

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 565th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 14.9.2016**

#### **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

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss 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

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

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 Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr T.Y. Ip

**In Attendance**

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

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Winnie W.Y. Leung

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 564th MPC Meeting held on 26.8.2016

[Open Meeting]

1. The Secretary reported that Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong proposed amendments to paragraph 18 of the draft minutes of the 564th MPC meeting held on 26.8.2016. The last sentence of that paragraph should read as “As Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong ~~was not in close acquaintance~~ **did not discuss the matter** with the Headmistress, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.”
  
2. The draft minutes were then confirmed subject to the above amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

3. The secretary reported that there were no matters arising.

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

- |         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Y/K12/1 | Application for Amendment to the Approved Ngau Chi Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K12/16, To rezone the application site from “Government, Institution or Community” to “Village Type Development” zone, Lots 1636 S.A and 1636 RP in SD 2, No. 57 Ngau Chi Wan Village, Kowloon<br>(MPC Paper No. Y/K12/1) |
|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
-

## Presentation and Question Sessions

4. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the representatives of the applicant were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr Tom C.K. Yip - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), PlanD

Ms Sandy S.K. Ng - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), PlanD

Mr Lau Ming - the applicant

Mr Pang Chi Keung - the applicant's consultant

5. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He then invited Ms Sandy S.K. Ng, STP/K, to brief Members on the background of the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Ng presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

### The Proposal

- (a) the site was zoned "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") on the Approved Ngau Chi Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K12/16. The applicant proposed to rezone the site from "G/IC" to "Village Type Development" ("V") for constructing two 3-storey houses;

### Background

- (b) in the 1970s, the Ngau Chi Wan Village (the Village) was mainly zoned "V". In 1980s, a Layout Plan for the Village was prepared to resite the southern part of the Village for the construction of the Choi Hung Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Station, and to provide the planning and development framework for the northern part of the Village with a view to improving the environmental conditions. The then Wong Tai Sin District Board (WTSDB) and the local communities were consulted on the Layout

Plan in 1986, and considered the land use proposals acceptable. The Layout Plan was adopted by the then Development Progress Committee on 11.4.1988, and the proposals were then incorporated into the Ngau Chi Wan Outline Development Plan (ODP);

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

- (c) subsequently, the proposals in the ODP were incorporated into the Ngau Chi Wan OZP. The northern part of the “V” zone was proposed to be rezoned to “Residential (Group B)”, “Open Space” (“O”), “G/IC” and area shown as ‘Road’. Among others, the “G/IC” zone (covering the site) was intended for development of a community hall and open-air public vehicle park. The majority of land owners and tenants had indicated their support to the proposals as it would result in general improvement to the environment of the area;
- (d) the site was the subject of two previous s.16 planning applications (No. A/K12/20 and A/K12/35) submitted by the same applicant. Both applications were rejected by the Committee on the grounds that it was not in line with the planning intention of the “G/IC” zone; it did not comply with the Town Planning Board (TPB) Guidelines in that the application site was still required for Government, institution or community (GIC) purposes and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent;
- (e) in 2012, a s.16 planning application (No. A/K12/39), in the vicinity of the site, for development of a house partly within the same “G/IC” zone and partly within an area shown as ‘Road’ was rejected by the Committee and then by TPB upon review. The applicant lodged an appeal to the Town Planning Appeal Board (TPAB) and TPAB allowed the appeal;

#### Departmental Comments

- (f) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The

Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD had some reservations on the proposed rezoning from the landscape planning perspective as the existing trees might be affected by the proposed village houses but no tree preservation and compensatory proposal was submitted. Other relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

#### Public Comments

- (g) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, six comments were received. One comment was submitted by Ngau Chi Wan Village Society and the other five comments by members of the general public. They objected to the application mainly on the grounds that air ventilation of the existing houses would be adversely affected; the Village was of poor living quality with no ventilation pocket, public sewers and drainage system; fire safety concern; the Village should be redeveloped in a comprehensive manner; approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent and “G/IC” land should be preserved for community use; and

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

#### PlanD's Views

- (h) PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although there was currently no programme for the development of the planned community hall, the “G/IC” site was still required to be reserved for such purpose. As the site was located in the central part of the “G/IC” zone, piecemeal rezoning of the site to “V” was considered inappropriate and might pre-empt comprehensive planning for the “G/IC” zone for provision of the planned GIC uses and would affect the provision of GIC facilities in the district. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar rezoning applications of “G/IC” site in the area. The applicant had submitted two previous s.16

applications and both were rejected by the Committee. With no material change in planning circumstances, there was no ground to agree to rezone the site in a piecemeal manner for the proposed houses. Regarding the public comments, the above assessments were relevant.

6. The Chairman then invited the Mr Lau Ming, the applicant, to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lau made the following main points:

Background

- (a) the Village had a history of about 200-300 years. He was the current land owner and was nearly 70 years old. The site was the only piece of land he owned. He owned a house at the site about 30 years ago. As the roof of the house had collapsed, he was ordered by the Buildings Department to demolish the house in three months. As he had no money to rebuild a house, the land was left vacant since then;
- (b) in 1994-1995, the site was rezoned from “V” to “G/IC” without any prior notice serving on him. That was not fair to him as his redevelopment right was jeopardised;

Applicant’s Justifications

- (c) recently, he had money to build two village type houses on the site so that his family members would be able to live close to him;
- (d) he was required by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) to eliminate mosquito at the site and paid the land rent annually, and was frustrated that he was not allowed to rebuild his own house;
- (e) in the past, the old township office supported the villagers to build their own houses. However, in recent years, the new township office, backed by developers, was in opposition;

- (f) as there were village houses surrounding the site, he queried why he could not build houses on the site;
- (g) the site had been rezoned to “G/IC” for 30 years but there yet to be any implementation programme. The site had long been left vacant without proper management; and
- (h) he urged the Committee to allow him to rebuild his house. If not, he would rather hand over the site to the Government for compensation in return.

7. A Member asked whether there were any drainage and sewerage facilities within the Village to serve the site. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, said that based on the comments of the Drainage Services Department (DSD) and Environmental Protection Department (EPD), there was no existing sewage system available for connection near the site but the applicant had committed to lay the sewerage connection to the public sewage manhole near Choi Hung Villa.

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

8. The Chairman asked PlanD to provide more information on the developments in the vicinity of the site. With reference to Plan Z-5 of the Paper, Mr Yip said that a residential development, i.e. Choi Hung Villa, located to the east of the site was under “V” zone and there were also some old village houses and temporary structures in the vicinity of the site. In response to the Chairman’s further question, Mr Yip said that based on the aerial photo in 1977, the applicant’s previous house should be located at the northern portion of the site.

9. The Vice-chairman asked whether the applicant was entitled to build his own house on the site. In response, Mr Yip said that the site fell within a mixed lot held under Block Government Lease (the Lease). The total area of the lot is 0.04 acre of which 0.02 acre (871.2 ft<sup>2</sup>) (i.e. about 80.9m<sup>2</sup>) was building land and 0.02 acre (871.2 ft<sup>2</sup>) (i.e. about 80.9m<sup>2</sup>) was agricultural land. The applicant was entitled under the Lease to build house



with a coverage of not more than 80.9m<sup>2</sup>. However, the building area as originally proposed by the applicant had exceeded the area permitted under the Lease and was in breach of the lease conditions. The applicant would be required to apply to the Lands Department (LandsD) for lease modification if the application was approved by the Committee.

10. The Vice-chairman further asked whether the applicant had revised his original proposal. In response, Mr Pang Chi Keung, the applicant's consultant, said that having received a letter from LandsD, they decided to reduce the built-over area of the proposed two houses to 871.2 ft<sup>2</sup> in order to comply with the requirement under the Lease.

11. A Member asked what use could be allowed on the site if the application was rejected. In response, Mr Yip said that the applicant could make good use of the land in accordance with provision under the lease and the "G/IC" zoning on the OZP. There were also some always permitted uses set out in the Covering Note of the OZP.

12. The Chairman asked PlanD to explain the differences between the two previous s.16 applications and the subject s.12A application. In response, Mr Yip said that there were two previous s.16 planning applications, i.e. No. A/K12/20 and A/K12/35. The former application was for the development of two houses with shops and two car parking spaces on ground floor which was rejected by the Committee in December 2000. There was no detailed breakdown of gross floor area (GFA) in the applicant's submission. The latter application was for the development of two houses with site coverage of 80.75m<sup>2</sup> which complied with the lease entitlement. It was quite similar to the subject s.12A application. That application was rejected by the Committee in March 2007 and then by TPB upon review in June 2007.

13. A Member asked for the location of the planned community hall and whether it was for the enjoyment of the villagers and the nearby residents. In response, Mr Yip said that according to the ODP No. D/K12/2D, there would be a community hall and open-air public vehicle park in the "G/IC" zone which covered the site. According to the comments of the then WTSDDB, the planned community hall should serve both the villagers and the nearby residents.

14. In response to the Chairman's query, Mr Yip said that there was yet to be any implementation programme for the planned community hall. Besides, the Director of Housing (D of H) had indicated that the site fell within an area which could be considered for public housing development.

15. A Member asked PlanD to provide more information regarding the appeal case which was allowed by TPAB in 2013. In response, Mr Yip said that the appeal case was the subject of a s.16 application No. A/K12/39 rejected TPB upon review. The applicant lodged an appeal to the TPAB which was allowed on a majority of three to two. The main considerations of allowing the appeal were that the appeal site had been zoned "G/IC" but the proposed community hall had not been developed, that was unfair to the appellant; the appeal site was previously occupied by a house in 1980s which was lost in a fire; the appeal site was located at the fringe of the "G/IC" zone; the appellant's proposed development was not incompatible with its surroundings; and the entire lot of the appellant was building lot, which was not the case in the subject s.12A application.

16. The Committee noted that the rejection reasons for the two previous s.16 applications were that the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of "G/IC" zone and approval of the applications would jeopardise the planned development for the "G/IC" zone.

17. In response to a Member's question on the presence of residential structures in the vicinity, Mr Yip said a comprehensive planning of the area had been carried out in the 1980s with a view to enhancing the overall environment and providing supporting recreation and community facilities. The proposals were then incorporated into the ODP and the subsequent OZP on which the area was rezoned to "O", "G/IC" and shown as 'Road'. The then WTSDB and the villagers of Ngau Chi Wan Village were consulted and they had no objection to the proposal. Mr Lau supplemented that he was not informed of the proposal at that time and it was unfair to him.

18. As the applicant had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairman informed him that the hearing procedure for the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in his absence and inform him of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the

representatives of PlanD, the applicant and his consultant for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

### Deliberation Session

19. Noting that the applicant could not rebuild his own house on the site just because it had been rezoned to “G/IC” and the proposed houses were considered not incompatible with the surrounding, the Vice-chairman was sympathetic to the applicant. However, considering that it was a s.12A application and the site was situated in the midst of the “G/IC” zone, he considered that approval of the application would jeopardise the overall planning of the GIC provision for the area.

20. Two other Members also expressed sympathy to the applicant and considered that it was unfair to the applicant as the site was zoned to “G/IC” for a long time but there was yet to be any implementation programme for the planned community hall.

21. In response to a Member’s query, the Chairman said that according to the Notes of the OZP, house was a Column 2 use of “G/IC” zone and the applicant could submit a s.16 application for house development at the site. The same Member said that the original intention for development of a community hall and open-air public vehicle park might not be appropriate as the planning circumstances might have changed already.

22. Another Member considered that it would be good to redevelop the entire “G/IC” site to improve the overall environment and provide supporting community facilities. Regarding the possible public housing development indicated by D of H, the Member was in support of the proposal but considered that land resumption issue would need to be resolved.

23. The Chairman said that in order to meet the future demand for community facilities, the site was rezoned to “G/IC” though the Government had yet to allocate any resources for implementation. Considering that the current application was a s.12A application, the proposed rezoning of a small part of the “G/IC” site to “V” in a piecemeal manner was not acceptable. While the application might warrant sympathetic consideration, there was local expectation on the planned GIC facilities and the site might be a part of a possible public housing development. In this regard, the Committee agreed that PlanD

should liaise with the relevant government departments to expedite the long-term development of the area.

24. After deliberation, the Committee decided not to agree to the application for the following reasons:

- “(a) the application is for rezoning of a small part of a “G/IC” site in a piecemeal manner. Approval of the application would jeopardise the comprehensive development of the “G/IC” zone to provide the required GIC facilities for the area; and
- (b) approval of the application will set an undesirable precedent for other similar rezoning applications on the “G/IC “ zone.”

[Mr Sunny L.K. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

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

#### **Agenda Item 4**

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

[Open Meeting]

A/DPA/TW-CLHFS/3 Proposed Residential Development (Houses) and Excavation of Land in “Unspecified Use” Area, Tsuen Wan Town Lot 389 (Part) and Adjoining Government Land, Chuen Lung, Tsuen Wan (MPC Paper No. A/DPA/TW-CLHFS/3)

---

25. The Secretary reported that Albert So Surveyors Limited (ASL), Urbis Limited (Urbis) and Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Limited (Environ) were three of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

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

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealing with Urbis and having past business dealings with ASL
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with Urbis
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his company having current business dealing with Urbis

26. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee also noted that the applicants had requested for a deferral of consideration of the application. As the interests of Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Franklin Yu were indirect and Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

27. The Committee noted that the applicants requested on 23.8.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time for the applicants to address departmental comments. It was the third time that the applicants requested for deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information on various technical assessments in response to comments from government department.

28. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicants pending the submission of further information from the applicants. 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 applicants. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants that since it was the third deferment of the application and a total of four months had been allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

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

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/KC/437 Proposed Columbarium in “Other Specified Uses” annotated  
“Columbarium (1)” zone, 2-6 Wing Lap Street, Kwai Chung  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/437)

---

29. The Secretary reported that Urbis Limited (Urbis), AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) and Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Limited (Environ) were three of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

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

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with AECOM and Environ

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealing with Urbis and AECOM

Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with Urbis and AECOM

Mr K.K. Cheung - his company having current business dealing with Urbis

30. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Franklin Yu were indirect and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

31. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Fannie F.L. Hung, STP/TWK,

presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed columbarium;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Commissioner of Police (C of P) was of the view that the number of visitors could be controlled if the e-booking system and the traffic and crowd management proposal could effectively function. Other relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the three weeks of the statutory publication periods, a total of 4,903 public comments were received. Among which, 4,860 comments supported and 43 opposed the application. The supportive comments were submitted by President of the Legislative Council (LegCo), 20 LegCo members, four District Council (DC) members and the Chairman of Kwai Shing East Estate Shing Ka House and members of the public. They supported mainly on the grounds that the proposed development helped to ease the demand for columbarium, it was compatible with the surroundings that would not create adverse impacts on residents and the local traffic, and the arrangements on operator arranged bus (OAB) services and crowd control management were considered acceptable. One opposing comment was jointly submitted by a LegCo member, the Democratic Party Vice Chairperson and a Kwai Tsing (K&T) DC member. Other opposing comments were submitted by a K&T DC member and members of the public. They opposed mainly on the grounds that the site was not suitable for columbarium development, the proposed development would further worsen the traffic impacts especially during the festival days, and the burning of offerings would generate adverse environmental impacts affecting the nearby residents' health;

- (e) no comment or local objection was received by the District Officer (Kwai Tsing) and he had no comment on the application from the community point of view; and
  
- (f) 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 processing of the s.16 application was not in contravention of the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 33. The proposed columbarium development was in line with the planning intention and the development restrictions of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Columbarium (1)” zone (“OU(Columbarium)1”). The proposed development was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. To minimise the traffic impact on the nearby road network, the applicant had entered agreements with the operators to provide OAB services. To address C of P's concern, relevant approval conditions were recommended. Other relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

#### *Demand for Columbarium*

32. Noting that there were three planned public columbaria in Kwai Chung (KC), a Member asked whether PlanD had any information on the long-term demand for columbarium in Hong Kong and whether PlanD had identified any specific districts/sites for provision of columbarium in the long run so as not to have uneven distribution of columbarium provision in the territory. In response, Ms Fannie F.L. Hung said that she had no information on the long-term demand for columbarium in Hong Kong. However, according to the ‘Public Consultation on Review of Columbarium Policy’ (the Review) issued in 2010, in order to increase the supply of columbarium, the Government proposed to introduce a district-based columbarium development scheme which urged various sectors of the community to support the sharing of the responsibility to accommodate such facilities in each district. In the Review, the Government had identified 3 suitable sites for columbarium development in KC district. The K&T DC members were consulted and they were generally in support of the proposal. One of the sites, locating at Tsing Tsuen Road, had



been rezoned from “Industrial” to “OU(Columbarium)” in 2014 to facilitate public columbarium development. The other two sites, falling within the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “Green Belt” (“GB”) zones, would be rezoned later. Ms Hung further said that there were two other rezoning applications for columbarium developments in KC. Application No. Y/KC/5 was rejected by the Committee in March 2015 while application No. Y/KC/9 was still being processed. In KC district, there were altogether 82,145 existing niches and 73,000 planned niches. If the current application for 23,000 proposed niches was approved by the Committee, a total of 178,145 niches would be provided in the KC district in the long run.

### *Internal Circulation*

33. A Member was worried that the internal circulation space might not be sufficient to cope with the peak hour demand during festive periods as the applicants proposed only three lifts and over half of the visitors would be expected to use staircases. The Member also pointed out that as the lobby of each floor was small, conflicts between those waiting for lifts and those using the staircases were likely to occur. The Member considered that the insufficient circulation space and waiting area on each floor might result in serious bottleneck and in order to allow more space for circulation, the current building height restriction on the Outline Zoning Plan might need to be relaxed. In response, Ms Hung said that C for T and C of P had also raised concern that in case the proposed development was unable to accommodate all the visitors within the building, some visitors might need to queue up on the street. To address the concern, the applicant had proposed an e-booking system, i.e. visitor-by-appointment, to manage and control the number of visitors. Besides, an approval condition was recommended requiring the applicants to submit annually the revised traffic and crowd management plan (TCMP) two months before the two festive periods, i.e. Ching Ming and Chung Yeung. Regarding the vertical circulation within the columbarium development, Ms Hung said that reference had been made to other similar columbaria where internal circulation was also relying very much on staircases. For example, there was no lift for the Tsuen Wan Chinese Permanent Cemetery, and there was only one lift for the Cape Collinson Chinese Permanent Cemetery. Ms Hung further said that a more conservative visitor rate of 0.392 was adopted in the subject application as compared to the visitor rate of 0.088 for Po Fook Hill in Tai Wai and 0.115 for the existing columbaria in KC district.

34. With reference to the examples of other existing public columbaria, the same Member considered that there should be three staircases, each of 6m wide, in the proposed columbarium development. However, the current scheme proposed only two staircases with 3m each in width. The Member further said that visitors using the staircases would need to pass through the lift lobby in order to gain access to the niches while there would be a lot of visitors waiting for lifts at the lobby. To ensure the safety of the future users of the building, the Chairman suggested that the internal layout of each floor might be revised so that the lift lobby could be enlarged. In response to the Member's question, Ms Hung said that while the Buildings Department (BD) was responsible for building matters to ensure the provisions of means of access and escape would comply with the fire safety requirements, the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) might be able to provide professional advice on the design of internal circulation space in columbarium development.

*Other Issues*

35. A Member asked about the selling price of the niches and whether some of the niches would be used for charity purposes. In response, Ms Hung said that the applicants had not provided any information on the selling price of the niches. However, the applicants had committed to donate the net proceeds of a certain number of niches to Po Leung Kuk for charity purposes.

36. Another Member enquired about the greening ratio of the proposed columbarium development. In response, Ms Hung said that the application had not provided any information on the greening ratio but landscaping would be provided on the ground floor and roof level according to the application.

37. A Member asked on what basis the building height restriction (BHR) of 50mPD was derived. In response, Ms Hung said that PlanD had conducted a study to examine the appropriate development parameters for the columbarium development at the site. In order to derive an appropriate BHR that could address the concerns on the possible adverse visual impact, a series of photomontages had been prepared to demonstrate the visual effect as viewed from some major public locations. It was considered that a BHR of 50mPD would pose the least visual intrusion to the nearby residents and public space users as the proposed columbarium development could be shielded-off by the existing ridgelines, vegetation and

buildings. With reference to the existing government columbaria, PlanD considered that 23,000 niches would be an appropriate development scale for the columbarium development with a BHR of 50mPD. Nevertheless, a private columbarium might have more ancillary facilities, e.g. the function rooms, than the government ones.

#### Deliberation Session

38. A Member raised concern on the internal circulation space within the proposed columbarium development and considered that relevant government department (e.g. ArchSD) should scrutinise the design of the building to avoid any safety problem for the future users.

39. Another Member said that the demand for columbarium was very high in Hong Kong and requested that the Government should have a long-term planning on columbarium provision. In response, the Chairman said that the mortality rate in Hong Kong was about 40 000 to 50 000 every year and the majority would choose cremation. Hence, the demand of niches was roughly estimated to be about 40,000 per year. In fact, in order to meet the demand for columbarium, the Government was looking for sites for the future development of such facilities. For the subject site, it was considered suitable for columbarium development and rezoned for such purpose.

40. A Member supported the application as it could increase the provision of columbarium to ease the demand for such facility.

41. Another Member had no objection to the application as the site was suitable for columbarium development but urged that more greening should be provided on ground floor, at street level and on every floor so that the proposed columbarium development would be better integrated with its surrounding. The Member worried that as the pavement was only 3.5m wide, there would be limited scope for greening in view of the need for pedestrian circulation. In response to the Member's concern, the Chairman said that an approval condition had already been recommended on landscape proposal, should the application be approved.

42. Members then went through the approval conditions for the application. A Member suggested that an approval condition should be added to require the applicant to

improve the façade design and internal layout for enhancing the vertical circulation within the building. Another Member considered that as the e-booking system was important to control and manage the number of visitors, an approval condition on the e-booking system might be necessary. The Chairman said that there was an approval condition on TCMP which would cover the e-booking system. As for the façade design, the Vice-chairman considered that there was already advisory clause (e) covering vertical greening on the building façade and peripheral planting to soften the building edge for a more pleasing pedestrian environment and hence, an additional approval condition might not be necessary. In order to address Members' concerns on the internal circulation, the Committee agreed to impose an additional approval condition on the submission of the design of internal layout to the satisfaction of ArchSD.

43. 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 14.9.2020, 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 planning permission and the conditions (the Conditions) for the proposed development shall not lapse when the proposed development was undertaken and should continue to have effect as long as the completed development or any part of it was in existence and the Conditions were fully complied with. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the maximum number of niches within the application premises shall not exceed 23,000;
- (b) no burning of ritual papers and joss sticks is allowed within the proposed development at any time;
- (c) the submission of the operator arranged bus (OAB) services proposal including but not limited to the information on the total fleet size of OAB buses, OAB trips, the proposed queuing area arrangement and pick-up/drop-off area adjoining the site and at the sites in Kwai Fong (with due consideration of the as-built situation of the public transport interchange) and Tsuen Wan, as proposed by the applicant, before

commencement of operation of the proposed development, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;

- (d) in relation to (c) above, the implementation of the approved OAB services proposal including but not limited to the proposed pick-up/drop-off area adjoining the site and at the sites in Kwai Fong and Tsuen Wan to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (e) the submission of revised traffic and crowd management plan (TCMP) including temporary traffic arrangements (TTA) 2 months before the two festive periods (i.e. Ching Ming and Chung Yeung) annually to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Commissioner of Police or of the TPB;
- (f) in relation to the (e) above, the implementation of the approved TCMP including TTA to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Commissioner of Police or of the TPB;
- (g) the submission of emergency vehicular access (EVA) and water supply proposal for fire fighting and fire services installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of EVA, water supply for fire fighting and fire services installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (i) the submission of landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of landscape proposal prior to the commencement of operation of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;

- (k) the submission of the design of internal layout including lobby waiting area and vertical circulation to the satisfaction of the Director of Architectural Services or of the TPB;
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (d), (f), (g), (h), (i) or (k) are not complied with, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (c), (e) or (j) are not complied with by the specified time frames, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

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

**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Item 6**

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/H4/94                      Submission for Compliance with Approval Condition (b) and Approval Condition (l) of Application No. A/H4/94. Proposed Alteration and Modification Works to the Building and External Façade for Cultural/Leisure/Retail/Food & Beverage Uses/Open Space/Ancillary Support, for the Central Market Revitalisation Project in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Building with Historical and Architectural Interests Preserved for Commercial, Cultural and/or Community Uses” Zone. The Former Central Market, 80 Des Voeux Road Central, Central, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. 14/16)

---

45.                      The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) with AGC Design Limited (AGC), Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup), AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) and Earthasia Limited (Earthasia) as four of the consultants.    The following Members had declared interests in the item:

Mr K.K. Ling (the Chairman) <i>as the Director of Planning</i>	- being the non-executive directors of the Board of URA
----------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang (the Vice-Chairman)	- being the Vice-chairman of Appeal Board Panel of URA
----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

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

- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being the non-executive directors of the Board of URA
- Mr Stephen H.B. Yau - being a member of the Wan Chai District Advisory Committee of URA
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with URA, AGC, Arup, AECOM and Earthasia
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam ]  
] having past business dealings with Arup and  
] AECOM  
Mr Franklin Yu ]
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealing with AECOM
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his company having current business dealings with Arup and himself having current business dealing with URA
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA

46. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of the Chairman, the Vice-chairman, Mr Simon S.W. Wang, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr K.K. Cheung were direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As the interests of Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, Mr Franklin Yu were indirect and Mr Stephen H.B. Yau and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

47. As both the Chairman and the Vice-chairman had to declare interest, as a matter of necessity, the Committee agreed that the Vice-chairman should take over the chairmanship.



[The Chairman, Mr Simon S.W. Wang and Mr K.K. Cheung left the meeting temporarily and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

48. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD), the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), URA and AGC were invited to the meeting at this point:

- Ms Ginger K. Y. Kiang - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), PlanD
  
- Mr J. J. Austin - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), PlanD
  
- Mr Kenneth S.W. Tam - Chief Heritage Manager (Antiquities & Monuments) of AMO, LCSD
  
- Mr Leo C.K. Lee - Senior Heritage Officer 4 of AMO, LCSD
  
- Mr Michael Ma ]  
]
  
- Mr Wilfred Au ]  
] representatives of the applicant (URA)
  
- Mr Jackey Chan ]  
]
  
- Mr Edwin Choy ]
  
- Mr Vincent Ng )  
)
  
- Mr Tony Lam )  
) representatives of the applicant's consultant (AGC)
  
- Mr Gordon Cheng )  
)
  
- Mr Wong Lap Ming )

## Presentation and Question Sessions

49. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited Mr J.J. Austin, STP/HK, to brief Members on the submission for compliance with approval conditions in respect of planning application No. A/H4/94 (the s.16 application). With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Austin presented the submission and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

### The Submission

- (a) the applicant had submitted the detailed design proposal for the new façade facing Des Voeux Road Central (DVRC) and the market stall preservation plan to comply with approval conditions (b) and (l), i.e.
  - the submission of a detailed design proposal for the new façade facing DVRC demonstrating the compatibility of interface between the new and old facades and the new façade and the existing footbridge (approval condition (b));
  - the submission of a market stall preservation plan (approval condition (l));

### Background

- (b) the application was approved with conditions by the Committee on 18.3.2016. Three of the approval conditions were to be complied with to the satisfaction of the Town Planning Board (TPB);

### Detailed Design Proposal

- (c) the design statement submitted by the applicant for the new façade was summarised as follows:
  - continuation of horizontality at the new structure compatible with the original streamlined modern style;

- reconstruction of the end bay facing DVRC with new design being compatible with the Old Central Market;
- a “clear and distinguishable” design for the interface between the new façade and the preserved facades and the existing footbridge; and
- use of transparent materials along main circulation spaces to enable a more pleasant and comfortable environment;

#### Market Stall Preservation Proposal

(d) the design considerations concerning the market stall preservation plan were summarised as follows:

- stalls within a structural grid would be defined as a “cluster” for preservation and a total of 13 stalls would be preserved; and
- the preserved market stalls were to be located at an easily accessible major circulation path to maximize their exposure to the public or near the atrium and grand staircases at the two ends;

#### Departmental Comments

(e) relevant government departments had no objection to or adverse comment on the applicant’s proposals;

#### PlanD’s Views

(f) PlanD considered the submission to fulfil approval conditions (b) and (l) acceptable based on the following assessments:

##### *Approval Condition (b)*

- the applicant had demonstrated the continuation of horizontality at the new structure which was to restore the essence of horizontality wrapping around the original building;
- the applicant also demonstrated a compatible interface in terms of the scale of modules of the windows approximating the existing windows

- on the preserved façade;
- the design approach was in line with Article 22 of the Burra Charter;
- the transparent design of the new façade could also enhance the overall visual permeability of the end bay and allow natural illumination to the pedestrian circulation area inside; and
- relevant government departments, including AMO, had no adverse comments on the proposal;

*Approval Condition (1)*

- the applicant had proposed to adopt a modular grid with a group of two to three stalls as a cluster for preservation and the preserved stalls were proposed at easily accessible major circulation path and near the atrium and grand staircases at the two ends to maximize the opportunity for public enjoyment;
- the proposed Market Stall Preservation Plan had taken into account the preservation constraints and the need to allow subsequent design flexibility for the Public Open Space and the proposed uses within the Central Market for public enjoyment at detailed design stage; and
- concerned government departments, including AMO, had no adverse comments on the proposal.

50. The Chairman then invited the representatives of the applicant to elaborate on the submission.

51. Mr Michael Ma, the representative of the applicant, said that the previous proposal (i.e. Application No. A/H4/92) was approved by the TPB in 2013. From 2009 to 2011, URA had conducted a series of public engagement exercises to gather the views of the stakeholders with a view to improving the design. The current design had already incorporated all the views of the stakeholders so as to meet public aspirations. He also said that URA had made great effort to address the Members' concerns previously raised when the s.16 application for the Central Market was considered by the Committee.

52. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Wilfred Au, the representative of the applicant, made the following main points:

## Detailed Design Proposal

### *Design Concepts*

- (a) the current submission was to address Members' concern on the interface of the reconstructed end bay of Central Market facing DVRC with the preserved façade;
- (b) it was recognised that the original essence of horizontality wrapping around the building was interrupted by the construction of Central-Mid-levels Escalator and the two connecting footbridges to the Hang Seng Bank Headquarters. The concept of the new façade was to recreate the essence of horizontality in the original façade built in 1939;
- (c) the new design would use transparent materials to differentiate the new from the old. Such design approach was in line with international best practice on heritage conservation;

### *Continuity of Horizontality*

- (d) the alternate bands of concrete and glass (i.e. solid and void) at the façades facing Queen Victoria Street and Jubilee Street would be re-connected in the new façade facing DVRC and reinterpreted in new material treatment of fritted glass and clear glass (i.e. solid and void). The horizontal bands of clear glass windows would be continued and the scales of modules of the windows would be compatible with the preserved façades. Projecting eaves or similar features at the top of the windows would be provided at the new façade to help emphasize the continuity of horizontality, which would be at the same levels as the existing projecting fins at the façades facing Queen Victoria Street and Jubilee Street. Round corners at the building corners at both sides of the DVRC façade would be maintained in the reconstructed portion to express the unique character of the original building;

### *Visual Permeability*

- (e) the reconstruction of the end bay facing DVRC improved the pedestrian

connections from G/F to 1/F and from 1/F to 2/F, in which the connection with the existing footbridge at 2/F was also improved with widened passageway and disabled ramps. The expression of circulation in façade design was in line with the “form follows function” principle of the original streamlined modern style architecture. The intention to rebuild such portion of façade with new design being compatible with the Old Central Market yet differentiating the new & old and with transparent materials to express the circulation of the building was considered appropriate and in line with public aspirations;

### Market Stall Preservation Plan

#### *Constraints*

- (f) a substantial amount of stalls were already demolished at 2/F to make way for the existing shops and passageway (i.e. the Central Escalator Link Alley Shopping Arcade); only a few stalls possessing all the authentic elements, particularly for stalls on G/F and 2/F still existed;

#### *Character Defining Elements*

- (g) the unique design of Central Market was the column and grid structure where market stalls were designed to fit in a modular grid with a group of two to three stalls. In response to Members’ concern that a cluster of each type of market stalls should be preserved to restore their function and enhance vibrancy, stalls within a structural grid was defined as a “cluster” for preservation; and

#### *Market Stalls Proposed for Preservation*

- (h) a total of 13 market stalls with two to three stalls for each type of stall (i.e. poultry, fish, pork, beef and mutton, vegetables and fruit) within one column grid were proposed to be restored.

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

### Detailed Design Proposal

53. A Member raised concern on the interface between the new façade facing DVRC and the existing footbridges linking to Hang Seng Bank Headquarters. In response, Mr Vincent Ng, the representative of AGC, said that modifications to the existing footbridges were outside the scope of the project. Hence, the design of the new façade facing DVRC would be detached from that of the footbridges.

54. The Vice-chairman asked whether it was possible to change the disposition of the footbridges linking to Hang Seng Bank Headquarters while preserving the horizontality as the original architectural characteristics. In response, Mr Michael Ma said that the original façade of Central Market had been interrupted by the Central-Mid-levels Escalator and the two connecting footbridges to the Hang Seng Bank Headquarters. Since the routing of Central-Mid-levels Escalator had been gazetted, nothing could be done at this stage. However, the linkage between the Central Market and the two footbridges would be enhanced.

55. Another Member raised concern on whether the semi-transparent design would be a problem to ladies. In response, Mr Vincent Ng said that there should be no such problem as glass screen wall was commonly used in Hong Kong's buildings.

### *Preservation of History*

56. The same Member asked how the story of Central Market would be communicated through the current design. In response, Mr Michael Ma said that URA had been conducting a series of public engagement exercises from 2009 to 2011 to communicate the story of Central Market and over 10,000 questionnaires had been conducted. The current design was, in fact, a result of all these public engagement exercises.

57. Another Member asked how the oral history of Central Market could be preserved apart from preserving the building itself. In response, Mr Michael Ma said that URA had been conducting a series of public engagement exercises from 2009 to 2011. Besides, the history of Central Market had been thoroughly studied by the Chinese University of Hong Kong. He further said that the project was once called the 'Central Oasis', however, to respond to public aspirations for preserving the history and collective memory of Central

Market, the project was now called Central Market again. Mr Tony Lam, the representative of AGC, supplemented that the revitalisation project in itself was a succession to the history. The public space in the past would be displayed upon revitalisation. Besides, publication could be another method for preserving the history.

### Market Stall Preservation Plan

#### *Preservation Method*

58. A Member asked whether there were any photos showing the existing conditions of the market stalls and which market stalls were in good condition. In response, Mr Michael Ma said that an unique character defining element of Central Market was the column and grid structure where market stalls were designed to fit in a modular grid with a group of two to three stalls. However, over the past 80 years, the internal layout and uses within the building had been subject to constant changes and very few market stalls could be preserved intact. In general, a substantial amount of the fish stalls on G/F had been destroyed while those stalls on the 2/F had been preserved in good condition. Mr Ma further said that as there was a need for repairing the columns and thickening the concrete walls and slabs, the market stalls proposed for preservation would need to be cut out, restored and re-installed. Mr Tony Lam supplemented that the concept of adaptive re-use of Central Market was not to restore its market function, but to create a space for public enjoyment while preserving some market elements. In fact, AMO only requested for the conservation of minimum one number of intact market stall for each type. The current proposal was an enhanced one which had defined stalls within a structural grid as a “cluster” for preservation.

59. In response to the same Member’s question, with the aid of the PowerPoint, Mr Wilfred Au said that those market stalls in green colour on each of the floor plans were proposed to be preserved. The proposed locations of each type of stall to be preserved would follow their original broad location, i.e. G/F for fish stalls and poultry stalls; 1/F for beef/pork stalls and mutton stalls; and 2/F for vegetable stalls and fruit stalls. Mr Au further said that the market stalls would be located at easily accessible major circulation path to maximise their exposure to the public or near the atrium and grand staircases at the two ends. Mr Tony Lam supplemented that the market stalls proposed for preservation would need to be cut out and then re-installed at nearby locations on the same floor. It was considered that the proposed locations of the preserved market stalls would be more easily accessible and the



ambience of Central Market could be recreated.

60. The same Member further asked whether the market stalls proposed for preservation as shown in the PowerPoint presentation were different from those proposed in the submission. In response, Mr Michael Ma said that they were the same, but because of the need for repairing the columns and thickening the concrete walls and slabs, the market stalls proposed for preservation would need to be cut out, restored and re-installed. Although in-situ preservation of the market stalls was not technically possible, the character defining element (i.e. structural grid) would be preserved as far as practicable.

#### *Uses of Preserved Market Stalls*

61. A Member raised concern that the number of preserved market stalls, i.e. 13 stalls, might not be sufficient and asked whether the concept of 'bazaar' could be adopted. The Member also concerned about the future uses of those spaces apart from the 13 market stalls proposed for preservation and how the preserved market stalls could be related to the other new spaces created within Central Market. In response, Mr Tony Lam said that the revitalisation of Central Market was not to restore its market function, but to create a space for public enjoyment while preserving some market elements. Mr Michael Ma supplemented that a market built in 1939 could be very different from a market at present. The revitalisation of Central Market had made reference to the Borough Market in London and the Addition Aquatic Development in Taiwan. He further said that the revitalisation project was not to preserve for the sake of preservation. In fact, the 2/F was found to be the best preserved portion within Central Market, i.e. market stalls were made of advanced materials like corian, and should be utilised as far as practicable. URA intended to rent out the 13 preserved market stalls but had yet to decide on the number of operators.

62. Another Member asked what would be the future uses of those stalls which were not proposed to be preserved. In response, Mr Michael Ma said that the project was a response to the Chief Executive's Policy Address in 2009 that URA was tasked to revitalise the Central Market for the enjoyment of the general public and the working population in the Central Business District. A series of public engagement exercise had been conducted from 2009 to 2011 with a view to better revitalise the Central Market to meet the public aspirations. Apart from preserving those market stalls in good condition, other areas within the building could be used for retail purpose.

*Other Issues*

63. A Member enquired about the arrangement for loading/unloading (L/UL). Mr Ma said that the proposed L/UL arrangement had been clearly indicated in the s.16 application. The L/UL activities would continue to be carried out along the on-street lay-bys located at the western side of Queen Victoria Street and the eastern side of Jubilee which was currently used by the vehicles of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD). URA was still liaising with FEHD on the details of the proposed arrangement.

64. As there were no further questions from Members, the Vice-chairman informed the representatives of the applicant that the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Committee's decision in due course. The Vice-chairman thanked the representatives of PlanD and LCSD, and the applicant's representatives for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

65. The Vice-chairman said that the s.16 application for the revitalisation of Central Market had been approved by the Committee and Members should consider whether the current submission by the applicant to comply with approval conditions (b) and (l) was acceptable.

*Approval Condition (b)*

66. Members generally considered that the detailed design proposal was acceptable and had no adverse comments on the design proposal for the new façade.

*Approval Condition (l)*

67. A Member considered that as many original market stalls had not been preserved in the current proposal, Members' previous concern had not been addressed. In response, the Vice-chairman said that those market stalls in good condition had already been chosen for preservation and there was a technical necessity for relocating the preserved market stalls. The same Member considered that it was more preferable to have as many market stalls as

possible to be preserved in-situ instead of having some of them being relocated to new locations on each floor of the Central Market. Another Member considered that the applicant's current submission was acceptable as the applicant had made effort to preserve as many market stalls as possible and the revitalisation of Central Market was not to restore it for a market function.

68. In response to a Member's concern on the provision of POS, the Secretary said that a minimum requirement of 1,000m<sup>2</sup> POS was required under the Outline Zoning Plan and the s.16 application approved previously by the Committee had already met the requirement.

69. A Member considered that the current submission was better than the previous submission as a cluster of each type of market stalls were proposed for preservation. The Vice-chairman said that this was in response to Members' previous concern that more market stalls, i.e. a cluster of each type of market stalls, should be preserved to restore their function, enhance vibrancy and help recreate the ambience of the old wet market.

70. Two Members supported the adoption of a modular grid with a group of two to three market stalls as a cluster for preservation but considered that the 13 preserved market stalls should be grouped together on one floor instead of scattering around different floors. Another Member considered that the current submission was acceptable as it would be better for the preserved market stalls to be scattered on different floors to enhance vibrancy of the entire development. Another Member considered that it did not matter whether the preserved market stalls were at the same location or scattered around different locations.

71. A Member said that the planning of the revitalisation project had adopted a bottom-up approach and the design was based on the views of the stakeholders gathered by URA during the public engagement exercises. Hence, the current submission was considered acceptable.

72. After deliberation, the Committee agreed that the applicant's current submission was acceptable for compliance with approval conditions (b) and (l) of application No. A/H4/94.

[The Chairman, Mr Simon S.W. Wang and Mr K.K. Cheung returned to join the meeting and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok left the meeting at this point.]

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

### **Agenda Item 7**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H8/426                      Religious Institution in “Commercial/Residential” zone, Shop D of G/F and 1/F, Aik San Mansion, 355-361 King's Road, North Point, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H8/426)

---

73.            The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in the item:

- |                     |                                                                                      |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Dr Wilton W.T. Fok  | - co-owning with his spouse a flat at Maieden Court, 46 Cloud View Road, North Point |
| Mr Stephen H.B. Yau | - owning a flat in North Point                                                       |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho   | - owning a flat at Braemar Hill Mansion, North Point                                 |
| Mr T.Y. Ip          | - his spouse owning a flat at 238 King's Road, Fortress Hill                         |

74.            The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr T.Y. Ip had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok and Mr Stephen H.B. Yau had already left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the religious institution at the premises;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. Relevant bureau and government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, two public comments from the Eastern District Council members were received. Both commenters supported the application as the religious institution had been operating at the premises for a long period of time, it was well supported by and maintained a harmonious relationship with the residents in the same building and neighbours, the subject religious institution had brought positive impact to the local community, and the applicant had confirmed that the premises would not be put for columbarium use. No complaints against the religious institution under application was received by District Officer (Eastern); 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 religious institution was considered not incompatible with the neighbouring uses within the same non-domestic portion of the subject building. The subject building was well served by various modes of public transport and the religious institution under application would unlikely generate any adverse traffic impact on the surrounding area. In view of its small scale and nature of operation, it was unlikely that the religious institution would generate adverse environmental impact on the surrounding areas.

76. Members had no question on the application.

### Deliberation Session

77. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 14.9.2020, 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.”

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

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

## **Kowloon District**

### **Agenda Item 8**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Proposed Amendments to Approved Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K9/24  
(MPC Paper No. 15/16)

---

79. The Secretary reported that as Amendment Item A involved rezoning a site for a Senior Citizen Residences Scheme (SEN) by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS), the following Members had declared interests in the item:

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam	]	
	]	having past business dealings with HKHS
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho	]	
Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon	-	being an ex-employee of HKHS

80. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had already left the meeting. As the interest of Mr Dominic K.K. Lam was indirect, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

81. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, STP/K, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

#### Proposed Amendments to the OZP

- (a) Amendment Item A – to rezone a site at Lee Kung Street from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) with a maximum domestic / total plot ratio (PR) of 7.5 / 9 and building height restriction (BHR) of 110mPD;
- (b) Incorporation of the Authorised Alignment of Kwun Tong Line Extension (KTE) and Shatin to Central Link (SCL) – to incorporate the alignments of the authorised railway schemes of Mass Transit Railway (MTR) KTE and SCL in the OZP for information;

- (c) Amendment to the Notes – to incorporate ‘Art Studio (excluding those involving direct provision of services or goods)’ as a Column 1 use in Schedule II for industrial or industrial-office (I-O) building for “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone;

#### Background

- (d) Amendment Item A was to facilitate a Senior Citizen Residences Scheme (SEN) by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS). The Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) has given in-principle policy support to HKHS to undertake the proposed SEN project;
- (e) the alignments of MTR KTE and SCL railway schemes were authorised by Chief Executive in Council under the Railways Ordinance (Chapter 519) on 30.11.2010 and 27.3.2012 respectively. The authorised schemes were deemed to be approved under section 13A of the Town Planning Ordinance;
- (f) the incorporation of ‘Art Studio’ as Column 1 use in Schedule II for industrial or I-O building for “OU(B)” zone was to support art development by allowing ‘Art Studio’ in the industrial or I-O building;

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

#### Technical Assessments

- (g) HKHS had prepared various technical assessments in support of the proposed zoning amendment, i.e. Amendment Item A. The proposed SEN development, with mitigation measures, would not have significant impact on the urban design and visual, landscape, air ventilation, traffic, environmental and infrastructure aspects;



### Departmental Consultation

- (h) relevant bureau and departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed amendments;

### Consultation with Kowloon City District Council (KCDC)

- (i) on 4.6.2015 and 23.6.2016, the Housing and Infrastructure Committee (HIC) of KCDC was consulted on the proposed SEN project. HIC KCDC members generally objected to the SEN project mainly on the grounds that the site should be reserved for public housing, elderly living there would suffer from traffic noise and the SEN project only targeted at higher income group. Some HIC KCDC members suggested that priority should be given to elderly living in Kowloon City (KC) District and the number of beds of residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) should be increased;
- (j) in response to HIC KCDC members' concern, HKHS would work with the policy bureau and explore the feasibility of according priority to elderly living in KC District. HKHS had also revised the proposed to increase the number of RCHE beds. To mitigate the traffic noise, the orientation and disposition of the building would be carefully designed and sound proof windows would be installed;
- (k) the KCDC would be further consulted during the plan exhibition period should the Committee agree to the proposed amendments to the OZP; and

### Public Comments

- (l) the Secretariat of KCDC referred to the Planning Department (PlanD) a letter dated 5.2.2016 from a group of owners from a nearby soon to be completed residential development (La Lumiere) indicating strong objection to the SEN proposal. Their main grounds were that it was questionable whether the SEN project would benefit the community as a whole as similar SEN residences in other parts of Hong Kong were not well

received and demand for such residences was low; relaxation of BHR for the development would adversely affect the surrounding built environment and public interest; wall effect of the development would aggravate air and noise pollution and sunlight exposure in the area; proposing the SEN project to be built on alternative site in Hung Hom; the SEN development would detrimentally affect the living quality (on noise, air and visual) of existing residence; and keeping the existing BHR of 11-storey for the SEN project. The letter was referred to HKHS for consideration, and HKHS's reply had been conveyed to KCDC.

82. In response to a Member's question, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that the site was originally zoned "G/IC" with BHR of 11 storeys, making reference to the building height of the Hung Hom Fire Station to the immediate east. There was no plot ratio restriction for the "G/IC" zone.

#### Deliberation Session

83. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Hung Hom OZP and its Notes and that the draft Hung Hom OZP No. S/K9/24A (to be renumbered to S/K9/25 upon exhibition) and its Notes were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised explanatory statement (ES) for the draft Hung Hom OZP No. S/K9/24A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and agree that the revised ES was suitable for publication together with the OZP.

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

**Agenda Item 9**

Any Other Business

[Closed Meeting]

84. This part was recorded under confidential cover.
  
85. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 1 p.m..