

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 627th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 17.5.2019

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

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

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

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

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

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr Franklin Yu

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms April K.Y. Kun

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Kevin C.P. Ng

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Karmin Tong

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 626th MPC Meeting held on 3.5.2019

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 626th MPC meeting held on 3.5.2019 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

[Mr Louis K.H. Kau, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), Mr Derek W.O. Cheung, District Planning Officer/ Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK), Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), Mr Edward H.C. Leung, Senior Town Planner/Metro & Urban Renewal (STP/M&UR) and Ms Yvonne Y.T. Leong, Senior Town Planner/Housing & Office Land Supply (STP/HOLS), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

General

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting]

Review of Sites Designated “Comprehensive Development Area” on Statutory Plans in the Metro Area for the Years 2017/2019

(MPC Paper No. 7/19)

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. Mr Edward H.C. Leung, STP/M&UR, introduced the background to the review of “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) sites. According to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 17A, the review of the “CDA” sites designated for more than three years should be conducted on a biennial basis. The review would assist the Committee in considering the rezoning of suitable “CDA” sites to other appropriate zonings and monitoring the progress of “CDA” developments. The last “CDA” Review was conducted in 2017.

4. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Edward H.C. Leung presented the results of the latest review on “CDA” sites in the Metro Area as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points:

- (a) as at the end of March 2019, there were a total of 64 “CDA” sites in the Metro Area. The current review had examined all 64 sites which had been designated “CDA” for more than three years;

“CDA” Sites with No Approved Master Layout Plan (MLP)

- (b) a total of 20 “CDA” sites had been designated for more than three years with no approved MLP, 14 of which were proposed for retention and six were subject to review on the zoning, site boundary and/or development intensity. Justifications for retention of the 14 sites and the details of the six sites under review were set out in Appendices I and II of the Paper respectively;

“CDA” Sites with Approved MLP

- (c) a total of 44 “CDA” sites had been designated for more than three years with approved MLP. Among them, one site was subject to review and 28 sites were proposed for retention to ensure proper implementation in accordance with the approved MLPs and approval conditions. Justifications for retention of the 28 sites and details of the site under review were set out in Appendices III and IV of the Paper respectively;

Sites already Agreed for Rezoning

- (d) there were six sites previously agreed by the Committee for rezoning to appropriate zonings to reflect their as-built conditions. They included: (i) the hotel development at Oil Street, North Point (H14B); (ii) the residential and commercial development at the Airport Railway Kowloon Station, West Kowloon Reclamation Area (K11); (iii) the development at the Former Marine Police Headquarters site in Salisbury Road (K14); (iv) the residential development at Pine Crest, Tai Po Road (K24); (v) the school and residential developments at the junction of Inverness Road and Junction Road (K34); and (vi) the comprehensive residential cum government, institution or community (GIC) development at the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Tsuen Wan West Station Site TW7 (TW 29). The current progress of rezoning these sites were set out in Appendix V of the Paper; and

Sites Proposed for Rezoning

- (e) the development in nine sites had been completed. It was proposed to rezone the sites to appropriate zonings to reflect their as-built conditions and approved uses subject to full compliance with the approval conditions (if applicable) and when opportunity arose. They included: (i) the office development at the junction of Fook Yum Road and King Wah Road, North Point (H14A); (ii) the conservation and conversion of the Chai Wan Flatted Factory Building for public housing development (H36); (iii) the

ex-Kowloon Motor Bus (KMB) Limited Lai Chi Kok bus depot site (K17); (iv) the hotel development at a site south of Hung Luen Road, Hung Hom (K47A); (v) the commercial development at a site at the junction of Hung Luen Road and Kin Wan Street, Hung Hom (K47B); (vi) the hotel development in Ting Kau (TW 26); (vii) the comprehensive commercial and residential development at the MTR Tsuen Wan West Station Site TW5 (TW 28); (viii) the comprehensive residential development cum public sports centre at MTR Tsuen Wan West Station Site TW6 (TW 30); and (ix) the comprehensive residential development (Home Ownership Scheme development) cum social welfare facility at Ex-Tai Wo Hau Factory Estate, Tsuen Wan (TW 35). Justifications for rezoning these sites were set out in Appendix VI of the Paper.

5. The Chairman recapitulated that review of “CDA” sites designated for more than three years had been undertaken regularly since 1999 in order to closely monitor the progress of development. For sites with approved MLP, questionnaires would be sent to the developers or their agents to have a better understanding on progress of their implementation. For “CDA” sites without approved MLP, the review would look into the difficulties hindering implementation and appropriate measures to resolve the difficulties would be explored. For instance, previously a large “CDA” site in the Yau Tong Industrial Area with no implementation progress for many years was sub-divided into several smaller “CDA” sites upon review and applications for development at the sub-divided “CDA” sites had subsequently been received. As for those “CDA” sites with development already completed, they would generally be rezoned to provide flexibility for subsequent modification of uses within the development site. The Planning Department (PlanD) would submit the details of the rezoning proposals of the individual “CDA” sites to the Committee for consideration in the context of amendments to Outline Zoning Plans.

6. In response to Members’ inquiries, Mr Edward H.C. Leung, STP/M&UR, said that according to the feedback from the questionnaires for the developers of “CDA” sites with approved MLP, there were no major issues or insurmountable difficulties in the implementation of the approved schemes. A summary of the replies was set out in paragraph 4.2.6 of the Paper. Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, supplemented that “CDA” sites with approved MLP were generally at various stages of implementation. Drawing

from past experiences, the issues that developers might encounter during implementation of the approved MLP were mostly non-planning related matters such as submission of general building plans, lease modification, etc. Regarding another Member's enquiry, Mr Edward H.C. Leung replied that as at end of March 2019, there was no "CDA" site in the Metro Area that was designated for less than three years.

[Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai, and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

7. In relation to the "CDA" sites without approved MLP, a Member asked whether the land owners had expressed concerns on implementation and made requests to rezone the concerned site(s) to other zonings to facilitate development. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, and Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, replied that no such requests were received in the last two years for the sites within the Hong Kong and Kowloon Districts. Mr Derek W.O. Cheung, DPO/TWK, reported that the land owners of some sites in the Tsuen Wan Industrial Area had previously approached the Development Bureau and PlanD to explore the possibility of rezoning the concerned sites for industrial/office development. In view that the sites were rezoned as "CDA" in 2010 to encourage comprehensive residential development and restructuring of the area as well as the completed "CDA" development nearby, the "CDA" designation of these sites were proposed to be retained.

8. In relation to the same Member's enquiry about the Wing Lee Street/Shing Wong Street site (H60), Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the site was one of the six sites with no approved MLP and subject to review. The Chairman remarked that the zoning of the site was subject to review so as to create synergy with the Urban Renewal Authority's revitalization proposal for the adjacent Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street project.

Deliberation Session

9. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) note the findings of the review of the sites designated "CDA" on statutory plans in the Metro Area;

- (b) agree to the proposed retention of the “CDA” designation for the sites mentioned in paragraphs 4.1.1 and 4.2.1 and detailed at Appendices I and III of the Paper;
- (c) note the sites which were subject to review mentioned in paragraphs 4.1.3 and 4.2.2 and detailed at Appendices II and IV of the Paper;
- (d) note the agreement of the Committee to rezone the sites mentioned in paragraph 4.2.3 and detailed at Appendix V of the Paper; and
- (e) agree to the proposed rezoning of the sites mentioned in paragraph 4.2.4 and detailed at Appendix VI of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, Mr Derek W.O. Cheung, DPO/TWK, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, Mr Edward H.C. Leung, STP/M&UR, and Ms Yvonne Y.T. Leong, STP/HOLS, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. Mr Kau, Ms Cheng, Mr Leung and Ms Leong left the meeting at this point.]

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TY/28

(MPC Paper No. 4/19)

10. The Secretary reported that the rezoning site was located in Tsing Yi and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan had declared interest on the item as he had close relatives owning properties in Tsing Yi.

11. As the properties owned by Mr Kwan's close relatives had no direct view of the rezoning site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

Background

- (a) the findings of the "Study on Strategic Development Plan for Hong Kong Port 2030" (the Study) revealed that Hong Kong's container throughput and transshipment cargo had been increasingly concentrated at Kwai Tsing Container Terminals (KTCTs). The Study also indicated that there had been a continual shift of inland transport mode for container cargoes from land-borne traffic to water-borne barge traffic by river-trade vessels to/from Pearl River Delta ports and KTCTs;
- (b) according to the "Proposals for Enhancing the Use of Port Back-up Land in Kwai Tsing" (the Proposals) promulgated by the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) in June 2015, a site in the immediate vicinity of Container Terminal 9 South (CT9S) in Tsing Yi had been identified for the provision of additional barge berths to meet the increase in river-borne container traffic;

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

Proposed Amendments

- (c) Amendment Item A (total area of about 1.88 ha) – rezoning of a site at Tsing Sheung Road from "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Marine-related Uses" to "OU (Container Related Uses)" and incorporation of related land and sea areas into the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) planning

scheme boundary under the same “OU(Container Related Uses)” zone (the Site);

Proposed Amendments to the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP

- (d) the ES was proposed to be revised to reflect the proposed amendments and other technical amendments for updating the latest developments/circumstances, and corresponding revisions to the Notes and ES were also proposed in accordance with the revised Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans promulgated by the Town Planning Board;

Technical Assessments

- (e) the proposed use of the Site for barge berths would not induce additional traffic on public road and thus no Traffic Impact Assessment was required. As the Site would be integrated with CT9S and transportation of containers would be made by internal container trailers, noise and air pollution were expected to be lesser due to the reduction in external traffic volume;
- (f) the proposed use was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were mainly port back-up uses and there were unlikely visual sensitive receivers in the surroundings. Significant adverse visual and landscape impact was not anticipated. No Visual Impact Assessment and Landscape Impact Assessment were required;
- (g) since there would be no particular building structures at the Site, significant air ventilation impact was not expected;
- (h) the Site fell within the Consultation Zone of the existing Potential Hazardous Installations. Restriction on the working population at the Site would be imposed under the future lease conditions;
- (i) concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the

proposed amendments;

Provision of Government, Institution or Community (GIC) Facilities and Open Space

- (j) the provision of open spaces and various GIC facilities in the area was generally sufficient except that there would be a shortfall in hospital beds and some elderly services/facilities. The proposed amendment would have no impact on the overall planned provision in the Tsing Yi District;

Consultation with Stakeholders

- (k) port-related industry bodies, the Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC) and the Panel on Economic Development of the Legislative Council, the then Hong Kong Port Development Council and Hong Kong Logistics Development Council were consulted/briefed by THB on the Proposals during June to August 2015;
- (l) no specific comment on the Proposals was received at the K&TDC meeting. Some members raised general concerns on local air quality and the carrying capacity of existing road network due to port activities; and
- (m) majority of the written submissions received during the consultation period supported the Proposals and some expressed concern on the allocation of land to terminal operators and requested reprovisioning from the Government.

13. A Member enquired about the implications of the proposed use of the Site on marine traffic and safety. Mr Derek W.O. Cheung, DPO/TWK, replied that the barge traffic mainly came from Pearl River Delta ports by river barges via the waters and fairways to the west of the KTCTs. The Marine Department (MD) had been consulted and had no objection to the proposed amendments. Another Member supplemented that in general, apart from MD, the Port Operations Committee and other relevant stakeholders/committees would normally be consulted on matters affecting the operations of ports. MD would maintain

surveillance over navigable waters through vessel traffic centre/control centres and radar surveillance, and conduct patrols so as to monitor and regulate vessel movements. Many of the river barges were self-propelling motor vessels and derrick lighters and tug boats were still used for transporting cargo to ports without container cranes.

14. In response to the Vice-chairman and a Member's enquiries on the reasons for retaining the area to the immediate west of the Site as "OU (Marine-related Uses)" zone, Mr Derek W.O. Cheung said that the area was currently occupied by the barging facilities associated with the Environmental Protection Department's Chemical Waste Treatment Facility (CWTF) located inland to the northwest of the Site. The CWTF relied on this marine access to collect chemical and oily waste from shipboard residues and mixtures containing oil, noxious liquids or garbage from nearby vessels. Retention of the current zoning was considered necessary to reflect the planning intention of the said area.

Deliberation Session

15. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/28 and that the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/28A at Appendix I of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/TY/29 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Appendix II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised ES at Appendix III of the Paper for the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/28A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Derek W.O. Cheung, DPO/TWK, and Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Mr Cheung left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/805 Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (2)”
Zone, Portion of Workshop C4, G/F, Block C, Hong Kong Industrial
Centre, 489-491 Castle Peak Road, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K5/805)

16. The Secretary reported that RHL Surveyors Limited (RHL) was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on this item :

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon	}	personally knowing the Managing Director of RHL.
Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung		
Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong		

17. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had no involvement in or discussion with the applicant’s consultant on the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

18. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 29.4.2019 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

19. 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 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TY/135 Temporary Asphalt Plant for a Period of 5 Years in “Industrial” Zone,
Tsing Yi Town Lot 108 RP (Part), Sai Tso Wan Road, Tsing Yi, New
Territories

20. The Committee noted that the application was rescheduled.

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TY/136 Temporary Concrete Batching Plant for a Period of 5 Years in
“Industrial” Zone, Tsing Yi Town Lot 108 RP (Part), Tsing Yi, New
Territories

21. The Committee noted that the application was rescheduled.

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

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TWK/12 Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) for a Period of 5 Years (Surplus Car Parking Spaces Only) in “Residential (Group A)” Zone,
(a) Lei Muk Shue Estate, Tsuen Wan
(b) Kwai Shing West Estate, Kwai Chung
(c) Lai King Estate, Kwai Chung
(d) Lai Yiu Estate, Kwai Chung
(e) Cheung Ching Estate, Tsing Yi
(MPC Paper No. A/TWK/12)

22. The Secretary reported that two of the application sites were located in Tsuen Wan and Tsing Yi, and the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests on this item :

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| 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 Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA, and having close relatives owning properties in Tsing Yi; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with HKHA; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his firm having current business dealings with HKHA; |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - | his spouse being an employee of the Housing Department (HD) (the executive arm of HKHA), but not involved in planning work; |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | being a member of the Building Committee of HKHA; |

- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society, which was in discussion with HD on housing development issues;
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and
- Professor John C.Y. Ng - his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.

23. The Committee noted that Mr Franklin Yu had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had already left the meeting. As the interests of 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 Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, and the properties owned by Professor John C.Y. Ng's spouse and the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi's spouse had no direct view of the application sites, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

[Messrs Martin W.C. Kwan and Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

24. 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 temporary public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) for a period of five years (surplus car parking spaces only);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 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, four public comments were received, including two supportive comments and two comments providing views or raising concerns on the application. The

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 on a temporary basis for a period of five years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The letting of surplus parking spaces to non-residents would help utilize resources more efficiently and would not compromise the parking needs of the residents. Assuming all the monthly parking spaces were let to non-residents and gross floor area accountable, the overall non-domestic plot ratio (PR) of the respective housing estates was still within the maximum PR restriction under the “Residential (Group A)” zone. An approval condition requiring priority be given to residents of the concerned estates in the letting of surplus vacant parking spaces was recommended. Previous applications for the same use had been approved and approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant. As for the public comment requesting more covered parking spaces for school buses, the current application involved the provision of parking spaces which might be considered for parking of suitable types of school buses. With respect to the concern on shortage of government, institution or community facilities, there was generally no shortfall in major community facilities in the areas except for hospital beds, elderly services/facilities, and/or secondary schools. An advisory clause was recommended to advise the applicant that consideration might be given to letting the surplus vehicle parking spaces for community uses.

25. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

26. Members noted that bicycle parking spaces were currently not provided in concerned housing estates. Noting a Member's concern, the Chairman suggested that information on the provision of bicycle parking spaces in public housing estates would serve

as a useful reference for Members when considering similar applications in future. Another Member opined that the applicant should consult and closely liaise with local stakeholders on the need for community/public facilities in public housing estates.

27. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of five years until 17.5.2024, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the following condition :

“priority should be accorded to the respective residents of Lei Muk Shue Estate in Tsuen Wan, Kwai Shing West Estate, Lai King Estate and Lai Yiu Estate in Kwai Chung, and Cheung Ching Estate in Tsing Yi in the letting of the surplus vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.”

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

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

[Messrs Martin W.C. Kwan and Thomas O.S. Ho returned to the meeting at this point.]

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H15/280 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction (from 80mPD to 91mPD) for Permitted School Use in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, Campus for “Preparatory Years and Primary Section” of Singapore International School (Hong Kong), 23 Nam Long Shan Road, Aberdeen, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/280)

29. The Committee noted that three replacement pages (page 6 and 10 of the Main Paper and Appendix IV) rectifying editorial errors in paragraph 10.5 of the Paper and the Environmental Protection Department’s comments in paragraph 8.1.4(d) of the Main Paper and Appendix IV, were tabled at the meeting for Members’ reference.

30. The Secretary reported that Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD) and Aedas Limited (Aedas) were the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on this item:

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having past business dealings with LD; and

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with Aedas.

31. As Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction from 80mPD to 91mPD;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 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, 171 public comments were received, including 67 supportive comments, 44 objecting comments and 60 comments providing views on the application. 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 made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Although the application involved relaxing the BH restriction on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) from 80mPD to 91mPD (i.e. 11m or 13.75%), the actual BH increase was only about 5m (i.e. 5.81%) from the existing roof level of the school at 86mPD. The proposed development was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Government, Institution or Community” zone and was not visually incompatible with the surrounding areas and developments with BHs ranging from 90mPD to 150mPD. On the traffic aspect, the applicant stated that the proposed staff office use would not induce any increase in student intake or change in traffic generation, and the school would advocate a ‘School Bus Only Policy’ to reduce the number of school-related private cars. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant. As regards the suggestion on opening school facilities after school hours, the applicant responded that the school had made available its campuses and facilities to support local community events, as well as its carpark for usage of a neighbourhood school.

33. The Vice-chairman and some Members raised the following enquiries :

The Site and Surrounding Areas

- (a) the BH restriction on the OZP and the BH of the existing school building on the application site (the Site);
- (b) background on nearby developments in Wong Chuk Hang, including the University of Hong Kong (HKU)'s student residence and development at the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Wong Chuk Hang Depot;

The Proposal for Minor Relaxation of BH Restriction

- (c) whether the current proposal would affect student intake;
- (d) details on the location and floor area of the existing staff offices, and the rationale for the increase in the overall floor space, while noting the applicant's claim that the proposed additional storey was merely for consolidating the existing staff offices;
- (e) the floor-to-floor height of typical floors of the existing school building and the rationale for the proposed floor-to-floor height for the additional storey;
- (f) how the current application complied with the relevant criteria for consideration of application for minor relaxation of BH;

Technical Aspects

- (g) whether the proposed BH relaxation would affect natural light penetration to the surrounding residential developments; and
- (h) in view of the traffic congestion due to the operation of different schools in the area, elaboration on the applicant's 'School Bus Only Policy' and the

implications of the proposal on the existing traffic conditions.

34. Mr Vincent W.Y. Wong, STP/HK, made the following responses:

The Site and Surrounding Areas

- (a) the Site was subject to a BH restriction of 80mPD or the height of the existing building, whichever was the greater. The BH of the existing school building was 86mPD and the building had already been in existence before the stipulation of BH restrictions on the OZP. The current application involved relaxing the existing BH of the school building from 86mPD to 91mPD, i.e. about 5m;
- (b) the HKU student residence development at Wong Chuk Hang comprised two 20-storey residential towers with a podium (at 90mPD up to main roof) providing about 1,224 hostel places. It was the subject of a planning application for proposed residential institution (student residences) and minor relaxation of BH restriction to 90mPD, which was approved with conditions by the Committee on 16.11.2018. The Wong Chuk Hang “Comprehensive Development Area” site was for a comprehensive commercial cum residential development on top of the MTR Wong Chuk Hang Depot, and it was being implemented in phases and general building plan submission had been received for portions of the development;

The Proposal for Minor Relaxation of BH Restriction

- (c) according to the submission, the proposed additional storey for staff office use would not induce any increase in student intake or student places;
- (d) the proposed BH relaxation was to provide floor space for a new staff office which aimed at consolidating the existing offices for administrative and management staff currently scattered around the school campuses. The floor area of the existing staff offices was about 220m², while the newly proposed staff office was about 261m². The applicant had not provided

details on the locations of the existing staff offices. According to the further information from the applicant attached at Appendix Ic of the Paper, if the application was approved, the existing staff offices would be converted to multi-purpose and specialized education facilities such as learning support room and multi-purpose room;

- (e) according to Drawing A-2 of the Paper, the floor-to-floor height of the typical floors of the existing school building ranged from about 3m to 4m. No information on the rationale for a proposed floor height of 5m for the additional storey was provided in the submission;
- (f) regarding the compliance with the criteria for consideration of minor relaxation of BH restrictions as set out in paragraph 7.2 of the Paper, as the proposed additional storey was located at the roof of the existing school building, there was no site extension which might affect the streetscape or tree preservation. The proposed BH relaxation was considered minor in nature and was acceptable from planning viewpoint;

Technical Aspects

- (g) with reference to Plan A-2 of the Paper, the nearby residential developments, namely Grandview Garden and South Wave Court, were located to the north and further northwest of the Site segregated by Nam Long Shan Road. Given the current building orientation, the school building with the proposed additional storey would not adversely affect light penetration to the nearby developments; and
- (h) according to the applicant, about 90% of the students would walk or take school bus or public transport to the school, with the remaining 10% relying on private car. The applicant had taken various measures to mitigate the traffic conditions and was committed to advocate a ‘School Bus Only Policy’ as an effort to reduce the number of school-related private cars. As the current proposal would not involve additional student intake, it would not induce additional traffic nor cause adverse impact on the existing

traffic conditions.

35. In response to a Members' question regarding whether payment of premium was required for taking forward the proposal, Mr Vincent W.Y. Wong, STP/HK, said that according to the information provided by the Lands Department (LandsD), lease modification would not be required. The applicant, however, would need to submit building plans for the proposed alteration and addition works for approval by the Building Authority. Mr Simon S.W. Wang, Assistant Director (Regional 1), LandsD, supplemented that as there was no BH restriction for the Site under the lease, lease modification or payment of premium/fees would not be required for the proposed additional storey, while the applicant would need to obtain policy support from the Education Bureau and fulfil the relevant requirements of concerned bureaux/departments.

Deliberation Session

36. Members generally agreed that, as a matter of principle, each application for minor relaxation should be considered based on its merits and the relevant criteria, and the proposal should be well justified. While Members were largely sympathetic to the application noting that the proposed BH of 91mPD at the Site was not visually incompatible with the surrounding developments, some Members considered that the applicant had neither provided sufficient details on the proposal nor adequately demonstrated the planning/design merits of the proposal to warrant relaxation of BH restriction.

37. Some Members were of the view that the submitted information in respect of the use of the free-up floor spaces of the existing staff offices, the proposed floor-to-floor height of the additional storey and possible impacts of the proposal were either inadequate or too generic, and not substantiated by any data or figures. A few Members, however, opined that since the proposal would be conducive to allowing more space for education purpose and improving the quality of the learning environment, the application warranted favourable consideration.

38. Upon further discussion, Members generally considered that more information, particularly on the use of the free-up floor spaces upon restructuring of the existing facilities and justification for the floor-to-floor height of 5m for the new additional storey, should be

provided to the Committee for further consideration.

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

[The Vice-chairman left the meeting temporarily and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Professor John C.Y. Ng left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H15/281 Temporary Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle) (surplus monthly vehicle parking spaces only) for a Period of Five Years in “Residential (Group A)” Zone, Shek Pai Wan Estate, Aberdeen, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/281)

40. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests on this item :

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| 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 Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with HKHA; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his firm having current business dealings with HKHA; |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - | his spouse being an employee of the Housing Department (HD) (the executive arm of HKHA), but not involved in planning work; |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | being a member of the Building Committee of HKHA; and |

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society, which was in discussion with HD on housing development issues.

41. The Committee noted that Mr Franklin Yu had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had already left the meeting. As the interest of Mr Martin W.C. Kwan was direct, the Committee agreed that he should leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) (letting of surplus monthly vehicle parking spaces to non-residents) for a period of five years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 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 public comments were received, including an objecting comment and the other providing views on the application. The 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 on a temporary basis for a period of five years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The letting of surplus parking spaces to non-residents would help utilize public resources more efficiently and would not compromise the parking need of the residents. No complaint for letting of surplus parking spaces in the estate to non-residents had been received since the last temporary approval granted in 2016. An approval condition requiring priority be given to residents of the estate in the letting of surplus vacant parking spaces was recommended. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant. As for the suggestion to release floor area of surplus vehicle parking spaces for provision of government, institution or community facilities, the applicant indicated that one of the carpark floors had already been converted to welfare facilities in 2010.

43. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

44. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of five years until 17.5.2024, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the following condition :

“priority should be accorded to the residents of Shek Pai Wan Estate in the letting of the surplus vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.”

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

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

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan returned to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H19/78 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Commercial Development within “Commercial (1)” Zone and Proposed Eating Place and Shop and Services Uses within an area shown as Pedestrian Precinct/Street, 7 Stanley Market Road and 78 & 79 Stanley Main Street, Stanley (Stanley Inland Lot 124 and Stanley Lot 427 and 428), Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H19/78A)

46. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 30.4.2019 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted responses to departmental comments, a Traffic Impact Assessment during construction phase, and a tree pruning proposal to address departmental comments.

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

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

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H3/440 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Flat (Government Staff Quarters) use from 80mPD to 104mPD in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, Western Police Married Quarters, 280 Des Voeux Road West, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/440A)

48. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Sai Ying Pun. Townland Consultants Limited (Townland) and AIM Group Limited (AIM) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on this item :

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - his firm having current business dealings with Townland and AIM; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - having past business dealings with Townland; and |
| Mr Michael H.S. Law | - co-owning with spouse a flat in Sai Ying Pun. |

49. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting. As Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application and the property co-owned by Mr Michael H.S. Law and his spouse had no direct view of the Site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

50. The Secretary further reported that a petition letter from the Democratic Alliance for Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (Central & Western Branch) was received before the meeting. As the petition letter was submitted after the expiry of the statutory publication period, it should not be treated as a submission made under section 16(2H)(a) of the Town

Planning Ordinance. Members noted that the views raised in the petition letter were similar to those public comments covered in paragraph 10 of the Paper.

Presentation and Question Sessions

51. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr J.J. Austin, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction for government staff quarters from 80mPD to 104mPD;

[The Vice-chairman returned to the meeting at this point.]

- (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. The District Officer (Central and Western), Home Affairs Department relayed that some members of Legislative Council (LegCo) and Central & Western District Council (C&WDC) had expressed concern towards the application;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 104 public comments were received, including 4 supportive comments from individuals, 97 objecting comments from LegCo members and individuals, and 3 comments from C&WDC members providing views on the application. The 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 departmental quarters (DQs) and supporting facilities were considered as ancillary uses to the Western Police Station (WPS) and were generally in line with the planning intention of the “Government, Institution or Community” zone. The Security Bureau had given policy support for

the redevelopment. The application had demonstrated planning merits, including footpath widening at Queen's Road West, building separation of 15m among the residential towers to serve as wind corridors, and special building layout and disposition to mitigate adverse air and noise impacts. The proposed BH relaxation would also enable the provision of an additional 171 units. The proposed BH was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas. The proposed development would not generate adverse impacts on traffic, sewerage, environmental, air ventilation, visual and landscape aspects, and concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of the concerned departments and the planning assessments above were relevant. As regards the concerns on the provision of government, institution or community (GIC) facilities within the Site, the applicant indicated that inclusion of community/public facilities would affect round-the-clock operation of the police station and undermine the emergency response capability of the police.

52. The Chairman and some Members raised the following enquiries :

The Proposed DQ Development

- (a) whether the proposed DQ was intended to serve mainly the adjacent WPS and the implication of the proposed development on the overall provision of DQs in Hong Kong;
- (b) whether the applicant had considered utilizing underground space to accommodate the proposed parking facilities;
- (c) impacts of the proposal on the existing trees and traffic conditions;
- (d) estimated population of the proposed DQ development;

Provision of GIC facilities at the Site

- (e) elaboration on C&WDC members' views/concerns on the proposed development; and
- (f) details on the current provision of open space and major GIC facilities in the area.

53. Mr J.J. Austin, STP/HK, made the following responses:

The Proposed DQ Development

- (a) while the proposed DQs would not exclusively serve the adjacent WPS, the development including its supporting facilities were considered as uses directly related and ancillary to the WPS. According to the applicant, there was a current shortfall of 3,294 DQ units for the Hong Kong Police Force. The proposed DQ development would provide about 540 units. While there was another DQ project at Fan Garden in Fanling which would provide about 1,180 units, there would still be an overall shortfall in DQ supply;
- (b) according to the submission, a total of 23 parking spaces would be provided at the LG3/F to serve the adjacent WPS, while 71 parking spaces were proposed at the LG1/F to serve the DQs. The applicant had not provided information on whether the use of underground space could be further optimized for accommodating the associated parking facilities;
- (c) the vehicular access for the proposed DQs was from Queen's Road West. According to the submitted Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), the proposed development was estimated to generate total two-way vehicle flows of 44 passenger car units at morning peak hours. The TIA concluded that the proposed development with the proposed ingress/egress would not cause adverse traffic impact on the existing road network and all key junctions would perform satisfactorily even with the additional traffic generated.

The Transport Department had no comment on the submitted TIA;

- (d) according to the submitted Tree Preservation and Landscape Proposal, all the trees within the Site were common species. Among the 38 existing trees identified, 34 trees were proposed to be felled and 4 trees were to be transplanted. A total of 40 trees would be planted to compensate for the vegetation loss;
- (e) the applicant had not provided information on the estimated population of the proposed development. However, assuming a person-per-flat ratio of 2.5 to 3, the estimated population of the proposed development was in the range of about 1500 persons;

Provision of GIC facilities at the Site

- (f) the C&WDC was consulted on the proposed DQ development in March 2019. While members generally had no objection to the redevelopment of the DQs, some members indicated that some GIC facilities should be included in the proposal. In this regard, the applicant responded that the Site was situated within the boundary of the WPS compound and the co-location of police operational facilities with public facilities was not desirable as it would compromise the operational effectiveness and security of the police station. Round-the-clock operation of the police station and emergency response capability of the police would be affected; and
- (g) the planned provision of open spaces and various major GIC facilities in the Sai Ying Pun and Sheung Wan OZP area was generally sufficient, except that there would be shortfalls of 4.99 ha of local open space, 150 hospital beds and 391 places of community care/elderly services/facilities. For the Central & Western District as a whole, however, there was a surplus of about 10.34 ha of district open space. The planning of hospital bed was on a regional basis and the site was too small to accommodate hospital facilities. On the requirements for community care/elderly services/facilities, the government was identifying suitable sites/premises

for such uses. There was currently no shortfall in the provision of library in the area and there was no set standard on the provision of study rooms under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines.

Deliberation Session

54. Members were in support of the proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction for government staff quarters.

55. 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 17.5.2023, 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 the car parking, loading/unloading facilities and locations of ingress/egress to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of a Noise Impact Assessment report and implementation of the recommendations identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of an Air Quality Impact Assessment report to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (d) the provision of water supplies for firefighting, fire service installations and emergency vehicular access to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

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

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K10/261 Proposed Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) in "Residential (Group B)" Zone, 349 Prince Edward Road West, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K10/261)

57. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 30.4.2019 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

58. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that 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 Jessie K.P. Kwan, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/770 Shop and Services (Money Exchange) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Workshop No. 1, G/F, Crown Industrial Building, 106 How Ming Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/770)

Presentation and Question Sessions

59. 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 shop and services (money exchange);

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

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment was received on the application; 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 applied use was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone and was compatible with the changing land use character of the Kwun Tong Business Area. The application complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D in that it would not induce adverse fire safety and environmental impacts on

the subject building and the adjacent areas. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Should the application be approved, the aggregate commercial floor areas on the G/F of the subject building would be within the maximum permissible limit of 460m². The Director of Fire Services had no objection to the application subject to imposition of an approval condition requiring the submission and implementation of the proposal for fire safety measures. No time clause for commencement of development was proposed as the applied use was already in operation.

60. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

61. 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 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 within six months from the date of approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 17.11.2019; and
- (b) if the above planning condition (a) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

62. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix II 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.]

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 15

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K7/117 Proposed School (Tutorial School) in “Residential (Group B)” Zone,
G/F, 1A La Salle Road, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K7/117)

63. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Ho Man Tin. Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had declared an interest on the item as he co-owned with his spouse a flat, and his spouse was a director of a company which owned a property in Ho Man Tin.

64. As the property co-owned by Mr Stanley T.S. Choi and his spouse, and that owned by his spouse’s company had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

65. 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 school (tutorial school);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no

objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment was received on 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 application complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 40 in that the proposed use was not incompatible with other uses within the same building, the main entrance/exit to the application premises was separated from that of the upper floors of the building, and concerned departments had no objection to or adverse comment on the application from fire and building safety viewpoints. Adverse traffic and environmental impacts were not anticipated. The application premises was subject to a previous planning approval for the same use and there were 30 similar applications approved by the Committee in the locality. Approval of the application was not inconsistent with the previous decisions of the Committee.

66. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

67. 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 17.5.2023, 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 submission and implementation of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting prior to commencement of school operation to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 16

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K7/118 Proposed Shop and Services (Convenience Store) in “Residential (Group B)” Zone, 128 Waterloo Road, Kowloon (Part of G/F of the Proposed Residential Development)

69. The Committee noted that the application was withdrawn by the applicant.

Agenda Item 17

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K9/274 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Office and Shop and Services/Eating Place Uses in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 13 Hok Yuen Street, Hung Hom, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K9/274)

70. The Secretary reported the application site was located in Hung Hom. The application was submitted by Global Coin Limited, which was a subsidiary of CK Hutchison Holdings Limited (CKHH) with Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) as one of the consultants. The following Members had declared interests on this item :

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having business dealings with CKHH;

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had current business dealings with KTA; and

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - owning a flat in Hung Hom.

71. As Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application and the property of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

72. 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 plot ratio (PR) restriction for permitted office and shop and services/eating place uses from 12 to 12.782;
- (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 statutory publication periods, two public comments objecting to the application were received. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed uses were in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone. The application had incorporated setback of not less than 4.5m along the southern and eastern boundaries of the application site to provide buffer from adjoining lots and a recessed corner at Hok Yuen Street (on the G/F and 1/F), which in general would enhance the walking environment. It was Government's policy to revitalize old industrial buildings and the Development Bureau gave

support to the application for the proposed minor relaxation of PR. On technical aspects, concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of the concerned departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

73. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

74. 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 17.5.2023, 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 parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces and vehicular access to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of a revised traffic impact assessment and implementation of the mitigation measures identified to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the provision of fire services installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (e) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment in approval condition (d) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

75. 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 C.H. Mak, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 18

Any Other Business

76. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 11:40 a.m..