

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 597th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 26.1.2018**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),
Transport Department
Mr Peter P.C. Wong

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr C.F. Wong

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

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Professor T.S. Liu

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms April K.Y. Kun

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

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 596th MPC Meeting held on 12.1.2018

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 596th MPC meeting held on 12.1.2018 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/TW/12 Application for Amendment to the Approved Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/33, To Rezone the Application Site from “Green Belt” to “Government, Institution or Community (10)”, Lots 613 RP (Part), 614 and 1229 in D.D. 453 and Adjoining Government Land, Lo Wai, Tsuen Wan

(MPC Paper No. Y/TW/12)

3. The Secretary reported that the application involved an existing columbarium namely Wing Shing Yuen at the application site and LLA Consultancy Limited (LLA) and BMT Asia Pacific Limited (BMT) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau	- having past business dealings with LLA and BMT
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho	- his firm having past business dealings with BMT
Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang (Vice-chairman)]] being a member of the Private Columbaria] Appeal Board
Mr Sunny L.K. Ho]]

4. The Committee noted that Messrs Patrick H.T. Lau and Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and the interests of Messrs Lincoln L.H. Huang and Sunny L.K. Ho were indirect, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

5. The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 9.1.2018 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments of the Transport Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 4

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/K22/3 Application for Amendment to the Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/5, To Rezone the Application Site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Tunnel Ventilation Shaft" and "Government, Institution or Community" to "Commercial (9)", Lucky Building, 3-5 San Ma Tau Street, Ma Tau Kok, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. Y/K22/3)

7. The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA), Ronald Lu and Partners (Hong Kong) Limited (RL&P), MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) and Ove Arup & Partner Hong Kong Limited (Arup) are four of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - having current business dealings with KTA, RL&P, MVA and Arup |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - his firm having current business dealings with RL&P and MVA |
| Mr K.K. Cheung | - his firm having current business dealings with Arup |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - having past business dealings with MVA and Arup |

8. The Committee noted that Messrs Patrick H.T. Lau and Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived at the meeting. As the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

9. The Committee noted that the applicants' agent requested on 9.1.2018 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments of relevant departments, including the preparation of quantitative risk assessment and foundation and structural design reports. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

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

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/KC/444 Proposed Comprehensive Development for Flat, Eating Place, Shop and Services and Office with Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction from 120mPD to 145mPD in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, Kwai Chung Town Lot 432 and Adjoining Government Land, 1-7 Cheung Wing Road, Kwai Chung (MPC Paper No. A/KC/444B)

11. The Secretary reported that MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) is one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - his firm having current business dealings with MVA

Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with MVA

12. The Committee noted that Messrs Patrick H.T. Lau and Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived at the meeting.

13. The Chairman drew Members’ attention that after issuance of the Paper, the applicant’s agent wrote to the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 22.1.2018 requesting deferment of consideration of the application for two months. The letter had been tabled at the meeting for Members’ information. It was the third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

14. The Secretary said that according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines PG-No. 33, should the request be received after the issue of the agenda, the Planning Department (PlanD) would report the case at the scheduled meeting. If the Board decided not to accede to the request, it might proceed to make a decision on the application at the scheduled meeting. PlanD did not support the request for deferment as there was no major outstanding

issue on the landscaping, traffic and environmental aspects that needed to be resolved before consideration of the planning application. Remaining concerns of relevant departments could be addressed through the imposition of approval conditions/advisory clauses, if the planning application were approved. Besides, if the applicant was aggrieved by the decision of the Committee under s.16, he might apply for a review of the Committee's decision under s.17 of the Town Planning Ordinance.

15. Members agreed that the applicant's request for deferment should not be acceded to and the Committee agreed to proceed to consider the application at the meeting.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed comprehensive development and minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction from 120mPD to 145mPD;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, a total of 942 comments were received. Among them, 928 comments submitted by the Community Development Alliance, Shek Lei Chiu Kiu Yulan Shing Wui, Shek Lei Fuk Tak Benevolent Society Limited and Kwai Chung Residents Association, the Owners' Corporation of Milo Industrial Building, the Associate of the Residents of Kwong Fai Circuit (Kwai Hing), the Incorporated Owners of Cheong Wang and Cheong Wai Mansion, the Incorporated Owners of Man Shing Building Kwong Fai Circuit, the

Incorporated Owners of Tak Cheong Building, the Incorporated Owners of Kwai King Building and members of the general public supported the application. Eight comments submitted by a member of Kwai Chung North East Area Committee and members of the general public objected to the application. Six comments submitted by the Owners' Corporation of Shui Wing Industrial Building, Kwai Tsing District Council members and two individuals raised concerns on the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed development was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone and the development intensity, i.e. plot ratio (PR) of 6.36, was within the permissible PR restriction for the “CDA” zone under the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The proposed development was compatible with the surrounding developments and would help phase out the industrial use and facilitate the gradual transformation of the area for residential/commercial development. The provision of a central landscape area within the development together with the stepped BH profile would help provide visual openness with improved visual permeability to the neighboring area and was considered a planning and design merit for the BH relaxation. Relevant departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application on visual, landscape, air ventilation, traffic, environmental and infrastructural aspects. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

Central Landscape Space

17. The Chairman and some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) opening hours and accessibility of the central landscape space;
 - (b) interface between the public and private portions of the central landscape space and the potential conflicts between the residents and outsiders; and
 - (c) whether there were any alfresco dining or other retail/commercial activities proposed in the central landscape space.
18. Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, made the following responses:
- (a) the applicant proposed that the central landscape space would be opened at reasonable hours and further liaison with relevant departments would be carried out at the implementation stage;
 - (b) as shown on Drawings A-10, to allow the public to access to the central landscape space, three pedestrian accesses from Tai Yuen Street, Kwok Shui Road and Cheung Wing Road were proposed. Besides, entrance to the residential towers would be located at the junction of the proposed new road (Road 27E) and Tai Yuen Street and would be completely separated from the commercial podium. Among the 5,000m² open space proposed by the applicant within the development, about 3,580m² would be on the upper ground floor (UG/F) and were publicly accessible, while about 1,420m² would be private open space locating on the residential podium and the west wing terraces of the office tower; and
 - (c) the applicant's submission did not indicate any alfresco dining or other retail/commercial activities at the central landscape space.

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

19. Some Members further raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the opening hours of the central landscape space could be specified in the approval conditions or in the lease condition; and
- (b) means to ensure that the central landscape space would be opened to the public in the future, particularly if residents' complaints were received.

20. Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, responded that should the Committee approve the application, the lot owner would be required to apply to the Lands Department for lease modification for the proposed comprehensive development. The management requirements of the central landscape space could be specified in the lease conditions as appropriate.

21. The Chairman drew Members' attention that the applicant did not propose a public open space within a private development. The applicant's proposal was that the central landscape space in the development would be accessible to the public.

Proposed Road Improvement Works

22. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the green area as shown on Drawing A-18 (Kwai Chung Town Lot No. 432) fell within government land (GL);
- (b) whether the proposed widening of the pedestrian walkway was within the site boundary; and
- (c) whether the proposed road improvement works were the requirements under the lease.

23. Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, made the following responses:

- (a) the lot was restricted to industrial and/or godown purposes excluding offensive trade. The green area as shown on the lease plan, which was government land and not owned by the applicant, was proposed for the road/pavement works surrounding the site. Under the lease, the lot owner was required to form the green area to the satisfaction of the Transport Department and Highways Department at his own costs and handed over the area to the government for management and maintenance upon satisfactory completion of work; and
- (b) the current proposal was considered as an opportunity to implement the proposed Road 27E, and the widening of footpath together with the road junction improvement works proposed by the applicant would address the traffic issue for the area.

Previously Approved Application

24. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the site boundary and proposed PR of the subject application were similar to those of the previously approved application; and
- (b) the maximum BH of the previously approved scheme and the major considerations when approving the application.

25. Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, made the following responses:

- (a) the site boundary and proposed PR of the current application were the same as those of the previously approved application (No. A/KC/241); and
- (b) the previously approved application involved the development of a 38-storey service apartment block of 169mPD and a 16-storey hotel block. The application was approved with conditions by the Committee taking

into consideration various factors and the prevailing circumstances. There was no BH or PR restriction for the application site at that time.

Deliberation Session

26. The Chairman said that in considering the subject application, the Committee should focus on whether the proposed scheme in the Master Layout Plan (MLP) was acceptable and whether the proposed BH relaxation from 120mPD to 140mPD was justified. The Vice-Chairman supplemented that the Committee should consider whether the traffic improvement associated with the proposed road improvement works and the opening of the central landscape space for public access could be regarded as planning gains as claimed by the applicant. As for the opening hours of the central landscape space, the issue could be dealt with during the lease modification stage. Mr Simon S.W. Wang, Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department (LandsD), advised that relevant guidelines on public open space in private development would be followed upon receipt of application for lease modification or land exchange for the proposed development. The Secretary drew Members' attention that for public open space within private developments, the authority would usually specify the opening hours, but the proposed central landscape space in the subject application was not a proposed public open space.

27. Based on the 3D image provided by the applicant, the Chairman and a Member said that the proposed scheme with a stepped BH profile with maximum BH of 145mPD could create a more spacious environment within the development than the baseline scheme with a monotonous BH profile of 120mPD. Given the proposed access points, the central landscape space could enhance pedestrian circulation in the area and provide a focal point for the neighbourhood.

28. Another Member also considered that the proposed scheme was better than the baseline scheme and the previously approved scheme. The Member appreciated the design of the proposed scheme as the building disposition had been carefully designed to allow more sunshine to penetrate into the central landscape area while shadow of the buildings could provide relief from the afternoon sunshine. Besides, the publicly accessible central landscape space was located on the UG/F which would be easily accessible by the public. Such kind of open space was necessary in the district. Notwithstanding that, the Member

raised concern on whether approval conditions could be imposed to specify the size of the area to be opened to the public and to ensure that the central landscape space would be opened to the public in the future. The Chairman pointed out that the development scheme as shown on the MLP with the location of the central landscape space would need to be followed by the applicant if the application were approved by the Committee.

29. Two other Members considered that the central landscape space could be regarded as a design merit. Given that the publicly accessible portion of the open space was located on the UG/F which would be separated from the private open space on the residential podium and office terraces, they had no doubt on the applicant's intention to open the central landscape space to the public. One of the Members considered that in recent years, the general public were fully aware of their rights of access to public open space including those in private developments. The other Member considered that alfresco dining/ refreshment kiosks might be provided in the central landscape space to serve the community. In this regard, the applicant should specify clearly the kind of activities to be organised in the central landscape space for consideration by the Committee.

30. A Member was of the view that the planning merit of a proposed development should not only add value to the development itself, but also benefit the community as well. The Member raised concern on the potential conflict between the residents and outsiders as noise problem and other nuisances might be created by the outsiders when using the central landscape space. In many similar cases, publicly accessible space within private developments would be closed by the estate management office upon receipt of residents' complaints. The Member was concerned that there might not be effective means to ensure that the central landscape space would be accessible by the public in the future. As such, the central landscape space could not be considered as a planning merit as it only added value to the development itself.

31. Another Member also raised similar concern and considered that the accessibility of the central landscape space was a major consideration. The applicant had not proposed any measures to resolve the potential conflict with the future residents and to ensure that the central landscape space would be genuinely opened to the public in the future. Besides, the Member had doubt on why the current layout could not be achieved with a BH of 120mPD and whether the proposed increase in BH was necessary. Some Members agreed on this

point and questioned whether the baseline scheme had been deliberately designed to present a very congested and enclosed environment so as to justify the proposed scheme with a higher BH. They doubted whether there were sufficient planning merits to justify the proposed BH relaxation.

32. The Vice-chairman pointed out that the proposed Road 27E was a requirement under the lease, it might not be considered as a planning gain. Some Members echoed that the proposed road improvement works which would mainly serve the residents of the development should not be regarded as a planning merit.

33. In response to a Member's query, the Chairman said that a set of general building plans for the previously approved scheme with a maximum BH of 169mPD had been approved by the Buildings Department.

34. Members generally considered that more information from the applicant regarding the opening hours, function and operation of the central landscape space, and comparison of the building bulk (including floor area and floor height) between the baseline and proposed schemes would be necessary to facilitate Members' further consideration of the application.

35. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application, pending submission of further information from the applicant.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr K.S. Ng, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

[The Vice-chairman left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TW/494 Proposed Shop and Services in “Industrial” Zone, Workshop on G/F,
First Asia Tower, 8 Fui Yiu Kok Street, Tsuen Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/494)

36. The Secretary reported that Centaline Property Agency Limited (CPAL) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr K.K. Cheung | - his firm having current business dealings with CPAL |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung | - being the Chairman of the Hong Kong Dance Company which had obtained sponsorship from CPAL before |

37. As Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application and the interest of Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung was indirect, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed shop and services;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment was received; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed shop and services was considered not incompatible with the subject building and the surrounding developments. The subject building was protected by sprinkler system subject to a maximum permissible limit of 460m² in accordance with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 25D (TPB PG-No. 25D). Should the application be approved, the aggregate commercial floor area of the subject building would be 189.67m², which was within the said permissible limit. The proposed use also complied with the TPB PG-No. 25D in that it would not have adverse traffic or environmental impact on the developments within the subject building and the adjacent areas. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. As the previous application at the Premises (No. A/TW/485) was revoked on 26.11.2017 due to non-compliance with the approval condition relating to fire service measures, it was suggested that a shorter compliance period should be imposed and the permission should be valid on a temporary basis for a period of three years, should the Committee decide to approve the application.

39. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

40. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years until 26.1.2021, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the submission of a proposal for fire safety measures, including the provision of means of escape separated from the industrial portion and fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting at the application premises within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the

satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 26.4.2018;

- (b) the implementation of the proposal for fire safety measures, including the provision of means of escape separated from the industrial portion and fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting at the application premises within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 26.7.2018; and
- (c) if any of the above planning conditions (a) or (b) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr K.S. Ng, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Lincoln L.H Huang returned to join the meeting and Mr K.K. Cheung left the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H7/174 Proposed Shop and Services/Eating Place in "Residential (Group B)"
Zone, Ground Floor (Part), 17 Yuk Sau Street, Happy Valley, Hong
Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H7/174)

42. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Bank of East Asia (Trustees) Limited (BEA) and the application site was located in Happy Valley. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - co-owning with his spouse a flat at no. 18 Kwai Sing Lane in Happy Valley and being the Chairman of Happy Valley Residents' Association |
| Dr Wilton W.T. Fok | - his parents owning a property at Blue Pool Road in Happy Valley |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - his spouse owning a property in Happy Valley in close proximity to the Causeway Bay area |
| Mr K.K. Cheung | - his firm having business dealings with BEA and co-owning with his spouse a flat at The Leighton Hill in Happy Valley |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung | - being the Founding President of Hong Kong Business Accountants Association which obtained sponsorship from BEA before |

43. The Committee noted that Messrs Patrick H.T. Lau and Dominic K.K. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr K.K. Cheung had already left the meeting. As the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and the properties owned by Dr Wilton W.T. Fok's parents had no direct view of the application site and the interest of Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung was indirect, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

44. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 17.1.2018 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time to address and resolve the comments of various government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

45. 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 submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K14/754 Proposed Shop and Services in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone, Car Parking Space No. 1, G/F, Po Yip Building, 23 Hing Yip Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/754)

46. The Committee noted that the applicant's agent requested on 18.1.2018 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments of the Transport Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

47. 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 submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K18/325 School (Kindergarten) in “Residential (Group C) 3” Zone, 3 Flint Road,
Kowloon Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/325)

48. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 10.1.2018 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for the preparation of further information in response to departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 10

Any Other Business

50. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 10:45 a.m..