

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 564<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 26.8.2016**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr K.K. Ling

Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

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

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),  
Transport Department  
Mr Wilson W.S. Pang

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Richard W.Y. Wong

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department  
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr T.Y. Ip

**In Attendance**

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

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Miss Gloria Y.L. Sze

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 563<sup>rd</sup> MPC Meeting held on 12.8.2016

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 563<sup>rd</sup> MPC meeting held on 12.8.2016 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting]

Y/K11/5                      Application for Amendment to the Draft Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K11/28, To Rezone the Application Site from “Government, Institution or Community” to “Residential (Group B)”, No. 99 Shatin Pass Road and Adjoining Government Land, Wong Tai Sin, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. Y/K11/5)

---

3.            The Secretary reported that BMT Asia Pacific Limited (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 BMT; and  |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho   | - | his firm having past business dealings with BMT, which were not related to the application. |

4.            The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had not yet arrived to join the meeting.    The Committee also noted that the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that as Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had no involvement in the application, he could stay in the meeting.

5.            The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 2.8.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments.    It was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

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

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

### **Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Submission for Compliance with Approval Condition (a) of Application No. A/K20/126, Proposed Public Utility Installation (Dry Weather Flow Interceptor) in "Open Space" zone and an area shown as 'Road', Government Land, Hoi Fai Road, Tai Kok Tsui, Kowloon West (MPC Paper No. 10/16)

---

7. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Drainage Services Department (DSD) and Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited (B&V) was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

- |                   |   |   |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Mr K.K. Cheung    | - | his firm having current business dealings with B&V; and   |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | his firm having past business dealings with DSD and B&V, which were not related to the application. |

8. As Mr K.K. Cheung and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

### Presentation and Question Sessions

9. Miss Michelle M.S. Yuen, STP/TWK, drew Members' attention that a supplementary information of a drawing of the proposed railings of the proposed development was dispatched to Members before the meeting. She then presented the applicant's submission with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) the Committee was invited to consider whether the submission made by the applicant, DSD, on the revised design of the proposed development was acceptable for compliance with approval condition (a) of application No. A/K20/126 for the proposed public utility installation (dry weather flow interceptor);

#### Background

- (b) the application was approved by the Committee on 23.10.2015. During the meeting, Members raised concerns on the design of the proposed development. In particular, Members considered that the overall design of the proposed development should be further revised to enhance visual openness for public enjoyment and facilitate pedestrian movement. The Committee decided to impose, amongst others, the following approval condition:

#### Approval condition (a)

the submission of a revised design of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Town Planning Board;

#### Submission under Approval Condition (a)

- (c) on 15.7.2016, 16.8.2016 and 24.8.2016, the applicant submitted drawings and supplementary information of a revised design of the proposed development for compliance with approval condition (a). The current revised design was different from the approved scheme in the following aspects: (i) removal of the fence wall above the underground pumping station of the proposed development in the northern part of the subject site

to enhance visual openness (the area would be fenced off during maintenance works and screenings removal for safety reasons), leading to a reduction in the fenced off area from 380m<sup>2</sup> to 170m<sup>2</sup>; (ii) addition of a staircase connecting the promenade and the open space at Hoi Fai Road to mitigate the bottleneck effect at the promenade and enhance pedestrian flow; (iii) increase in the remaining area open to the public (except during maintenance period) from 757m<sup>2</sup> to 967m<sup>2</sup>; (iv) increase in the percentage of the area open to the public from 77% to 90%; (v) additional tree planting and greening measures including vertical greening at the northern and western facades of the proposed above-ground pumping station, grasscrete and removable planters with shrubs and benches with shelter above the underground pumping station, planting of shrubs and six additional trees on removable planters at the promenade; and (vi) the height of planter boxes had been reduced and semi-sunken to a height of 0.75m above ground;

- (d) according to the applicant, further widening of the promenade at the bottleneck was not achievable due to the site constraint and space requirement to accommodate the pumping station and all the required underground facilities;
- (e) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 5 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the applicant's submission; and
- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered the applicant's current submission acceptable for compliance with approval condition (a) based on the assessment made in paragraph 6 of the Paper. The applicant had revised and improved the design of the proposed development, in particular the removal of the original fence wall above the underground pumping station in the northern part of the subject site to enhance visual openness and maximise the provision of open space. A staircase had been proposed to connect the promenade and the open space at Hoi Fai Road to enhance pedestrian circulation. Additional landscaping and greening measures had been proposed to further soften the building

mass, maximise tree planting opportunities and enhance visual openness. Members' concerns on the visual openness of the site, the bottleneck effect at the waterfront promenade and public enjoyment of the open space had been addressed by the currently revised design.

10. The Chairman recapitulated that the Committee had previously agreed that the location and scale of the proposed development, which was a necessary facility, were appropriate while there were some concerns on the design of the proposed development in view of its location at the harbourfront. The applicant currently submitted a revised design to address the Committee's concerns.

11. The Vice-chairman noted that planting and greening would be provided at the promenade and vertical greening would also be provided at the facades of the proposed above-ground pumping station, but concrete walls were proposed near the bottleneck point. The Vice-chairman asked if vertical greening was possible at the concerned concrete walls or consideration could be taken to replacing the concrete walls by wooden ones to mitigate the visual impact.

12. With reference to Drawing AA-4 of Paper, Miss Michelle M.S. Yuen, STP/TWK, said that three benches with vertical greening were provided in the southern portion of the promenade in the original design and they would be retained in the currently revised design. Although vertical greening had not been proposed by the applicant at the concrete walls near the bottleneck point, the suggestion could be conveyed to the applicant for consideration in refining the design.

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

13. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether a public observation deck could be provided on the rooftop of the above-ground pumping station, Miss Michelle M.S. Yuen said that the technical feasibility of such provision had to be ascertained, noting that machinery and dangerous goods would be stored within the pumping station, and about half of the rooftop area would be occupied by solar panels. She supplemented that the rooftop would not be open to the public in the current design.



14. A Member expressed appreciation of the applicant's current design of the proposed development, which had taken into account the Committee's previous comments and shown improvements to the previous scheme. Nevertheless, the Member was of view that the proposed staircase at the bottleneck point might attract more pedestrians from different directions, resulting in more congestion at that location. The Member suggested constructing a footbridge decking over part of the sea so as to provide some relief to the bottleneck point for better pedestrian circulation. The Chairman remarked that the feasibility of building a footbridge decking over the sea had previously been examined but found to be not feasible due to the stringent requirements under the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance.

#### Deliberation Session

15. The Chairman summarized that Members had made two main suggestions with regard to the design of the proposed development, namely vertical greening at the concrete walls near the bottleneck point and provision of public observation deck at the rooftop of the proposed above-ground pumping station. The Chairman said that the former could be further considered by the applicant, while for the latter, there might be technical constraints as the rooftop area was generally occupied by building utilities. A Member also remarked that additional facilities such as lifts or ramps for the disabled would need to be provided should the rooftop be open to the public, which might not be possible in the subject development.

16. The Chairman remarked that improvements had been made to the original design of the proposed development in that there was a reduction in the fenced off area and the public could visit the place most of the time throughout the year, except during its maintenance period which might last for about 1.5 to 2 months per year. The area open to the public would also be subject to regular maintenance works and screenings removal about two to three times per week, lasting for about half a day each time.

17. After deliberation, the Committee agreed that the submission was accepted for compliance with approval condition (a) of application No. A/K20/126, and approval condition (a) had been complied with. The Committee also agreed to request PlanD to liaise with the applicant to explore the feasibility of increasing vertical greening at the proposed

development.

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

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K2/215                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction from 10 Storeys to 11 Storeys for School (with Boarding Facilities) in “Government, Institution or Community” zone, No. 1 Jordan Road, Kowloon  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/K2/215A)

---

18.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Council of the Diocesan Girls’ School (DGS). Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had declared interest in the item as she knew the Headmistress of DGS and both of them served on the Women’s Commission. As Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong did not discuss the matter with the Headmistress, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

19.            With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss 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 minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction from 10 storeys to 11 storeys for school (with boarding facilities);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. Major departmental comments were summarised as follows:
  - (i) the Secretary for Education had no objection to the application and

in-principle approval had been given to DGS to provide boarding facilities in-situ;

- (ii) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) noted that as the additional floor for the proposed boarding facilities would be constructed/accommodated within the already built structural frame of the school building, the perceivable bulk of the existing development would remain more or less the same. The proposed increase in BH was relatively small in scale and it was not anticipated that the proposal would induce any significant ventilation and visual impact to the surroundings;
  - (iii) noting that the proposed development would be fitted into the architectural features of the existing school, the Chief Architect/Central Management Division (2), Architectural Services Department (CA/CMD2, ArchSD) advised that there would be no significant visual impact on the surrounding area;
  - (iv) the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) had no objection to the application as adverse air quality and noise impacts were not anticipated for the proposed boarding facilities; and
  - (v) other concerned government 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 10 public comments were received and all of them objected to the application, mainly on the grounds that the proposed development would create a wall effect blocking air circulation and sunlight; there was already dormitory use at the school and erection of dormitory should not be allowed as the premises should be for educational rather than residential purpose; dormitory and residences should only be reserved for tertiary institutions; and it was not justified to allow the redevelopment of DGS again after only

less than five years as it would cause further disturbance, pollution and traffic congestion to the neighbourhood. The District Officer (Yau Tsim Mong) advised that the proposed increase in BH might have visual impact on the residential flats of neighbouring buildings; and

- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments made in paragraph 10 of the Paper, which were summarised as follows:
- (i) the proposed ancillary boarding facilities as part of the school were always permitted within “Government, Institution or community” (“G/IC”) zone and such facilities in support of the existing school were in line with the planning intention of the “G/IC” zone;
  - (ii) the proposed development involving an addition of one storey from 10 to 11 storeys (+10%) was not significant and could be considered as minor. Notwithstanding that the applicant had not provided any design merits in support of the application, the proposed increase in BH could be considered to have satisfied the relevant criteria for consideration of application for minor relaxation of BH restriction as stated in paragraph 7.5 of the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP);
  - (iii) CTP/UD&L, PlanD and CA/CMD2, ArchSD were of view that the proposal would unlikely cause significant visual impact on the surrounding areas. CTP/UD&L, PlanD also considered that the proposed increase in BH would not induce any significant air ventilation impact on the surrounding environment;
  - (iv) DEP had no objection to the application and advised that on-site works would be minimised by employing pre-fabricated building elements and the construction period was expected to be not more than nine months given the relatively small-scale of the project;

- (v) other concerned government departments had no adverse comments on the application from building safety, traffic, drainage and sewerage aspects; and
- (vi) regarding the adverse public comments, the planning assessment above was relevant.

*Proposed Boarding Facilities*

20. In response to a Member's enquiry, Miss Michelle M.S. Yuen, STP/TWK, said that there were a total of 42 existing beds on 9/F and 10/F of the school and 18 beds would be provided on 11/F, resulting in a total of 60 beds. After the redevelopment of DGS in 2011, 9/F and 10/F were originally built as dormitory for expatriate teachers. However, having noted that expatriate teachers did not prefer living in school dormitories, DGS intended to convert 9/F and 10/F into student dormitory, together with the proposed additional floor at 11/F, for providing a total of 60 beds for students.

21. A Member asked about the ratio for boarding provision in other schools and whether there was any principle or regulation in determining the ratio. In response, Miss Michelle M.S. Yuen said that the provision of 60 beds in DGS represented a 5% boarding ratio for the 1,100 students in the secondary school, whereas several hundreds of beds were provided in Diocesan Boys' School.

22. The same Member asked PlanD to elaborate the responses to the public comments. Miss Michelle M.S. Yuen said that one of the concerns was the potential wall effect of the development blocking air ventilation. CTP/UD&L, PlanD had been consulted and she considered that the proposal would not induce any significant ventilation impact on the surrounding environment taking into account that the proposed increase in BH was relatively small in scale and it would not alter the street pattern. Another concern was that the premises should be for educational rather than residential purpose. PlanD was of view that DGS was an educational institution and the provision of 60 beds could be considered as its ancillary use. The premises was still mainly for educational use. Regarding the concern on potential environmental nuisance to the neighbourhood, Miss Yuen said that DEP

had no objection to the application, the proposed construction works would be small in scale and the applicant had indicated that relevant environmental regulations would be observed during the nine-month construction period.

23. Another Member noted that the proposed floor area for 11/F would be about 525m<sup>2</sup> and asked why only 18 beds were provided, particularly in comparison with the number of beds provided on the 9/F and 10/F. With reference to Drawing A-2 of the Paper, Miss Michelle M.S. Yuen explained that the proposed 11/F would not only be occupied by beds, but also other common facilities such as bathroom, common room and guardian room. The room size of the previous staff dormitory was about 25 to 30 m<sup>2</sup> (for shared use), and that for the proposed student dormitory would be about 30 m<sup>2</sup> (which would be for more beds).

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

*Policy or Regulation for Provision of Boarding Facilities in Secondary Schools*

24. Referring to paragraph 10.3 of the Paper which stated that the proposed increase in BH could be considered to have satisfied the relevant criteria as stated in the ES of the OZP notwithstanding that the applicant had not provided any design merits in support of the application, the Vice-chairman invited Miss Michelle M.S. Yuen to explain how the proposal had fulfilled the relevant criteria. The Vice-chairman was of the view that there should be planning merits warranting approval of the application, otherwise it might set an undesirable precedent for similar applications. Two other Members shared similar view. One of them asked how the proposed addition of 18 beds would benefit school teaching, and enquired if there was any principle guiding the provision of dormitories in secondary schools by the Education Bureau (EDB), noting that over 90% of secondary schools in Hong Kong did not provide any dormitory.

25. In response, Miss Michelle M.S. Yuen said that the proposal complied with the relevant criteria stated in paragraph 7.5(f) of the ES of the OZP in that there were site constraints in the school development. She further said that the total area of DGS was about 1.3 ha and most of the land were already used up for educational and sports facilities and the remaining land near the entrance were for vehicular access and maneuvering. As such, there

was no other space for additional boarding facilities. Taking into account the existing dormitory at 9/F and 10/F, it was not unacceptable to provide the required dormitory by adding a floor within the already built concrete structure of the existing school.

26. A Member asked whether an application for relaxation of BH for completed public housing development for provision of additional housing units would also be approved. In response, the Chairman said that each application would be considered on its own merits.

27. In response to another Member's enquiry, Miss Michelle M.S. Yuen clarified that the 42 beds on 9/F and 10/F had yet to be occupied.

### Deliberation Session

28. A Member expressed doubt on the need to provide boarding facilities for students in secondary schools as there did not appear to be any government policy on such provision. EDB had given in-principle approval to the school to provide the facilities in-situ, but without giving any reason. This Member was concerned about the implication of the approval of the subject application on other similar applications. The Chairman remarked that there was no planning standard for provision of boarding facilities in secondary schools and the provision of such facilities in a few secondary schools in Hong Kong might be related to school traditions or the educational needs of individual schools. He drew Members' attention that the boarding facilities, which were ancillary to the permitted school use at the subject site, did not require planning permission and the Committee should focus on whether the application for minor relaxation of BH restriction could be approved from the planning perspective, having noted that such application was to facilitate the provision of additional beds for students of the school.

29. A Member noted from one of the public comments that DGS was a Direct Subsidy School and approval of the current application in relation to the provision of boarding facilities might imply that school places to local families would be lost and the school might be in the direction of becoming an international school. The Member had no objection to the application but wondered whether the concerns raised, which were under the purview of relevant departments or bureaux, should be addressed by the Committee. The Chairman said that the concerns raised were speculative and were not directly related to the

application. As school admission policies were under the purview of EDB, the concerns raised in the public comment could be conveyed to EDB for their attention, if necessary. The Chairman further said that no adverse impacts were anticipated from the additional boarding facilities. In addition, the proposed boarding facilities would be constructed within the already built structural frame of the school building and there was structural capacity available to accommodate the additional loading, and concerned departments had no objection to the application.

30. A Member supported the application as residence education was beneficial to students for developing their independence, though such planning merits were not clearly stated in the application. The Member also opined that the addition of dormitory places could achieve economy of scale for better provision of such facility for the students.

31. Another Member also supported the application, having considered that the proposed additional floor would be constructed within the already built structural frame of the school building, the proposal would not cause adverse impact, and there was policy support from the concerned bureau. The proposal would also benefit the students and the operation of the school and could to a certain extent be considered as a planning gain.

32. 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 26.8.2020, 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 condition:

“the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board.”

33. 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 Miss Michelle M.S. Yuen, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]



**Agenda Item 6**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/439                      Proposed Religious Institution (Buddhism Institution) in “Residential (Group A)” zone, Shop G5 on G/F and 1/F to 3/F, 1-5 Shek Man Path, Kwai Ying Building, Kwai Chung  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/439)

---

34.            The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 18.8.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

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

**Agenda Item 7**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TWW/112                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted House Development in “Residential (Group C) 1” zone, Lot 425 in D.D. 399, Ting Kau, Tsuen Wan  
(MPC Paper No. A/TWW/112)

---

36. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 16.8.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

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

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

### **Hong Kong District**

#### **Agenda Item 8**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H20/21  
(MPC Paper No.13/16)

---

38. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendment sites were in Chai Wan area. One of the proposed amendments involved rezoning of a site for a public housing development by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members and the Secretary 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 of HKHA;
- Mr Martin W.C. Kwan  
*as the Chief Engineer (Works) of the Home Affairs Department* - being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a Member of the SPC and Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA;
- Mr Sunny L.K. Ho - owning a flat and a car parking space and co-owning another flat with his spouse in Chai Wan area;
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - being a Director of a company owning a property in Chai Wan area; and having past business dealings with HKHA;
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau  
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho } having current business dealings with HKHA;
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HKHA;
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse working in the HD, but had no involvement in the subject matter; and
- Mr Raymond K.W. Lee  
(the Secretary) - owning property in Chai Wan area and his spouse also owning a property in Chai Wan area.

39. Mr Dominic K.K. Lam declared that the property owned by his company was in proximity to the subject sites. The Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

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

40. As the properties of Mr Sunny L.K. Ho and/or his spouse and the Secretary and/or his spouse did not have a direct view of the subject sites, 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 Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of those Members in relation to HKHA on the item only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting.

### Presentation and Question Sessions

41. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr J.J. Austin, STP/HK, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

#### Proposed Amendment Item A

##### *Background*

- (a) to meet the pressing need for housing land, a piece of government land of about 0.37 ha (with a net site of about 0.33 ha) at the junction of Chai Wan Road, Wing Ping Street and San Ha Street was proposed for rezoning from “Open Space” (“O”) to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) for a proposed public housing development by HD. A maximum building height restriction (BHR) of 120mPD was also proposed, taking account of the surrounding high-rise residential developments ranging from 100mPD to 120mPD and to maintain a stepped BH profile gradually decreasing towards the waterfront;

##### *Proposed Public Housing Development*

- (b) according to HD’s proposal, a public housing block on top of a podium would be developed with a plot ratio of 10 and a BH not exceeding 120mPD, providing about 800 flats for an estimated population of about 1,830. A Neighbourhood Elderly Centre and a public open space with

children's playground would be provided;

*Technical Assessments*

- (c) various technical assessments for the proposed development were conducted, including Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), Visual Appraisal (VA), Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) – Expert Evaluation, Preliminary Landscape Proposal and Quantitative Risk Assessment. The proposed development would not cause insurmountable problems in traffic, visual, air ventilation and landscape aspects with implementation of suitable mitigation or improvement measures. No insurmountable noise, air and sewerage problem would be anticipated. Concerned departments had no adverse comment on or no objection to the rezoning proposal;
- (d) HD would carry out Environmental Assessment Study (including Air Quality Impact Assessment and Noise Impact Assessment), Sewerage Impact Assessment and further public transport assessment for the proposed development at the detailed design stage;

Proposed Amendment Item B

*Background*

- (e) the Government launched a public consultation on the review of the columbarium policy from July to September 2010, and had been promoting the district-based columbarium development scheme. The proposed public columbarium development site at Cape Collinson Road was one of the shortlisted sites in the consultation;

*Proposed Columbarium*

- (f) it was proposed to rezone the site (with an area of about 3,940m<sup>2</sup>) from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Funeral Parlour” (“OU(Funeral Parlour)”) to “OU” annotated “Columbarium” (“OU(Columbarium)”) to

take forward the proposed public columbarium development. The current BHR of 5 storeys (excluding any basement floor(s)) covering the site would remain unchanged. It was estimated that the proposed public columbarium development would be a 6-storey building (including one storey of basement) providing 25,000 niches;

*Technical Assessments*

- (g) VA and Landscape and Tree Preservation Proposal were conducted and concluded that the proposed development would not cause insurmountable problems in visual and landscape aspects with implementation of suitable mitigation or improvement measures. Concerned departments had no adverse comment on or no objection to the rezoning proposal from environmental, drainage, sewerage, and water supply perspectives;
- (h) the TIA Review confirmed that the proposed columbarium would increase the traffic and pedestrian flows in the vicinity, particularly in Lin Shing Road and recommended some improvement measures and special traffic arrangements to mitigate the potential impacts, including: (i) provision of a new pedestrian access route by linking Cape Collinson Road and San Ha Street with escalators and stairway, together with associated footpath and carriageway widening on Cape Collinson Road; and (ii) widening of carriageway and footway at the junction of Lin Shing Road and Cape Collinson Road, coupled with the provision of bus lay-bys;
- (i) a Preliminary Environmental Review, ground investigation and geotechnical assessment, and drainage and sewerage plans would be conducted and submitted at the detailed design stage;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (j) a new set of Notes for the “OU(Columbarium)” zone was proposed;

- (k) 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 the “Industrial” zone and in Schedule II of the “OU” annotated “Business” zone. 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)’;

#### Departmental Consultation

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

#### Consultation with Eastern District Council (EDC)

- (m) on 27.6.2016, the Planning, Works and Housing Committee of the EDC was consulted on the proposed OZP amendments. In general, members supported the proposed amendments which would facilitate the provision of public housing units and public columbarium niches. Their main concerns were on the compensation on the loss of “O” site, traffic arrangement of the two sites and potential noise problem arising from the flyover junction between Chai Wan Road and Wing Tai Road affecting the public housing site; and
- (n) in response to EDC’s concerns, HD indicated that a public open space with children’s playground would be provided at the proposed development. Regarding the traffic aspect, according to the TIA, there would be no adverse traffic impact on the surrounding road network and parking spaces would be provided in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. On the noise aspect, mitigation measures would be provided through the design of the housing block including the disposition of tower and the provision of noise-reduction balconies, and the Director of Environmental Protection considered that there was no insurmountable noise problem.

*Amendment Item A - Proposed Public Housing Development*

42. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang, DPO/HK, said that the TIA conducted for the proposed public housing development confirmed that all critical junctions surrounding the site would operate within their capacities in design year 2025 and Transport Department considered that the TIA was acceptable.

43. Another Member asked if there was any assessment on pedestrian traffic and whether any footbridge would be constructed to connect the proposed development with the existing network of pedestrian walkways leading from Chai Wan MTR Station, noting that pedestrians would need to cross the wide carriageways (Chai Wan Road and Wing Tai Road) adjoining the subject site. Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang replied that as there were wide pedestrian walkways in the area and MTR station was in proximity to the subject site, there was no need for construction of footbridges for better connectivity.

44. Noting from the photomontages at Plans 5 to 8 of the Paper, the same Member said that the proposed development would cause some visual impacts, and asked whether mitigation measures would be provided to alleviate the visual impact, notwithstanding that, the Member had no objection to the proposal given the acute need for housing units.

45. In response, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that the design and layout of the proposed development submitted by HD was only preliminary at the current stage. Nevertheless, a garden had been proposed at the podium level for public use, which would compensate to some extent the rezoning of the "O" site for the proposed public housing development. As shown in the VA, the proposed development would cause slight adverse visual impacts on the surroundings and mitigation measures including building setback and greening had been proposed by HD to reduce the visual impact, which would be incorporated at the detailed design stage.

*Amendment Item B - Proposed Columbarium*

46. A Member asked about (i) the reasons for not implementing the originally proposed funeral parlour use at the subject site; (ii) the progress of the rezoning application



for proposed columbarium along the waterfront in Chai Wan; and (iii) whether future columbarium developments in the district should also consider the cumulative traffic impact of those committed columbarium projects.

47. In response, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that the originally proposed funeral parlour use had been earmarked on the OZP since the 1970s and there was no implementation programme. The review of columbarium policy in 2010 had shortlisted the subject site as suitable for the proposed columbarium use. The concerned rezoning application was still under processing and had not been submitted to the Committee for consideration. In general, any future columbarium developments should take into account the committed columbarium projects in the district for assessing the cumulative traffic impact.

48. A Member asked (i) if more niches could be provided in the proposed columbarium; (ii) the scale of the proposed columbarium as compared with other similar developments in the territory; and (iii) the traffic impact caused by the proposed development during Ching Ming and Chung Yeung Festivals and the mitigation measures proposed.

49. Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang replied that the proposed scale of the columbarium had taken into account the infrastructure provision and traffic conditions in the area. For the eight columbaria operated by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department, five of them provided less than 10,000 niches each and the remaining columbaria (including the one at Cape Collinson Road) provided about 20,000 to 60,000 niches each. With reference to Plan 12 of the Paper, Ms Kiang said that traffic mitigation measures were proposed in the TIA, including: (i) provision of a new pedestrian access route by linking Cape Collinson Road and San Ha Street with escalators and stairway, together with associated footpath and carriageway widening on Cape Collinson Road; and (ii) widening of carriageway and footway at the junction of Lin Shing Road and Cape Collinson Road, coupled with the provision of bus lay-bys. It was considered that with the proposed traffic mitigation measures, there should be sufficient capacity to meet the estimated pedestrian flow.

50. In response to the Vice-chairman's enquiry, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that the large parking spaces as shown in the notional scheme of the proposed columbarium would be for coaches taking family members for attending funeral ceremonies.

51. A Member asked if there would be any garden of remembrance with memorial walls for mounting plaques of the deceased within the proposed development. The Chairman said that the notional scheme showed no provision of garden of remembrance in the proposed columbarium.

*Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the OZP*

52. In response to a Member's question, the Chairman clarified that 'Art Studio' was considered acceptable in the industrial and industrial-office buildings only if it did not involve direct provision of services or goods. It included those art studios which did not involve hobby classes, sale of goods, seminars, art gallery and venue for rehearsal for art performance.

Deliberation Session

53. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Chai Wan OZP as mentioned in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Paper and that the draft Chai Wan OZP No. S/H20/21A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/H20/22 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Chai Wan OZP No. S/H20/21A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the TPB for the various land use zonings of the OZP and agree that the revised ES is suitable for publication together with the OZP.

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

[Miss Jessica K.T. Lee, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 9**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Submission for Partial Fulfillment of Approval Condition (a) under Application No. A/H15/232-2, Proposed Hotels in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Ocean Park” zone, Ocean Park, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No.11/16)

---

54. The Secretary reported that the submission was for partial fulfillment of approval condition (a). The subject site was within Ocean Park. The application was submitted by Tourism Commission represented by the Ocean Park Corporation, and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

- |                     |   |   |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Dr Wilton W.T. Fok  | - | co-owning a flat in Ap Lei Chau area with his spouse;   |
| Mr K.K. Cheung      | - | his firm having current business dealings with Tourism Commission, but he had no relationship with the applicant and no involvement in the application; |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - | having current business dealings with AECOM and past business dealings with Ocean Park Corporation;   |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - | having past business dealings with Ocean Park Corporation and AECOM;  |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho   | - | his firm having past business dealings with AECOM, but he had no involvement in the application;  |
| Mr Franklin Yu      | - | having past business dealings with AECOM; and   |

Mr Wilson W.S. Pang - owning a flat in Ap Lei Chau area.

55. The Committee noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had not yet returned to the meeting. As the properties of Mr Wilson W.S. Pang and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok did not have a direct view of the site, and as Messrs K.K. Cheung, Patrick H.T. Lau, Thomas O.S. Ho and Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

56. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Jessica K.T. Lee, STP/HK, presented the applicant's submission and covered the following main points:

##### Background

- (a) application No. A/H15/232 for three proposed hotels (i.e. Ocean Hotel, Fisherman's Wharf Hotel (FWH) and Spa Hotel) within Ocean Park was approved by the Committee on 19.12.2008;
- (b) during the consideration of the application, the Committee noted that the application was intended to ascertain the location and the major development parameters for the three proposed hotels so as to allow the prospective bidders to formulate their design schemes. The design of the three proposed hotels was not final, and the actual design schemes would be subject to further refinements and changes by the future developers. For FWH, some Members also commented that there might be scope to reduce the building height (BH) of the development to 8 storeys so that the building profile would be more in line with the mountain backdrop. The Committee generally considered that there was scope for improvement and the final design should be subject to the scrutiny of the Committee. The following approval condition, amongst others, had been imposed:

##### Approval condition (a)

the building form, layout, design, disposition and BH of the proposed hotel developments to the satisfaction of the Committee of the Town

Planning Board (TPB);

- (c) in respect of FWH, the Ocean Park Corporation conducted a tendering exercise in 2015 and appointed the “Most Preferred Proponent” to implement the proposed hotel in February 2016;

Submission under Approval Condition (a)

- (d) on 29.7.2016, the applicant submitted the current proposal for partial fulfillment of approval condition (a) in respect of FWH. The major development parameters of the current proposal were generally the same as those in the originally approved scheme (application No. A/H15/232), except that the proposed site coverage of the hotel tower had been reduced from 40% to 25% and the maximum BH at main roof had been reduced from 74mPD to 73.5mPD;
- (e) the key features relating to the building form, design, disposition and BH of the proposed FWH were as follows:
  - (i) two curvilinear blocks separated by a 15m building gap so as to fulfill the requirements on building separation under the Sustainable Building Design (SBD) Guidelines. The blocks were also set back towards the hillsides;
  - (ii) a terraced podium cascading towards the sea with a landscaped garden at 3/F of the podium;
  - (iii) a uniform 10m wide waterfront promenade at 1/F and a 3m wide pedestrian walkway at G/F; and
  - (iv) a BH of 73.5mPD for the East Tower and a stepped BH of 69mPD and 65.5mPD for the West Tower;

Departmental Comments

- (f) major departmental comments were summarised as follows:

- (i) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) commented that whilst the proposed scheme with three tiers of height (i.e. 65.5mPD, 69mPD and 73.5mPD) would provide a less distinct height variation, the hotel towers were set back considerably from the waterfront and sit on top of a podium designed with cascading open decks looking out to the sea. A 10m wide waterfront promenade would be provided on the first floor deck and lined with retail and dining facilities on the hill-ward side to add to the vibrancy of the area. The proposed scheme would provide an open, spacious and welcoming waterfront area for public enjoyment. Regarding the landscape aspect, detailed comments would be given upon submission of Landscape Master Plan (LMP) under approval condition (d);
  
- (ii) the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department (CA/CMD2, ArchSD) suggested the applicant to review the followings at the detailed design stage: (i) the clear width of at-grade pedestrian walkway; (ii) podium effect along the seafront; (iii) fire fighting strategy; (iv) location of parking spaces at 2/F; (v) stairs/escalators/lifts linking the promenade and ground level; (vi) the floor heights at G/F and 2/F; and (vii) the detailed design of planters, balconies, architectural fins, articulations, roof features and waterfront promenade; and
  
- (iii) other relevant departments had no adverse comment on or no objection to the submission; and

PlanD's Views

- (g) PlanD had no objection to the building form, layout, design, disposition and BH in the current proposal for the proposed FWH for partial fulfillment of approval condition (a) based on the assessment set out in paragraph 6 of the Paper. The applicant had made an effort to reduce the overall building mass and enhance the building design by arranging the two hotel towers close to the mountain at the back and sit on top of a terraced and landscaped podium cascading towards the sea, and also separation of the

two curvilinear hotel towers by a 15m building gap. The proposed layout would also allow a more open, spacious and welcoming waterfront area at the edge of the 1/F podium for public enjoyment, and a 3m wide pedestrian walkway lined with trees would be provided at G/F as an alternative choice to the public to walk along the waterfront area. Further reduction in the BH would increase the hotel footprint and result in considerable loss in open space and greenery provision on the podium, and thus defeating the design intent for the cascading podium deck. Notwithstanding that, to soften the visual impact, the applicant had introduced a BH profile cascading down from 73.5mPD for the East Tower to 69mPD and 65.5mPD for the West Tower. The present submission was a follow up to address the Committee's concern and fulfill the said condition imposed by the Committee. The key development parameters of the proposed FWH remained the same.

#### *Proposed Traffic Arrangements*

57. In response to a Member's enquiries, Miss Jessica K.T. Lee, STP/HK, with reference to Drawings AA-2b and AA-5b of Paper, said that Shum Wan Road, which fell within "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Ocean Park" zone, was open to the public for pedestrian and vehicular access. Visitors arriving from Shum Wan Road could take the escalators in the western portion of the subject site to the waterfront promenade at 1/F, which would be open to the public. Roof garden would be located at 3/F and whether it would be open to the public would be subject to the future hotel management.

58. A Member said that although the subject project was known as 'Fisherman's Wharf Hotel', there was no pier within the proposed development. The Member suggested that consideration could be given to constructing a public pier next to the development for enriching the tourism project, so that visitors or tourists could travel by yachts or water taxis. Another Member asked about the provision of public transport services and carpark in the area. Miss Jessica K.T. Lee said that boats and yachts were mainly anchored in the Aberdeen typhoon shelter area to the north-west of the subject site. While the subject site was not currently served by public transport, shuttle buses would be provided by Ocean Park between the main entrance of Ocean Park, and FWH and the future Water Park upon

development. A carpark would also be provided at the future Water Park.

59. In response to another Member's enquiry, Miss Jessica K.T. Lee said that about 100 coach parking spaces would be provided at the basement level of the Ocean Hotel.

*Comparison with the Approved Scheme in 2008*

60. A Member asked PlanD to elaborate on the approval conditions imposed in 2008. Miss Jessica K.T. Lee explained that the locations and scale of the three proposed hotels were approved with conditions by the Committee in 2008. As the design submitted by the applicant at the time of application was not final and would be subject to further refinements and changes by the future developers, Members agreed that the final design should be subject to the scrutiny of the Committee and an approval condition on the building form, layout, design, disposition and BH of the proposed hotel developments was therefore imposed. Other approval conditions included the submission of a revised visual impact assessment (VIA); the design and provision of the waterfront promenade at FWH; the access arrangements, car parking and loading/unloading spaces; and the submission and implementation of a tree preservation scheme and a LMP to the satisfaction of D of Plan or of the TPB.

61. The same Member opined that the proposed hotel blocks were massive and asked if the development parameters of the current scheme were the same as those approved in 2008. In response, Miss Jessica K.T. Lee said that there were no major changes in the development parameters as compared with the 2008 scheme, except the reduction in site coverage of hotel and slight reduction in the maximum building height.

62. In response to a Member's enquiry on the reason for reducing the site coverage in the current scheme. Miss Jessica K.T. Lee, with reference to the typical floor plan, explained that the footprint of the hotel towers in the approved design in 2008 was larger than that in the current submission as hotel rooms in the original scheme were found on both sides of the corridor (i.e. with hotel rooms facing both the mountain side and seaward side). Under the current submission, all hotel rooms would face the seaward side.



## Deliberation Session

63. The Vice-chairman considered the design of the proposed hotel with a terraced and landscaped podium cascading down towards the sea acceptable, but the descending BH profile from east to west with a BH of 73.5mPD for the East Tower and a stepped BH of 69mPD and 65.5mPD for the West Tower showed a less distinct height variation. It would be desirable if the BH of the West Tower could be further reduced to be more in line with the mountain profile at the back.

64. A Member shared the Vice-chairman's view and opined that the mountain was important in separating the area from the urban settlement in Aberdeen, providing a setting for the pleasant oceanic theme of the proposed development, which could blend in with the future Water Park. The current design of the hotel blocks, which aimed at maximising view from the hotel rooms towards the sea, did not take into account the natural topography of the mountain at the back and failed to take care of public view from the sea towards the site. There was also inadequate greening for the proposed hotel at such a prominent location. Another Member suggested to provide more greening to soften the edges of the building blocks, and was of view that it was not desirable to provide artificial lighting at the G/F driveway which would be decked over by the promenade on the 1/F of the podium.

65. The Chairman said that the built form under the current scheme was cascading down from the mountain towards the sea and the public could enjoy the sea view at the pedestrian walkway at G/F and the 10m wide waterfront promenade on 1/F. The proposed reduction of BH of the West Tower suggested by some Members might affect the overall design concept of the proposed hotel development, if the total gross floor area (GFA) was to be kept unchanged. The suggestion of providing more greening at the edges of the podium and hotel towers could be dealt with under the approval condition (d) on landscaping. Members noted that the applicant would also need to fulfil the greenery ratio requirement under the SBD Guidelines.

66. A Member expressed concern on the visual impact that might be caused by the proposed hotel whilst noting that there were not many public view points towards the subject site located at the waterfront. The Chairman remarked that permission for the proposed hotel had already been granted. Though the development would inevitably cause some

visual impact on the surroundings, the Committee could consider appropriate mitigation measures to help ameliorate the visual impact by provision of more greenery for the proposed hotel to blend in better with the surroundings.

67. A few Members considered that the overall design of the proposed hotel could be improved to make it more compatible with the natural topography of the mountain backdrop if the BH could be reduced to create a greater degree of cascading effect in the West Tower, though not to the extent of reducing the height of the hotel from 14 to eight storeys. One Member further suggested that the building footprint could be widened by providing hotel rooms facing both the seaward and the mountain sides.

68. The Chairman reminded Members that the location and development parameters of the proposed hotel had already been approved by the Committee, which should form the basis for Members' consideration of the current design of the proposed development. While consideration of design matters would inevitably involve certain degree of subjective judgement and preference, the Committee would need to decide whether the collective views of Members would carry the weight leading to not accepting the design scheme. The Chairman further said that if the BH of a few storeys was cascaded while keeping the total GFA unchanged, it would be inevitable to increase the BH of some portions of the proposed development to a level exceeding the maximum BH of 14 storeys. Or alternatively, the reduction in the BH of the West Tower would result in an increase in the overall footprint at the expense of the open space and greenery provision, and defeating the design intent for the cascading podium deck.

[Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

69. A Member said that the hotel site only occupied a part of the long seafront in the Southern District, and buildings with special design could actually become attraction points in the area, such as Cyberport in Kong Sin Wan.

70. Another Member opined that while part of the mountain backdrop might be obstructed by the proposed hotel, planning approval had already been granted and the overall design of the development with a waterfront promenade under the current scheme was considered acceptable.

71. The Chairman concluded that Members generally considered the current design of the hotel acceptable, but there might be some scope for fine-tuning the building design so as to enhance the cascading effect, particularly on the western part of the West Tower. In addition, more greening should be provided at the building edges to soften the hard building structures so as to better blend in with the green mountain backdrop, which could be taken care of under the approval condition (d) on the submission and implementation of a LMP.

72. A Member asked if the revised design incorporating the cascading design would need to be resubmitted to the Committee for consideration. In response, the Chairman said that if the revisions were only minor in nature, the revised design might not need to be resubmitted to the Committee for consideration. The Secretary supplemented that reference would be made to the TPB Guidelines No. 36A regarding the Class A and Class B amendments to Approved Development Proposals in processing minor amendments to the approved scheme.

73. After deliberation, the Committee agreed that the submission had partially fulfilled approval condition (a) for the proposed Fisherman's Wharf Hotel. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VI of the Paper and the following additional clause:

“(c) to note the Committee's suggestion to fine-tune the building design so as to enhance the cascading effect, particularly on the western part of the West Tower of the proposed hotel development.”

[The Chairman thanked Miss Jessica K.T. Lee, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

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

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

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

## **Kowloon District**

### **Agenda Item 10**

[Open Meeting]

Further Consideration of the Draft Planning Brief for the “Comprehensive Development Area(1)” Zone in Kai Tak Development

(MPC Paper No.12/16)

---

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

74. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/K, presented the background and the results of the consultation with the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC), Wong Tai Sin District Council (WTSDC) and the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (the Task Force) of the Harbourfront Commission on the draft planning brief (PB) as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

#### **Background**

- (a) on 10.6.2016, the Committee considered that the draft PB for the “Comprehensive Development Area(1)” (“CDA(1)”) zone in the Kai Tak Development (KTD) was suitable for consultation with the KCDC, WTSDC and the Task Force. During the Committee’s deliberation, Members made some suggestions regarding the Underground Shopping Street (USS) and Station Square (i.e. major open space in KTD), and the suggestions had been relayed to the Kai Tak Office of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) in taking forward the relevant proposals;
- (b) the Housing and Infrastructure Committee (HIC) of KCDC, the WTSDC and the Task Force were consulted on the draft PB on 23.6.2016, 5.7.2016 and 13.7.2016 respectively;

HIC of KCDC's Views on the Draft PB

- (c) HIC generally had no adverse comments on the draft PB and raised the following major comments:

*USS*

- (i) whether the scale of the proposed USS could be increased in view of the inadequacy of land resources in Hong Kong;
- (ii) the USS should be provided with shops and air-conditioning. An open shopping arcade should be provided at the basement level with highly accessible passageway to link up shops in different sites;

*Colonnade Design of the Retail Belt*

- (iii) the colonnade design might take up a lot of floor space, resulting in a waste of scarce land resources, and attract wanderers, leading to management issue. The G/F passageway under the colonnade should be designated for public use to avoid abuse by developers for commercial use, and such area should be utilized for other effective uses such as social welfare facilities;
- (iv) the incorporation of detailed design requirement in the land sale conditions might affect the design flexibility;

*Social Welfare Facilities*

- (v) there was a need to identify a suitable site in KTD for developing an integrated family service centre to serve the locals. Suitable floor space should be reserved in the subject development for the required community facilities such as social welfare centre and library. If a site for such purpose could be identified, a concrete implementation programme should be provided;

*Mix of Uses*

- (vi) it should be explored if the lease condition could require that a certain percentage of retail gross floor area (GFA) be allocated for small shops or shops with local characteristics to avoid concentration of pharmacies and shops for luxury goods;

*Traffic and Pedestrian Connectivity*

- (vii) provision of monthly rental carparking spaces in the proposed development was required to serve the needs of local residents;
- (viii) whether sufficient at-grade crossings and public transport facilities would be provided to serve the residents of Kai Ching and Tak Long Estates; and
- (ix) there was a concern on the progress of the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS). Local consultation should be conducted on the alignment and station locations;

WTSDC's Views on the Draft PB

- (d) WTSDC generally had no adverse comments on the draft PB and raised the following comments:

*USS*

- (i) whether the two sections of USS leading to San Po Kong and Kowloon City would be connected. Barrier-free and convenient pedestrian facilities, such as travelator, should be provided within the USS to facilitate the movement of the elderly/disabled; and

- (ii) whether the developer was required to construct, maintain and manage the USS. If the USS was not open on a 24-hours basis, it would cause inconvenience to the public;

Task Force's Views on the Draft PB

- (e) while having no in-principle objection to the draft PB, the Task Force raised the following comments:

*Mix of Uses*

- (i) whether there was a need to cap the maximum GFA for hotel use in the proposed development;

*Traffic and Pedestrian Connectivity*

- (ii) the proposed Road L11 was of an odd configuration and realignment might achieve better land utilization. The addition of access points connecting the curvilinear landscaped elevated walkway to the north of the site with nearby roads would enhance connectivity;
- (iii) whether the public transport terminus (PTT) would be covered and the purpose of designation of the Dedicated Pedestrian Zone (DPZ) in the "Open Space" ("O") zone abutting the site; and

*Urban Design*

- (iv) the urban design justifications should be provided for the demarcation between the two building height sub-zones running from the north-east to south-west direction;

Responses to Comment raised by KCDC, WTSDC and the Task Force

(f) USS

- (i) the proposed USS was intended to enhance the connectivity between the hinterland and KTD as well as to provide a pleasant and attractive walking environment for pedestrians. It had a total length of 1.5km connecting the Kai Tak and To Kwa Wan Stations of the Shatin to Central Link (SCL) in KTD with San Po Kong and Kowloon City. The proposed scale was considered appropriate;
- (ii) a 8m wide public passageway would be provided with shops on the remaining area with proper supporting facilities including air-conditioning and barrier-free access facilities;
- (iii) a retail GFA of not less than 4,000m<sup>2</sup> should be provided at the USS and basement level of the development so as to create a critical mass for a vibrant and attractive shopping environment;
- (iv) the two sections leading to Kowloon City and San Po Kong would be well-connected. Ample access points and connections between the B/F and G/F at different nodes along the USS would be provided to ensure walkability of the USS;
- (v) subject to detailed design, the provision of travelator could be considered at suitable sections; and
- (vi) the PB stipulated that the developer was required to construct, maintain and manage the USS within the site and the USS would be open on a 24-hour basis;

(g) Colonnade Design of the Retail Belt

- (i) the retail belt with colonnade design would only have a width of about 15m, and the G/F passageway under the colonnade would be about 3.6m wide. It was of a reasonable scale without taking up



substantial floor area. It would enhance the vibrancy and walking experience of pedestrians, and protect them from the sun, rain and adverse weather, and bring back the old Kowloon atmosphere;

- (ii) it was set out in the lease conditions that the G/F passageway under the colonnade was dedicated for public use, and any non-compliance would be subject to enforcement action under lease; and
  - (iii) basic design parameters such as the width, depth and headroom of the G/F passageway would be set out in the lease conditions to ensure design consistency among different sections of the retail belt. There was still flexibility for the future developer to come up with their own design within the broad framework set out in the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and lease;
- (h) Social Welfare Facilities
- (i) adequate “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) sites had been earmarked on the Kai Tak OZP for the provision of the required community facilities, such as indoor sports centre, library and social welfare facilities. A “G/IC” site to the south of Kai Ching and Tak Long Estates had been reserved for provision of social welfare facilities including the requested integrated family service centre and library;
- (i) Mix of Uses
- (i) flexibility should be left to the developer in deciding the appropriate mix of retail uses with reference to marketing condition and commercial viability;
  - (ii) the site was intended for a landmark commercial building with a variety of uses to achieve greater vibrancy with office, retail, eating

place and hotel uses; and

- (iii) a number of hotel sites had been reserved in KTD. To achieve a reasonable balance, it was proposed that hotel use at the site should be of a moderate scale with a GFA not exceeding 15,000m<sup>2</sup>;

(j) Traffic and Pedestrian Connectivity

- (i) adequate ancillary parking facilities would be provided in the proposed “CDA” development in accordance with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and the findings of the Traffic Impact Assessment;
- (ii) suitable facilities would be included in the proposed elevated walkways and subways connecting Kai Ching and Tak Long Estates, the proposed development and surrounding areas;
- (iii) as stipulated in the draft PB, a covered PTT would be proposed to provide public transport services to serve the nearby residents;
- (iv) CEDD was conducting a detailed feasibility study for the proposed EFLS to examine the appropriate transport mode and alignment. Public consultation would be conducted in the study process;
- (v) comments on the proposed Road L11 and access points for the curvilinear landscaped elevated walkway had been conveyed to concerned departments for consideration; and
- (vi) the DPZ was intended to serve the purposes of natural lighting, ventilation and means of escape as required under the Building (Planning) Regulations for the adjoining development sites; and

(k) Urban Design

- (i) in order to provide a wider vista along the Kai Tak River, the developments on the two sides of the river are subject to a lower building height restriction (BHR) of 40mPD, including the western

part of the Site. The demarcation line of the BHR was in alignment with the north-east to south-west running visual corridor between the open space/grid neighbourhood in the south and the hinterland and the Lion Rock in the north; and

PlanD's Views

- (1) no amendment to the draft PB was necessary.

*Cultural and Art Elements in the Proposed USS*

75. A Member was of view that community integration should be enhanced in the overall planning of the area, and that more cultural and art elements should be incorporated into the design of the proposed USS.

76. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, responded that the draft PB provided a framework for guiding the future developments at the “CDA(1)” site. Subject to the developers’ detailed design of the development, cultural and art elements could be incorporated into the proposed USS. Besides, different interest nodes would be found along different sections of the proposed USS. More cultural related uses or facilities were planned to be located in the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Preservation Corridor (LTSBPC) and the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Arts and Performance Related Uses” zone to the south-west of the subject site across Kai Tak River. The use and design of the portions of USS passing through the two areas would contain more cultural and art elements.

77. Noting that the proposed USS would pass through various private lots, a Member raised concern as to how integration of cultural elements in the proposed USS could be achieved amongst different lot owners, given that the future developers would likely determine the use and design of the proposed USS largely on commercial considerations such as maximization of rents.

78. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that cultural and preservation elements had been incorporated into the planning and design of some development sites and those elements should also be incorporated into the design of the associated portions of the USS passing

through those sites. Studies had been conducted on the operation mode of the proposed USS, taking into account technical, financial and design considerations. As the proposed USS would pass through about 10 development sites, it would be most efficient for the concerned developers to construct the portions of USS within and adjoining their own sites and design vertical integration between the USS and developments above the ground. To ensure consistency in the design of the proposed USS, the developers would need to meet basic requirements including the width and headroom of the public passageway and fire safety requirements, etc.

79. Noting that there were USS projects in other countries such as Japan and Taiwan, a Member enquired the characteristics of the proposed USS in KTD. The Chairman said that the proposed USS would provide a better connection with Kowloon City and San Po Kong and serve as an alternative pedestrian passageway between the SCL To Kwa Wan and Kai Tak Stations. The success of a USS would largely depend on commercial and market elements such as connection with shopping malls for attraction of pedestrians. There were two important nodes of interest along the proposed USS, namely the LTSBPC and the Kai Tak River. The portion of USS passing through LTSBPC would contain cultural and art elements while the one passing through Kai Tak River would integrate with the landscaping along the two sides of the river. The intention was not to impose excessive control so as not to stifle design creativity.

#### *Colonnade Design of the Retail Belt*

80. A Member said that the clear depth of the proposed colonnade design, which was about 3m, was considered relatively narrow, given that the length of the retail belt would be about 1,000m in length and open spaces were found adjoining the retail belt at the Station Square. The Member asked if there would be any further study on the design and scale of the colonnade.

81. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that the 15m-depth retail belt abutting commercial and residential areas facing the Station Square and Multi-purpose Sports Complex was designated with the intention to encourage small shops and building structures with traditional style so as to re-create the traditional atmosphere of small shops in the old districts. The maximum building height was two storeys within the retail belt. A 3.6m

wide public passageway would be found at G/F, with a clear headroom of 4.2m and clear depth of about 3m (excluding the width of brick columns). As open spaces were planned outside the colonnade, the colonnade design would be compatible with the overall design of the district. Moreover, the design requirements of the colonnade were formulated based on findings of the urban design study for KTD.

82. Mr Tom C.K. Yip further said that the intention of specification of dimensions of the retail belt of the “CDA(1)” site in the PB was to maintain consistency with those of the retail belt in other landuse zones, whereas there would be no specification on the materials and colour for the construction of the retail belt to allow for design variation.

83. The Secretary supplemented that the submission of Master Layout Plan was required in support of planning applications for proposed developments within “CDA” zones on the OZP. Detailed design and scale of the retail belt for individual sites within the “CDA” zones could be considered upon receipt of planning applications.

84. In response to a Member’s enquiries, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that 3.6m wide pedestrian passageway would be provided at the G/F of the retail belt and the concerned area would not be accountable for commercial GFA calculation.

#### *Provision of Social Welfare and GIC Facilities*

85. A Member asked if child care facilities would be provided in commercial buildings within the subject “CDA(1)” zone. Mr Tom C.K. Yip replied that the planning intention for the subject site was for landmark commercial development and a number of “G/IC” sites had been planned near the residential clusters in the Grid Neighbourhood, Kai Ching Estate and Tak Long Estate, including a “G/IC” site reserved for social welfare facilities and a library.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

86. A Member asked if spaces could be reserved for government use or social enterprises in commercial buildings within the subject “CDA(1)” site, so as to form an anchor to bring in people to the area. Another Member supported the proposal and opined that the

whole district would only become lively if more people were attracted to the area.

87. In response, the Chairman said that the Social Welfare Department (SWD) had been consulted regarding the G/IC facilities to be provided in the district. “G/IC” sites had been earmarked on the OZP to cater for the needs of the district. The Chairman suggested to request PlanD to liaise with SWD on the need for reserving suitable spaces for social welfare facilities and social enterprises in the area. Members agreed.

*Others*

88. A Member concurred with the Task Force’s views that there was a need to provide 3D drawings to facilitate the public to visualize the proposed design concepts and understand the development/design requirements. In response, the Chairman said that 3D drawings would be submitted in support of planning applications for developments within the “CDA(1)” zone in future.

Deliberation Session

89. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- (a) note the views of the Kowloon City District Council, Wong Tai Sin District Council and the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development of the Harbourfront Commission, and the responses of government departments as summarized in paragraph 4 of the Paper; and
- (b) endorse the draft Planning Brief at Appendix I of the Paper.

90. The Committee also agreed to request PlanD to liaise with SWD on the need for reserving suitable spaces for social welfare facilities and social enterprises in the area.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, and Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/K, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 11**

**Any Other Business**

91.           There being no other business, the meeting closed at 12:30 p.m..