

**TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**Minutes of 566th Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 30.9.2016**

**Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr K.K. Ling

Chairman

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

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

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 Ken Y.K. Wong

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

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr T.Y. Ip

Mr Franklin Yu

**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  
Ms Anita M.Y. Wong

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 565th MPC Meeting held on 14.9.2016

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 565th MPC meeting held on 14.9.2016 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/H20/3                      Application for Amendment to the Approved Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H20/21, To Rezone the Application Site from "Industrial" to "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Columbarium", 50 Ka Yip Street, Chai Wan, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. Y/H20/3A)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

3.                      The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Kerry Warehouse (Chai Wan) Limited, which was a subsidiary of Kerry Properties Limited (KPL) with Urbis Limited (Urbis), BMT Asia Pacific Limited (BMT) and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited (MMHK) as three 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 Kerry Property Management Services Limited, which was a subsidiary of KPL; |
|                     | - having current business dealings with BMT;   |
| Mr K.K Cheung       | - his firm having current business dealings with KPL;  |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - being a Director of a company owning a workshop at Cheung Lee Street, Chai Wan;                                  |
|                     | - having past business dealings with MMHK;   |

- Mr Sunny L.K. Ho - owning a flat and a car-parking space and jointly owning another flat with spouse at Heng Fa Chuen;
  
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - his company having current business dealings with Urbis;
  - having past business dealings with BMT;
  
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with Urbis and MMHK; and
  
- Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - owning property in Chai Wan area and his spouse also owning a property in Chai Wan area.

4. Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon also declared that his spouse was an ex-employee of KPL and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho also declared that his company currently have business dealings with MMHK.

5. The Committee noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Franklin Yu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had not arrived to join the meeting yet. As the interest of Mr K.K. Cheung was direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As the interests of Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon was indirect and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had no involvement in the project, they should be allowed to stay in the meeting. As Mr Sunny L.K. Ho's properties had no direct view of the application site, he should be allowed to stay in the meeting. The Committee also noted that the interest of Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, the Secretary, was remote and agreed that he should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

6. The Secretary reported that a letter from the applicant's legal representative and a letter from the Planning, Works and Housing Committee of the Eastern District Council (EDC), both dated 28.9.2016, were tabled for Members' information.

7. The Secretary also reported that eight petition letters, which were from 107動力聯同全港骨灰龕位關注組, EDC member Mr Wong Kin Hing, 杏花邨業主委員會住宅代

表分會, Eastern Branch of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment of Hong Kong, Island Resort Owners' Committee, representatives of the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions, Eastern Pan-Democrats Platform, and EDC member Mr Stanley N.K. Ho were submitted immediately before the meeting. Of the eight petitions received, seven objected to and one supported the application. The petition letters were circulated to Members at the meeting.

8. The following representatives from the government departments and the representatives of the applicant were invited to the meeting at this point:

- |                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang | - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (DPO/HK, PlanD) |
| Mr J.J. Austin       | - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), PlanD                            |
| Mr Chan Kin Fung     | - Senior Engineer, Transport Department (SE/TD)                            |
| Mr William Ma        | } Applicant's Representatives  |
| Mr Ellis Cheng       |  |
| Ms Denise Lai        |  |
| Mr Francis Cheung    |  |
| Ms Maggie Chan       |  |
| Mr Stanley Chan      |  |
| Ms Winona Ip         |  |
| Mr Haider Kikabhoy   |  |
| Mr Quinton Chan      |  |
| Ms Bonnie Lo         |  |
| Ms Kathina Wong      |  |
| Mr James Lo          |  |
| Ms Eugenne Yuen      |  |

9. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He then invited PlanD's representatives, to brief Members on the background of the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr J.J. Austin, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper.

The Proposal

- (a) the site was zoned “Industrial” (“I”) on the approved Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H20/21. The applicant proposed to rezone the site from “I” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Columbarium” (“OU(Columbarium)”) with ‘Columbarium’ placed under Column 2 of the Notes to facilitate the wholesale conversion of the existing godown building into a columbarium with 82,000 niches;
- (b) the major development parameters of the proposal were set out in paragraph 1.2 of the Paper;
- (c) the applicant had proposed a traffic and crowd management plan during the two festival periods of Ching Ming and Chung Yeung, which included, inter alia, owner/operator arranged bus (OAB) services between the site with two pick-up/drop-off points, one at Shing Tai Street near Heng Fa Chuen and the other at Hoi Chak Street in Quarry Bay; owner/operator arranged ferry (OAF) between the site and Central Pier No. 10; closure of the car park on 1/F of the existing building for use as an area for picking up/dropping off passengers and turning the entire 2/F into a concourse to facilitate movement of visitors; and a triple-access control system to control the number of visitors to the proposed development etc.;
- (d) the proposed development would adopt a minimalist architectural design approach with a low hue, low tone, matte look profile which would not give any hint of its use as a columbarium;

Justifications from the Applicant

- (e) the justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application were set out in paragraph 2 of the Paper;

Background

- (f) since 2000, PlanD had regularly conducted studies on industrial areas to ascertain updated information on the usage of industrial buildings and

their transformation into different land uses. In 2014, PlanD conducted the 2014 Area Assessments of Industrial Land in the Territory (2014 Area Assessments) which recommended that the “I” zone in the Chai Wan area should be retained in view of the low vacancy rate of industrial buildings in the area and their relatively high usage for industrial purposes (including both warehousing/storage and manufacturing/workshop);

Departmental Comments

- (g) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 and Appendix II of the Paper, which were summarised as follows:
  - (i) the Director General of Trade and Industry (DG of TI) had reservation on the application as the proposed rezoning would induce loss of industrial land and might set an undesirable precedent for similar rezoning applications within the “I” zone, thus jeopardising the provision of industrial floor space. Besides, the 2014 Area Assessments recommended retaining the “I” area in view of the low vacancy rate of industrial buildings in the area and their relatively high usage for industrial purposes;
  - (ii) the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had reservation on the application as the traffic impact assessment (TIA) had not reflected the worst case scenario during peak hours and did not assess other planned columbarium developments in the area. C for T also had reservations on the modal split and the estimated number of grave sweepers during peak periods; the feasibility of providing the proposed OAB and OAF services; the proposed pedestrian plan as well as the triple-access control system. The proposed development would seriously affect the daily operation of the existing godowns nearby and the Chai Wan Public Barging Point. A comprehensive sensitivity analysis should be conducted to examine the effect of some unexpected incidents arising from the proposed development;



- (iii) the Commissioner of Police (C of P) had concern on the traffic impacts that might be generated by the proposed development, especially during the two festival periods of Ching Ming and Chung Yeung;
- (iv) the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department considered that the building form and façade of the proposed development was bulky, substantial and monotonous;
- (v) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD considered that the suitability of the site for the proposed use should take into account the implication on the limited availability of waterfront sites;
- (vi) other concerned government bureau and departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;

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

Public Comments

- (h) during the first three weeks of the two statutory publication periods of the application, a total of 12,853 public comments were received. Amongst them, submissions from past/current Legislative Council members, EDC members and Central and Western District Council members, owners' corporations, mutual aid committees and concern groups were received. Most of the public comments objected to the application mainly on the grounds that the proposed columbarium would reduce industrial land supply; was incompatible with the planning intention for waterfront area; was too close to residential area; would cause adverse traffic and environmental impacts; and that it was inappropriate to consider the application before enactment of the Private Columbaria Bill and there was

inadequate consultation. A total of 242 comments supported the application mainly on the grounds that the proposed development was in line with the government policy to increase provision of niches; it was an appropriate location away from the cemetery cluster in Chai Wan and residential areas with good accessibility; and it allowed revitalisation of the existing industrial buildings;

- (i) the District Officer (Eastern), Home Affairs Department advised that local residents had grave concern about the environmental nuisance and tremendous traffic burden brought about by the proposed columbarium. A concern group also raised objection to the previous application and future possible applications by the applicant due to traffic overload, stifling the use of converted industrial building and upsetting the town planning in the Eastern District, which would have territory-wide implications;

PlanD's View

- (j) PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper, which were summarised as follows:
  - (i) in terms of planning intention and land use compatibility, the working harbour in Chai Wan, which included the public cargo working area, public fill barging point, preliminary treatment works and refuse transfer station, all of which required marine access, were mainly for the passage of goods/materials/wastes to meet the economic and social needs of the eastern part of Hong Kong Island. In that regard, the planning intention of the industrial sites along the waterfront in Chai Wan, including the subject site, was to provide land for general industrial uses in support of the operational and functional needs of the harbour as a maritime and logistics hub. The proposed columbarium was not conducive to the functioning and sustainability of the area as a working harbour;

- (ii) the “I” zone was to reserve land primarily for general industrial uses to ensure an adequate supply of industrial floor space. The proposed columbarium was neither an industrial use nor a use in support of industrial operations. According to the 2014 Area Assessments, the area where the site was located was recommended to be retained as “I” in view of the low vacancy rate of the industrial buildings within the area and the relatively high usage for industrial purposes. Given the vibrancy of industrial activities in Chai Wan, there was no strong justification to sacrifice industrial land for columbarium development at the site. The DG of TI had reservation on the application as the proposed rezoning would induce loss of industrial land and might set an undesirable precedent for similar rezoning applications within the “I” zone, thus further jeopardising the provision of industrial floor space;
  
- (iii) in terms of traffic, the 82,000 niches proposed was equivalent to more than one-third of the existing provision in the whole of Chai Wan district. The visitors generated from the proposed columbarium would impose great pressure on the road network and public transport services in the district. Although the applicant had claimed that the proposed development would not create any adverse traffic, C for T had reservation and C of P had grave concern as the TIA did not reflect the worst case scenario during peak hours and the cumulative traffic impact on weekdays and weekends without Police’s special arrangement; and
  
- (iv) C for T also had reservations on the feasibility of the applicant’s traffic and crowd management plans, the feasibility of the proposed arrangements to facilitate pedestrian flow between the Chai Wan MTR Station and the site, and the feasibility of providing OAB and OAF services to meet the high passenger demand. The applicant had also failed to demonstrate how a sufficient ferry fleet could be found to support and run the proposed OAF. With regard to the e-appointment system proposed by the applicant, C for T had

reservations as the applicant had not yet demonstrated how that measure could help reduce traffic impact and to what extent.

10. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application. Mr Francis Cheung, one of the applicant's representatives, requested that supplementary information on their responses to the departmental comments, slight modifications to some measures proposed and their PowerPoint materials be allowed for tabling at the meeting for Members' information. The Chairman agreed.

11. Ms Maggie Chan, the legal representative of the applicant, elaborated the content of their letter dated 28.9.2016. In particular, she complained that a District Council meeting held on 27.9.2016 (i.e. before the Committee's meeting) attended by representatives from government departments posed a real risk that a pre-judgement and/or pre-determination of the application might have been made prior to its consideration by the Committee, which was unfair to the applicant. She strongly urged Members to disregard all subjective, irrelevant and biased views when considering the application.

12. With the aid of a short video presentation and a PowerPoint presentation, Mr William Ma, Mr Ellis Cheng and Mr Francis Cheung made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed columbarium, with 82,000 niches, would help to alleviate the shortage of niches in Hong Kong, which would reach a shortage of 400,000 by 2023. It would also offer a new style of columbarium with better facilities that would not have an eerie feeling like those in conventional columbaria in Hong Kong;
- (b) the proposed development would bring about the following planning merits:
  - (i) according to the lease, the site was required to provide storage space for dangerous goods at the lowest 30m of the building. The proposed columbarium would allow removal of a dangerous goods godown situated in an urban district which would pose safety threats to local residents. The current proposal would allow the

transformation of a dangerous godown (i.e. an industrial space) into a much-needed social facility;

- (ii) the existing building at the site had marine access and had been left unused since mid-2004. The applicant proposed to enhance the harbourfront through the proposed columbarium development by opening up a promenade that would provide public connectivity and accessibility to the waterfront, which was in line with the waterfront promenade proposals presented in the Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study;
- (c) with regard to traffic, the TIA conducted by the applicant had adopted a very conservative approach and had included all known planned facilities in the Chai Wan area and the TIA concluded that the measures proposed were technically feasible. Moreover, as compared with a similar private columbarium development in Kwai Chung (under application No. A/KC/437) approved by the Committee on 14.9.2016, extensive surveys and studies had been carried out in support of the proposed development, more conservative assumptions had been adopted, and more internal transport facilities had been proposed under the application;
- (d) in terms of traffic congestion, the proposed development and the existing columbarium facilities in Cape Collinson were located at two different parts of Chai Wan area and there were no overlapping routes. Since C of P had implemented special traffic arrangements in the Chai Wan area during the two festive periods, there were no traffic congestion issues at the key junctions. As for C for T's concern on the walking distance to the proposed columbarium and the feasibility of the proposed arrangements to facilitate pedestrian flow, it was considered that the distance between the site and the Chai Wan MTR Station an acceptable distance given that the roads in between were flat and paved;
- (e) regarding the comments that the proposed columbarium was in close proximity to residential developments, since the existing use at the site

was a godown with dangerous goods storage, it must be located away from populated areas. Compared with the distance between the columbarium facilities at Cape Collinson and its nearest residential developments, the proposed development was located relatively further away from the nearest residential developments;

- (f) unlike most public and private columbaria in the territory where access was mostly unrestricted, the proposed columbarium would apply strict access control which would be legally-binding. The proposed triple-access control system would allow the applicant to effectively control visitor and traffic flow. Sufficient internal transport facilities, circulation and holding area would be provided in the proposed development;
- (g) with regard to C for T's concern on the feasibility of the OAF service, the proposed OAF service was proposed to reduce impact on road traffic. Professors specialised in traffic had given their support to the proposal. As for the concern on whether sufficient fleet could be acquired, since the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge was targeted to be completed in 2018, it was anticipated that the current ferry services between Hong Kong and Macau would be reduced. The applicant was willing to accept an approval condition requiring them to acquire the abandoned ferries for operation of the OAF service;
- (h) the burning of paper offerings would not be permitted except on the day of inurnment. Only eco-friendly incense could be used during grave sweeping;
- (i) for operation and community benefits, the pricing of each columbarium niche would make reference to columbaria listed in Part A of Development Bureau's Information on Private Columbaria. 10% of the revenue would go into a sinking fund to maintain high quality and sustainable service and 10% of profits before tax would go toward community and charity groups. 10,000 niches with a discounted price

would be reserved for residents within 1km of the proposed development;  
and

- (j) to gather public views on the proposed development, the applicant had carried out three surveys to gauge public views. The results of the third survey showed that over 60% of those participating in the survey did not object to the proposal.

13. A Member asked what the current operations at the application site were and the applicant's rationale for proposing a columbarium development. In response, Mr William Ma said that the majority of the dangerous goods storage at the site had been vacated and the remaining floor areas were mostly used for storage of documents and other goods. With the decreasing demand for storage space on the Hong Kong Island, they had plans to revitalise the existing godown at the site. Besides, their company had business operations in over 40 countries. Having communicated with their counterparts in Malaysia, Singapore and Taiwan, columbarium facilities in Hong Kong were found to be lacking behind those in the Chinese community of the said Asian countries/city. Given the strong demand for cremation and the storage of cremains in Hong Kong, reference had been made to the development of columbaria in the said countries/city with a view to providing a better service for those in need.

#### *Traffic Impact and Traffic and Crowd Management*

14. A Member asked how the applicant would handle the negative sentiment of those visitors who were not able to successfully make an appointment during the two festive periods. In response, Mr William Ma said when selling niches to the customers, it would be made clear to them that they would be bound by house rules in worshipping, which would form part of the sales and purchase agreement, and that prior appointment must be made in order to enter the columbarium. While most columbaria in Hong Kong had no restrictions on access, the current proposal would impose restrictions to not only alleviate pressure on traffic and pedestrian flow, but also provide a peaceful and tranquil environment for the visitors and the deceased. Mr Francis Cheung supplemented that the applicant had considered different measures in handling reservations for the two festive periods, and it would take time for all 82,000 niches to be fully occupied.

15. Noting that the applicant had estimated that the peak hour visitor flow in Ching Ming Festival would be over 8,400 persons per hour, which was equivalent to handling one visitor every two seconds, a Member asked how such a large amount of visitors could be handled in such a short period of time. In response, Mr Francis Cheung said that ample circulation/waiting space had been planned within the proposed columbarium to cater for the peak hour visitor flow and a number of reception counters would be made available to receive the visitors. Mr William Ma supplemented that there would be no registration process at the reception counters as information relating to the visits, including the visitors' mode of transport to the columbarium, would be transmitted to the reception counters prior to the visitors' arrival. The reception counters would only be used for the verification process and issuance of smart cards.

16. A Member asked about the maximum number of passengers the proposed OAB could cater for during peak hour and the procedures for verification prior to boarding the OAB. In response, Mr Stanley Chan said that two OAB routes to the site were proposed, one from Quarry Bay and the other from Heng Fa Chuen. It was anticipated that the peak flow on Ching Ming Festival would be about 1,700 passengers per hour at Quarry Bay and 1,200 passengers per hour at Heng Fa Chuen. With all doors of the bus opened for simultaneous boarding during the peak hours, Mr Chan said it would take about 5 minutes for all passengers to board the bus. Also, in response to comments received on the traffic aspect, the original proposal of arranging passenger line-up at the service lane between Kerry Centre and the adjacent playground had been changed to line-up within Kerry Centre.

17. A Member asked whether the slight modifications to the traffic arrangements as proposed by the applicant's representatives at the meeting had been assessed by the Transport Department. In response, Mr Chan Kin Fung, SE/TD said that he was only aware of the applicant's latest proposal at the meeting. The Chairman also enquired whether the pick-up/drop-off points proposed by the applicant were located at public streets and whether designated bus bays would be allocated to the applicant for the proposed development. In response, Mr Chan said that the proposed pick-up/drop-off point at Heng Fa Chuen was currently a general lay-by for public use while the original pick-up/drop off point at Quarry Bay was located on a public road. Both pick-up/drop-off points would not be exclusively designated for the applicant's OAB services.



*Letter from the Applicant's Legal Representative*

18. Noting that the Planning, Works and Housing Committee (PWHC) of the EDC on 27.9.2016 had passed a motion requesting the Committee to reject the current rezoning application, and the letter from the applicant's legal representative dated 28.9.2016 which mentioned that the EDC meeting on 27.9.2016 was in fact an illegal hearing on the subject application, a Member asked about the details of the matter. Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang, DPO/HK, explained that the PWHC of EDC had discussed the application on 27.9.2016 prior to the Committee's meeting. At the invitation of EDC, PlanD and the relevant government departments explained at the meeting the details of the application, comments of the concerned departments, and PlanD's views on the application. During the meeting, EDC members expressed their concerns and views on the application. Notwithstanding that, it would be the Committee of the Town Planning Board that would make a decision on the application.

19. Ms Maggie Chan said that it was clearly stated in the Town Planning Ordinance that only public comments received within the three-week statutory public inspection period of the application could be accepted, and included in the Paper for Members' consideration. There were two public inspection periods for the application, one between 11.12.2015 and 2.1.2016 and the other between 15.7.2016 and 5.8.2016. On the basis of natural justice, appropriate amount of time should be given to the applicant to study all views and comments made within the public inspection periods and to suitably make responses. She considered that PlanD and the relevant government departments had bypassed statutory procedures to carry out consultation and the views of PWHC of EDC included in the Paper were illegally sought as they were obtained beyond the three-week statutory public inspection periods of the subject application. The applicant had requested to appear before PWHC of EDC to explain the application but their request was declined. As they were not invited to the PWHC meeting, it resulted in a subjective and prejudicial discussion which would affect the decision of the Committee. She said that the Committee should only consider those public views received within the statutory publication periods and any consideration of the views received outside the statutory periods would be unjust to the applicant.

*Planning Merits and Locational Factors*

20. A Member asked about the planning merits of the application, and the similarities and differences between the recently approved columbarium development in Kwai Chung and the application. Another Member also enquired the rationale for choosing a waterfront site for the proposed columbarium. In response, Mr Francis Cheung said that the recently approved columbarium development in Kwai Chung (No. A/KC/437) was a s.16 application arising from a previously approved rezoning application (No. Y/KC/3). Both the Kwai Chung site and the current application site were located in “T” zone, whilst the Kwai Chung site was located adjacent to a crematorium. The level of detail of the proposed development and the technical assessments undertaken in support of the subject rezoning applications far exceeded those normally submitted in a s.16 application. As the site was used for a dangerous goods storage, the removal of such, which posed risks and threats to a populated area, was considered a planning merit in itself. Secondly, from an urban design perspective, the proposed development would open up the harbourfront for public enjoyment. Lastly, with very few manufacturing industries remaining on Hong Kong Island, the demand for storage spaces was low and the Chai Wan industrial area was undergoing de-industrialisation and some parts of the industrial area were currently used as art gallery and offices. The conversion of the existing godown into a columbarium could help address the shortage of columbarium niches in Hong Kong.

21. A Member, whilst noting that the proposed columbarium would be a modern facility unlike those traditional ones in Hong Kong, said that the notion of ‘death’ was somehow conceived as a ‘pollution’ by the general public and asked whether consideration had been given to locate columbarium facilities at a place away from the local population. In response, Mr Francis Cheung said that whilst he supported green burial, it might be difficult to change people’s mindset with regard to ‘death’ within a short time. The proposed development would be able to provide high quality columbarium facilities in the interim to meet the needs of the public. The same Member also asked why the quantitative survey conducted by the applicant to gather the views from the local residents of Chai Wan did not include qualitative questions in the questionnaire. Mr Francis Cheung thanked the Member for his suggestion and would improve the methodology in future surveys.

*Others*

22. A Member noted that there were many objecting comments on the application and asked whether the applicant had any views or responses to these objecting public comments. In response, Mr Ellis Cheng said that of the objecting comments received, 75% were traffic related. Whilst the public had a general misconception that the proposed columbarium might generate heavy traffic congestion in the Chai Wan area, based on field observations as demonstrated in the 2000-hour traffic video footages, he considered that the concerns of the public could be alleviated. As for the remaining 25% of the objecting comments, they were mainly on environmental and other issues. Mr Cheng reiterated that the proposed columbarium had adopted a number of environmental measures and would bring about a number of planning merits to the local community and the general public.

23. As the applicant's representatives had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairman informed the applicant's representatives that the hearing procedure for the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the applicant's representatives, and the representatives from PlanD and TD for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

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

Deliberation Session

24. Regarding the concern raised by the applicant's legal representative, the Chairman said that it was the usual practice of the Secretariat to alert Members to the petitions submitted by the public before the meeting for Members' information. The letter submitted by the applicant on 28.9.2016 had already been tabled and noted by Members. As for the letter from PWHC of EDC, the Chairman said that clarifications had been sought from PlanD during the open session that the EDC members only provided their comments and views on the application. While their comments were noted, it should be pointed out that the decision on the subject application rested with the Committee and not others. The Chairman also said that the supplementary information tabled by the applicant at the meeting

mainly involved response to departmental comments and minor changes to the proposal and could be accepted. Members agreed.

25. With regard to the traffic aspect, a Member considered that it was inevitable that the proposed columbarium would result in an increase in traffic during the Ching Ming and Chung Yeung festival periods. The use, together with the number of cemeteries and columbaria in the Chai Wan area, would exert immense pressure on the existing road and public transport network in the area. Although the applicant had proposed an appointment system and provision of OAB and OAF services, the Member expressed doubts that the existing road and public transport network would be able to cope with the additional traffic caused by the proposed development and that public resources would be entailed in controlling the traffic. The same Member also said that unlike the recently approved columbarium in Kwai Chung (No. A/KC/437), which was located adjacent to a crematorium and a cemetery, the proposed columbarium was not located close to similar uses in the Chai Wan area and not compatible with surrounding uses.

26. Another Member did not support the application as the applicant failed to demonstrate that the traffic concern and the negative sentiment from the visitors who were unable to make their desired appointment could be addressed.

27. A Member enquired whether the additional information tabled by the applicant at the meeting today was able to address the concerns of the relevant departments, particularly that of TD. Mr Wilson W.S. Pang, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), TD, said that having regard to the applicant's presentation and the additional information provided at the meeting, it was noted that only minor changes had been proposed, and TD maintained its stance of having reservations on the application on the grounds that TIA had underestimated the pedestrian flow and the modal split. The applicant was also not able to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed OAB and OAF services, and the location of the proposed pick-up/drop-off points might impose significant adverse impact on traffic and operation of public transport services. The application was hence not acceptable from traffic point of view.

28. The Chairman said that the applicant had made efforts to propose a management-style columbarium which was not common in Hong Kong. Whilst traffic

management measures were imposed to complement the operation mode of the proposed columbarium, he noted that both C for T and C of P had reservations on the application from the traffic perspective.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung left the meeting at this point.]

29. In terms of planning intention of the site and the land use compatibility issue, the Chairman said that while the applicant considered that removal of the dangerous goods godown at the site was a planning merit, it was difficult to find a suitable site for dangerous goods storage. It was also rare for dangerous goods storage to have marine access. Given that the planning intention was to retain the larger area covering the site as a working harbour with existing godown, public cargo working area, public fill barging point, Drainage Services Department Chai Wan preliminary treatment works, refuse transfer station and industrial buildings, PlanD was of the view that the proposed columbarium development was not compatible with the planning intention of the "T" zone.

30. A Member considered that scarce harbourfront resources should be treasured. The Member also said that there was a high demand for storage space in Hong Kong, especially for dangerous goods storage, and the site should be retained for such uses.

31. Another Member said that should the existing godown at the site be converted for columbarium use, it would not only affect the nearby residents but also the functionality of the working harbour and the revitalisation of industrial uses in the area.

32. A Member said that whilst columbarium use was a public need, the proposed columbarium at the current location was considered not compatible with the surrounding uses and hence could not be supported. Given that there were already a number of columbarium facilities in Chai Wan, another Member also did not support the application.

33. After further discussion, the Chairman concluded that Members generally did not support the application on consideration that (a) relevant government departments maintained their reservations from the traffic perspective and raised doubts on the feasibility of the traffic and crowd management plan; (b) the application site occupied a waterfront location and formed part of the working harbour. The proposed columbarium use was not compatible

with the surrounding industrial development and not conducive to the functioning and sustainability of the area as a working harbour; and (c) the Chai Wan area already had a number of columbarium facilities, and proposing additional columbarium facilities in the area would overtax the existing traffic and transport infrastructure in the area and affect the livelihood of the local residents.

34. Members then went through the rejection reasons as stated in paragraph 12 of the Paper and agreed that rejection reason (b) could be suitably amended to state clearly that the proposal would induce a loss of industrial land, particularly that with marine access for dangerous goods godown. Members also agreed that the recommended rejection reason (e) in paragraph 12.1 of the Paper should be deleted as reason (d) already covered the concern on the feasibility of the traffic and crowd management plan.

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

- “(a) the planning intention of the “Industrial” zone is to reserve land primarily for general industrial uses to ensure an adequate supply of industrial floor space. The site is situated in the industrial area which is still in active operation. The proposed columbarium development is considered incompatible with the surrounding industrial development operations;
- (b) the proposal will induce a loss of industrial land, particularly that with marine access for dangerous goods godown. Approval of the application will set an undesirable precedent for similar applications falling within the same “I” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would aggravate the loss of industrial land and adverse traffic impact in the area;
- (c) the existing working harbour in Chai Wan serves as a maritime and logistics hub for the safe and efficient passage of goods to meet the economic and social needs of the eastern part of HK Island. The

proposed columbarium use is not conducive to the functioning and sustainability of the area as a working harbour; and

- (d) the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the traffic impact assessment and the proposed traffic arrangements/improvement measures can address the traffic impact generated by the proposed columbarium development on the surrounding area.”

36. As the processing of agenda item 5 was subject to statutory time limit, the Chairman suggested to consider that item first. Members agreed.

[Dr. Wilton W.T. Fok left the meeting and Mr K.K. Cheung returned to join the meeting at this point.]

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

[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/441                      Temporary Shop and Services (Convenience Store) for a Period of 1 Year in "Industrial" zone, Godown B (Portion), G/F, Prosperity Centre, 77-81 Container Port Road, Kwai Chung  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/441)

---

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

37. The Secretary reported that Lanbase Surveyors Limited (Lanbase) was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with Lanbase; and

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

38. The Committee noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had no direct involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

39. 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 temporary shop and services for a period of 1 year;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment was received from an individual stating that the proposed use was considered acceptable. No local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Kwai Tsing); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The application complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Use/Development within “Industrial” Zone (TPB PG-No 25D) including fire safety and traffic aspects. No adverse traffic, environmental, sewerage and drainage impacts on the surrounding area were anticipated.

40. Members had no question on the application.



Deliberation Session

41. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of one year until 30.9.2017, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- (a) the submission and implementation of fire safety proposals, including fire service installation and equipment within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (b) if the above planning condition is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.

42. 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.]

43. The Chairman said that the meeting could proceed with the original agenda. Members agreed.

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

[Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK) and Mr Philip Y.L. Chum, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK) were invited to the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting]

Draft Planning Brief for the Two "Comprehensive Development Area" Zones at the Lin Cheung Road Site, Sham Shui Po

(MPC Paper No.18/16)

---

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

44. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Philip Y.L. Chum, STP/TWK, presented the draft planning brief (PB) as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

##### **Background**

- (a) the draft PB covered two sites which were zoned "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") and "CDA(2)" on the approved South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K20/30. The "CDA" and the "CDA(2)" sites covered an area of about 1.93ha and 0.49ha respectively. The two sites were located at the waterfront in the northern part of Southwest Kowloon to the northwest of the Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Food Market and were government land which was currently used as a temporary works area for the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link (XRL) project;
- (b) the two sites, together with the "Residential (Group A) 12" ("R(A)12") zone to the northeast, two "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") zones to the east and west and the "Open Space" zone fronting the two sites, were known as the Lin Cheung Road site which was originally reserved for the development of the Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Food Market Phase 2 and related industrial and cargo handling use. However, it was confirmed by relevant bureaux/departments that the site would no longer be required for the wholesale market use;

- (c) developments within the “CDA” and “CDA(2)” sites were subject to a maximum building height (BH) of 100mPD. For the “CDA” site, a maximum domestic gross floor area (GFA) of 91,770m<sup>2</sup> and a public open space (POS) of not less than 3,600m<sup>2</sup> should be provided. Two non-building areas (NBAs) of 15m and 22m wide were designated along the northwestern boundary and in the middle part of the CDA site respectively;

Planning Intention

- (d) the “CDA” site was intended for a private residential development with POS of not less than 3,600m<sup>2</sup> while the “CDA(2)” site was intended for a hotel development with ground level commercial use to enhance vibrancy along the waterfront;

Urban Design Requirements

- (e) a number of urban design considerations, including the creation of a focal point for a vibrant waterfront and pleasant living environment, encouraging diversity in built form with height variation, adopting a distinct gradation of height profile with descending building height towards the harbourfront, adopting podium-free design, enhancing pedestrian connectivity to the public transport network, providing an open space network well connected with the surrounding areas to waterfront promenade, providing sufficient building separation, visual and ventilation corridors and high quality greening, should be taken into account when formulating the Master Layout Plan (MLP). An urban design proposal should be submitted as part of the MLP submission;

Visual and Air Ventilation Requirements

- (f) a visual impact assessment and quantitative air ventilation assessment should be carried out and submitted as part of the MLP submission for the “CDA” and “CDA(2)” sites. The two NBAs within the “CDA” site

should be maintained as breezeways to allow better wind penetration into the inland sites;

*Open Space and Landscape Requirements*

- (g) a landscape master plan should be prepared for the “CDA” and “CDA(2)” sites. A minimum greenery coverage of 20% based on the net site area should be provided. For the “CDA” site, a POS of not less than 3,600m<sup>2</sup> should be provided in the central part of the site, which should align with the POS in the public housing development to its north to create a continuous POS leading to the waterfront promenade;

*Traffic and Transport Requirements*

- (h) a traffic impact assessment should be carried out for the “CDA” and “CDA(2)” sites. A proposal on pedestrian linkages should also be prepared to improve local pedestrian connectivity;

*Environmental and Infrastructural Requirements*

- (i) an environmental assessment and sewerage impact assessment should be carried out and proper drainage system should be provided for the “CDA” and “CDA(2)” sites;

*Waterfront Promenade*

- (j) the “O” zone fronting the “CDA” and “CDA(2)” sites were planned to be developed into a 20m wide waterfront promenade. Each developer would be required to construct the respective section of the promenade. For the “CDA” site, the respective section of the promenade and the 3,600m<sup>2</sup> POS would be handed over to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department for management and maintenance;
- (k) for the “CDA(2)” site, the developer was also required to conduct a

technical feasibility study on the refurbishment works of the existing disused pier in order to explore opportunities to capitalise water-land interface facilities and to enhance accessibility. The respective section of the waterfront promenade fronting the “CDA(2)” site would be maintained and managed by the developer/owner of the hotel; and

Way Forward

- (1) subject to the Committee’s agreement, the Planning Department would consult the Sham Shui Po District Council (SSPDC) and the Task Force of Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing of the Harbourfront Commission (the Task Force of the HC).

45. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the current use of the sites and the relation of the boatyards with the “CDA” and “CDA(2)” sites, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, explained that the two sites were currently used as works areas for the XRL project while foundation works were being carried out for the public rental housing (PRH) and the subsidised flats at the “R(A)12” zone. A planned social welfare block zoned “G/IC” would act as a buffer between the “CDA” site and the boatyard.

46. In response to another Member’s question, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the BH restriction of the “R(A)12” zone was 120mPD whilst that for the “CDA” and “CDA(2)” sites were 100mPD.

47. The same Member went on to ask about the design of the waterfront promenade. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau explained that the developers of the “CDA” site and “CDA(2)” sites was responsible for the design and construction of the respective section of the waterfront promenade. Guidelines would be provided to ensure a coherent design of the promenade despite it would be implemented by two parties.

48. Mr Simon W.S. Wang, Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department commented that as the developer of the “CDA(2)” had to manage and maintain their respective waterfront promenade, including the existing disused pier, it was not clear at the current stage whether gazettal under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance

was required and whether it would have any implication on the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. While he had no objection to the draft PB, those matters would need to be followed up as they would likely be included in the conditions of sale of the "CDA(2)" site. The Chairman said that those were administrative issues on which the relevant government departments would follow-up as appropriate.

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, and Mr Philip Y.L. Chum, STP/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 6**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/DPA/TW-CLHFS/4 Proposed Holiday Camp in "Unspecified Use" zone, Lots 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 135 in D.D. 359, Ha Fa Shan, Tsuen Wan  
(MPC Paper No. A/DPA/TW-CLHFS/4)

---

50. The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interest in the item:

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

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

51. The Committee noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau could stay

in the meeting as he had no involvement in the application.

52. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 9.9.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the first time that the applicant had requested for deferment of the application.

53. 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. 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 7**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan  
No. S/H3/29

(MPC Paper No.17/16)

---

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

54. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendment site was in the Sheung Wan and Sai Ying Pun area and involved the rezoning of a site arising from an approved s.12A

application related to the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals (TWGHs). The following Members had declared interests in the item:

Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with TWGHs; and

Mr Wilson W.S. Pang - owning a flat and car park at Sai Ying Pun

55. The Committee noted that Mr Franklin Yu had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the proposed amendment was to take forward the decision of the Committee on an approved s.12A application, the Committee agreed that Mr Wilson W.S. Pang should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

56. 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:

Background

- (a) on 13.5.2016, the Committee agreed to a s.12A application (No. Y/H3/8) to rezone the site at 122A to 130 Hollywood Road comprising the Man Mo Temple Compound (MMTC) and the vacant ex-TWGHs Lee Sai Chow Primary School from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “G/IC(2)” to facilitate a proposed youth hostel development on the vacant school portion of the site (eastern portion). The proposed youth hostel would be a 21-storey building with a building height (BH) of about 97mPD and provide 302 bed spaces. The existing MMTC at the western portion of the site would be preserved;

The Proposed Amendment

- (b) the proposed amendment was mainly for rezoning the site (1,684m<sup>2</sup>) comprising MMTC and the ex-TWGHs Lee Sai Chow Primary School from “G/IC” with a maximum BH restrictions of 8 storeys and 1 storey at the eastern and western portions respectively to “G/IC(2)” with a maximum BH restriction of 97mPD and 1 storey for the eastern and western portions



respectively (Amendment Item A);

Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (c) in relation to Amendment Item A, it was proposed to add ‘Residential Institution (Hostel only) (on land designated “G/IC(2)” only)’ under Column 1 of the Notes of the “G/IC” zone, and to replace ‘Residential Institution’ under Column 2 with ‘Residential Institution (not elsewhere specified)’;

Departmental Consultation

- (d) concerned government bureaux/departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the proposed amendment;

57. In response to a Member’s question, Mr J.J. Austin, STP/HK, confirmed that there are no other sites zoned “G/IC(2)” on the Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan.

58. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/29 and that the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/29A (to be renumbered to S/H3/30 upon exhibition) and its Notes are suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised ES for the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/29A (to be renumbered to S/H3/30 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings for 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.]

**Agenda Item 8**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H5/405                      Proposed Alfresco Dining Facilities/Outdoor Sitting Areas  
(Amendments to an Approved Master Layout Plan) in "Comprehensive  
Development Area" zone, Existing Outdoor Sitting Areas, The Avenue,  
No. 200 Queen's Road East, Hong Kong  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/H5/405)

---

59.                      The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) with Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Limited (RLP) as one of the consultants of the applicant.    The following Members had declared interests in the item:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Mr K.K. Ling<br>(the Chairman)<br><i>as the Director of Planning</i>                            | -    being a non-executive director of the Board of URA;  |
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang<br>(the Vice-Chairman)  | -    being the Vice-chairman of Appeal Board Panel of URA;  |
| Mr Simon S.W. Wang<br><i>as the Assistant Director<br/>(Regional 1) of Lands<br/>Department</i> | -    being an alternate member of the Director of Lands who was a non-executive director of the Board of URA; |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon   | -    being a non-executive director 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;
  
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with URA;  
-  
his firm having past business dealings with RLP;
  
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA; and
  
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with RLP.

60. The Committee noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that as the interests of Mr Simon S.W. Wang, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr K.K. Cheung were direct, they should be allowed to stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. As Mr Stephen H.B. Yau's interest was indirect, and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

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

62. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 22.9.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the first time that the applicant had requested for deferment of the

application.

63. 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. 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.

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 9**

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

[Open Meeting]

A/K18/320 Proposed Institutional Use (Educational Research Institute) in "Residential (Group C) 1" zone, 15 Kent Road, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon (MPC Paper No. A/K18/320A)

---

64. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kowloon Tong and Lanbase Surveyors Limited (Lanbase) and LLA Consultancy Limited (LLA) were the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

- |                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau   | - having current business dealings with Lanbase and LLA;  |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam   | - having past business dealings with Lanbase; and   |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - working in the City University of Hong Kong and living in its quarters in Kowloon Tong covered by the Shek Kip Mei Outline Zoning Plan. |

65. The Committee noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee also noted that the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon could stay in the meeting as Mr Lau had no involvement in the application and Dr Poon's residence had no direct view of the application site.

66. The Committee noted that after the issuance of the paper, the applicant requested on 27.9.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from the Transport Department. It was the applicant's first request for deferment. The deferment letter was tabled at the meeting for Member's consideration.

67. 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 further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

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

[Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan, Chief Town Planner/Housing & Office Land Supply (CTP/HOLS) and Mr Timothy Y.M. Lui, Senior Town Planner/Housing & Office Land Supply (STP/HOLS) were invited to the meeting at this point.]

## Housing and Office Land Supply Section

### Agenda Item 10

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Draft Planning Brief for the "Comprehensive Development Area" zone at Site 3 of the New Central Harbourfront

(MPC Paper No.16/16)

---

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

68. The Secretary reported that two public comments, one being jointly submitted by the Central & Western Concern Group, Victoria Harbourfront Concern Group, Centre for Democratic Community Planning, Designing Hong Kong and Green Sense, and the other from a member of the public, were submitted expressing concerns and comments on the draft Planning Brief (PB). As requested by the joint concern groups, their comments had been tabled at the meeting for Members' reference.

69. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan, CTP/HOLS, and Mr Timothy Y.M. Lui, STP/HOLS, presented the draft PB as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

#### Background

- (a) the draft PB covered Site 3, with an area of about 4.67ha, which was zoned "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") on the draft Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H24/8. The site, divided into three portions separated by Yiu Sing Street and Lung Wo Road, occupied a prominent location at the new Central harbourfront with Statue Square to its south and Central Piers 7 and 8 to its north;
- (b) except for a small existing U-trap Tower Outfall, the site was a piece of government land with part of it let out under short-term tenancies which

were to be terminated before land disposal;

- (c) the site was one of the eight key sites under the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS) completed by Planning Department (PlanD) in 2011. According to the final recommendations of the UDS, the site would be developed into a comprehensive development mainly for office and retail uses in separate medium-rise buildings on top of a continuous landscape deck stretching from Connaught Place to the Central Piers across Lung Wo Road and Yiu Sing Street;

#### Planning Intention and Development Parameters

- (d) the “CDA” zone was intended for comprehensive development/redevelopment of the area for commercial development, mainly for office and retail uses, and landscaped pedestrian deck, with provision of public open space (POS) and other supporting facilities. It was subject to a maximum building height (BH) of 50mPD for the medium-rise commercial development on the western part and a maximum BH of 16mPD for the low-rise landscaped pedestrian deck with commercial facilities below on the eastern part;
- (e) the maximum gross floor area (GFA) for office and retail uses for the site was 150,000m<sup>2</sup>. In addition, a minimum of non-commercial GFA of 21,200m<sup>2</sup> should be provided for public facilities including car parking spaces, transport facilities, government, institution or community (G/IC) facilities and the reconstruction of the Star Ferry Clock Tower (SFCT);

#### Urban Design Requirements

- (f) to respect the prominent waterfront setting of the site and to promote an attractive and accessible waterfront, a number of urban design considerations were proposed, which included diversity in building form; variation in BH and a stepped height profile with descending BH towards the harbourfront; a continuous landscaped deck; sufficient building

separation; comprehensive multi-level barrier-free pedestrian network within the Site and linkage with the surroundings; adequate POS at-grade and on the landscaped deck; integrated site planning and innovative design; clear vista from Statue Square to the harbourfront and improvement of streetscape and amenity. An urban design proposal should be submitted as part of the Master Layout Plan (MLP) submission;

*Landscaped Deck*

- (g) a barrier-free, continuous landscaped deck spanning from Connaught Place to the Central Piers across Lung Wo Road and Yiu Sing Street should be provided along the north-south direction to connect Statue Square to the harbourfront;

*Open Space and Landscape Requirement*

- (h) a minimum of 25,000m<sup>2</sup> of POS should be provided within the site for public enjoyment, of which not less than 12,000m<sup>2</sup> should be located at grade. The at-grade POS should mainly be located at the eastern portion of the site and well integrated with the future open space in Site 7 and the City Hall Complex. The developer was also required to develop, manage and maintain the POS at the railway reserve area upon completion of railway works. Two additional areas at the northern and southeastern peripheries of the site would be converted into at-grade POS by the developer to facilitate better integration with the surroundings;
- (i) a Landscape Master Plan should be submitted as part of the MLP submission. A minimum overall site coverage of greenery of 30% should be provided at the whole site. To ensure extensive greenery and soft landscape within the POS, a minimum site coverage of greenery of 50% at the POS area should be provided;
- (j) in accordance with the recommendation of the UDS, the old SFCT would be reconstructed at its original location. As the BH of the old SFCT was



about 25mPD which would exceed the BH restriction of 16mPD on the western portion as stipulated in the OZP, an application for minor relaxation of BH restriction should be submitted as part of the MLP submission;

G/IC Facilities

- (k) the developer would be required to design and construct some district-tied facilities of the Government Post Office (GPO) and two public toilets which would be handed over to relevant departments for continued and uninterrupted provision of public services;

Pedestrian Connections

- (l) a pedestrian network plan was required to be devised as part of the MLP submission. The developer was required to maintain a 24-hour unobstructed pedestrian access within the site and to adjacent nodal attractions, and to provide a number of elevated connections to surrounding developments. In addition, an underground connection providing direct access from Mass Transit Railway Central Station to the Site across Connaught Road Central, and temporary pedestrian access with barrier-free access when the existing footbridge between the GPO and the Central Terminal Building was demolished by phases should be provided;

Traffic and Transport Requirements

- (m) to assist in relocating the existing traffic facilities at Man Kwong Street, the developer was required to provide transport facilities at the ground level in the future development to the north of Yiu Hing Street. A total of 325 public car parking spaces and 30 public motorcycle parking spaces should also be provided within the site. Moreover, in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, about 520 ancillary car parking spaces should be provided to serve office, retail and other uses in the future development. A traffic impact assessment should be carried out by the

developer and submitted as part of the MLP submission;

Other Technical Assessments

- (n) as part of the MLP submission, the developer would be required to submit technical assessments including visual impact assessment, quantitative air ventilation assessment, environmental assessment and drainage and sewerage impact assessments;

Implementation

- (o) the site should be implemented in two phases according to the demarcation of Site 3A (north of Lung Wo Road) and Site 3B (south of Lung Wo Road). Site 3A should be developed first to re-provide the district-tied facilities and the public car parking spaces. Upon completion of Site 3A, development in Site 3B would then proceed. An implementation plan including the phasing strategy should be submitted as part of the MLP submission; and

Way Forward

- (p) subject to the Committee's agreement, PlanD would consult the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) and the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Hong Kong (Task Force of HC).

70. A Member asked about the difference between the major parameters proposed in the UDS and the draft PB. In response, Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan, CTP/HOLS, said that the major parameters were largely the same except for the increase in the non-commercial GFA from 7,400m<sup>2</sup> to 21,200m<sup>2</sup> due to the reprovisioning of G/IC facilities such as the GPO and increase in the number of public car parking spaces from 150 to 325, and slight increase in the maximum BH restriction for the eastern portion of the "CDA" zone as the site formation level of the Central Reclamation Phase III project was unavailable at the time of the UDS recommendation. There was no change in the urban design concept for development at the site.

71. In response to a Member's question on the pedestrian linkage between the Central Piers and the future development, Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan said that at-grade pedestrian connection was available, and landscaped deck connecting the Central Piers and Statue Square and subway connections to adjacent developments would also be provided. These connections would be open 24-hours a day.

72. The Chairman said that the two comments received before the meeting mainly proposed to preserve the GPO. In that regard, he enquired whether the UDS had recommended preservation of the GPO. In response, Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan said that the draft PB was formulated based on the UDS, which recommended that the GPO and the Star Ferry Car Park would be demolished. She also said that when PlanD briefed LegCo members on the UDS in 2009 and 2010, LegCo members noted the recommendation of relocating of the GPO for efficient use of the precious harbourfront resources. Moreover, in a LegCo document for discussion on the Shatin-Central Link and in a report produced by the Audit Commission in 2015, it was also mentioned that GPO would be relocated in accordance with the recommendations of the UDS. The Chairman supplemented for Members' information that there were no strong views on preservation of the GPO during public consultation stages of the UDS.

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

[The Chairman thanked Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan, CTP/HOLS, and Mr Timothy Y.M. Lui, STP/HOLS, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 11**

#### **Any Other Business**

74. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 1:00 p.m.