

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 559<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 10.6.2016**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr K. K. Ling

Chairman

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Stephen H. B. Yau

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W. C. Poon

Mr K. K. Cheung

Ms Sandy H. Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

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 Ken Y.K. Wong

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department  
Mr Vincent K.L. Pang

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr T.Y. Ip

Professor T.S. Liu

**In Attendance**

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 558<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 27.5.2016

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 558<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 27.5.2016 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

[Mr Tom C.K. Yip, District Planning Officer/ Kowloon (DPO/K) and Ms Joyce Y.S. So, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

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

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K15/23

(MPC Paper No. 6/16)

---

3. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments mainly involved rezoning of a site for public housing development by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA); and a site for private residential development atop the MTR Yau Tong Ventilation Building (YTVB) with MTR

Corporation Limited (MTRCL) as the project proponent. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Mr K.K. Ling<br>(the Chairman)<br><i>as the Director of Planning</i>                   | - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and the Building Committee of HKHA;                                     |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan<br><i>as the Chief Engineer (Works) of Home Affairs Department</i> | - being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA; |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau  | } having current business dealings with HKHA and MTRCL;  |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho  |  |
| Mr K.K. Cheung   | - having current business dealings with MTRCL;   |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam  | } having past business dealings with HKHA and MTRCL; and   |
| Mr Franklin Yu   |  |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon  | - his spouse working in the HD, which was the executive arm of HKHA, but had no involvement in the subject matter.                 |

4. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr K.K. Cheung and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan had not yet arrived to join the meeting. As Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in HD and MTRCL's proposal, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (TPB), as the proposed development in relation to the HKHA site was a subject of amendment to the OZP proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the

interests of the Members in relation to HKHA would only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting.

### Presentation and Question Sessions

5. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

#### Background

- (a) to meet the pressing need for housing supply, a piece of Government land of about 1.11ha. at Yan Wing Street, Yau Tong was proposed for rezoning from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) for public housing development by HD. HD proposed to develop the site as Phase IV of the adjoining Lei Yue Mun Estate (LYM Estate), comprising three residential towers on top of a podium with a domestic/total plot ratio (PR) of 7.5/9 and a building height (BH) not exceeding 150mPD. It was estimated that the proposed public housing development would provide about 2,400 flats with an estimated population of about 6,000;

[Mr Sunny L.K. Ho arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (b) the Policy Address 2016 mentioned that the Government was actively exploring with MTRCL the development potential of stations and related sites along existing and future rail lines, as a way to increase housing land supply. MTRCL submitted a proposal for a proposed residential development at YTVB and its adjoining land at Ko Chiu Road. The proposed residential development was divided into two portions, i.e. Portion A to the south and Portion B to the north, and comprised one residential tower on each portion providing a total of about 980 flats with a domestic PR of 7.5 to accommodate an estimated population of about 3,100. The residential tower of Portion A would be provided atop the existing YTVB;

The Proposed Amendments to the OZP

- (c) Item A – to rezone a site at Yan Wing Street from “GB” to “R(A)” and stipulation of building height restriction (BHR) of 150mPD;
- (d) Items B1 to B3 – to rezone a site at YTVB and its adjoining land at Ko Chiu Road from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Ventilation Building”, “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “GB” to (i) “Residential (Group A)7” (“R(A)7”) and stipulation of BHR of 190mPD (Item B1); (ii) an area shown as ‘Road’ (Item B2); and (iii) “R(A)” and stipulation of BHR of 170mPD (Item B3);
- (e) Item C – to rezone a natural slope to the east of YTVB from “G/IC” to “GB” to reflect the existing condition;
- (f) Item D – to rezone a portion of Yau Tong No. 2 Fresh Water Service Reservoir together with its access road and adjoining man-made slopes from “GB” to “G/IC” and to rezone a small site falling within the existing lot boundary of Ko Chun Court from “GB” to “R(A)” to reflect the existing condition;

*Technical Assessments*

Amendment Item A

- (g) HD had completed the relevant technical assessments, namely, Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), Air Ventilation Assessment (Expert Evaluation) (AVA(E)), Visual Appraisal (VA), Landscape Assessment (LA), Tree Survey, Ecological Assessment (EcoA) and Geotechnical Study in support of the proposed public housing development. The proposed development would not induce significant traffic, air ventilation, visual, landscape and ecological impacts;

- (h) the AVA(EA) Study recommended that a quantitative AVA be conducted to explore appropriate mitigation measures at the detailed design stage by HD and the mitigation measures should be implemented accordingly. Such requirements would be incorporated into the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP;

Amendment Items B1 to B3

- (i) MTRCL had submitted a proposal, supported with detailed technical assessments (namely TIA, AVA(EA), VA, Landscape Proposal, Tree Survey, Environmental Assessment, Drainage Impact Assessment, Sewerage Impact Assessment, Water Supply Assessment and Geotechnical Study). The proposed development would not induce significant traffic, air ventilation, visual, landscape, environmental, and infrastructural impacts;
- (j) the requirements for a quantitative AVA to be conducted to explore mitigation measures at the detailed design stage and the mitigation measures would be incorporated in the ES of the OZP;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes and ES of the OZP

- (k) corresponding amendments to the Notes of the “R(A)7” zone would be incorporated to facilitate the proposed residential development;
- (l) to facilitate art development, it was proposed to include ‘Art Studio (excluding those involving direct provision of services or goods)’ as a Column 1 use in Schedule II of “Residential (Group E)” and “Other Specified Use” annotated “Business” zones. Corresponding amendment would also be made to replace ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture’ under Column 2 of the same schedules by ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (not elsewhere specified)’;

- (m) the ES would be revised to take account of the above proposed amendments, and the latest status and planning circumstances;

Departmental Consultation

- (n) relevant government bureaux and departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the proposed amendments; and

Consultation with Kwun Tong District Council

- (o) on 3.5.2016, PlanD consulted the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) on the proposed amendments and KTDC members raised grave concerns on the traffic congestion in Kwun Tong District and the inadequate provision of GIC facilities in Yau Tong area. KTDC also passed a motion expressing dissatisfaction with the continued residential developments and population increase in the area which had overloaded the community facilities, and requested the Government to respond to their request for community facilities before re-submitting the proposals for KTDC's consideration. A group of KTDC members also submitted on 3.5.2016 a letter to the Secretary for Development (SDEV) to express similar concerns. On 3.6.2016 and 6.6.2016, SDEV issued letters to the Chairman of KTDC and the group of KTDC members respectively informing them that their views and the proposed amendments would be submitted to the Committee for consideration, and if the amendments were agreed by the Committee, the public could submit representations to the TPB in accordance with the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).

*Landscape Impact*

6. A Member asked what would be the changes in the overall area of the "GB" zone on the OZP due to the proposed amendments. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, said that about 58.55ha of land would remain zoned "GB" on the OZP upon rezoning. The proposed amendments would not result in significant change in the total size of the "GB" zone in the area with the rezoning of the natural slope from "G/IC" to "GB" to the southeast



of the proposed residential development at Ko Chiu Road under Amendment Item B1.

7. Another Member asked whether the existing trees, though having lower ecological value, could be transplanted and whether there was an overall coordination among various projects within the Government in that regard. In response, Mr Yip said that for the proposed public housing development under Amendment Item A at Yan Wing Street, site formation works would be required as it was a sloping site. Based on the EcoA and Tree Survey conducted by HD, the ecological impact of the proposed amendment would be low and no protected, rare species or Old and Valuable Trees were found within the site. Tree felling application and compensatory proposal would be processed in accordance with the relevant technical circulars promulgated by the Development Bureau. Compensatory planting and vertical greening would also be provided in the proposed development. Besides, given the species and conditions of the existing trees at the site, transplantation was not recommended as the survival rate for the transplanted trees was expected to be low. Generally speaking, it would be preferable to transplant the affected trees to a nearby location as they would have a higher chance of survival. Regarding an overall strategy for greening in Hong Kong, a Greening Master Plan had been formulated by the Civil Engineering and Development Department to coordinate the various greening initiatives within the Government. The Chairman supplemented that the best endeavor would be made by the Government to transplant affected trees where appropriate. There were examples of trees being transplanted to Kai Tak area in the past.

#### *Provision of Community Facilities*

8. In response to the same Member's question on demographics of Kwun Tong area, Mr Yip said that in terms of planned population, the elderly population in Kwun Tong district was relatively high at about 27.8% whereas children and youth aged 3 to 17 would comprise only about 9.8% of the population. According to the Social Welfare Department, there was no shortage of children and youth facilities but elderly facilities were relatively in short supply.

#### *Impacts of YTVB on the Proposed Residential Development*

9. Two Members enquired whether the proposed residential development and

YTVB would affect each other in that YTVB might create noise and air quality issues for the future residents and the residential tower might also affect the operation of YTVB. One of the Members also suggested that it might be better to relocate either YTVB or the proposed residential development to other vacant land in the “GB” zone. In response, Mr Yip said that YTVB would be used as an air intake for the MTR railway tunnel only during emergency situations and its operation would be short and infrequent. MTRCL had also proposed to relocate the ventilation opening to a southeastern direction facing the hillside to minimise any potential impact. The current design of the proposed residential towers had already incorporated measures to address the noise and air ventilation impacts. Mr Ken Y.K. Wong, Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), Environmental Protection Department, supplemented that in view of the short operational time of YTVB and suitable design features such as louvers and relocation of the ventilation opening would be incorporated by MTRCL, the operation of YTVB was not expected to generate noise and air impacts to the residential development above.

10. With reference to a cross-section plan of the proposed residential development atop YTVB shown on the visualiser, two Members considered that the current proposal with long columns to support the residential tower above YTVB might not be desirable in visual terms and suggested that a more comprehensive and integrated design of the proposed development should be considered. Suitable visual treatment to YTVB should also be provided. The Chairman said that it was not uncommon in Hong Kong to have buildings on top of utility structures. Nevertheless, taken into account the scale of YTVB, vertical greening should be incorporated into the design to provide a visual relief and Members’ suggestion on the design of the proposed residential development would be conveyed to MTRCL for their reference.

#### Deliberation Session

11. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :
- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun OZP as mentioned in paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of the Paper and that the draft Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun OZP No. S/K15/23A at Attachment II (to be renumbered to S/K15/24 upon

exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III are suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and

- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment IV for the draft Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun OZP No. S/K15/23A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the TPB for various land use zonings of the OZP and agree that the revised ES is suitable for publication together with the OZP.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, and Ms Y.S. Joyce So, STP/K, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

[Mr K.K. Cheung and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting]

Draft Planning Brief for the "Comprehensive Development Area(1)" zone in Kai Tak Development

(MPC Paper No.7/16)

---

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

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/K, presented the draft planning brief (PB) as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

##### **Background**

- (a) the draft PB covered a site, with an area of about 1.77ha, located in the

North Apron area of the Kai Tak Development (KTD) and zoned “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) on the approved Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/4. The site was in the central part of the Kai Tak City Centre and commanded a convenient location with the Kai Tak Station of the Shatin to Central Link (SCL) located to its south-east and adjoined Kai Tak River to the west;

- (b) the site was a piece of Government land to be disposed through land sale. A major portion of the site was allocated to the Railway Development Office, Highways Department and was occupied by the Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited as temporary works site of SCL;

#### Development Restrictions on the OZP

- (c) developments within the site which was zoned “CDA(1)” was subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 10 and a maximum building height (BH) of 40 mPD and 200mPD for the western and eastern sub-zones respectively. The 200mPD sub-zone was intended for a landmark commercial development while the 40mPD sub-zone was intended for lower structures with a cascading BH profile with descending BH to 15mPD towards the Kai Tak River or the curvilinear walkway to the southwest and northwest respectively;

#### Planning Intention

- (d) the “CDA(1)” zone was intended for a comprehensive office/hotel/retail development. The zoning was to facilitate appropriate planning control over the development mix, scale, design and layout of development, taking into account various environmental, traffic, infrastructure and other constraints;

#### Urban Design Requirements

- (e) a prominent gateway image of the site and a vista linking the existing communities in the hinterland and KTD should be created. The landmark

tower should have a distinctive design with the lower structures adopting a cascading BH profile descending towards Kai Tak River or the curvilinear walkway. Podium-free design with a high overall greening ratio of 30% with quality greening was also required;

#### Retail Belt and Colonnade

- (f) the retail belt in the Kai Tak City Centre, i.e. the belt of retail frontage of the sites abutting the Station Square/Multi-purpose Sports Complex, should adopt a colonnade design concept. The colonnade design could help moderate wind and protect pedestrians from adverse weather as well as bring back the old Kowloon atmosphere that Kai Tak once embraced;

#### Underground Shopping Street

- (g) to improve the connectivity with the surrounding districts and the pedestrian environment, a comprehensive Underground Shopping Street (USS) system connecting Kowloon City and San Po Kong with KTD and the Kai Tak Station of SCL was proposed. A public passageway at the basement level of the site would be provided as part of the USS system and the passageway should be opened to the public on a 24-hour basis;

#### Dedicated Pedestrian Zones

- (h) Dedicated Pedestrian Zones (DPZs) of 4.5m wide within “Open Space” zone on areas abutting the retail belt in the Kai Tak City Centre had been designated. The future applicant might be requested to form and pave DPZ to the Government’s satisfaction and hand over DPZ to the Government upon demand;

#### Landscaped Elevated Walkway

- (i) a curvilinear landscaped elevated walkway connecting San Po Kong, the 1/F landscaped deck of the Trade and Industry Tower and the large

platform of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Arts and Performance Related Uses” zone to the southwest would be provided. Another landscaped elevated walkway was planned to connect the proposed landmark tower of the site with the above curvilinear walkway across Concorde Road (Road D1);

#### Visual and Air Ventilation Requirements

- (j) a 5m wide non-building area was designated at the south-western boundary of the site on the OZP. Visual Impact Assessment and Air Ventilation Assessment should be conducted;

#### Open Space and Landscape Requirements

- (k) a greening ratio of 30% of the total site area, including a minimum of 20% at-grade greening of the total site area and 20% roof level greening of the total roof area, was required. The landscaped elevated walkway to be constructed by the applicant should be subjected to a minimum greening ratio of 15% which should not be counted towards the aforesaid overall greening ratio of 30%;

#### Traffic and Transport Requirements

- (l) apart from providing a public transport terminus with a GFA of not less than 3,800m<sup>2</sup>, a Traffic Impact Assessment was required to be conducted. Adequate transport infrastructures (including the landscaped elevated walkway, the USS/underground public walkway and other at-grade pedestrian crossing/connections as appropriate) would be provided to improve connectivity and pedestrian accessibility;

#### Environmental and Infrastructure Requirements

- (m) requirements for submission of Environmental Assessment, Sewerage Impact Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment had been

incorporated; and

### Way Forward

- (n) subject to the Committee's endorsement, the Planning Department (PlanD) would consult the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC), Wong Tai Sin District Council (WTSDC) and the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development of the Harbourfront Commission (the Task Force) on the draft PB. The views collected together with the revised PB incorporating the relevant comments, where appropriate, would be submitted to the Committee for further consideration and endorsement.

### *BH Profile*

13. A Member asked whether the BHR of 200mPD for the landmark building was compatible with the surrounding developments and whether it would result in a "toothpick" building at the site. By making reference to the OZP on the visualiser, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/K, elaborated on the general land uses, urban design consideration and BH profile of the surrounding areas. He further said that the current BHR of 200mPD for the landmark building as stipulated on the OZP was intended to create a focal point for the Kai Tak area where the BH profile reached its maximum at the development and then gradated towards the surrounding areas. The Chairman supplemented that given the site was of a considerable size, the future development would unlikely result in a "toothpick" building usually seen in very small development sites.

### *Design and Implementation of the USS*

14. A Member suggested that not only retail uses but other uses such as art galleries and community uses should be incorporated into the USS to create point of interests (POI) for pedestrians and to better integrate with the local community. Another Member considered that to avoid the USS being operated solely on commercial considerations such that the USS would be able to incorporate community-oriented uses, suitable agreements would have to be made between the Government and the respective developers.

15. A Member said that the USS was some 1,500m in length and would pass through quite a number of sites in the Kai Tak area. It might be more promising if it was constructed and managed collectively by a single party. If sections of the USS were completed by different developers of individual sites at different times, the USS might become fragmented and unable to achieve its intended purpose as a well-connected 24-hour public passageway with integrated design linking up different parts of the Kai Tak area. Sufficient entry points and POI should be provided at different nodes along the USS. In response, the Chairman said that a detailed consultancy study had been conducted to assess the technical, engineering and financial feasibility of USS development so as to explore the recommended implementation approach. The USS would pass through a number of POI including the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge and the Kai Tak River and sufficient vertical connections with the ground level would be provided along the USS. The current thinking of the Government was to require the future developers of the concerned sites to construct, manage and maintain the section of USS within/adjoining the sites by the incorporation of appropriate sales conditions in the leases. The development of the USS would be technically complicated given the presence of all the existing/planned infrastructures and utilities underground intersecting with some of the USS sections. Notwithstanding, the USS would be implemented in the early stages of KTD. Developers of the relevant sites in KTD would have to construct the USS in accordance with the technical and development requirements stipulated on the control drawings to the satisfaction of the Government.

#### *Land Uses Around the Station Square*

16. A Member suggested that there might be scope to plan for more comprehensive developments immediately adjacent to the Station Square. Public open spaces should also be provided along the Kai Tak River. In response, the Chairman said that according to the current land use concept, comprehensive/commercial developments would concentrate to the north of the Station Square, whereas the area to the southeast, i.e. the Grid Neighbourhood, was mainly planned for residential development.

17. The Chairman said that as the implementation of the KTD would be led by the Kai Tak Office (KTO) of Civil Engineering and Development Department in close liaison with the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) and PlanD, Members' comments and suggestions regarding the USS and Station Square could be conveyed to them for reference.



18. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree that the draft PB was suitable for consultation with KCDC, WTSDC and the Task Force. The views collected together with the revised PB incorporating the relevant comments, where appropriate, would be submitted to the Committee for further consideration and endorsement.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He 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.]

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 5**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K/16                      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Public Vehicle Park  
(excluding Container Vehicle) (Surplus Vehicle Parking Spaces only) for  
a Period of 3 Years in "Residential (Group A)" zone,  
(a) Ma Tau Wai Estate, Kowloon City, Kowloon  
(b) Sheung Lok Estate, Kowloon City, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K/16)

---

19. 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) <i>as the Director of Planning</i>	- being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and the Building Committee of HKHA;
--	--

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

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau }  
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho } having current business dealings with  
HKHA;

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam }  
Mr Franklin Yu } having past business dealings with  
HKHA; and

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse working in the Housing  
Department, which was the executive  
arm of HKHA, but had no involvement  
in the planning application and  
management work of the subject estate.

20. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had left the meeting temporarily. The Committee agreed that as the interest of Mr Martin W.C. Kwan was direct, he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

21. The Committee also noted that the interest of Mr K.K. Ling, the Chairman was direct, but the Vice-chairman, Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang, had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, if the matter was subject to a statutory time limit, then as a matter of necessity, Mr Ling should continue to assume the chairmanship but a conscious effort should be made to contain his scope of involvement in an administrative role to minimise any risk that he might be challenged. The Committee agreed to the arrangement.

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

22. 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 renewal of planning approval for temporary public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) (surplus vehicle parking spaces only) under application No. A/K/12 for a period of three years until 11.6.2019;
- (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, one public comment was received from an individual objecting to the application regarding the vehicle park at Ma Tau Wai Estate (the estate) mainly on the grounds that surplus parking spaces should be converted for alternative permanent uses as there was a deficit in the provision of open space in the estate; there was no justification and overriding need for continued letting of the parking spaces to non-residents; and inclusion of advisory clause to suggest HKHA to consider converting surplus car parking area for provision of permanent uses was insufficient. No local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Kowloon City); 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 application complied with the TPB Guidelines No. 34B on Renewal of Planning Approval and Extension of Time for Compliance with Planning Conditions for Temporary Use or Development in that there was no material change in planning circumstances since the previous approval was

granted. An approval condition was recommended to ensure that priority would be given to the residents in renting the surplus vehicle parking spaces. Regarding the public comment, the assessments above were relevant and the applicant had also advised that the surplus monthly vehicle parking spaces were fully let to non-residents during the past approval period and local open space provision in the estate was in line with the requirement under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines.

23. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

24. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 12.6.2016 to until 11.6.2019, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition :

“priority should be accorded to the residents of Ma Tau Wai Estate and Sheung Lok Estate in the letting of the surplus monthly vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of monthly vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.”

25. 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 W.Y. Johanna Cheng, STP/K, 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.]



Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse working in the Housing Department, which was the executive arm of HKHA, but had no involvement in the planning application and management work of the subject estate.

27. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan had left the meeting temporarily. As Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

28. The Committee also noted that the interest of Mr K.K. Ling, the Chairman was direct, but the Vice-chairman, Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang, had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, if the matter was subject to a statutory time limit, then as a matter of necessity, Mr Ling should continue to assume the chairmanship but a conscious effort should be made to contain his scope of involvement in an administrative role to minimise any risk that he might be challenged. The Committee agreed to the arrangement.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

29. 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 renewal of planning approval for temporary public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) (surplus vehicle parking spaces only) under application No. A/TW/488 for a period of three years until 11.6.2019;
- (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 (DHK) and an individual. DHK expressed its views that the issue on shortage of parking space should be tackled by the Government comprehensively; the vacant parking spaces should be used as pedestrian path or open space to serve local residents; and the proposed public vehicle parks might generate additional traffic, whereas the individual opined that the surplus parking spaces should be used for provision of Government, institution and community facilities. The District Officer (Tsuen Wan) conveyed that Tsuen Wan District Council members had concerns on whether the application would have adverse impact on the number of parking spaces in the estates; 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 application complied with the TPB Guidelines No. 34B on Renewal of Planning Approval and Extension of Time for Compliance with Planning Conditions for Temporary Use or Development in that there was no material change in planning circumstances since the previous approval was granted. An approval condition was recommended to ensure that priority would be given to the residents in renting the surplus vehicle parking spaces. Regarding the public comments, the assessments above were relevant. An advisory clause was also recommended to advise the applicant that consideration might be given to letting the surplus vehicle parking spaces for community uses.

30. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, STP/TWK, said that no information was available at hand on the overall take-up rate of the vacant car parking spaces being let to non-residents. In response to another Member's enquiry, Mr Kwong said that the applicant had resized and reconfigured the car parking spaces at Cheung Shan Estate after taking into account the latest requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. The number of monthly private car parking spaces in that estate was therefore reduced from 138 to 96. As for Fuk Loi Estate, there was a rising trend for the

number of car parking spaces being utilised by residents. He further said that the Committee could review the situation by the end of the 3-year approval period of the current application so as to determine whether further planning permission should be granted.

### Deliberation Session

31. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 12.6.2016 to until 11.6.2019, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition :

“priority should be accorded to the residents of Cheung Shan Estate and Fuk Loi 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.”

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

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

[Mr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan returned to join the meeting at this point.]



**Agenda Item 7**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/477                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Gross Floor Area and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Religious Institution Development (Ancillary Monks Dormitory) in “Government, Institution or Community (4)” zone, Lots 660, 1253, 1461 (Part) and 1499 in D.D. 453 and adjoining Government land, Western Monastery, Lo Wai, Tsuen Wan  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/477A)

---

33.                      The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 20.5.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the second time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

34.                      After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information. Since it was the second deferment of the application and a total of three months had been allowed for the preparation of the submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[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 8**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K1/253                      Proposed Hotel in “Residential (Group A)” zone, 66-68 Shanghai Street,  
Jordan, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K1/253A)

---

35.            The Committee noted that a set of missing pages of the Paper were sent to Members before the meeting.

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

36.            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 hotel;
- (c)    departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. All concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application except that the District Officer (Yau Tsim Mong) advised that the proposed 17-storey building block might have direct visual impact on the residential flats of the neighbouring buildings;
- (d)    during the first three weeks of the two statutory publication periods, a total of ten public comments were received from Designing Hong Kong Limited (DHK), Tsim Sha Tsui Resident’s Concern Group and individuals. They objected to the application mainly on the grounds that the site should be used for development of residential flats; the trend of converting buildings in the area to commercial use should be halted; no information on shortage of budget hotels in the area was provided; traffic impact and the approval of the application would create an undesirable precedent; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed hotel development would result in reduction of sites available for residential developments and the supply of housing land in meeting the pressing housing demand over the territory. The applicant failed to provide strong justification to demonstrate that the site was very conducive for hotel development or the proposed development would meet a specific planning objective. Approval of the current application without strong justifications would set an undesirable precedent and the cumulative effect of approving such applications would aggravate the shortfall in the supply of housing land and jeopardise the planning intention of the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone. Regarding the public comments, the assessments above were relevant.

37. A Member asked whether there was any information on the type of hotel that was in greater demand. In response, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen, STP/TWK, by referring to paragraph 8.1.8 of the Paper, said that there were 59.3 million visitor arrivals in Hong Kong 2015 and hotel occupancy rate in the past decade in general stood at over 80%. In that regard, the Commissioner for Tourism supported the application. The Chairman supplemented that tackling the housing and land supply issue was currently the top priority task of the Government. While there was also a demand for land for hotel development, sites that were planned for residential use should be retained for housing purpose unless there were exceptional circumstances justifying their use for hotel development.

38. In response to another Member's enquiry, Ms Yuen said that the site was originally zoned “Commercial/Residential” before it was rezoned to “R(A)” on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) in 1993. The same Member said that if by rejecting the application, the site would not be redeveloped and there would still be no increase in the flat production. In response, Ms Yuen said that if the application was rejected by the Committee, the applicant would be informed of the reasons for rejection. The Chairman supplemented that it would be up to the applicant to determine whether he would submit application for other uses at the site but the Committee should consider the current application in accordance with the provision of the OZP and the prevailing Government policies.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the application site is located in a predominantly residential neighbourhood. Given the current shortfall in housing supply, the application site should be developed for its zoned use. The proposed hotel development would result in reduction of sites for residential developments, which would affect the supply of housing land in meeting the pressing housing demand over the territory; and
- (b) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would aggravate the shortfall in the supply of housing land.”

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

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

**Agenda Item 9**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Variation of Approval Conditions of the Planning Permission for the Approved Hong Kong Polytechnic University (Phase 8) Development under Application No. A/K2/184-2  
(MPC Paper No. 8/16)

---

40. The Secretary reported that the proposal was submitted by Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) and MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA), AGC Design Ltd. (AGC) and WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff (Asia) Ltd. (WSP) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr K.K. Cheung      | - having current business dealings with PolyU;          |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | having current business dealings with MVA and AGC;      |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho   | having current business dealings with MVA; and          |
| Mr Franklin Yu      | having past business dealings with MVA and WSP; and     |
| Mr Sunny L.K. Ho    | - being a guest lecturer and visiting scholar at PolyU. |

41. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interest of Mr K.K. Cheung was direct, he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application and the interest of Mr Sunny L.K. Ho was indirect, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

42. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen, STP/TWK, presented the proposal to vary approval conditions (a) and (b) as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

- (a) the proposed variation of approval conditions (a) and (b) of the planning permission under application No. A/K2/184-2 in relation to PolyU (Phase 8) development. The applicant requested to replace the proposed ‘underpass’ in approval conditions (a) and (b) by ‘footbridge’ in view of the technical difficulties on soil instability encountered by PolyU during the construction of the underpass which would pose unforeseeable high risk implication on Chatham Road South;
- (b) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 3 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed variations; and
- (c) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the proposed variations based on the assessments set out in paragraph 4 of the Paper. As advised by the applicant, the construction of the underpass was suspended since December 2011, due to problems of soil instability and unforeseeable high risk implication on Chatham Road South. The variation of approval conditions (a) and (b) would not jeopardise the planning intention of the “Government, Institution or Community (1)” zone and the PolyU Phase 8 development that had mostly been completed. Under the latest proposal, a footbridge was proposed at 2/F of the Phase 8 development for connection to the main campus. While the proposal would have some landscape impact, it could be addressed by approval condition (j). On the visual aspect, the Advisory Committee on the Appearance of Bridges and Associated Structures had accepted the footbridge design.

43. Members had no question on the proposal.

#### Deliberation Session

44. After deliberation, the Committee decided to vary approval conditions (a) and (b) of the planning permission under application No. A/K2/184-2 as follows:

“(a) the submission of a risk assessment plan and contingency plan in relation to the construction of the proposed footbridge at Chatham Road South to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the Town Planning Board (TPB); and

(b) the design, implementation and maintenance of the proposed footbridge to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB”.

45. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note that other approval conditions and advisory clauses of the planning permission under application No. A/K2/184-2 would remain unchanged.

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

[Mr K.K. Cheung returned to join the meeting while Mr Sunny L.K. Ho left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

**Agenda Item 10**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K3/571                      Flat, Shop and Services in “Residential (Group E)1” zone and an Area shown as ‘Road’, 25-29 Kok Cheung Street, Tai Kok Tsui, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K3/571)

---

46.                      The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTA) was one of the consultants of the applicant and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had declared interest in the item for having current business dealings with KTA. The Committee noted that Mr Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

47.                      The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 23.5.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time to address the departmental comments and to prepare further information in support of the application. It was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

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



**Agenda Item 11**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/777                      Shop and Services (Real Estate Agency) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business(1)” zone, Flat D1B (Portion), G/F, Garment Centre, 576-586 Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/777)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

49.                      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 (real estate agency);

[Mr Sunny L.K. Ho returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (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, no public comment was received. No local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Sham Shui Po); 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 application complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Development within the “Other Specified Uses (Business)” zone (TPB PG-No. 22D) in that it would not induce significant adverse fire safety, traffic, environmental and infrastructural impacts to the developments within the subject building and the adjacent areas. Should the Committee

decide to approve the application, no time clause on commencement was proposed as the shop and services (real estate agency) use under application was already in operation.

50. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

51. 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 10.12.2016; and
- (b) if the above planning condition is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

**Agenda Item 12**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/SC/10                      Proposed Temporary Industrial Use (Revalidation and Repair Workshop for Liquefied Petroleum Gas Vehicle Fuel Tanks) for a Period of 5 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Boatyards and Marine-oriented Industrial Uses” zone, New Kowloon Inland Lot No. 6370 (Part), 85 Hing Wah Street West, Stonecutters Island, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/SC/10)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

53.                      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 proposed temporary industrial use (revalidation and repair workshop for liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) vehicle fuel tanks) for a period of 5 years;
- (c)    departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 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, one public comment was received from Shun Tak – China Travel Ship Management Limited, whose shipyard was located to the immediate north-east of the site, mainly on ground of risk of leakage of LPG; adverse impact on evacuation and rescue in case of accidents/fire; risks associated with inflammable gas resulting in changes in policy terms/increase of premium of insurance for their company, and risks to the general public. No local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Shum Shui Po); 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. The proposed temporary workshop was a kind of industrial use which was not incompatible with the industrial use (i.e. shipyard) at the subject lot and the shipyards/marine-oriented industrial uses in the surrounding area. The proposed development was unlikely to cause any adverse traffic and environmental impacts. There had been no material change in planning circumstances and the characteristics of the surrounding area since the last approval of the previous application in October 2015. Regarding the public concern on the risks associated with the proposed use and traffic impact, the planning assessments above were relevant and relevant departments including the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services, the Director of Fire Services and the Commissioner for Transport had no objection to the application.

54. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

55. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 10.6.2021, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission of fire safety measures including the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 10.12.2016;
- (b) in relation to (a) above, the implementation of fire safety measures including the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB before commencement of operation of the proposed development;

- (c) 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; and
- (d) if the above planning condition (b) is not complied with before commencement of operation of the proposed development, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

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

### **Hong Kong District**

#### **Agenda Item 13**

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

[Open Meeting]

A/H3/425                    ‘Eating Place’ and ‘Shop and Services’ Uses (on the 4th and 5th floors of the Proposed Composite Commercial/Residential Development) in “Residential (Group A) 12” and “Residential (Group A)” zones and an Area shown as ‘Road’, 37-39 Elgin Street and 73-73E Caine Road, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/425C)

---

57. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Sun Crystal Ltd., a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd. (HLD), and BMT Asia Pacific Ltd. (BMT) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with HLD and BMT;
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HLD;
- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok - being an employee of the University of Hong Kong which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD before; and
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being the President of the Hong Kong Business Accountants Association which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before.

58. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok had left the meeting. The Committee also noted that the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that as Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, he could stay in the meeting.

59. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 18.5.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time to acquire a lot within the site and to address departmental comments. It was the fourth time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application. Since the last deferment in February 2016, the applicant had submitted an updated Air Quality Impact Assessment on 19.4.2016 and claimed to have made progress in acquiring a lot within the site and meetings were being arranged to address the comments of relevant departments.

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 two months from the date of receipt of further information from the

applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information. Since it was the fourth deferment of the application and a total of eight months had been allowed for the preparation of submission of the further information, it was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted.

#### **Agenda Item 14**

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

[Open Meeting]

A/H3/429                      Proposed Composite Residential and Commercial Development (Flat, Eating Place and Shop and Services) and Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction in "Government, Institution or Community" and "Residential (Group A) 7" zones, 6-22 Chung Ching Street, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/429)

---

61.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Camluck Development Ltd., a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd. (HLD), and Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTA) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (OAP) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - having current business dealings with HLD, KTA and OAP; and; |
| Mr Franklin Yu      | - having past business dealings with HLD and OAP;              |

- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with OAP;
- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok - being an employee of the University of Hong Kong which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD before; and
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being the President of the Hong Kong Business Accountants Association which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before.

62. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok had left the meeting. The Committee also noted that the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that as Mr Franklin Yu and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had no involvement in the application, they could stay in the meeting.

63. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 20.5.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of an air ventilation assessment. It was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

64. 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.



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

### **Agenda Item 15**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H5/217-3            Proposed Class B Amendments to the Approved Master Layout Plan for a Proposed Hotel and Commercial Development, Inland Lot No. 8715 on Kennedy Road and Ship Street, Wanchai, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H5/217-3)

---

65.            The Committee noted that a letter from the applicant dated 8.6.2016 providing responses to the Planning Department's (PlanD) views in the Paper was tabled for Members' reference.

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

66.            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 Class B amendments to the approved Master Layout Plan for a proposed hotel and commercial development under application No. A/H5/217 (the approved scheme) which mainly involved a change in the egress point at Hopewell Centre II (HCII) (the current proposal);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper and:
  - (i) the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) considered that taking into account the potential increase in traffic due to HCII, the original

traffic arrangement under the approved scheme had struck a balance in minimising adverse traffic impacts at Kennedy Road (KR) and any changes to the original traffic arrangement would induce changes to the balance and hence would require very strong justifications. The proposed egress was relatively close to the proposed flyover-tunnel system at KR as compared with the existing egress of Hopewell Centre (HCI). C for T was concerned about the potential conflicts as the detailed design of the aforesaid flyover-tunnel system had not yet been submitted by the applicant or agreed by relevant authorities. The swept path submitted by the applicant indicated that a significant portion of the footpath adjoining the proposed egress at KR would be utilised by vehicular movement from HCII. That was not desirable from traffic and road safety viewpoints. According to the applicant, the section of KR (2-lane carriageway) outside HCII would only have a width of about 7.3m. Due to the presence of the proposed flyover-tunnel system, such width would be less than the carriageway width outside the existing egress point at HCI. Therefore, the proposed egress at KR was not a desirable design given the future need for maneuvering of long vehicles from the aforesaid egress;

- (ii) the District Officer (Wanchai) (DO(Wch)) advised that a Wan Chai District Council member considered that the current proposal was unnecessary as the authorised road improvement works at KR (i.e. the original traffic arrangement) should have satisfied the requirements of the relevant departments. As a result of the HCII development, various works were taking place along KR and the additional works arising from the construction of the new egress and demolition of the existing egress would only worsen the traffic condition. DO(Wch) also expected that any modification of the existing vehicular arrangement on KR would draw concerns from the stakeholders in the community, particularly nearby residents;
- (iii) the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS) had concerns

from tree preservation point of view as the details regarding the interface between the tunnel-flyover system and the trees within the Old and Valuable Tree – Tree Protection Zone during both the construction stage and commencement of operation/future maintenance upon the works completion were not known at the moment; and

- (iv) other concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application; and

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

- (d) the PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The current application was for a proposed at-grade vehicular egress at about 55.5mPD at HCII (i.e. 12/F in the Current Scheme) with left-turn onto the eastbound lane of KR and permanent closure of the existing egress at HCI. The proposed egress would form part of the whole traffic arrangement for HCI and HCII, but the detailed design of the flyover-tunnel system on KR was yet to be available from the applicant. C for T echoed the Committee's view in considering the previous application (No. A/H5/217-2) that the original traffic arrangement had struck a balance in minimising adverse traffic impacts at KR and any changes to the original arrangement should require very strong justifications. C for T also considered that the proposed egress at HCII was not a desirable design for smooth maneuvering of long vehicles given the presence of the flyover-tunnel system which limited the width of that section of KR to about 7.3m and a significant portion of the footpath adjoining the proposed egress would be affected by vehicular movement. The essentiality of the proposed at-grade egress at HCII was yet to be demonstrated. The applicant was also advised to address C for T's concerns over the provision of parking spaces and loading/unloading bays for HCII under the relevant condition of the previous planning permissions.

67. Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo, STP/HK, supplemented that the letter submitted by the applicant dated 8.6.2016 (i) claimed that as the applicant proposed to permanently close an existing egress at HCI, PlanD's reference to the "additional" egress at KR in the proposed rejection reason in paragraph 10.1(b) of the Paper was incorrect and misleading; and (ii) questioned whether the Transport Department's (TD) comment had taken into account the further information submitted on 1.6.2016 which should have addressed TD's technical concern. In response to the concerns raised in the letter, Miss Lo said that if the Committee decided to reject the application, the rejection reasons could be revised as considered appropriate by the Committee; and C for T had advised that their comments provided had taken into account the applicant's latest submission.

68. The Chairman asked whether (i) the concern of the Transport Department (TD) from traffic point of view could be addressed by way of imposing an approval condition; and (ii) the proposed change in egress would create a more pedestrian-friendly environment for HCI and HCII as a whole as pedestrians would only need to cross one, instead of two, vehicular access points. In response, Mr W.L. Tang, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), TD, said that the access arrangement for long/heavy vehicles (up to 12m in length) was the major consideration in the current application. Based on the information provided by the applicant, the proposed egress point would be located at the section of KR with a width of about 7.3m only. That was considered undesirable from road safety perspective in that long vehicles would have to utilise either a large portion of the pedestrian footpath or part of the opposite traffic lane in order to exit from HCII. In comparison, the egress in the approved scheme was located at a wider section of KR where the carriageway would offer more maneuvering space. Mr Tang further said that in view of TD's comments, the applicant proposed on 1.6.2016 to re-align the pedestrian footpath within the boundary of HCII which would fall within private land so as to provide additional maneuvering space for long vehicles. However, the feasibility of such arrangement was yet to be ascertained by the applicant in a holistic manner. It was also considered that such revised egress location had no significant design merit for pedestrian traffic when compared to that of the approved scheme. As the feasibility of the revised egress proposal together with the whole traffic arrangement for HCII had not yet been demonstrated, if the application was approved and the proposed egress was found to be not feasible or not desirable at a later stage, it might result in substantial abortive work by all concerned parties. As such, TD did not consider that the traffic concerns could be dealt with by imposing an approval condition at this stage.

69. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Tang, by referring to Drawing AA-8 of the Paper, said that the applicant was unable to demonstrate clearly the feasibility of the proposed egress as the photomontages submitted by the applicant were for indicative purpose only and not to scale. Structural drawings with details such as location and thickness/size of the structural walls and supporting columns were required so that TD could better determine the implications of the proposed egress, such as its effect on sightlines.

70. Another Member asked whether there was information regarding the sightline for east-bound traffic on KR towards the proposed egress. In response, Mr Tang said that despite the applicant had provided some information regarding the sightline, additional information on structural design of the proposed flyover-tunnel system should be required to demonstrate the feasibility of the current proposal. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Mr Tang said that the current proposal was not considered favourable from traffic perspective when compared to the original arrangement under the approved scheme.

71. Noting that the applicant had proposed to close off the existing ingress and egress points at HCI, a Member enquired on the future use of the closed off area in HCI. In response, Miss Lo said that according to the applicant, there was an internal road within the closed off area which would still be maintained to provide access to the car park of HCI. The main reason for the applicant to permanently close off the existing egress at HCI was to address the Committee's previous concern when considering application No. A/H5/217-2. In response to the Chairman's question, Miss Lo said that based on the applicant's submission, if the original traffic arrangement was implemented, major alteration works for a number of car parking floors at HCI would be required so as to enable heavy vehicles to exit from HCI.

72. In responses to a Member's enquiry on whether the current proposal would cause tailback at KR, Mr Tang said that it would depend on the internal circulation arrangement between HCI and HCII and such information from the applicant was still pending although TD previously had requested for it.

### Deliberation Session

73. Mr Tang said that according to the applicant's submission, the size of the proposed hotel lobby would be increased to more than 3,000m<sup>2</sup>. If the lobby was used for other purposes, it might have implication on the overall traffic impact of the proposed development at HCII.

74. The Committee noted that the main issue with the revised egress proposal was on traffic safety grounds. In response to a Member's concern on whether the proposed internal circulation arrangement at HCI and HCII would worsen the traffic at KR, the Chairman said that the total traffic volume entering and exiting the site should remain the same. A Member considered that the design of the revised egress was inferior to that of the original approved scheme. Members generally considered that the application should not be approved before the feasibility and design merit of the current proposal could be fully demonstrated.

75. In going through the rejection reasons, the Chairman suggested and the Committee agreed that, subject to refinement by the Secretariat, the rejection reason (b) in the Paper would have to be revised to reflect the above deliberation.

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

- “(a) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed egress at Kennedy Road will not cause traffic safety threats due to potential conflict with the proposed flyover and tunnel system necessitated by the proposed development; and
- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed egress at Kennedy Road has merits over the egress arrangement under the approved scheme of application No. A/H5/217.”

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

**Agenda Item 16**

**Any Other Business**

[Open Meeting]

77. A Member asked whether there was information from the Planning Department on the future land requirements for various uses such as hotel and public car park to facilitate Members in considering relevant planning applications. In response, the Chairman said that there was no information on the exact number of hotel rooms required in Hong Kong as a whole. However, suitable sites had been reserved for hotel development in different parts of Hong Kong such as Kai Tak Development. As for public car parking spaces provisions, Transport Department was investigating whether there was scope to incorporate such requirement into sales conditions of land sale sites as appropriate so as to cater for the demand.

78. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 12:20 p.m..