

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 625th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 12.4.2019

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer /Kowloon,
Transport Department
Mr David C.V. Ngu

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 Alex T.H. Lai

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

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
Miss Kirstie Y.L. Law

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 624th MPC Meeting held on 22.3.2019

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 624th MPC meeting held on 22.3.2019 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

[Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/KC/13	Application for Amendment to the Draft Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/KC/29, To Rezone the Application Site from “Industrial” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Columbarium (2)”, 24-28 Wing Lap Street, Kwai Chung, New Territories (MPC Paper No. Y/KC/13C)
---------	---

3. The Secretary reported that the application was for columbarium use. The following Members had declared interests on this item:

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang
Mr Sunny L.K. Ho } being a member of the Private Columbaria Appeal Board.

4. As 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 following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD), Transport Department (TD) and Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF), and the applicant's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD's Representatives

Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan - Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon (STP/TWK)
Mr Robert H.C. Tsang - Town Planner/Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon (TP/TWK)

TD's Representatives

Mr C.T. Chan - Senior Engineer/Kwai Tsing
Mr Matthew H.L. Li - Engineer/Special Duties 1

HKPF's Representatives

Mr Brian T.K. Ling - Assistant Divisional Commander (Operations) (Tsing Yi)
Mr C.S. Leung - Road Management Office (Enforcement & Control Div) (Traffic NTS)

Applicants and their Representatives

Electric Vehicles (Hong Kong) Ltd.

Mr So Tse Kwan
Mr Gary So

PlanArch Consultants Ltd. (PlanArch)

Ms Betty Ho
Ms Cheung Hoi Yee

Turner & Townsend Brechin Ltd.

Mr Sam Cheng
Mr K.K. Yip
Mr K.L. Chow

AAJP Consultants Ltd.

Ms Anna Kwong
Mr Ken Tong
Ms Sophia Yuen

Ozzo Technology (HK) Ltd. (Ozzo)

Mr Calvin Chan
Mr Stanley Chan
Mr Benny Kwok

Presentation and Question Sessions

6. 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, 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 rezoning from "Industrial" ("I") to "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Columbarium (2)" ("OU(Columbarium)2");

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. The Director General of Trade and Industry had reservation on this application as the application would induce loss of industrial land and might set an undesirable precedent for similar rezoning applications within the "I" zone, jeopardising the provision of industrial floor space. The Commissioner for Transport did not support the application since the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) submitted by the

applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have adverse traffic and crowd management impact in the area particularly during the festive period. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would aggravate the traffic impact in the area. The Commissioner of Police had reservation on the application from traffic and crowd management point of view. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

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

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, a total of 1,029 objecting public comments were received, with 16 from six Kwai Tsing District Council members and 1,013 from individuals. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD's views - PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed columbarium development located in the inner part of the "I" zone was considered incompatible with the surrounding developments which were predominately industrial in character. The existing "I" zone to reserve land primarily for general industrial uses was considered appropriate to ensure an adequate supply of industrial floor space. Based on the Area Assessment study conducted by PlanD in 2014, the subject "I" zone was recommended to be retained given the prevalent active and high usage for industrial uses and low vacancy rate, and there was no strong justification for sacrificing industrial land for columbarium development at the Site. There were already a total number of about 204,200 existing/approved/planned columbarium niches/graves/memorial plaques within Kwai Chung, due considerations should be given to the cumulative effects of columbarium developments in Kwai Chung. The approval of the subject application for columbarium development would aggravate adverse traffic impact and adversely affect supply of industrial floor space, setting an undesirable precedent and encourage similar applications within the same "I" zone. Regarding the adverse public comments, the

comments of the concerned departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

7. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentations, Ms Betty Ho, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

Background and site suitability

- (a) the Site was the subject site of two previous applications for industrial-cum-columbarium development. One was withdrawn and the other was rejected by the Committee mainly due to the failure to address the concerns of the Fire Services Department. The current application was purely for proposed columbarium uses;
- (b) the Site was located away from residential estates in the area and was separated by trunk roads. Comparing with a similar application (No. Y/KC/3) for columbarium use partially agreed by the Committee previously, both application sites were located at the fringe of the industrial area, and the location of the subject site was considered more suitable for columbarium development due to its further distance from residential area and community facilities;

Overwhelming demand and lengthy waiting time for columbarium niches

- (c) the demand for columbarium niches was ever-growing;
- (d) while the number of existing and planned columbarium niches provision seemed large, the progress of implementing the planned district-based columbarium was slow and the provision of public columbarium niches was uncertain. It was impossible to rely on public niches to meet the growing demand;

Optimization of land use in industrial zone

- (e) the vacancy rate of industrial buildings in Kwai Chung was high. The predominant use in the industrial buildings in Southwest Kwai Chung was not manufacturing industry by nature. There was high non-response rate in PlanD's survey, and there was doubt on whether the concerned units were used for industrial purpose;
- (f) there should be comprehensive consideration of suitable land use at the fringe of the "I" zone to optimize use of land resources and meet the pressing community demand for columbarium niches;

Proposed columbarium use

- (g) the proposed columbarium at the Site could provide niches to meet the imminent demand;
- (h) the proposed columbarium had no religious affiliation. The daily operation hours would be from 8am to 6pm, with no burning of incense, candles, ritual paper, treasures, paper replicas etc. to avoid causing environmental nuisance and ensure safety. Professional management agent would be employed to manage the operation of the columbarium and professionally trained traffic controllers would be appointed to manage the pedestrian flow properly. A maintenance fund would also be set up to ensure proper and sustainable operation;
- (i) there would be suitable building design and provision of landscape treatment to ensure the proposed columbarium would blend in with the surroundings;
- (j) the proposed columbarium complied with the requirements set out in the Private Columbaria Ordinance, as well as the Food and Health Bureau (FHB)'s 'Guidelines for Provision of Columbarium Facilities in Industrial Buildings'; and

- (k) should the s.12A application be approved, a s.16 application for the columbarium use would be submitted, providing technical details for the consideration by the Committee. The Committee could recommend relevant approval conditions to monitor the development of the proposed use and to address the concerns of relevant departments. Hence, Lands Department (LandsD)'s concern that the requirements could not be incorporated into the lease could be addressed via imposing approval conditions.

8. Mr Calvin Chan, representative of the applicant made the following main points:

- (a) as compared with the TIA conducted for other proposed columbarium developments, a very conservative approach had been adopted in the TIA for the subject application which had included the total of 227,145 niches/graves covering all of the existing/planned columbarium in Kwai Chung, including the two submitted rezoning applications, and a 100% take-up rate and the high end trip generation rate;
- (b) Wing Kei Road would be used for vehicular access only, but not for pedestrian access, whereas Wing Lap Street would be used for pedestrian access;
- (c) escalators would be used to serve the proposed columbarium. An area of 270m² on 1/F would be designated as a waiting area, as a crowd management arrangement;
- (d) a turn table would be provided on ground floor to ensure smooth run-in/out of Owner/Operator Arranged Bus (OAB);
- (e) detailed timetable and routing of OAB had been prepared;
- (f) written agreement and quotation from CityBus and KMB had been sought for provision of double decker buses to cater for additional visitors. In response to TD's comment, should non-franchise private bus be hired, it

would be provided free-of-charge and complying with relevant requirements;

- (g) unlike the approved application No. A/KC/437 which would use about 130m of public road along Kwai Hei Street for drop-off/pick up, the subject application would use only two lay-bys as drop-off points for buses for around 2 hours during the festive season;
- (h) the proposed drop-off point to be implemented by the applicant would not adversely affect the drop-off point to be implemented by the HKPF;
- (i) same as the approved application No. A/KC/437, two bays would be occupied by the subject application at Kwai Fong Public Transport Interchange (PTI), and traffic controllers would be arranged to monitor the queuing within the proposed queuing areas; and
- (j) the subject application had advantages over the approved application No. A/KC/437 in terms of internal circulation, provision of internal buffer zone, OAB provision, designated pick-up/drop-off point at both MTR side and columbarium side, arrangement of traffic controllers and contingency measures, adoption of conservative estimations on niches in the area and proposed junction improvement scheme. The application was considered technically feasible from traffic point of view.

9. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and applicant's representatives were completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

10. Some Members made the following enquiries:

Nature of s.16 and s.12A application

- (a) Whether there were any differences, in terms of planning considerations, for processing s.16 and s.12A applications;

Background of previously approved application

- (b) background of the previously approved application No. A/KC/437 and whether the development had been implemented;
- (c) noting comments from LandsD that details regarding the proposed daily operation management and traffic/crowd control management were not enforceable under lease, whether similar situations were observed for application No. A/KC/437;
- (d) what the differences were in the consideration of the current application and application No. A/KC/437 apart from the traffic aspect;

Industrial activities in Kwai Chung

- (e) what the major industrial activities were in the area;
- (f) occupation rate of the subject industrial building and its major uses;

Columbarium development in Kwai Chung

- (g) existing status of the columbarium development in the area shown as green on Plan Z-5 of the Paper;
- (h) the land use zones which allowed development of columbarium uses; and
- (i) whether the provision of niches was to meet the demand of the district or the territory.

11. In response, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

Nature of s.16 and s.12A application

- (a) planning intention, land use compatibility with the surroundings, technical

feasibility and comments from government departments were planning considerations for both s.16 and s.12A application. S.12A was to propose zoning amendment to plans, while s.16 was mainly to apply for planning permission of those uses listed under 'Column 2' of the Notes of the OZP;

Background of previously approved application

- (b) the previously approved s.16 application No. A/KC/437 was related to a s.12A application No. Y/KC/3 for proposed rezoning of a site from "I" to "OU(Columbarium)" in the area. The s.12A application was partially agreed by the Committee on 13.12.2013 on the ground that the application site was suitable for columbarium use. The Committee agreed to include 'Columbarium' as a Column 2 use for that site, such that appropriate control could be imposed through the planning application mechanism. The Committee, however, did not agree to the scale of the proposed development with 50,000 niches as submitted by the applicant. The Committee requested PlanD to examine the appropriate development restrictions for the proposed "OU(Columbarium)" zone. The Committee subsequently agreed to PlanD's suggestion to restrict the development intensity of the site to not higher than 50mPD with not more than 23,000 niches. The OZP was subsequently amended on 9.5.2014 to rezone the site from "I" to "OU(Columbarium)". On 14.9.2016, the Committee approved the s.16 application (No. A/KC/437) at this site for a proposed columbarium development with a building height of 50mPD and 23,000 niches, and with a set of approval conditions including submission of a Traffic Control Management Plan. The applicant was currently liaising with LandsD on lease modification and the construction work had not yet commenced;

- (c) in terms of development scale, the proposed building height of the s.16 application No. A/KC/437 was 50mPD and that of the current application was 105mPD. While the context of the two applications were similar, the technical feasibility of the application especially on traffic and crowd management aspect would be the major factors in considering the proposed

columbarium use;

Industrial activities in Kwai Chung

- (d) while information regarding the utilization rate of specific industrial buildings was not available at hand, the overall vacancy rate of the industrial buildings in Southwest Kwai Chung area was around 1.6% according to the 2014 Area Assessment conducted by PlanD. The overall vacancy rate for private industrial/office building in the territory in 2017 was approximately 7.4% according to the information from the Rating and Valuation Department;
- (e) the industrial developments in the area were in active operation and they were mainly used for general industrial uses, logistics centres and workshop uses. For the two pieces of land recently tendered for land sale, one was for data centre development;

Columbarium development in Kwai Chung

- (f) the area shown as green on Plan Z-5 of the Paper was planned for columbarium development, and the target year for completion of the development at Tsing Tsuen Road was 2025;
- (g) for areas zoned “OU” annotated “Cemetery”, “Funeral Parlours and Crematorium” and “Columbarium”, ‘Columbarium’ use was a Column 1 use and was always permitted; for areas zoned “OU” annotated “Columbarium (1)”, ‘Columbarium’ use was a Column 2 use and planning permission would be required; for areas zoned “I”, ‘Columbarium’ was neither a Column 1 nor Column 2 use; and
- (h) the provision of niches in Kwai Chung was to meet the demand of the district and the territory.

Operation of the Proposed Columbarium

12. Some Members raised the following enquiries:
- (a) the estimated number of people the building would accommodate at peak hours on festival days;
 - (b) the estimated capacity of the waiting area on 1/F;
 - (c) what the advantages were of the proposed columbarium use as compared with the provision of public columbarium niches; and
 - (d) the nature of the proposed columbarium, and the intended pricing of the niches.
13. In response to Members' enquiries, Mr Calvin Chan and Ms Betty Ho, the applicant's representatives, made the following responses:
- (a) with a total gross floor area (GFA) of 8,825m² and assuming each person would occupy 0.88m² space, it was estimated that the building could accommodate over 10,000 people at the peak hours during festive seasons;
 - (b) with a ratio of 0.6m² waiting space per person, it was estimated that around 450 visitors could be accommodated on 1/F waiting area (270m²);
 - (c) while the proposed columbarium use had no religious affiliation, venues were provided for memorial purposes, with no burning of incense, candles, ritual paper, treasures, paper replicas etc.; and
 - (d) the pricing of the columbarium niches would be determined according to the market price. However, it should be noted that some of the columbarium niches would be reserved for Yan Chai Hospital for non-profit making purposes.
14. Ms Anna Kwong, the representative of the applicant, supplemented that the

waiting space designated on 1/F was intentionally designed to alleviate congestion at the pavements.

Traffic and Crowd Management

15. Some Members raised the following enquiries:
- (a) the approximate number of traffic controllers to be stationed during festive periods;
 - (b) how the proposed traffic controllers would operate; and
 - (c) whether a private columbarium operators could arrange a team of traffic controllers for traffic control purpose.
16. Ms Betty S.F. Ho and Mr Calvin Chan, representatives of the applicant, replied that about twenty traffic controllers would be deployed at key locations, mainly to provide guidance for pedestrian flow. For those to be stationed at Wing Lap Street, they were mainly to guide the picking-up and dropping-off activities of private cars and taxi, and for those to be stationed at Kwai Fong PTI and Tsuen Wan West MTR station, they were mainly to provide information and to guide the registered visitors to take the shuttle bus services:
17. In response to Members' enquiries, Mr Brian T.K. Ling, Assistant Divisional Commander (Operations) (Tsing Yi), HKPF, said that HKPF might request the organizer of big events to arrange marshals in the event, yet traffic controllers for a columbarium facility was not common. He also expressed concerns that the role of those proposed traffic controllers might cause unnecessary confusion to the public.
18. A Member sought clarification relating to the use of OAB service. In response, Mr Calvin Chan, the applicant's representative, made the following points:
- (a) OAB service would be arranged on festival days by providing bus services with drop-off/pick-up at two major transport nodes, one at Tai Ho Road and one at Kwai Chung Container Port Road. In response to TD's request,

the applicant had obtained quotation from CityBus and KMB for renting double-decker bus to provide OAB service; and

- (b) in response to TD's further comment, should rental of double decker buses from CityBus and KMB fail, the applicant had also explored the possibility of providing free of charge OAB service under category B04 of Non-Franchised Private Bus.

19. Some Members raised the following enquiries to the government team:

- (a) whether the proposed pick-up points for OAB were satisfactory from traffic management point of view; and
- (b) whether TD's concern over traffic could be satisfactorily addressed by the applicant's proposed traffic improvement measures.

20. Mr C.T. Chan and Mr Matthew H.T. Li, representatives from TD, made the following responses:

- (a) although the applicant had proposed specially arranged bus service with pick-up/drop-off points at Tai Ho Road and the PTI at Container Port Road, it failed to demonstrate that the proposed columbarium would not have adverse traffic and crowd management impacts on the area. While there were a total of five bays for pick-up/drop-off by non-franchise bus in the PTI, a number of Residents' Services Routes were using the five bays, and there were not much spare capacity;
- (b) TD generally considered that the information provided and the proposed traffic improvement measures submitted by the applicant could not satisfactorily address their concerns. The two proposed pick-up points of OAB at Kwai Hei Street were located very near to the ingress/egress point of the Kwai Chung Public Mortuary, which was undesirable and might be in conflict with the relevant Transport Planning & Design Manual standards;

- (c) the proposed 2.5m-wide pedestrian footpath at Kwai Hei Street would not be sufficient as much of the footpath would be occupied by the queues especially during the festive season; and
- (d) TD expressed concern on the technical feasibility for the applicant's proposed improvement measures for Junctions J4, J7 and J9.

21. Some Members had the following enquiries:

- (a) given there was a total number of 227,145 niches/graves in all the existing/planned columbarium in the surrounding areas, what the estimated number of visitors per hour was; and
- (b) whether there was any official record of pedestrian flow and whether the figure was similar to the estimate adopted by the applicant.

22. In response, Mr Brian T.K. Ling and Mr C.S. Leung of HKPF, said that according to the official record, the cumulative number of visitors to Tsuen Wan Chinese Permanent Cemetery at Ching Ming Festival from 7am to 5pm on 5 April 2019 was 42,461, and around 6,000 to 9,000 people entered the Cemetery every hour during the peak hours.

23. Mr Calvin Chan, the applicant's representative, supplemented that the pedestrian flow for the area during the Ching Ming Festival for the past ten years had been recorded and adopted in the assessment. The figures were similar to the statistics recorded by HKPF.

24. 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 them the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representatives from PlanD, TD, HKPF and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join the meeting during the Q&A session.]

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

Deliberation Session

25. Some Members considered that the low vacancy rate of industrial buildings as well as the recent land sale showed that the industrial activities in the area were still active. Rezoning the Site would adversely affect the provision of industrial floor spaces and approving the application would also set an undesirable precedent. Due considerations should be given to the cumulative effect on the loss of industrial floor space.

26. Some Members considered that the applicant failed to demonstrate the technical feasibility of the application in terms of traffic and crowd management. Mr David C.V. Ngu, Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, TD, supplemented that TD's previous comments regarding the proposed lay-by along Kwai Hei Road, junction improvement measures and crowd management measures were not satisfactorily addressed. Based on the information submitted by the applicant, TD could not offer support to the application from traffic and crowd management point of view.

27. A Member pointed out that the approved application No. A/KC/437 had its own background. Another Member remarked that there was no particular merit to rezone the Site for the proposed columbarium use. Members in general did not agree with the justifications for rezoning of the application site from "I" to "OU(Columbarium)2".

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

- “(a) the Site is situated in the inner part of a major industrial area and is surrounded by industrial buildings which are still in active operation. It is the recommendation of the ‘2014 Area Assessment of Industrial Land in the Territory’ to retain the subject “Industrial” (“I”) zone, which is intended to reserve land primarily for general industrial uses to ensure an adequate supply of industrial floor space. The existing “I” zone for the site is considered appropriate and there is no strong justification to rezone the Site

for the proposed columbarium use;

- (b) the proposed columbarium use is considered incompatible with the surrounding developments which are predominately industrial in character with vibrant industrial activities. Given that there is already a large supply of both public and private columbarium niches in Kwai Chung, there is no strong justification for sacrificing potential industrial floor space for the proposed columbarium use;
- (c) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed columbarium use would not have adverse traffic and crowd management impact in the area particularly during festive periods; and
- (d) the approval of the application will set an undesirable precedent and encourage similar applications falling within the same “I” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would aggravate the adverse traffic impact in the area and affect the supply of industrial floor space in the “I” zone.”

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 4

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/K10/2 Application for Amendment to the Approved Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K10/24, To Rezone the Application Site from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Commercial Development with Public Vehicle Park” to “Residential (Group A) 4”, 128 Carpenter Road, Kowloon City, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. Y/K10/2)

29. The Committee noted that a replacement page (page 2) of the Paper, rectifying editorial errors at paragraph 3.2, was tabled at the meeting for Members’ reference.

30. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup), Wong Tung & Partners Ltd. (WTP) and MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with Arup and MVA; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his firm having current business dealings with Arup, WTP and MVA; and |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | having past business dealings with Arup and MVA. |

31. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Franklin Yu were indirect, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

32. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 28.3.2019 deferment of 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.

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

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

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K4/70 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restrictions and Proposed Amendments to Approved Scheme for Permitted Public Housing Redevelopment in "Residential (Group A)" Zone, Pak Tin Estate (Part), Shek Kip Mei, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K4/70)

34. The Secretary reported that the application site was in Shek Kip Mei. The application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) with AECOM

Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM) as consultant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
(the Chairman)
<i>as the Director of
Planning</i> | - | being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee (BC) of HKHA; |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan
<i>as the Chief Engineer
(Works), Home Affairs
Department</i> | - | being an alternate representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and the Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA; |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | Being a member of the BC of HKHA and having past business dealings with HKHA and AECOM; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with HKHA and AECOM; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his firm having current business dealings with HKHA and AECOM; |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - | working in the City University of Hong Kong and living in its quarters in Kowloon Tong. His spouse being an employee of the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of HKHA, but not involved in planning work; and |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | - | being an ex-employee of Hong Kong Housing Society, which was in discussion with HD on housing development issues. |

35. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had temporarily left the meeting. As the interests of the Chairman, Messrs Martin W.C. Kwan and Thomas O.S. Ho were direct, the Committee agreed that they should leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As the interest of Mr Franklin Yu was indirect and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, they should be allowed to stay in the meeting. The Vice-chairman took over the chairmanship at this point.

[The Chairman and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

36. 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 minor relaxation of building height (BH) restrictions for permitted public housing redevelopment;
- (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, two supporting comments were received from individuals, and three objecting comments were received from a Sham Shui Po District Councillor and an individual. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed scheme would not be incompatible with the high-rise residential developments in the vicinity intended under the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The proposed scheme would produce an addition of 584 public housing units, and was in line with the Government's housing policy objective. Additional parking spaces were proposed to address the demand for parking spaces. The proposed scheme had maintained various design elements as in the approved scheme and there was no significant impact on visual, air ventilation and landscape. The proposed scheme was

considered generally in line with criteria (d) and (e) for consideration of minor relaxation of BH restrictions stipulated in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, and would not create adverse traffic, environmental and sewerage impacts on the surrounding areas. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

37. A Member enquired if there was any increase in provision of open space and community facilities in view of the additional population. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, STP/TWK, said that additional open spaces were provided in accordance with the requirement set out in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (i.e. 1m² per person). As compared with the scheme previously approved in 2013, an additional kindergarten and day care centre for elderly were proposed.

Deliberation Session

38. 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 12.4.2023, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following condition:

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

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

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

[The Chairman, Mr Martin W.C. Kwan and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon returned to the meeting and the Chairman resumed the chairmanship at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/804 Religious Institution (Church) in “Residential (Group A) 8” Zone, 1/F and 2/F, Florence Plaza, 23 Cheung Wah Street, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K5/804)

40. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 20.3.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address comments from the Transport Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/457 Proposed Offensive Trades (Lard Boiling Factory) in “Industrial” Zone,
Kwai Chung Town Lot 145, 7-11 Wing Kin Road (odd numbers), Kwai
Chung, New Territories

(MPC Paper No. A/KC/457)

42. The Secretary reported that the application was jointly submitted by Hung Hing Keung and three other applicants, with Lu Tang Lai Architects Ltd. (LTLA) as one of the consultants. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest for his firm was having current business dealings with Hung Hing Keung and LTLA. The Committee noted that the applicants had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

43. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 29.3.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from Environmental Protection Department. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including responses to departmental comments, replacement pages of planning statement, revised number of HGV and LGV bays and revised floor plans.

44. 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. Since it was the second deferment and a total of two months had been allowed for the preparation of the further information, 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.]

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/KC/459 Proposed Hotel in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone,
2/F, Hotel Ease Tsuen Wan, 15-19 Chun Pin Street, Kwai Chung, New
Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/459)

Presentation and Question Sessions

45. 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 hotel (partial conversion of the original shop use at the second floor of an existing hotel);
- (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, one public comment was received from an individual raising no objection to the application; 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 conversion of the Premises was generally in line with the

planning intention of “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone, where development or redevelopment/conversion of the whole buildings for commercial development and clean industrial uses were encouraged. The proposed conversion was also generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D. The proposed conversion involved no increase in the overall development bulk and building height of the existing hotel development, and would not create adverse visual, environmental, sewerage, drainage and traffic impacts on the surrounding areas.

46. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

47. 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 12.4.2023, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following condition:

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

48. 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 Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/505 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Industrial Building Redevelopment in “Industrial” Zone, 14-18 Ma Kok Street, Tsuen Wan, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/505)

49. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan. Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had current business dealings with KTA;
- Professor John C.Y. Ng - his spouse owned a property in Tsuen Wan; and
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse was a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan.

50. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, and the property of Professor John C.Y. Ng’s spouse and that owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi’s spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

51. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 27.3.2019 deferment of 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.

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

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

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TWW/116 Proposed House Development at Plot Ratio of 0.75 in "Residential (Group C)" and "Village Type Development" Zones, Lot 162RP (Part) in D.D. 399 and Adjoining Government Land, Ting Kau, Tsuen Wan West, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/TWW/116B)

53. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 25.3.2019 for deferment of 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 third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

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

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

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/117B)

55. The Secretary reported that the Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup) and Vibro (H.K.) Ltd. (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; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with Arup; and |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | having past business dealings with Arup. |

56. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. The Committee also noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting. As Mr Franklin Yu 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

22.3.2019 deferment of 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 third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

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

[Mr J.J. Austin, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 12

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Submission for Compliance with Approval Condition (j) of Application No. A/H4/94. Proposed Alteration and Modification Works to the Building and External Facade for Cultural/Leisure/Retail/Food & Beverage Uses/Open Space/Ancillary Support, for the Central Market Revitalization Project in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Building with Historical and Architectural Interests Preserved for Commercial, Cultural and/or Community Uses" Zone, The Former Central Market, 80 Des Voeux Road Central, Central, Hong Kong (MPC Paper No.3/19)

59. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA), with AGC Design Ltd. (AGC), Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup) and AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. as three of the consultants. The following Members had declared interests on this item:

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
<i>(the Chairman)</i>
<i>as Director of Planning</i> | - | being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of URA; |
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang
<i>(the Vice-Chairman)</i> | - | being the Deputy Chairman of Appeal Board Panel of URA; |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - | being a non-executive director of the URA Board, a member of the Lands, Rehousing and Compensation Committee and the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee, and a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA; |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung | } | being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA; |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law | | |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with URA, Arup and AECOM; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his firm having current business dealings with URA, AGC, Arup and AECOM; |
| Mr Stephen H.B. Yau | - | being a past member of the Wan Chai District Advisory Committee of URA; |

- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had current business dealings with URA; and
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with Arup and AECOM.

60. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Ms Lilian S.K. Law had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting. As the interests of the Chairman, Messrs Lincoln L.H. Huang (the Vice-chairman) and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon were direct, the Committee considered that they should leave the meeting temporarily for the item. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, as a matter of necessity, the Chairman or the Vice-chairman should continue to assume the chairmanship. As the interest of the Vice-chairman was comparatively less direct than the Chairman, the Committee agreed that the Vice-chairman should take over the chairmanship for the item 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. As the interests of Messrs Wilson Y.W. Fung and Stephen H.B. Yau were indirect, and as Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau and Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. The Vice-chairman took over the chairmanship at this point.

[The Chairman and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

61. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr J.J. Austin, STP/HK, presented the applicant's submission and covered the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

Background

- (a) the Committee approved with conditions a planning application (No. A/H4/94) for proposed alteration and modification works to the building and external façade of the former Central Market. Approval condition (j)

required the applicant to submit footpath widening proposals in connection to the entrance widening proposals of Queen Victoria Street and Jubilee Street. The Committee was invited to consider the applicant's submission for fulfilment of approval condition (j) of the application at this meeting;

The Footpath Widening Proposal

- (b) the applicant had further liaised with the relevant government departments regarding the above, and came to the view that there was no scope to further widen the existing footpath on Queen Victoria Street and Jubilee Street without sacrificing the Transport Department (TD)'s requirements on the length of lay-bys to be provided. Main features of the footpath widening proposals, which were more or less the same as those proposed in their original submission, were as follows:
- i. conversion of a section of road carriageway on the western side of Queen Victoria Street (about 26m) to pedestrian pavement with a width of about 4.95m including planting;
 - ii. extension and conversion of an existing 28m long lay-by reserved for the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) vehicles on Queen Victoria Street to a 34m public lay-by for loading/unloading activities;
 - iii. widening of pedestrian pavement at the junctions of Jubilee Street/Des Voeux Road Central and Jubilee Street/Queen's Road Central respectively;
 - iv. retaining an existing lay-by of about 65m on the eastern side of Jubilee Street;
 - v. planting four trees along the widened pavement of Queen Victoria Street and retaining the two existing trees on the pedestrian pavement along Queen's Road Central; and

- vi. re-paving the pedestrian pavement surrounding the Central Market with the Highways Department (HyD)'s standard concrete paver blocks;
- (c) the proposed shared use of on-street lay-by between the public and the tenants of the Central Market was considered technically feasible. The proposed footpath widening and associated works were scheduled to be completed by Q3 2021;

Departmental Comments

- (d) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 4 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the current proposal; and

Planning Department (PlanD)'s Views

- (e) PlanD had no objection to the submission made by the applicant to fulfil approval condition (j) as set out in paragraph 5 of the Paper. Complementing with the widened entrances along Queen Victoria Street and Jubilee Street, the applicant's footpath widening proposals would enhance accessibility and vitality of the two streets. The applicant had explored the feasibility of further widening the footpath of the two streets. However, due to TD's requirements on the length of lay-bys to be provided along the streets, i.e. a 34m long lay-by at Queen Victoria Street and a 65m long lay-by at Jubilee Street, no further widening of the footpath could be made. All government departments have no comment on/no objection to the footpath widening proposals.

62. Two Members enquired about the adoption of 'standard concrete paver blocks' and reasons for planting *Polyspora axillaris* (大頭茶) at footpath on Queen Victoria Street. Mr J.J. Austin, STP/HK, made the following responses:

- (a) while the applicant had considered using other types of material for the pavement surrounding the Central Market, 'standard concrete paver blocks' were adopted as per request from HyD; and
- (b) the planting of *Polyspora axillaris* at the location was considered suitable by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) in view of the characteristics of the footpath on Queen Victoria Street, where sun penetration was not high and there were busy vehicular traffic.

63. Two Members enquired about the purpose of the approval condition, and whether the Committee had previously discussed the need of retaining the lay-bys. In response, Mr J.J. Austin made the following responses:

- (a) the Committee did not raise concern over the provision of lay-bys, and TD considered the provision of the lay-bys necessary in view of the inadequacy of provision in the area; and
- (b) the approval condition was imposed to request the applicant to explore and liaise with concerned government departments including HyD and TD on the feasibility of further widening the pedestrian footpath.

64. Noting that further widening of the pedestrian footpath might not be possible, a Member considered that the applicant could explore other means to widen the footpath such as recessing the entrances along Queen Victoria Street and Jubilee Street, where glass folding doors were proposed, to create more space for pedestrian circulation. In relation to the Member's enquiry, the Vice-chairman also asked about the proposed uses on ground floor of the Site. Mr J.J. Austin made the following responses:

- (a) according to the approved scheme, the G/F of the Site was proposed for commercial, cultural and community uses, with the provision of an open space of about 1000m² at the centre;
- (b) at the previous meeting, the Committee did not have any discussion on recessing the entrances for widening the pedestrian footpath. As the

Central Market was a Grade 3 historic structure, the building facade had to be preserved; and

- (c) should the applicant be required to consider recessing the entrances to enhance the pedestrian walking environment, there would be implications on the agreed layout of the revitalization scheme.

Deliberation Session

65. A Member noted the difficulties to widen the pedestrian footpath given the need for retaining the lay-bys as requested by TD and HyD. The Member also noted that the facade of the Central Market should be protected as it was a Grade 3 historic structure.

66. The Secretary supplemented that the discussion of the Committee at the previous meeting only focused on exploring the possibility of widening the footpath, and had not requested setback or recess of the entrance on G/F. In this submission for compliance with approval condition (j), the applicant had taken into account the request by TD and HyD to retain the lay-bys. As a result, according to the applicant, there was no room for further widening of the footpaths on both Queen Victoria Street and Jubilee Street.

67. A Member clarified that the suggestion on recessing G/F entrances along Jubilee Street and Queen Victoria Street would not affect the facade of the building, as the recess could be limited to the installation of glass folding doors only in order to provide a more spacious ambience to facilitate pedestrian circulation. In relation to the Member's suggestion, the Vice-chairman enquired if, as illustrated on Drawing AA-7 of the Paper, the opening of the glass folding doors during operation hours would be sufficient to address the Member's concern on enhancing the circulation space. The Member expressed that should the installation of glass folding door be recessed, the delineation of public space would be different which would create different experience for users of the space. Another Member said that if the recessed area on G/F of the Site was dedicated for public passage, it would have implications on land grant, the liability of the applicant might not be the same.

68. The Committee noted that there were four entrances to the Site, and the existing staircases at the entrances fronting Jubilee Street and Queen Victoria Street could not be

altered. Therefore, even if the entrance was recessed, it might not help in widening the circulation space along the pavement because of the level difference.

69. A Member pointed out that the retention of existing lay-bys along Jubilee Street and Queen Victoria Street had posed constraint on footpath widening and the applicant should further liaise with the relevant departments to explore the possible alternative arrangements.

70. The Committee in general considered that the applicant had not fully explored the alternatives in fulfilling approval condition (j) on widening the pedestrian footpath. The Committee considered that the applicant could further liaise with the concerned government departments, and to take into account the Committee's discussion at this meeting to further refine the submission for the Committee's consideration.

71. After deliberation, the Committee decided not to agree to the applicant's submission for compliance with approval condition (j).

[The Vice-chairman thanked Mr J.J. Austin, STP/HK for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Dr Franklin W.C. Yeung and Mr Stephen H.B. Yau left the meeting at this point.]

[The Chairman and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon returned to the meeting, and the Chairman resumed the chairmanship at this point.]

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

Agenda Item 13

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Further Consideration of Section 16 Application No. A/H15/277 Massage Establishment
in “Residential (Group A) 2” Zone, Room 1-2, 7/F, Goodview Centre, 12 Wu Pak Street,
Aberdeen, Hong Kong

Presentation and Question Sessions

72. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Vincent W.Y. Wong, STP/HK, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed massage establishment;
- (c) further information (FI) submitted by the applicant in response to the Committee’s concerns raised in the previous meeting as set out in paragraph 2 of the Paper;
- (d) supplementary information prepared by the Planning Department (PlanD) as set out in paragraph 3 of the paper;
- (e) departmental comments – departmental comments on the FI were set out in paragraph 4 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application; and
- (f) PlanD’s views – PlanD maintained its previous view of having no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 5 of the Paper. The Premises was located on the entire 7/F of the subject building. The applied use was considered not incompatible with other non-domestic uses within the same building. As advised by the applicant, no flickering LED light boards would be installed outside the Premises or window. According to the site visit conducted by the Commissioner of Police (C of P), no irregularities nor offence were observed.

73. In response to some Members' enquiries relating to the background of the application and the licensing requirement of massage establishment, Mr Vincent W.Y. Wong, STP/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) no Massage Establishment License from the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) was required for the current operation at the premises which involved only facial and foot massage;
- (b) there were no approved similar applications for massage establishment in the district; and
- (c) should the planning application be approved, the applicant would need to apply for a Massage Establishment License under the Massage Establishment Ordinance for its operation of providing full-body massages to customers of opposite sex as stated in the submission.

Deliberation Session

74. A Member was concerned about land use compatibility as there were tutorial schools in the same building. There would be potential nuisance if the massage establishment was approved. Another Member said that with the further information provided by the applicant, the Committee's concern on the application regarding the compatibility issue had been addressed. A Member considered that the operation of massage establishment would be monitored by the relevant authorities including HKPF.

75. Some Members considered that since massage establishment and other uses e.g. tutorial school were largely commercial in nature, they were not incompatible. Potential incompatibility might only appear where there were mal-practices during operation. Nonetheless, the operation should be controlled and monitored by the licensing authority. Based on the above, there were no strong grounds for the Committee not to approve the application.

76. Members noted that the premises was located within an existing non-domestic building without any residential use and the application met the relevant assessment criteria

under the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 14B.

77. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission shall be valid until 12.4.2023, 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 following permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the submission and implementation of fire services installations proposal within six months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 12.10.2019; and
- (b) if the above approval 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 immediately without further notice.”

78. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at F-Appendix IV 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 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K11/233 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Non-Polluting Industrial Use (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of dangerous goods) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 1 Tsat Po Street, San Po Kong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K11/233A)

79. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in San Po Kong. Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup) and WSP Hong Kong Ltd. (WSP) were two of the consultants. The following Members had declared interests on this item:

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with Arup;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with Arup and WSP;
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with Arup and WSP;
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse was a director of a company which owned properties in Wong Tai Sin; and
- Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - his close relative owning a flat in Choi Wan.

80. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting. As Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, and as the property owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi’s spouse and the property owned by the close relative of Mr Martin W.C. Kwan had no direct view on the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

81. 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 proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) restriction from 12 to 14.4 for permitted non-polluting industrial use (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of dangerous goods);
- (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 periods, one public comment from an individual was received. 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 assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone. Policy support had been given by the Development Bureau to the current application for minor relaxation of PR by 20% to incentivise redevelopment of old industrial buildings (IBs). With the demonstration of the technical feasibility of the proposed relaxation of PR by the applicant, the requirements of the new policy initiative were met. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessment above were relevant.

82. A Member enquired about the use of the cross-hatched areas on Drawing A-3 of the Paper. In response, Ms Sandy S.K. Ng, STP/K, said that the cross-hatched areas were designated for paving and landscaping purposes as shown on the landscape master plan.

83. In response to another Member’s question, Ms Ng clarified that the similar applications in Kwun Tong were applications for minor relaxation of both PR and building height (BH) restrictions.

Deliberation Session

84. A Member said that it would be desirable if the triangular piece of land at the eastern corner of the Site could be used as public space.

85. 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 12.4.2023, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following condition:

“provision of parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces, vehicular access and internal driveway to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board.”

86. 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 Items 15 & 16

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/767	Proposed Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Portion of Workshop Unit, G/F, Hung Fuk Building, 60 Hung To Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon
A/K14/768	Proposed Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Portion of Workshop Unit, G/F, Hung Fuk Building, 60 Hung To Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon (MPC Paper No. A/K14/767 & 768)

87. The Committee noted that the two applications for proposed shop and services were similar in nature and the premises were located in the same building within the same “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone. The Committee agreed that they could be considered together.

88. The Committee also noted that three replacement pages (p.1 and p.5 of the Main Paper and p. 1 of Appendix III) reflecting the latest comments from the Lands Department and the corresponding changes to the advisory clauses were tabled at the meeting for Members’ reference.

Presentation and Question Sessions

89. 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 applications;
- (b) the proposed shop and services at each of the sites;
- (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 applications;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment were received on the applications; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the applications based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed uses were generally in line with the planning intention of the “OU(B)” zone and were compatible with the changing land use character of the Kwun Tong Business Area. The applications complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D in that it would not induce adverse fire safety, traffic and environmental impacts on the subject building and the adjacent areas. Concerned departments had no objection to and no adverse comment on the applications. Should the applications be approved, the aggregate commercial floor areas on the G/F of the subject building would be within the maximum permissible limit of 230m². The Director of Fire Services had no objection to the applications subject to an approval condition on the submission and implementation of the proposal for fire safety measures.

90. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

91. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications, on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 12.4.2021, 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 proposal for fire safety measures, including the provision of fire services installations and equipment at the application premises and means of escape separated from the industrial portion of the subject industrial building 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 (a) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 17

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/769 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Grey Water Treatment Plant) in
“Open Space” Zone, Government Land Anderson Road Quarry
Development, Kwun Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/769)

93. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Water Supplies Department (WSD). Black & Veatch Hong Kong Ltd. (B&V) was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on this item:

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with
WSD and B&V; and

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - his firm having past business dealings with B&V

94. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

95. 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 public utility installation (Grey Water Treatment Plant) (GWTP);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 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. 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 assessment set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed GWTP was considered in line with the Smart, Green and Resilient City Strategy as advocated under PlanD’s 2030+ Study. With the proposed landscaping/greening of the site to be provided at the Regional Open Space (ROS) level that would be handed over to Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) and will form part of the ROS for public enjoyment, the proposed GWTP and the ancillary facilities would not affect the integrity and function of the ROS. As such, the planning intention of “Open Space” (“O”) zone would not be undermined. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Regarding the public comments received, comments of concerned departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

96. Some Members raised the following enquiries:

Design of the facility

- (a) the consideration behind the design of the facility at Anderson Road Quarry Development (ARQD);
- (b) whether the proposed soil depth of 600mm at roof top of the facilities was

sufficient;

Adoption of grey water treatment

- (c) whether ARQD would fully adopt grey water for flushing;
- (d) whether there were successful examples of developments which had adopted grey water for flushing; and
- (e) how to ensure the future households at ARQD would install the facilities required for using grey water.

97. In response to Members' enquiries, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, made the following main points:

Design of the facility

- (a) ARQD was located at a high altitude with mean site formation level in the range of about 175mPD to 202mPD and the proposed grey water recycling system was more desirable than the conventional way of pumping sea water for flushing from environmental perspective. The proposed GWTP was at the lowest topographical level within ARQD with vehicular access, thus was suitable for collecting the grey water generated from various developments by gravity in a cost-effective way. In order to minimize the impact on public enjoyment of the ROS, the roof of the proposed GWTP would be at the same level of the adjoining ROS and would be kept for open space use. Three voids proposed at the ROS level were mainly for fire safety, natural lighting/ventilation purposes and the design of these voids could be further reviewed at detailed design stage;
- (b) the façade design and exterior material palette was a mixture of materials such as granite that aimed at reflecting the quarrying history and identity of ARQD;

- (c) the signage of WSD was erected at the entrance of the facility mainly to provide direction as well as hiding the stairhood to minimize visual impact;
- (d) a soil depth of 600mm was proposed, which was agreeable to the relevant government departments. There was room for allowing deeper soil for tree plantings, which would be further explored in the detailed design stage of the GWTP if required by relevant departments;

Adoption of grey water treatment

- (e) grey water referred to waste water separately collected from baths, showers, wash basins, kitchen sinks and laundry machines, etc. which could be collected, treated and reused for non-portable purposes such as toilet flushing;
- (f) LOHAS Park was an example of residential development that had adopted grey water for flushing; and
- (g) relevant clauses would be included in the land grant/lease conditions requiring the future project proponents/ developers to provide the relevant utilities in the development to support the grey water recycling system.

98. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms Kwan explained that WSD was in charge of the provision of the GWTP instead of the Drainage Services Department.

Deliberation Session

99. A Member said that the proposal had demonstrated a good integrated design of a public utility installation in an open space.

100. Another Member expressed appreciation for the effort put in by the applicant in providing a large area of greening at the facility, but suggested that vertical greening could be considered instead of providing a concrete wall design.

101. The Vice-chairman said that the lighting of WSD's signage should not be excessive so as to minimize the nuisance to the nearby residents.

102. The Chairman concluded the discussion with the following main points:

- (a) Members in general supported the application;
- (b) Member's various comments on the design of the facilities should be conveyed to WSD for consideration at the detailed design stage; and
- (c) similar public utilities with environmentally-friendly design that integrated with open space provision should be encouraged.

103. 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 12.4.2023, 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 water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission of a Geotechnical Planning Review Report and implementation of the necessary geotechnical remedial works identified therein, in respect of the slopes adjacent to the application site to the satisfaction of the Director of Civil Engineering and Development or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of landscaping proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the Town Planning Board.”

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

[Mr C.H. Mak, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 18

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K18/329 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Educational Institution (University Hostel and Academic Building Complex) in "Government, Institution or Community (9)" Zone, 30 Renfrew Road (Part), Kowloon Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/329)

Presentation and Question Sessions

105. The Secretary reported that the application site was in Kowloon Tong. The application was submitted by the Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU). Llewelyn Davies Hong Kong Ltd. (LD), ACLA Ltd. (ACLA), ERM Hong Kong Ltd. (ERM) and P&T Architects and Engineers Ltd. (P&T) were four of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on this item:

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong - being an employee of HKBU;

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau - being the Chairman of the Social Work Advisory Committee of the Department of Social Work in HKBU;

- Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being a council and court member of HKBU;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with HKBU, ACLA and ERM;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having past business dealings with LD;
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - working in the City University of Hong Kong and living in its quarters in Kowloon Tong;
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse was a director of a company which owns properties in Kowloon Tong; and
- Ms Jacinta Woo - her spouse being a Group Director of P&T.
as Secretary

106. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Messrs Stephen H.B. Yau and Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting. As the interests of Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong were direct, they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily. As the staff quarter Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon lived and the property owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi's spouse had no direct view of the site and the interest of Ms Jacinta Woo was remote, the Committee agreed that they could be allowed to stay in the meeting.

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

107. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr C.H. Mak, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of building height restriction (from 13 storeys to 17 storeys) for a permitted educational institution (University

Hostel and Academic Building Complex);

- (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, a total of 32 public comments were received, with 27 supporting comments from HKBU Alumni Association, HKBU Director of Students Affairs, HKBU alumni and staff and members of the public. Three objecting comments were received from individuals and two comments providing views were received from a member of Kowloon City District Council and an individual. 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 assessment set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. After obtaining previous planning approval on minor relaxation of BH restriction in 2016, the applicant proceeded to detailed design and technical consideration of the proposed development. In response to stakeholder's concerns while avoiding disturbances to the surrounding neighbourhood, a further increase in BH to 17 storeys was proposed. The Secretary for Education and University Grants Committee had given policy support to the proposed development with relaxation of BH restrictions at the site. As compared with the approved scheme, the current scheme with stepped BH might create some visual interests to the site and the Baptist University Renfrew Road Campus cluster. The BH of the current scheme was considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments, and would unlikely create significant adverse effects on the visual character of the area. It was considered generally in line with criteria (c) and (d) for consideration of minor relaxation of BH restriction stipulated in the Explanatory Statement of the Outline Zoning Plan. While the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape had no objection to the application from landscape, visual and air ventilation perspective, the applicant was encouraged to provide further tree planning opportunities at street level and

upper levels. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

108. Noting the public comments received, some Members enquired about the facilities in the proposed development that would be opened for public use and their opening hours. In response, Mr C.H. Mak, STP/K, made the following points:

- (a) while no such information was provided in the application stating the facilities to be opened to public, according to HKBU's previous consultation at the District Council, facilities including conference rooms, multi-purpose activity rooms, canteen and the outdoor courtyard on 3/F would be opened for public use in the hours to be determined by HKBU; and
- (b) open space and access road on G/F could be accessible by public as no fencing would be installed.

Deliberation Session

109. Some Members appreciated the applicant's effort to improve the scheme which might bring enhancement to the environment of the complex in terms of sunlight penetration and air ventilation. In addition, some Members made the following points:

- (a) apart from providing facilities for the students, universities should be encouraged to allow more facilities for public's use;
- (b) the vertical design of the scheme should be further enhanced so that the openness of the complex would not be constrained; and
- (c) the revised design would allow more common space for social interaction. In this regard, making the facilities available for public use could encourage better social integration.

110. Members in general supported the application for minor relaxation of BH

restriction. A Member suggested to add an additional advisory clause recommending the applicant to further explore means to make the facilities more accessible for public use. Members agreed.

111. 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 12.4.2023, 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 proposed development should not exceed the building heights as proposed by the applicant;

- (b) the design and provision of vehicular access, car parking spaces, loading/unloading spaces and pedestrian crossing facilities for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;

- (c) the submission of a revised Traffic Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;

- (d) the submission of a Noise Impact Assessment and implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;

- (e) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;

- (f) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment in approval condition (e) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board; and

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

112. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV of the Paper together with the following additional clause:

“(f) the applicant should explore means to make the facilities more accessible for public use.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr C.H. Mak, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 19

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K7/115 Proposed Minor Relaxation of the existing BH (“11 Storeys over 1 Storey of Car Park”) to “11 Storeys over 2 Storeys of Car Park” for a Permitted Residential Development in “Residential (Group B) 1” Zone, 5-7 Ho Man Tin Street, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K7/115A)

113. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup) was the consultant 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; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with Arup; and |

Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with Arup.

114. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. The Committee also noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting. As Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

115. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 4.4.2019 deferment of 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 address departmental comments.

116. 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. 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 20

Any Other Business

117. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 1:30 p.m..