

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 616<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 16.11.2018**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),  
Transport Department  
Mr Michael H.S. Law

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Dr. Sunny C.W. Cheung

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

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Franklin Yu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

**In Attendance**

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Miss Kirstie Y.L. Law

**Agenda Item 1**

**Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 615<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 2.11.2018**

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 615<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 2.11.2018 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]

Y/H5/5

Application for Amendment to the Draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H5/28, To Rezone the Application Site from “Open Space”, “Residential (Group C)”, “Government, Institution or Community” to “Comprehensive Development Area”, 1, 1A, 2 and 3 Hill Side Terrace, 55 Ship Street (Nam Koo Terrace), 1-5 Schooner Street, 53 Ship Street (Miu Kang Terrace) and adjoining Government Land, Wan Chai, Hong Kong

(MPC Paper No. Y/H5/5A)

---

3. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Wan Chai. The application was submitted by Yuba Company Ltd., which was a subsidiary of Hopewell Holdings Ltd. (Hopewell). AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM), Hopewell Construction Co. Ltd., WMKY Ltd. (WMKY), and WSP (Asia) Ltd. (WSP) were four of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with Hopewell, AECOM and WMKY;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with AECOM;
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with AECOM and WSP; and
- Mr Stephen H.B. Yau - his office locating at Southorn Centre, Wan Chai.

4. The Committee noted that Messrs Franklin Yu and Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting and the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. Since Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, and the office of Mr Stephen H.B. Yau had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

5. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 25.10.2018 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 second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to provide technical clarification on the traffic impact assessment and the proposed in response to departmental comments.

6. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further

information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for the preparation of the further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Agenda Item 4**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting]

Y/H15/12                      Application for Amendment to the Approved Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau (HPA 15 & 16) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H15/33, To Rezone the Application Site from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (3)” to “Residential (Group E)”, 111 Lee Nam Road, Ap Lei Chau, Hong Kong  
  
(MPC Paper No. Y/H15/12A)

---

7.                      The Secretary reported that Ove Arup and Partners Hong Kong Limited. (Arup) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Alex T.H. Lai            -            his firm having current business dealings with Arup;  
and

Mr Franklin Yu             -            having past business dealings with Arup.

8.                      The Committee noted that Mr Franklin Yu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. Since Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

9.                      The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 1.11.2018 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 second time that the applicant requested deferment of the

application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including new Vacancy Survey Report and revised technical assessment reports to address departmental and public comments.

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

[Ms Katy C.W. Fung, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK) was invited to the meeting at this point.]

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

#### **Agenda Item 5**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K20/130            Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone, New Kowloon Inland Lot 6549, Off Hing Wah Street West, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K20/130A)

---

11. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Sky Asia Properties Limited, which was the joint-venture of Sino Land Company Limited (Sino) and Wheelock Properties Limited (Wheelock) and three other companies. AECOM Asia Company

Limited (AECOM), P&T (M&E) Limited (P&T), Urbis Limited (Urbis) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) were four of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on this item:

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealing with Wheelock, AECOM and his firm having current business dealings with Urbis;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with Sino, Wheelock, AECOM and Arup;
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with AECOM, Urbis and Arup; and
- Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo - her spouse being a Group Director of P&T.

12. The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Franklin Yu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Since Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, and the interest of Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo was remote, the Committee agreed that they could be allowed to stay in the meeting.

13. The Committee also noted that a replacement page (page 7 of the Paper) with revision in paragraph 5, as well as an additional page (Annex A of the Paper), were tabled at the meeting for Members' reference.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed comprehensive residential development;

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 11 and Appendix VI 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, a total of 39 public comment were received from a District Councillor, the Hong Kong and China Gas Company and private individuals. Among the public comments received, 16 supported the application, 5 objected the application and 18 provided comments/concerns on the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 12 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 13 of the Paper. The application, with provision of Public Open Space (POS) in the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone, was in line with the planning intention and the maximum GFA and building height (BH) restrictions under the OZP. The proposed comprehensive residential development with open space provision was considered not incompatible with surrounding land uses, and generally complied with the development parameters and relevant planning and urban design requirements set out in the Planning Brief. The proposed BH was considered not incompatible with the development context and height profile of the area, various design features would help enhance air penetration and visual permeability, and create a sense of openness with development away from the POS and waterfront promenade. No adverse landscape and air ventilation impacts were anticipated. The POS in the site and the Public Waterfront Promenade together with the planned POS in the public housing development to the northeast of the site would serve the local as well as for enjoyment of the public accessed through existing and proposed pedestrian facilities. The POS would be designed and constructed by the applicant and handed back to LCSD for management and maintenance upon its completion. The proposed development would not create adverse traffic, fire safety, environmental, drainage and sewerage impacts on the



surroundings. Approval conditions were suggested to address the concerns from departments. Regarding the public comments, comments of the concerned departments and the planning assessment above were relevant.

15. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there would be nuisance brought about by the operation of the nearby Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Food Market (CSWWFM) and Stonecutters Island Sewage Treatment Works (SCISTW) opposite to the site;
- (b) whether the several piers near the application site were currently in use or if there were any future plans for waterborne transport in the area; and
- (c) whether facilities relating to waste management were provided in the proposed development.

16. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, STP/TWK, made the following responses:

- (a) according to the Environmental Assessment submitted by the Applicant, it was demonstrated that no significant impact on noise and odor would be resulted from the West Kowloon Refuse Transfer Station (WKRTS), SCISTW at Stonecutters Island and CSWWFM;
- (b) there were a total of five piers near the site. The design of the pier located at the southeastern section of the waterfront promenade formed part of the planning application for the “CDA(2)” site adjacent to the application site. According to the application for “CDA(2)”, uses compatible with the waterfront setting had been proposed at the pier. The application was under processing and would be submitted to the Committee for consideration in due course. As for the other piers, the one immediately outside the CSWWFM was currently not in use while the remaining ones were currently used to support the operation of the CSWWFM according to the

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department; and

- (c) the applicant had not provided any information on waste management facilities but indicated that they would follow the practices under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines.

17. Another Member raised the following enquiries:

- (a) accessibility of the proposed POS at the proposed development;
- (b) whether the proposed development would induce wall effect and adverse impact on air ventilation as pointed out in some public comments; and
- (c) direction of the major breezeway at the proposed development and whether the direction of prevailing wind had been respected in the formulation of the layout of the proposed development.

18. In response to the Member's enquiries, Ms Fung made the following points:

- (a) the proposed POS at the site and the waterfront promenade were connected to the planned public open space in the planned public housing development across Lai Ying Street and the public housing developments to the further northeast via the two proposed footbridges across Lin Cheung Road/West Kowloon Highway and Fat Tseung Street/Fat Tseung Street West; and
- (b) according to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, the NBAs were designated wind corridors to improve air penetration and visual permeability towards the hinterland. The layout and the major breezeways of the proposed development, as illustrated on the Indicative Master Layout Plan and Urban Design Concept Plan at Drawing No. A-1 and A-8 of the Paper respectively, were in line with the two NBAs designated on the OZP. Apart from adhering to the requirement of excluding structures at or above the NBAs, various features, including

urban windows, ground floor recess with higher headroom at some towers as well as a 15m-wide building separation between Towers 6 and 7 in Portion B of the Site were proposed to enhance visual permeability and air ventilation. According to the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) submitted by the applicant, it was demonstrated that no adverse impact on air ventilation aspect was anticipated.

### Deliberation Session

19. While it was noted that details on waste management measures and facilities were not available at present, a Member considered that the proposed development of such scale should have the capacity to provide for more advance and environmentally friendly facilities, which the Committee agreed that this could be further explored by the project proponent at the detailed design stage.

20. Another Member raised concerns on the waterfront and streetscape design, and considered that the proposed landscape design and planters might compromise the provision of a pleasant and spacious walking environment along the waterfront for the public's enjoyment. The same Member also considered that more interesting streetscape design could be proposed along Lai Ying Street to provide a less monotonous setting. The Chairman acknowledged the Member's concerns and considered that the applicant should be advised to take into account under the approval conditions on submission and implementation of the Landscape Master Plan and design and provision of the POS relating to landscape and waterfront design.

21. Another Member considered that in view of the proximity of the site to the waterfront, water-borne transport and other functional uses at the waterfront could be further explored while it was noted that the Harbourfront Commission had been discussing water-borne transport arrangement.

22. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 16.11.2022, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the

permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan to take into account of the approval conditions (b) to (i) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a revised Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the design and provision of a public open space of not less than 3,600m<sup>2</sup> within the application site and the proposed northwestern section of the waterfront promenade fronting the application site including the section connecting to Lai Ying Street to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) the design and provision of vehicular access, car parking and loading/unloading facilities for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (e) the submission of a revised Noise Impact Assessment and the implementation of noise mitigation measures identified in the Noise Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (f) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (g) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (h) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting

to the satisfaction of Fire Services Department or of the Town Planning Board; and

- (i) the submission of an implementation programme indicating the timing and phasing of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Ms Katy C.W. Fung, STP/TWK for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 6**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K4/69                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction (from 70mPD to 90.8mPD) for Permitted Education Institution (University Indoor Sports Centre, Auditorium and Laboratory Building Complex) in “Government, Institution or Community (4)” Zone, 83 Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/K4/69A)

---

24. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the City University of Hong Kong (CityU). Andrew Lee King Fun & Associates Architects Limited (ALKF) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being a senior lecturer at CityU and living in its quarters in Kowloon Tong;

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being a part-time lecturer at CityU;

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with CityU; and

Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with ALKF.

25. The Committee noted that Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Mr Franklin Yu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. Since Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

26. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 31.10.2018 deferment of the consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from Transport Department. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

27. 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 one month were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of three months had been allowed for the preparation of the further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Agenda Item 7**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/801                      Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (4)”  
Zone, Portion of G/F including Portion of Cockloft, Wing Ming  
Industrial Centre, 15 Cheung Yue Street, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/801)

---

28.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 6.11.2018 deferment of the consideration of the application for one month 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 requested deferment of the application.

29.            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 one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

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

**Agenda Item 8**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TW/501 Proposed Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Portion of Workshops E & F, G/F, TML Tower, 3 Hoi Shing Road, Tsuen Wan, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/501A)

---

30. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse was a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and

Professor John C.Y. Ng - His spouse owned a property in Tsuen Wan.

31. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and agreed that since the property of Professor John C.Y. Ng’s spouse had no direct view of the application site, he could be allowed to stay in the meeting.

32. The Committee also noted that two replacement pages (page 5 of the Paper and Appendix IV), providing updated departmental comments in paragraph 9.1.1 (b) of the Paper and paragraph (a) of the Advisory Clauses at Appendix IV, were tabled at the meeting for Members’ reference.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

33. 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 comments on the application;



- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment was received from an individual objecting to the application. The major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 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 11 of the Paper. The proposed use was considered generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Use” annotated “Business” zone and was compatible with the changing land use character of the area. The proposed use also complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D in that it would not induce adverse fire safety, traffic, environmental and infrastructural impacts on the developments within the subject building and the adjacent areas, and the aggregate commercial gross floor area on the ground floor was within the maximum permissible limit of the industrial building with sprinkler system.

34. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

35. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 16.11.2020, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the provision of fire service installations and equipment and means of escape separated from the industrial portion before operation of the use 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 before operation of the use, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the

same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

### **Agenda Item 9**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TWW/114 Proposed Access Road for Residential Development at Lots 92, 382 RP, Extension (Ext.) to 382 and Lot 440 RP in D.D. 399, Ting Kau, Tsuen Wan in “Green Belt” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, Government Land adjacent to Lot 92, Lot 382 RP, Ext. to 382 and Lot 440 RP in D.D. 399, Ting Kau, Tsuen Wan, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TWW/114C)

---

37. The Secretary reported that Winfield Engineering Co. (Winfield) was one of the consultants of the applicant and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest on the item for his firm having current business dealings with Winfield. Since Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could be allowed to stay in the meeting.

38. The Committee noted that a replacement page (Appendix III) providing updated advisory clauses was tabled at the meeting for Members’ reference.

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

39. 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 access road for residential development at Lots 92, 382 RP,

Ext. to Lot 382 and 440 RP in D.D. 399, Ting Kau, Tsuen Wan;

- (c) departmental comments - departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (HyD) had no comment on the submission provided that the construction and operation of proposed access road would not affect the operation of pump house. Other concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a total of 22 public comment were received from individuals objecting to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 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 11 of the Paper. The proposed access road was mainly to upgrade an existing sub-standard access to serve two “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) zones. Although the proposed access road mainly fell within a “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone, the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation advised that it largely followed the alignment of an existing access which had already been hard paved. Besides, only some trees of common species would be affected and the applicant had proposed tree compensation and landscape proposal that all the trees felled would be compensated at a 1:88 ratio. Concerns of government departments could be addressed through the incorporation of approval conditions. Regarding the public comments, the comments of relevant government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

40. A Member enquired the following:

- (a) the village environ (VE) boundary of Ting Kau Village;
- (b) the background of the “R(C)” site and the two sites for the proposed access road; and

- (c) whether the proposed access road was accessible by the public.

[Dr Frankie Yeung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

41. In response, Mr K.S. Ng, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), made the following points:

- (a) the two sites for proposed access road, and the concerned “R(C)” sites were located outside the VE boundary of Ting Kau Village as shown in Plan A-1 of the Paper;
- (b) the two “R(C)” sites (i.e. Lots 92, 382RP, Ext. to Lot 382 and 440 RP in DD399) were zoned “GB” on the draft Tsuen Wan West Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TWW/1 gazetted in 1989 under Section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). Adverse representations were received on the grounds that the “GB” zoning would restrict the development right of the sites under lease. Subsequently, noting Highways Department(HyD)’s confirmation that the two sites would not be affected by the finalized alignment of Route 3 (i.e. Tsing Long Highway Section), the Town Planning Board (the Board) agreed to rezone the sites to “R(C)” (for Lots 92, 382RP, Ext. to Lot 382) and “R(C)1”(for Lots 440RP);
- (c) upon the completion of road improvement work of Castle Peak Road in 2001, it was considered that the PR of the “R(C)” sites could be increased from 0.4 to 0.75 given the enhanced infrastructural capacity. However, in view of Environmental Protection Department (EPD)’s concern on the noise impact from Castle Peak Road, relaxation of the maximum PR of the “R(C)” sites to 0.75 would be subject to submission of planning application to demonstrate that the noise impact from Castle Peak Road on the proposed development would be satisfactorily mitigated;
- (d) the existing access road was not a public road managed by TD nor maintained by HyD. The proposed upgrading of the access road was

located entirely on government land; and

- (e) according to the information provided by the applicant, the proposed access road, which would linked up the two “R(C)” sites with Castle Peak Road, would be open to public 24 hours a day. According to the submission, the applicant would also be responsible for the management and maintenance of the proposed access road.

42. Mr Michael H.S. Law, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), Transport Department (TD), supplemented that the applicant had agreed to take up both the management and maintenance responsibility of the access road in which TD had no objection. He drew Members’ attention to TD’s views as stated in para. 9.1.3 of the Paper which should be amended to reflect the above.

43. In response to the Vice-chairman’s enquiry, Mr K.S. Ng explained that the replacement page for the advisory clause tabled at the meeting reflected the updated comments from Lands Department.

44. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the section running through the two housing sites would be open for public access;
- (b) whether there were measures to prevent the applicant or occupier of the two housing sites from blocking the public from accessing the road by setting up features like entrance gate; and
- (c) whether there would be road signs along Castle Peak Road for this access road.

45. In response, Mr K.S. Ng confirmed that according to the applicant, the proposed access road which connected to Castle Peak Road and running through the two housing sites would be open to public 24 hours a day upon completion. The proposed access road would be maintained and managed by the applicant as a non-exclusive right-of-way. Management

details including setting up of signage and ensuring public's access to the road could be further discussed among the applicant, TD and LandsD during lease modification stage.

46. Some Members enquired the following:

- (a) any requirements on the type and size of trees to be planted as compensation;
- (b) authorities responsible for assessing the compensatory tree planting as proposed by the applicant; and
- (c) any enforcement action to be taken should the applicant fail to comply with the requirement.

47. In response, Mr K.S. Ng made the following points:

- (a) an approval condition relating to submission and implementation of the landscape proposal had been recommended should the application be approved. The compensatory tree planting would form part of the landscape proposal; and
- (b) enforcement action could be taken through the lease condition.

48. A Member enquired the following:

- (a) difference between private and public road;
- (b) whether the government had the obligation to provide an access road to the private lot; and
- (c) land administration procedures and premium involved upon approval of the provision of the access road which only served the two housing sites.

49. In response, Mr K.S. Ng said that the proposed access road was located on

government land. LandsD would further liaise with the applicant during lease modification stage regarding the premium involved. As regards whether the government had obligation to provide an access road for private lots, he said that there was no guarantee by the government that an access road or right-of-way would be provided for private developments.

50. Mr Simon S.W. Wang, Assistant Director (R1), LandsD, pointed out that the proposed access road appeared mostly be used by the occupiers of the two private housing sites in view of the site characteristics. In this connection, taking into account the views from concerned government departments, LandsD would identify an appropriate way to grant access to the two sites during the lease modification/land exchange stage.

### Deliberation Session

51. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Secretary explained that planning permission was not required for road projects coordinated by government on various zones. Since the proposed access road under this application was regarded as an ancillary use directly related to the residential developments, and "flat" was a Column 2 use in "GB" zone, planning permission was required.

52. The Chairman remarked that it was the applicant's proposal to make available the proposed access road for public use. It was not the requirement of government departments. Should the Committee agree to approve the application, LandsD would further liaise with the applicant at the lease modification stage.

53. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 16.11.2022, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the design and provision of the proposed access road to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission of a drainage impact assessment and implementation of the

mitigation measures as identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board; and

- (c) the submission and implementation of landscaping proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board.”

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

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

### **Agenda Item 10**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TWW/117 Proposed House Development at Plot Ratio of 0.75 in “Residential (Group C)” Zone, Lot 407 in D.D. 399 and Adjoining Government Land, Ting Kau, Tsuen Wan West, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TWW/117)

---

55. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup and Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and Vibro (H.K.) Limited (Vibro) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with Arup and Vibro; and

Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with Arup.

56. The Committee noted that Mr Franklin Yu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. Since Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the



Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

57. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 8.11.2018 deferment of the consideration of the application for one month 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 requested deferment of the application.

58. 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 one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

## **Hong Kong District**

### **Agenda Item 11**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H21/149 Proposed Office, Shop and Services and Eating Place in "Residential (Group A)" Zone and an area shown as 'Road', 48-94 Pan Hoi Street, Quarry Bay, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H21/149)

---

59. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Quarry Bay. The application was submitted by Wealth First Limited, which was the joint-venture of Swire Properties Limited (Swire) and Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD). MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) and Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Limited (RLP) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests

on the item:

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - owned a property in Taikooshing, having current business dealings with Swire and RLP and his firm having current business dealings with MVA;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with HLD and RLP;
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HLD and MVA;
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - co-owned a property with his spouse in Taikooshing; and
- Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - co-owned two properties with his spouse in Taikooshing.

60. The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Franklin Yu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. Since Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, and the properties co-owned by Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung and his spouse and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan and his spouse respectively did not have a direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

61. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 7.11.2018 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 requested deferment of the application.

62. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its

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

[Mr Vincent W. Y. Wong, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK) was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 12**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H15/276            Proposed Residential Institution (Student Residences) with Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction from 80mPD to 90mPD in "Government, Institution or Community" and "Green Belt" Zones, Police School Road adjacent to Singapore International School, Wong Chuk Hang, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/276)

---

63.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Estate Office, University of Hong Kong (HKU). AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM) and ACLA Ltd. (ACLA) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interest on the item:

- Mr Alex T.H. Lai            - his firm having current business dealings with HKU, AECOM and ACLA;
  
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung       - being the Chairman of Accounting Advisory Board of School of Business, HKU;

Professor John C.Y. Ng - being the Honorary Professor of the Department of Urban Planning and Design, HKU;

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with AECOM; and

Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with AECOM.

64. The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Franklin Yu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Since Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Wilson Y.W. Fung and Professor John C.Y. Ng had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

65. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Vincent W. Y. Wong, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed residential institution (Student Residences) and minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment was received objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 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 11 of the Paper. As compared with the previous approved scheme (Application No. A/H15/268), the main changes in the current scheme were reduction in the

site area by 55m<sup>2</sup>, increase in total GFA by 665m<sup>2</sup> and increase in BH by 3m. There was no change to the number of student hostel rooms and staff accommodation, the number of storeys, the provision of internal transport facilities and the floor uses. The Secretary for Education (SED) and University Grant Committee (UGC) maintained their policy support to the proposed development at the site. Other government departments had no adverse comment on the application. While a small portion of land in the “GB” was included, no works would be carried out by the applicant in that portion. Regarding the adverse public comment, comments of concerned department and the planning assessment above were relevant.

66. Some Members raised the following enquiries:

- (a) estimated number of students living in the proposed hostel and how would they travel to the campus;
- (b) whether ancillary facilities were included in the proposed hostel;
- (c) how the adoption of Modular Integrated Construction (MiC) System would contribute to an increase of BH; and
- (d) setbacks in the proposed scheme from Police School Road.

67. In response, Mr Vincent W. Y. Wong, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), made the following points:

- (a) A total of 1,224 hostel rooms had been proposed. It was expected that the students would travel to the campus by public transport, mainly MTR and bus;
- (b) ancillary facilities like study room and resting area would be provided for students at the hostel;
- (c) due to the technical characteristic of modular construction, modules

stacking on top of each other would result in a double-beam arrangement between the lower module and the module above. This double beam system would result in an increase in the floor height while keeping the original clear headroom unchanged. To maintain a clear headroom of around 2.675m, minor relaxation of BH restriction would be required;

- (d) with the adoption of MiC System, the construction period would be shortened and less construction waste would be generated; and
- (e) same as the previously approved scheme, a 5m setback of the podium from Police School Road had been provided.

68. In response to a Member's question, Mr Wong, with the use of Plan A-1 of the Paper, explained that only a small portion of the site was situated in the "Green Belt" ("GB") zone and the proposed hostel development would not affect the vegetation at the "GB" zone.

#### Deliberation Session

69. The Chairman drew Members' attention to the section Plan from the Applicant's submission which better illustrated the adoption of MiC system in the proposed hostel building.

70. A Member explained that whether the adoption of MiC system would result in an increase in BH would depend on the design and construction method of the developments. The Member added that semi-precast slab had been adopted for construction of public housing in the past decades. The Government was now promoting the MiC system, which involved on-site installation of precast structure. The Chairman added that the construction industry responded quite favourably to the adoption of MiC system as it could enhance quality control, minimize pollution and reduce construction time.

71. A Member enquired if approval of this application would become a precedent for the Committee's future consideration of similar applications for minor relaxation of development restrictions arising from the adoption of MiC system. The Chairman remarked that although the Government had been promoting the MiC system, the Committee's

consideration should base on the individual merits of each planning application.

72. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 16.11.2022, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the design and provision of parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces and internal access roads for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (c) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr Vincent W. Y. Wong (STP/HK) for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Sandy S.K. Ng, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 13**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K13/311            Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone,  
Unit No. 1C, G/F, Kowloon Bay Industrial Centre, 15 Wang Hoi Road,  
Kowloon Bay, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K13/311)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the shop and services;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment was received; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed use was considered generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Use” annotated “Business” zone and was compatible with the changing land use character of the area. The proposed use also complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D in that they would not induce adverse fire safety, traffic,



environmental and infrastructural impacts on the developments within the subject building and the adjacent areas. The premises were the subject of two planning applications (Nos. A/K13/176 and A/K13/303) for real estate agency use and 'Shop and Services' use respectively approved with conditions by the Committee. The former had lapsed and the latter was revoked due to non-compliance with the approval condition on provision of fire safety measures before the specified date. In support of the planning application, the applicant had included the Certificate of Fire Service Installation (FSI) and Equipment (FS251), Certificate of Compliance (FSI/314A) and FSI layout plan to demonstrate the implementation of the fire safety measures to meet the requirements of the Director of Fire Services (D of FS). D of FS had also confirmed that the fire services installations were satisfactory. Also, the aggregate commercial gross floor area was within the maximum permissible limit of the industrial building with sprinkler system.

75. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

76. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB).

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

[The Chairman thanked Ms Sandy S.K. Ng, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 14**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/762            Proposed Hotel (Guesthouse) in “Commercial (1)” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zones, 2/F to 5/F, 90 Hung To Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/762)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

78.            With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel (Guesthouse) (partial conversion of existing commercial building);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 and Appendix VI 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, three public comments were received from individuals. One supported the application and the other two raised objections. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 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 10 of the Paper. The proposed hotel was considered not in conflict with the planning intention of the “Commercial (1)” zone and compatible with the changing land use character of Kwun Tong Business Area. Upon partial conversion of the existing commercial building, the proposed guesthouse was

considered not incompatible with the uses on the remaining floors. Commissioner for Transport had no adverse comment on the nil provision of parking and loading/unloading (L/UL) facility within the building and the traffic measures proposed by the applicant. Concerns of government departments could be addressed through the incorporation of approval conditions. Regarding the public comments, the comments of relevant government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

79. A Member enquired about the implementation of the traffic management plan. In response, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, explained that the Transport Department (TD) was concerned about the potential traffic impact to King Yip Street arising from the L/UL activities at the backlane. According to the applicant, the L/UL activities would generate negligible additional traffic. Staff member would be deployed to assist vehicles to manoeuvre in and out of the L/UL area to ensure road safety and no obstruction to traffic along King Yip Street.

80. In response to another Member's questions, Ms Kwan said that only 24 dormitory rooms at the staff quarters would be provided. As regard the different uses on different floors of the building, she said that an access card system would be installed so that only authorized cardholders could access the particular floors.

#### Deliberation Session

81. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 16.11.2022, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the provision of the traffic management plan and proper implementation of measures as proposed by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;

- (b) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment in condition (b) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (d) the provision of fire services installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 15**

#### **Any Other Business**

83. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 11:15 a.m..