic from Victoria Road to reduce the burden on the said junction. Besides, sections of Victoria Road would be widened and picking up/dropping off laybys and bus bays would be provided to improve the road capacity. Pedestrian facilities including footbridges and widening of footpath would also be provided coupled with the enhancement of the capacity of the junctions by revising the traffic signalings.

16. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Tang said that there was no plan to extend any new strategic road to the Kennedy Town area at this stage and improvement measures had already been proposed to address the capacity problem of the key junctions of Victoria Road, Cadogan Street and Belcher's Street as mentioned above.

Connection to Rail Station

17. A Member opined that the traffic problem in the area could be addressed by taking advantage of the rail network as the Kennedy Town Station was already in operation. The Member considered that to improve the traffic of the area, one measure was to improve the capacity of the road junctions which had already been proposed by TD and the other was to rely more on the rail network by providing a good pedestrian connection to the rail station.

18. In response to the Chairman's question on the connectivity to the Kennedy Town Station, Mr Tse said that most of the proposed developments would be within 500 m walking distance from the Station. The connectivity to the Station could be improved by the

provision of more pedestrian facilities and widening of footpaths.

19. A Member said that should Sai Wan Estate be redeveloped, the additional population would insert pressure on road traffic, and adequate pedestrian connection to the Kennedy Town Station should be provided in future. In response, Mr Tse said that HD had no plan to redevelop Sai Wan Estate at this stage. However, should it be redeveloped, provision of pedestrian connection to Forbes Street could be considered.

20. A Member asked whether adequate pedestrian linkage connecting the proposed PRH development to the Kennedy Town Station had been considered and whether the western part of the PRH site had allowed space for future railway extension. In response, the Chairman said that the provision of pedestrian facilities could be referred to HD for consideration at the detailed design stage of the PRH development. There was currently a railway overrun underneath the western part of the PHR site.

PRH Development

21. A Member asked why the proposed BH of the PRH site was descending from 140 mPD in the east to 65 mPD in west and whether the BH in the western part of the site could be increased as the BH of the buildings on its opposite side was about 100 mPD. Noting that the PRH site was close to IWTS, another Member suggested that consideration could be given to having the residential development located in the eastern part of the site so as to provide a buffer to minimise the environmental impacts from IWTS. In response, Mr Tse said that the proposed BH at 140 mPD in the east was comparable to the maximum BH allowed for the developments in Ka Wai Man Road. On the western side, a BH of 65 mPD was to cater for a proposed complex for car parks, social welfare facilities and retail shops. The proposed complex with a BH of 65 mPD was compatible with the surrounding “GB” zone and would also serve as a buffer to IWTS which was a cavern development.

Primary School

22. In response to a Member’s question, Mr Tse said that the proposed school was to address the current deficit of a whole-day primary school in the district, as advised by the Education Bureau.

Public Mortuary

23. In response to the Chairman's question on the site selection for relocation of the public mortuary, Mr Tse said that the proposed relocation of the public mortuary was generally supported by C&W DC and members of the public. So far, there was no objection to the proposed cavern site for the mortuary.

24. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) note the findings of the recommendations of the LUR on the Western Part of Kennedy Town;
- (b) agree to the proposed amendments to the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis OZP and that the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis OZP No. S/H1/19A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/H1/20 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 7 of the Ordinance; and
- (c) adopt the revised ES at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis OZP No. S/H1/19A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP.

25. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the TPB would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before its publication under the Town Planning Ordinance. Any major revision would be submitted for the TPB's consideration.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Derek P.K. Tse, STP/HK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo, 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/HK/10 Proposed Utility Installations for Private Project (Tram Power Substations) in areas shown as 'Road',

(1) Footpath and Planter Area Underneath the Elevated Canal Road Flyover No. H110 between Pier No. 25 and No. 26 at Morrison Hill Road, Wong Nai Chung

(2) Island Planter surrounded by Irving Street and Yee Wo Street, adjacent to the Causeway Bay Tram Terminus, Causeway Bay

(MPC Paper No. A/HK/10)

26. The Secretary reported that a replacement page (page 1 of the Paper) was dispatched to Members to include the land status of Site (1).

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed utility installations for private project (tram power substations);

[The Chairman left the meeting temporarily and the Vice-chairman took up the chairmanship at this point.]

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper and highlighted as follows:
 - (i) the Secretary for Transport and Housing (STH) supported the

application from public transport policy point of view;

- (ii) the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department (CA/CMD2, ArchSD) commented that the proposed utility buildings for the proposed Morrison Hill Road (MHR) substation appeared to be bulky and the applicant should strive to minimise the overall bulk. For the proposed Causeway Road (CWR) substation, CA/CMD2, ArchSD was concerned that the removal of the planter for the proposed substation would cause adverse visual nuisance to the pedestrians and surroundings; and
 - (iii) the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services had expressed concerns that the proposed CWR substation would result in a significant loss of greenery in an eye-catching location;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four public comments were received from a Legislative Councillor, Regal Hong Kong Hotel and two members of the public. The comments were set out in paragraph 9.2 of the paper and the key concerns were summarised as follows:
- (i) essential public transport facilities should be protected when commercial development was allowed on the previously public utility site;
 - (ii) relocation need of the existing Times Square (TSQ) substation could not be ascertained as it was unclear whether a substation for tram service was required under the lease or the planning approval for the TSQ development;
 - (iii) no explanation on whether the two substations could be combined as one, relocated to a location visually less sensitive or located underground or be sunken to reduce adverse effect to the public; and;

- (iv) the height of the proposed CWR substation would have visual impact on St. Paul's Convent and the Regal Hong Kong Hotel. It would visually block any tram passing through the roundabout which was inconvenient to passengers and tourists; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. There was no requirement for a substation for the tramways in both the leases of the private lots of TSQ and in the planning permission for the TSQ development. The relocation proposed by the applicant was primarily a commercial decision. The sites fell within areas shown as 'Road' on the respective Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs). As the sites were located within or surrounded by tram track and tram-only lane areas that would not affect other road users, the proposed developments would not unduly compromise the road function of the sites. The proposed substations, which were of small scales and considered acceptable from land use point of view, would not cause significant traffic impact on the road networks in their vicinity. The concerns on visual and landscape impacts could be addressed by relevant approval conditions with appropriate landscape treatments. Regarding the adverse public comments, the above assessments were relevant.

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

MHR Substation

28. A Member said that the applicant had generally made improvements to the proposal for the MHR substation in terms of visual and landscape aspects. Another Member considered that the proposed pillar box at the MHR site could be shifted to directly underneath the flyover to minimise its visual impact. In response, Miss Lo said that the applicant had already minimised the size of the pillar box and in order to meet the Highways Department's requirement of the minimum safety distance from the flyover, there might not be any scope to further shift the pillar box underneath the flyover. The same Member

opined that the proposed height of the pillar box at the site could further be minimised and the facility could be shifted further northeast underneath the flyover with a higher headroom to minimise its visual impact.

CWR Substation

29. For the CWR substation, given the proposed site was located at a prominent location and was serving as a green buffer, a Member asked whether other alternative sites had been considered, such as the area underneath the flyover of Tsing Fung Street, which was partly used as a refuse collection point. In response, Miss Lo said that the area underneath the flyover of Tsing Fung Street did not have much space to accommodate the proposed substation and the applicant had indicated in his justifications that the locations of the substations were subject to stringent selection criteria in meeting operation needs. Any shifting of the CWR substation further east might affect the stability of power supply and hence affecting the operation of the tram service. Notwithstanding that, the Vice-chairman suggested that PlanD could convey this suggestion to with the applicant for consideration.

30. A Member considered that there should not be any technical difficulties in providing an underground substation at the CWR site, which was desirable from the visual quality and traffic safety points of view. In response, Miss Lo said that the applicant had already considered the possibility of locating the substation underground. As there were existing water pipes in the area, there would be technical problems in providing an underground substation. To minimise the visual impact, the applicant had proposed vertical greening at the CWR site.

31. The same Member said that when the TSQ site was redeveloped, arrangements should have been made for the continued supply of power to the tramways. Although there was no requirement in the leases of the TSQ site for the provision of a substation for tramways, there might still be scope for the applicant to negotiate with the owner of TSQ on the provision of a substation. The Member opined that the government had no responsibility to ensure the provision of the substations for the tramways. It was the responsibility of the applicant, as a private company, to ensure that land could be secured for the substations through commercial means. In response, Miss Lo said that in the redevelopment process of the TSQ site in the 1970s, the main focus of the discussion was on

the development potential of the site and there was no requirement in the lease or planning permission for the developer to provide a substation for the tramways within the TSQ site. The current relocation of the substation from TSQ following the change in the ownership of the tram company was a commercial decision. She further said that there were cases in which the Government was requested by the public transport operators to provide land for their operational needs. Whether relevant policy support had been obtained and public interest was involved should be taken into account. For the subject application, it was supported by the STH and the Transport Department (TD) considered that the two sites were suitable for the proposed substations from traffic point of view. Should the application be approved, the applicant would still be required to apply to the Lands Department to take forward the proposed development.

32. In response to a Member's enquiry, Miss Lo said that an area of about 95m² for the substation was shown on the Building Plans (BP) for the TSQ development which were approved in 1993 but the floor area was not included as accountable gross floor area (GFA) on the BP. According to the Notes of the OZP, the TSQ site was subject to a maximum GFA of 183,589m². PlanD had not received any proposal from the developer on the future use of the subject premises after relocation of the substation.

Deliberation Session

33. A Member suggested that the space underneath the flyover of Tsing Fung Street, as shown on the visualiser, might be able to accommodate the substation. The Tsing Fung Street site appeared to be a better location for the proposed CWR substation.

34. A Member opined that the applicant had only tried to justify that the sites were the most suitable locations for the proposed substations but failed to fully address the concerns of the Committee. The application should be rejected so that the applicant could attend the meeting and answer Members' questions at the s.17 review stage.

35. The Vice-chairman said that the proposed location of the MHR substation was considered acceptable with the applicant's further adjustments in its design but there were concerns on the proposed location of the CWR substation. In response to the Vice-chairman's enquiry, the Secretary said that decision on the previous applications at the

sites were deferred pending further information to be provided by the applicant to address the Members' concerns. The applicant subsequently withdrew the previous applications and submitted the current application. In the current application, Members had expressed concerns on the visual impacts of the substations and whether alternative sites for the CWR substation had been explored. Should the application be rejected, the applicant could apply for a review of the application under s.17 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) by which the applicant could attend the meeting and answer Members' questions. However, if the applicant decided to pursue alternative locations for the proposed substations after taking into account Members' concerns in this meeting, a fresh planning application under s.16 of the Ordinance could be submitted by the applicant, who would not be able to attend the meeting to answer Members' questions at the s.16 stage.

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok left the meeting at this point.]

36. The Vice-chairman said that the Committee could either reject the application or defer a decision on the application pending further information to be provided by the applicant to address Members' concerns. Members considered that the application should be rejected.

37. The Secretary then invited Members to go through the suggested reasons for rejection as highlighted in paragraph 11.3 of the Paper. A Member suggested to include an additional rejection reason that the applicant had failed to demonstrate that other possible locations had been exhausted for the proposed substations. Another Member expressed concerns that if the suggested reason was adopted, it would be very stringent on the part of the applicant. The Secretary suggested and the Committee agreed that the additional rejection reason could be revised to the effect that the applicant had not demonstrated that the sites were the most suitable locations given the proposed developments would cause adverse visual and landscape impacts.

38. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reasons were :

“(a) the proposed developments would generate adverse visual impact on the area;

- (b) the applicant failed to demonstrate that the sites were the most suitable locations for the substations given the proposed developments would have adverse visual and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (c) the proposed substations would result in the removal of some existing amenity plantings. The approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a degradation of the amenity of the urban area.”

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

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

[Mr H.W. Cheung left the meeting at this point. Ms Julia M.K. Lau and Mr Laurence L.J. Li arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H10/89	Proposed Minor Relaxation of Site Coverage Restriction for Permitted ‘House’ Use in “Residential (Group C)” zone and Proposed House Use in an area shown as 'Road', No. 138-138A, Pok Fu Lam Road, Pok Fu Lam (MPC Paper No. A/H10/89B)
----------	--

39. The Secretary reported that LLA Consultancy Limited (LLA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with LLA

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

40. As Mr Lam and Mr Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

41. The Secretary also reported that a replacement page (page 14 of the Paper) to amend the typo of the suggested approval condition (d) in paragraph 12.2 was tabled at the meeting for Members' information.

Presentation and Question Sessions

42. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of site coverage (SC) restriction for permitted 'House' use in "Residential (Group C)" ("R(C)") zone; and proposed 'House' use in an area shown as 'Road';
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Environmental Protection had raised concerns on air quality and noise impacts as the site was located very close to Pok Fu Lam Road. Other concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the three statutory publication periods, a total of 21 public comments were received, of which 15 objecting to, five supporting and one offering general comments on the application. The main reasons for supporting the application were that the proposed minor relaxation in SC would not result in an increase in plot ratio; it could allow the terraced design and pleasing tree plantings as well as improvement in traffic condition. The main grounds of the objections were that the old

colonial building should be renovated; the proposed relaxation was not minor; the proposed development would jut out over the pavement and have a considerable negative impact on the local scenery; the proposed provision of car parking spaces was excessive; the construction work would have adverse noise and traffic impacts on the area; and the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed minor relaxation of domestic SC restriction was to allow for design flexibility for the proposed residential development and would not result in adverse traffic, drainage and geotechnical impacts. The proposed relaxation of domestic SC restriction did not exceed the maximum permissible level (i.e. 50% for residential Zone 3 Areas in the Metro area) as agreed by the Town Planning Board on 24.3.2000. Regarding the public comment on the historical significance of the original building, it was noted that the building was not a graded historic building and was being demolished.

43. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

44. 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 5.2.2020, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of a Noise Impact Assessment report and implementation of the recommendations identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of

Environmental Protection or of the TPB;

- (c) the submission of a revised Air Quality Impact Assessment report and implementation of the recommendations identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) report to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (e) the implementation of the sewerage improvement measures identified in the SIA report to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (f) the submission and implementation of a landscape and tree preservation proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

45. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV of the Paper.

[Mr Clarence W.C. Leung left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H20/184 Proposed Wholesale Conversion of an Existing Building for Office, Eating Place, Shop and Services Use in “Industrial” zone, 8 Fung Yip Street, Chai Wan, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H20/184)

46. The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA), LLA Consultancy Limited (LLA) and Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Limited (Environ) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item :

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

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

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

47. As Ms Lau, Mr Lam and Mr Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

48. The Committee noted that the applicant on 21.1.2016 requested for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. This was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

49. 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.

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

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H24/24 Proposed Eating Place in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pier and Associated Facilities” zone, Portion of public viewing area and public shared area adjacent to Watermark on public viewing deck level (2/F) of Central Pier No. 7 at Central Star Ferry Terminal, Central, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H24/24)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed eating place;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper which were summarised as follows:
 - (i) the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services did not support the application as the proposed development would reduce the area of the existing public viewing space at Central Pier No. 7;
 - (ii) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (PlanD) did not support the application as the proposed conversion of the public viewing deck to private use would affect the public access to the deck for the views of the harbour. On the landscape aspect, the proposed options would require a reduction of the public viewing area without providing the design of the upgrading works while the proposed upgrading works were outside the application site boundary and thus its implementation could not be ensured;
 - (iii) the Lands Unit of the Development Bureau (DevB) commented that there was no evidence from the application on whether the applicant

had taken any measures to help members of the public better enjoy the public open space;

- (iv) the Harbour Unit of DevB commented that the proposed scheme had not provided sufficient information on the detailed design of the enhancement works, provision of seating, landscaping and lighting, etc.; and
 - (v) the Harbourfront Commission commented that the proposed development would result in a net nominal loss in the public area for corridor, washroom and viewing deck;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a total of 25 public comments, including 23 objecting and 2 supporting comments, from a District Councillor, Designing Hong Kong Limited, the Central and Western Concern Group and members of the public were received. The main reasons for supporting the application were that the proposal would provide a better use of space in the pier, offer improved dining experiences and upgrade the public viewing deck; it would provide a more vibrant use of space in the pier; and the proposal would contribute towards the non-fare box revenue of Star Ferry which would help alleviate the pressure to increase ferry fares. The main grounds for objecting to the applications were that the proposed development would exploit the public's right to have access to the public viewing area; the proposal would set an undesirable precedent for privatisation of public space for commercial benefit; the conversion of public space into private commercial use was against the initial planning intention of providing a viewing deck at Pier 7 for public enjoyment; and the proposal did not help improve non-fare box revenue to Star Ferry nor improve employment opportunities as the restaurant had already been in operation. The District Officer (Central and West), Home Affairs Department commented that a District Council member objected to the application; and
- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the application based on the

assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Option 1 proposed by the applicant would result in incorporation of the western and northern sections of the existing public viewing areas, which was a strategic vantage point and should be open for public enjoyment, into the restaurant. The proposed extension of the restaurant under Option 1 was therefore unacceptable. For Option 2, the western section of the public viewing area would be incorporated into the restaurant, resulting in a loss of 46m² of the public viewing area. Although the applicant had proposed a number of enhancement works to upgrade the eastern section of the public viewing area, the applicant had not provided sufficient information to demonstrate the planning merits of the enhancement works to justify the loss of public viewing area. The applicant's claim that many other areas were available for the public to enjoy the harbour was not a reason to justify the loss of the existing public view area at Central Pier 7. There were public comments against the proposed conversion of public space for the restaurant use and the proposal would have adverse impact on public access to the public viewing area.

51. The Secretary reported that an email from a member of the public was received on 4.2.2016 who claimed that the Transport Department (TD) had not been informed of the application and requested defer consideration of the application. The submission from the public was made after the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, which ended on 26.1.2016. The submission should be treated as not having been made under s.16(2H)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The email was tabled at the meeting for Members' information. In response to the Secretary's enquiry, Mr W.L. Tang confirmed that TD had been consulted on the application and had no views on the proposal.

52. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Jerry Austin, STP/HK, said that the restaurant and the viewing deck shared a common entrance. The applicant indicated that the signage for the public access to the viewing deck would be enlarged.

Deliberation Session

53. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reasons

were :

- “(a) there is insufficient justification for the loss of public viewing area for restaurant use from the viewpoint of public enjoyment of the harbour;
- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the planning merits of the enhancement works can justify the proposed conversion of public viewing area to restaurant use; and
- (c) the approval of the application will set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for conversion of public space for private commercial use without sufficient justifications.”

[The Vice-chairman thanked Mr Jerry Austin, STP/HK, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H4/94 Proposed Alteration and Modification Works to the Building and External Facade for Cultural/Leisure/Retail/Food & Beverage Uses/Open Space/Ancillary Support, for the Central Market Revitalization Project in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Building with Historical and Architectural Interests Preserved for Commercial, Cultural and/or Community Uses” zone, The Former Central Market, 80 Des Voeux Road, Central
(MPC Paper No. A/H4/94)

54. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA). AGC Design Limited (AGC), Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup), AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM), Earthasia Limited (Earthasia), and CKM Asia Limited (CKM) were five of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr K.K. Ling
(the Chairman), as the
Director of Planning

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Laurence L.J. Li

} being non-executive directors of the Board of URA

Mr Simon S.W. Wang, - being an alternate member of the non-executive director
as the Assistant Director of the Board of URA
(Regional 1) of the
Lands Department

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau - being a member of the Wan Chai District Advisory
Committee of URA

Professor P.P. Ho - being a conservation consultant of URA; and having
current business dealings with Arup, AECOM and CKM

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with URA, AGC, Arup,
AECOM and Earthasia

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

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with Arup, AECOM and
Earthasia

55. The Committee noted that Professor Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Ling had temporarily left the meeting. The Committee also noted that the applicant had requested for deferral of consideration of the application. As Ms Lau and Mr Lam had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. As the interests of Dr Poon, Mr Li, Mr Wang, Mr Yau and Mr Lau were direct, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion.

56. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 29.1.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two weeks in order to allow time for preparation of further information to substantiate the application. This was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

57. 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 weeks were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 9

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/KC/8 Application for Amendment to the Draft Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/KC/28, to amend the maximum building height restriction of the "Government, Institute or Community" zone from 4 storeys to 7 storeys, No. 116 Shek Yam Road, Kwai Chung
(MPC Paper No. Y/KC/8)

58. The Secretary reported that Mr Clarence W.C. Leung had declared an interest in the item as he owned an office in Kwai Chung, where the application site was located. The Committee noted that Mr Leung had already left the meeting.

59. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 20.1.2016 for deferment of

the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to carry out an Air Ventilation Assessment and prepare further information on mitigation measures of the possible traffic and social impacts of the proposed zoning amendment. This was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

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

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

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K16/42 Shop and Services, Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture and Office in
"Comprehensive Development Area" zone, 6/F, Kowloon Motor Bus
Headquarters Building, 9 Po Lun Street, Lai Chi Kok
(MPC Paper No. A/K16/42)

61. The site was located at Kowloon Motor Bus Headquarters Building in Lai Chi Kok. Ms Julia M.K. Lau declared an interest in this item as she was the Project Director of the Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited. As the interest of Ms Lau was direct, the Committee agreed that she should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Ms Julia M.K. Lau and Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the shop and services, place of recreation, sports or culture and office at the premises;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 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
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The uses under application were considered not incompatible with the “Comprehensive Development Area” zone which had been comprehensively developed for residential and commercial uses. The conversion did not involve any change in the total non-domestic gross floor area of the subject building and would unlikely generate adverse traffic and environmental impacts.

63. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

64. 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 submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan and development schedule incorporating the shop and services, place of recreation, sports or culture and office uses on 6/F of the Kowloon Motor Bus Headquarters Building to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of fire service installations in the subject premises within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 5.8.2016; and
- (c) if the above planning condition (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.”

65. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV of the Paper.

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

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/773 Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business(3)” zone, Workshop 2, G/F, CRE Centre, No. 889 Cheung Sha Wan Road, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/773)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the shop and services at the premises;
- (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
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The use under application complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Development within “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone (TPB PG-No. 22D) in that it would not induce significant adverse fire safety, traffic and infrastructural impacts on the developments within the subject industrial building and the adjacent area. Approval of the application with a total floor area of 40.3m² was within the maximum permissible limit of 460m² for aggregate commercial floor area on the ground floor.

67. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

68. 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 submission and implementation of fire safety measures, including the

provision of fire service installations and equipment in the subject premises and means of escape separated from the industrial portion, within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 5.8.2016; 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.”

69. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix II of the Paper.

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/774 Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business(4)”
zone, G/F (Portion), Wing Ming Industrial Centre, 15 Cheung Yue
Street, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/774)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the shop and services at the premises;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in

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

- (d) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The use under application complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Development within “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone (TPB PG-No. 22D) in that it would not generate significant adverse impacts on the developments within the subject building and the adjacent areas. Approval of the application with a total floor area of 304m² was within the maximum permissible limit of 460m² for aggregate commercial floor area on the ground floor.

71. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

72. 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 submission and implementation of fire safety measures, including the provision of fire service installations and equipment in the subject premises and means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion, within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 5.8.2016; 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.”

73. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix II of the Paper.

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

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

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K20/125 Proposed Religious Institution (Church) in “Residential (Group A) 1” zone, 1-2/F(part) with Entrance on G/F, Commercial Podium of Imperial Cullinan, 10 Hoi Fai Road, Tai Kok Tsui, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K20/125B)

74. The Secretary reported that Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD) and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members have declared interests in this item:

Professor P.P. Ho	}	having current business dealings with AECOM
Ms Julia M.K. Lau		
Mr Dominic K.K. Lam	-	having past business dealings with AECOM
Mr Patrick H.T. Lau	-	having current business dealings with LD and AECOM
Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan	-	her father owned a few units in a property in Ash Street in Tai Kok Tsui where the site was located

75. The Committee noted that Professor Ho and Ms Chan had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Ms Lau, Mr Lam and Mr Lau had no involvement in the applicant, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

76. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed religious institution (church) at the premises;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

[The Chairman returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (d) during the first three weeks of the two statutory publication periods, a total of 1,078 public comments were received, of which 1,073 from the owners' committees of the nearby residential developments, local residents and members of the public objected to, one supported and four expressed concerns on the proposed development. The main grounds of the objections were that there was inadequate information on the nature or exact religion of the proposed religious institution; no completely separated lift access to the commercial portion and residential portion which might lead to conflicts and trespassing, uncertainty of the construction of the 'possible future internal staircase' within the premises; problems of traffic accident and congestion, noise and air pollution, environmental hygiene, crime, property damage, and fire hazard; inadequate lift capacity of the footbridge at Hoi Fai Road; a sufficient number of religious institutions had

already been provided in the area; shortage of commercial shops to serve the daily needs of residents in the area; and depreciation of property value. The four public comments expressing the views that the application should contain more details including the nature of the proposed religious institution, the religion involved, type of usage, assessment of impact on the neighbourhood, etc, before meaningful comments could be made; and the proposed development would attract a lot of visitors and cause disruption to residents and affect the pedestrian/road traffic safety and environmental hygiene. The supportive comment was on the ground that there was no religious institution in the area; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. While visitors of the proposed religious institution might share the use of Lifts Set 2 (from G/F to 1/F and 2/F) and Lifts Set 3 (between 1/F and 2/F) with the residents for accessing to the commercial podium, the applicant had proposed separate access for the proposed development by providing an internal staircase from G/F to 1/F and 2/F. As Lifts Sets 2 and 3 could access to the 3/F podium where the lobbies of the residential towers were located, and Lifts Set 2 could also access to 5/F of the residential club house level, the applicant proposed to provide additional security measures to prevent unauthorised entry by non-residents into the residential portion. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on pedestrian and fire safety, traffic and environmental aspects. Relevant approval conditions on the provision of security measures, internal staircase and fire services requirements were also recommended. On the public comments that there was shortage of retail shops, the commercial podium of the subject development (Imperial Cullinan) had been vacant since its completion in 2011. The retail demand in the neighbourhood was well served by the retail cluster in Olympian, which was within a short walking distance.

77. In response to a Member's question on how access arrangement for the visitors to the proposed church could be separated from the residents, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen,

STP/TWK, said that there were a total of 3 sets of lifts in the podiums; Lifts Set 1 was for the exclusive use of the residents; Lifts Set 2 and Lifts Set 3 would be for shared use between the residents and the visitors to the proposed church. The applicant had indicated that a new internal staircase would be provided within the premises from the ground floor to the second floor for the use of the visitors to the proposed church. In response to the Chairman's further enquiry on security aspect, Ms Yuen said that new security measures such as smart card would be proposed at the 3/F podium to stop non-residents from entering the residential portion.

Deliberation Session

78. 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 5.2.2020, 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 provision of proposed security measures to prevent unauthorised entry to the residential portion of the existing development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and provision of internal staircases at the premises, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Buildings or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission and implementation of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting at the application premises, before operation of the proposed religious institution (church), to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (d) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b) or (c) is not complied with before operation of the use, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

79. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

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

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/KC/434 Shop and Services (Pharmacy) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone, Workshop No. 15, LG/F, Man Lee Industrial Building, 10-14 Kin Chuen Street, Kwai Chung
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/434A)

80. The Secretary reported that the site was located in Kwai Chung. Mr Clarence W.C. Leung had declared an interest in this item as he owned an office in Kwai Chung. The Committee noted that Mr Leung had already left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

81. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Fannie F.L. Hung, 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 (pharmacy) at the premises;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or

no adverse 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 (Kwai Tsing), Home Affairs Department; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The small scale of the proposed use would unlikely generate adverse traffic or environmental impacts on the surrounding areas and the applied use complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Development within “Other Specified Uses (Business)” Zone (TPB PG-No. 22D) in terms of fire safety, land use, and environmental impacts. Approval of the application with a total floor area of 43.94m² was within the maximum permissible limit of 460m² for aggregate commercial floor area on the ground floor.

82. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

83. 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 submission and implementation of fire safety proposals, including fire service installations and equipment, within 6 months from the date of the approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 5.8.2016; 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.”

84. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

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

[Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 15

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TW/475 Proposed Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture in "Industrial" zone,
Unit 12A, G/F, Wah Wai Industrial Building, 53-61 Pak Tin Par Street,
Tsuen Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/475)

Presentation and Question Sessions

85. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed place of recreation, sports or culture at the premises;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Fire Services Department (FSD) did not support the application from fire safety point of view due to the public's unpreparedness in facing the potential risks inside and outside the industrial buildings and their unfamiliarity with the situation in case of emergency, rendering their escape materially much more difficult;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment expressing concerns on traffic impact and safety problem was received; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was considered not compatible with the industrial uses of the subject building. It was not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Use/Development within “Industrial” Zone (TPB-PG No. 25D) as FSD did not support the application from fire safety point of view.

86. A Member noted that there were recreational uses on the upper floors of the subject building. In view that the subject premises was of a small scale providing recreational services to only a small number of people, the Member asked whether FSD had considered the proposed use as a potential fire hazard to the subject industrial building. Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, STP/TWK, said that none of the recreational uses on the upper floors had obtained planning permission. The main concern of FSD was that the visitors of the proposed recreational facilities were not familiar with the fire escape arrangement of the subject building, and might encounter difficulties in their escape in case of a fire accident.

Deliberation Session

87. A Member had reservation to reject the application as the premises was small and located on the ground floor, and the fire risk should be low. The Chairman said that the subject application would attract public to the industrial building who were not familiar with the fire escape arrangements. As the public safety concern was very important, the professional advice from FSD should be respected. Another Member said that there might also be concern on pedestrian safety with children coming to the premises when there were heavy goods vehicles running around.

88. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reasons were :

- “(a) the proposed development is not compatible with the existing uses in the subject industrial building which is predominately industrial in character; and
- (b) the proposed development does not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Use/Development within “Industrial” Zone (TPB PG-No. 25D) in that the proposed place of recreation, sports or culture use is considered unacceptable from the fire safety point of view.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

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

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 16

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K/14 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary ‘Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle)’ (Vacant Car Parking Spaces only) under Application No. A/K/11 for a Period of 3 Years until 5.3.2019 in “Residential (Group A)” zone, (a) Choi Hung Estate, (b) Choi Wan (II) Estate, (c) Fu Shan Estate and (d) Mei Tung Estate, Wong Tai Sin, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K/14)

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

- Mr K.K. Ling (the Chairman), as the Director of Planning - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and the Building Committee (BC) of HKHA
- Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, as the Chief Engineer (Works) of the Home Affairs Department - being an alternate member of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA
- Professor P.P. Ho - being a member of the BC of HKHA
- Ms Julia M.K. Lau - being a member of the Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with HKHA
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with HKHA
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his wife working in the Property Services Administration Unit of the Housing Department which had submitted the application

90. The Committee noted that Professor Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Mr Ling, Mr Kwan, Ms Lau, Mr Lau and Dr Poon were direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As Mr Lam had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting. The Vice-chairman took over the chairmanship of the meeting at this point.

[Ms Julia M.K. Lau, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr Laurence L.J. Li, Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left the meeting at this point. Mr K.K. Ling and Mr K.F. Tang left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

91. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Sandy S.K. Ng, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary ‘public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle)’ (vacant car parking spaces only) under application No. A/K/11 for a period of 3 years until 5.3.2019;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments were received from Designing Hong Kong Limited (DHKL) and a nearby school. DHKL raised concerns on shortage of parking spaces in the community; alternative use of land; and traffic generation issues, while the nearby school requested to occupy 20 car parking spaces in Choi Hung Estate car park so as to release existing parking spaces within the school for teaching purpose; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The use under application complied with assessment criteria of 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) in that there was no material change in planning circumstances of the surrounding areas since the previous temporary approval was granted, no adverse planning implication, and no adverse comment from relevant government departments. As only the vacant monthly parking spaces would be let out to non-residents, the parking need of the residents of the four estates would

not be compromised. Regarding the public concerns on shortage of parking space and traffic impact, the Commissioner for Transport would continue to review the guidelines on the supply of parking spaces in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. Regarding the request for converting the vacant parking spaces in Choi Hung Estate to other uses, an advisory clause to advise the applicant to consider letting the area of surplus parking spaces for community uses in need or letting the surplus parking spaces to non-governments/schools was suggested.

92. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

93. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 5.3.2019, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and the permission was subject to the following condition :

“Priority should be accorded to the residents of Choi Hung Estate, Choi Wan (II) Estate, Fu Shan Estate and Mei Tung Estate in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.”

94. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

Agenda Item 18

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K13/300 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary ‘Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle)’ (Vacant Car Parking Spaces only) under Application No. A/K13/287 for a Period of 3 Years until 9.4.2019 in “Residential (Group A)” zone, Choi Ying Estate, Ngau Tau Kok, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K13/300)

95. As agenda item 18 was similar in nature to agenda item 16, the Vice-chairman suggested and Members agreed to proceed with agenda item 18 first.

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

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

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, - being an alternate member of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of SPC and the Subsidised (Works) of the Home Housing Committee of HKHA
Affairs Department

Professor P.P. Ho - being a member of the BC of HKHA

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

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with HKHA

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

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his wife working in the Property Services Administration Unit of the Housing Department which has submitted the application

97. The Committee noted that Professor Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Ms Lau, Mr Lau, Dr Poon and Mr Kwan had already left the meeting. The Committee also noted that Mr Ling had left the meeting temporarily. As Mr Lam had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

98. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Sandy S.K. Ng, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary ‘public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle)’ (vacant car parking spaces only) under application No. A/K13/287 for a period of 3 years until 9.4.2019;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, three public comments were received from members of the public. One had no objection to the application; one objected on the ground that the vacant areas could be allocated for other community uses; and one suggested to increase the provision of public motorcycle parking spaces to meet the district need; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the

application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The use under application complied with assessment criteria of 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) in that there was no material change in planning circumstances of the surrounding areas since the previous temporary approval was granted, no adverse planning implication, and no adverse comment from relevant government departments. As only the vacant monthly parking spaces would be let out to non-residents, the parking need of the residents of Choi Ying Estate would not be compromised. Regarding the suggestion on provision of more public motorcycle parking spaces, the applicant advised that the number of parking spaces that could be let to non-residents would be suitably increased after meeting the residents' demand.

99. In response to the Vice-chairman's enquiry, Ms Sandy S.K. Ng, STP/K, said that according to the Notes of the Outline Zoning Plan, 'Social Welfare Facilities' was always permitted in area zoned "Residential (Group A)" and no planning permission would be required if the car parking spaces were converted to social welfare facilities.

Deliberation Session

100. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 9.4.2019, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and the permission was subject to the following condition :

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

101. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

Agenda Item 17

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K13/299 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Public Housing Development in “Residential (Group A) 2” zone, Choi Wing Road, Ngau Tau Kok, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K13/299)

102. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). ADI Limited (ADI) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) were the two consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

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

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, - being an alternate member of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of SPC and the Subsidised (Works) of the Home Housing Committee of HKHA
Affairs Department

Professor P.P. Ho - being a member of the BC of HKHA; and
having current business dealings with Arup

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

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with HKHA, ADI and Arup

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with HKHA and Arup

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of the Housing Department but not involved in planning work

103. The Committee noted that Professor Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Ms Lau, Mr Lau, Dr Poon and Mr Kwan had left the meeting. The Committee also noted that Mr Ling had left the meeting temporarily. As Mr Lam had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

104. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Sandy S.K. Ng, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction for permitted public housing development;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (PlanD) commented that there was no data regarding the tree planting in Phases 1 and 2 of Choi Fook Estate. The proposed tree planting to meet the requirements under the Planning Brief could not be fully ascertained. Other government departments consulted had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the two statutory publication periods, a total of two public comments from members of the public were received. The commenters suggested that more parking spaces should be provided and expressed concerns on the insufficient provision of open space and amenity facilities in the area. No local objection was received by the District Officer (Kwun Tong), Home Affairs Department; and

- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The site was surrounded by a cluster of high-rise residential developments. The proposed BH of 190mPD would not be incompatible with the high-rise residential developments in the vicinity. The minor relaxation in BH would enhance pedestrian circulation, visual permeability and the amenity of the area. It was not anticipated that the proposal would have any significant adverse air ventilation impact. Regarding the public comments, the Commissioner for Transport had no comment on the application and there was adequate provision of open space and other amenity facilities in Choi Fook Estate.

105. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

106. 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 5.2.2020, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage connection works identified in the revised SIA to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (d) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

107. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

[The Vice-chairman thanked Ms Sandy S.K. Ng, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She 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 20

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K15/116 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary 'Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle)' (Vacant Car Parking Spaces only) under Application No. A/K15/108 for a Period of 3 Years until 23.3.2019 in "Residential (Group A)" zone, Yau Mei Court and Ko Cheung Court, Yau Tong, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K15/116)

108. As agenda item 20 was also submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) and the interests involved were similar to that of agenda item 17, the Vice-chairman suggested and Members agreed to proceed with agenda item 20 first.

109. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by HKHA. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

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

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, - being an alternate member of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of SPC and the Subsidised (Works) of the Home Housing Committee of HKHA

Affairs Department

- Professor P.P. Ho - being a member of the BC of HKHA
- Ms Julia M.K. Lau - being a member of the Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with HKHA
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with HKHA
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his wife working in the Property Services Administration Unit of the Housing Department which had submitted the application
- Mr Laurence L.J. Li - his wife's relative owning a factory in Yau Tong

110. The Committee noted that Professor Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Ms Lau, Mr Lau, Mr Li, Dr Poon and Mr Kwan had left the meeting. The Committee also noted that Mr Ling had left the meeting temporarily. As Mr Lam had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

111. 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 public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) (vacant vehicle parking spaces only) under application No. A/K15/108 for a Period of 3 Years until 23.3.2019;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in

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

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a total of four public comments were received from Designing Hong Kong Limited (DHKL) and individuals. Two members of the public objected to the application mainly on the grounds that there were insufficient monthly parking spaces at the site and suggested to convert the hourly parking spaces to monthly ones. DHKL and an individual commented that the public vehicle park was not a temporary use which was not in line with the planning intention of “Residential (Group A)” zone; and the vacant spaces could be used as pedestrian road or open space to serve the recreational need of the local residents.

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The use under application complied with assessment criteria of 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) in that there was no material change in planning circumstances of the surrounding areas since the previous temporary approval was granted, no adverse planning implication, and no adverse comment from relevant departments. As only the vacant monthly parking spaces would be let out to non-residents, the parking need of the residents of Yau Mei Court and Ko Cheung Court would not be compromised. Regarding the public comments on insufficient monthly parking spaces and traffic impacts, the Commissioner for Transport had no objection to the application. For the comments on alternative use, an advisory clause to advise the applicant to consider letting the area of surplus parking spaces for community uses in need was suggested.

112. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Ms Joyce Y.S. So, STP/K, said that the subject application only involved the car parks managed by HKHA and not those for the

government staff quarters.

Deliberation Session

113. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 23.3.2019, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and the permission was subject to the following condition :

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

114. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

[Mr K.K. Ling and Mr K.F. Tang returned to join the meeting at this point. Mr W.L. Tang left the meeting at this point and Mr Simon S.W. Wang left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Agenda Item 19

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K15/114 Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development in “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zone, 5 and 8 Tung Yuen Street and adjoining Government Land, Yau Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/114)

115. The Sectary reported that the application was submitted by Korn Reach Investment Limited and Glass Bead Limited, both were subsidiaries of CK Hutchison (Holdings) Limited which was related to Cheung Kong (Holdings) Limited (CKL).

Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA), LWK & Partners (Hong Kong) Limited (LWK), Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Limited (Environ) and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited (MMHK) were four of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Professor P.P. Ho | - | having current business dealings with CKL |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - | having current business dealings with CK Hutchison (a subsidiary of CKL) and KTA |
| Ms Julia M.K. Lau | - | having current business dealings with Environ |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - | having past business dealings with KTA, Environ and MMHK |
| Mr Laurence L.J. Li | - | having current business dealings with LWK; and his spouse's relatives owning a factory in Yau Tong |

116. The Committee noted that Professor Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Ms Lau, Mr Lau and Mr Li had left the meeting. As Mr Lam had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

117. 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 proposed comprehensive residential development;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and

Landscape, Planning Department (PlanD) had reservation on the application as the tree compensatory ratio was considered low and the proposed streetscape failed to meet the requirement of the Planning Brief (PB). Other departments consulted had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the eight statutory publication periods, a total of 14 public comments from Redland Concrete Limited, an operator of industrial installation nearby, and individuals were received. Eleven opposed the application on grounds that the site was not suitable for residential development; the proposed development would worsen the traffic condition in Tung Yuen Street; the proposed development was too dense and high, and had insufficient open space for active outdoor recreational activities. Two supported the application as the proposed development was in line with the planning intention of the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone and could alleviate the poor living conditions in Yau Tong. The remaining one commented that the Town Planning Board should not hinder any development by imposing excessive requirements; and

- (e) PlanD’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed comprehensive residential development was considered compatible with the planned land use of the area and would facilitate the gradual transformation of the area for residential use. The intensity of the proposed development did not exceed the permissible statutory limits and generally complied with the requirements specified in PB. The proposed development would have no significant adverse visual and air ventilation impact on the surrounding areas. The concerns of landscape treatment and tree planting could be addressed by including an approval condition requiring the applicant to submit a revised Landscape Master Plan. Environmental assessments had been conducted which demonstrated that the proposed development was acceptable in noise and air quality aspects. Regarding the adverse public comments, the above assessments were relevant.

118. In response to a Member's enquiry on the future management and integration in design of the proposed promenade, Ms Joyce Y.S. So, STP/K, said that the site was one of the five "CDA" zones in Yau Tong Industrial Area. The Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) indicated that it would take up the management of the proposed promenade after the five "CDA" zones were completed and in the interim, individual developers would be responsible for the maintenance and management of the promenade. As for the integration in design of the proposed promenades in different "CDA" sub-zones, it was stipulated in the Planning Brief that the design of the waterfront promenade of the later developments would have to make reference to the design of the earlier development(s).

119. A Member raised concern on the design of the proposed podium which served as a noise mitigation measure, and whether there was any plan for relocation of the waterfront industrial-related uses. Mr K.F. Tang, Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), Environmental Protection Department, said that the existing industrial activities, including cement factories and recycling business, had imposed potential constraints to the development of the "CDA" sub-zones, mainly on noise and air quality aspects. However, it was considered that the industrial activities would not generate excessive noise impact on the surrounding area and the noise impact, including traffic noise, could be addressed by adopting appropriate mitigation measures in the building design. On air quality aspect, the existing cement factory, sewage treatment plant and the Wholesale Fish Market would not have adverse air quality and odour impacts as demonstrated in the air quality impact assessment submitted by the applicant. Details of the noise mitigation measures would be included in various revised impact assessments to be submitted by the applicants.

120. The Chairman supplemented that as for the waterfront industrial-related use, their phasing out would be subject to the market force.

Deliberation Session

121. A Member asked if an additional advisory clause should be added requiring a government department to vet the overall design of the waterfront promenade. In response, the Chairman said that that might not be necessary as PlanD would co-ordinate with the Architectural Services Department and LCSD to ensure that the design of the promenade

would meet the requirement of the PB.

122. A Member supported the development as it would expedite the redevelopment of the area.

123. 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 5.2.2020, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan to incorporate the approval conditions as stipulated in conditions (b) to (k) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a development programme indicating the timing and phasing of the comprehensive development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission and implementation of a revised Landscape Master Plan, including tree preservation proposal, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (d) the implementation of the drainage facilities identified in the Drainage Impact Assessment Report to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (e) the implementation of the sewerage facilities identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment Report to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (f) the design and provision of ingress/egress point, vehicular access, parking spaces, and loading/unloading facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;

- (g) the design and provision of a full height setback to allow a minimum width of 3.5m for footpath on each side of Tung Yuen Street, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (h) the submission of a revised Air Quality Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (i) the submission of a Noise Impact Assessment and the implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (j) the design and provision of the public waterfront promenade with a public pedestrian access connecting Tung Yuen Street and the promenade, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB;
- (k) the provision of emergency vehicular access, water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (l) the public waterfront promenade with the public pedestrian access should be opened from 8:00 to 18:00 every day, and maintained and managed by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB.”

124. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VI of the Paper.

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

[Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Simon S.W. Wang returned to join the meeting at this point. Mr K.F. Tang left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 21

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K18/316 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction (from 13 storeys to 15 storeys) for a proposed Educational Institution (University Hostel and Academic Building Complex) in “Government, Institution or Community (9)” zone, 30 Renfrew Road (part), Kowloon Tong, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K18/316B)

125. The application was submitted by the Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU). Townland Consultants Limited (TCL) and AGC Design Limited (AGC) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Laurence L.J. Li - being an Honorary Member of the Court of HKBU

- Mr Stephen H.B. Yau - being the Chairman of the Social Work Advisory Committee of the Department of Social Work in HKBU

- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with HKBU and TCL

- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with TCL and AGC

- Professor P.P. Ho - having current business dealings with TCL

- Ms Julia M.K. Lau - owning a share of a property near the junction of

Hereford Road and Waterloo Road; and her family members living in Waterloo Road

Mr Clarence W.C. - owning a property near the junction of Durham Road and
Leung La Salle Road

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - living in Kowloon Tong

126. The Committee noted that Professor Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Ms Lau, Mr Lau, Mr Li, Mr Leung, Mr Yau and Dr Poon had left the meeting. As Mr Lam had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

127. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction (from 13 storeys to 15 storeys) for a proposed educational institution (university hostel and academic building complex);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. The Secretary for Education supported the application as the application was to optimise the utilisation of the site. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (PlanD) had reservation on the application as there were concerns on the treatment of existing trees and on whether the proposed open space provision would comply with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the two statutory publication periods, a total

of 35 comments were received, among which 33 supported and 2 objected to the application. The main reasons for supporting the application were that the minor relaxation of BH could address HKBU's shortfalls and alleviate congestion at the campus; the proposed academic and hostel would help achieve greater synergy at the campus; the minor relaxation of BH would not have any adverse effect on traffic, drainage and environmental aspects, and could allow utilisation of the limited land resources; and the proposed development with landscape planning and design would enhance the environment. The main grounds for objecting to the application were that the additional gross floor area and BH applied for were excessive; and Hong Kong should devote more resources in developing technical expertise of labour force instead of investing in university education; and

- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed relaxation of BH was not substantial; the proposal was in line with the criteria for consideration of relaxation of BH on the Outline Zoning Plan and would not have adverse traffic, visual, air ventilation, fire safety, environmental and sewerage impacts. The concerns on landscape aspects could be addressed at the detailed design stage by imposing an approval condition on tree preservation and landscape proposal. Regarding the adverse public comments, the above assessments were relevant.

128. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

129. 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 5.2.2020, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting

to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and

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

130. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

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

Agenda Item 22

Any Other Business

131. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 1:50 p.m..