

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 631st Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 19.7.2019

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

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 Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

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 Gloria Y.L. Sze

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 630th MPC Meeting held on 5.7.2019

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 630th MPC meeting held on 5.7.2019 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/TW/14

Application for Amendment to the Notes of the “Government, Institution or Community (2)” Zone on the Approved Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/33 to Amend the Maximum Gross Floor Area, Building Height and Site Coverage for the Application Site in “Government, Institution or Community (2)” Zone, Lot 1236 RP in D.D. 453 and Extension Thereto, Lo Wai, Tsuen Wan, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. Y/TW/14)

3. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Lo Wai, Tsuen Wan. Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) and WSP (Asia) Limited (WSP) were two 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 was having current business dealings with KTA;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with WSP;
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with WSP; and
- Professor John C.Y. Ng - his spouse owning a flat at Discovery Park in Tsuen Wan.

4. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting. As the property owned by Professor John C.Y. Ng's spouse did not have a direct view on the Site and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

5. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 2.7.2019 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

6. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending 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 further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/32

(MPC Paper No.10/19)

7. The Secretary reported that the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) area was one of the subject sites for the proposed amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). 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 non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of URA; |
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang
(the Vice-chairman) | - | being the Deputy Chairman of the 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 of URA, 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; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his firm having current business dealings with URA; and |

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

8. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had not yet arrived to join the meeting. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the proposed amendments to the OZP in relation to the URA site were proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of those Members as a Member of URA only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting. The Committee agreed to this arrangement.

9. The following representatives from PlanD, URA and Social Ventures Hong Kong (SVhk) (URA's consultant) were invited to the meeting at this point:

- Mr Louis K.H. Kau - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK);
Ms Natalie L.Y. Luk - Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK);
Mr Wilfred Au - Director, Planning and Design, URA;
Mr Mike Kwan - General Manager, Planning and Design, URA; and
Mr Francis Ngai - Founder and Chief Executive Officer, SVhk

Presentation and Question Sessions

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

- (a) the proposed amendments to the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP were mainly related to: (a) zoning of the area covered by the URA Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street DSP and rezoning of the Wing Lee Street area; (b) rezoning of a site at 70-72 Staunton Street (i.e. Centre Point) to reflect the existing development; and (c) rezoning of a site at Tak Sing Lane to take

forward the decision of the Committee on s.12A application No. Y/H3/6;

URA Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Area - Amendment Items A1 to A7

Background

- (b) the redevelopment project of Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Development Scheme (H19) was first proposed by URA in 2003, comprising three sites (i.e. Sites A, B and C) zoned “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”). Site A (i.e. the tenement buildings at Wing Lee Street and the Bridges Street Market) was excised from the DSP on 8.7.2011 and the Wing Lee Street area and the Bridges Street Market site were then designated as “CDA” and “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Historical Site Preserved for Cultural and Recreational Uses” zones respectively on the OZP;
- (c) following the announcement in the 2018 Policy Address, a revitalisation proposal for the URA-owned properties in the DSP area was submitted by URA on 5.3.2019, and an updated one on 12.7.2019 having considered the findings of the Community Making Study (CMS) which had incorporated the local comments. The Central & Western District Council (C&WDC) was consulted on 4.7.2019 and its members in general welcomed the findings;
- (d) in view of the latest intention to revitalise the area instead of a comprehensive redevelopment as envisaged in the approved DSP, URA considered that the project was no longer possible to be implemented by way of a development scheme under section 25 of the URA Ordinance;

Proposed Amendments to Matters shown on the OZP

- (e) Amendment Item A1 (about 2,034m²) – incorporation of the area covered by the approved URA Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street DSP No. S/H3/URA1/4 into the OZP;

- (f) Amendment Item A2 (about 452m²) – zoning of the site at 4-10 Shing Wong Street, 16 Wa In Fong East and a portion of Wa In Fong West as “OU” annotated “Cultural, Community, Commercial and Open Space Uses” (“OU(Cultural, Community, Commercial and Open Space Uses)”), with stipulation of a building height restriction (BHR) of four storeys, provision of a public open space (POS) of not less than 135m², of which 90m² would be at-grade, and not less than 50% of the total gross floor area (GFA) of the future development should be for cultural and community uses;

- (g) Amendment Item A3 (about 824m²) – zoning of the sites at 60-66 Staunton Street, 88-90 Staunton Street, 2-2A Shing Wong Street, 2-10 Wa In Fong West and a portion of Wa In Fong West and Chung Wo Lane as “OU” annotated “Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses” (“OU(Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses)”) and stipulation of a BHR of four storeys;

- (h) Amendment Item A4 (about 699m²) – rezoning of the site at 1-12 Wing Lee Street and 17-19 Shing Wong Street from “CDA” to “OU(Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses)” and stipulation of a BHR of four storeys;

- (i) Amendment Item A5 (about 669m²) – zoning of the sites at 8 and 13 Wa In Fong East, 4-6 Chung Wo Lane, Chung Wo Lane Sitting-out Area, the government land adjacent to 6 Chung Wo Lane and a portion of Wa In Fong East and Chung Wo Lane as “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) with a maximum plot ratio of 5 and BHR of 12 storeys;

- (j) Amendment Item A6 (about 22m²) – zoning of the strip of land near 13 Wa In Fong East as “Residential (Group A)25” (“R(A)25”) and stipulation of a BHR of 150mPD to reflect the area within the private lots of Centre Point which was proposed to be rezoned as the same “R(A)25” zone;

- (k) Amendment Item A7 (about 29m²) – zoning of the strip of land near Chung Wo Lane as “R(A)” and stipulation of a BHR of 150mPD to reflect the area within the same private lot of the adjacent pedestrian lane currently zoned “R(A)” with the same BHR;

70-72 Staunton Street - Amendment Item B

Background

- (l) the proposed OZP amendment was to reflect the existing development on the site;

Proposed Amendment to Matters shown on the OZP

- (m) Amendment Item B (about 797m²) – rezoning of the site comprising Centre Point from “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) and “R(A)” to “R(A)25” and stipulation of a BHR of 150mPD, a maximum GFA of 8,265m² and provision of a POS of not less than 712m²;

1-7 Tak Sing Lane, Sai Ying Pun - Amendment Items C1 to C4

Background

- (n) on 17.4.2015, the Committee decided not to agree with s.12A rezoning application No. Y/H3/6 for the site and a judicial review (JR) application against the decision was lodged by the applicant. On 12.1.2018, the Court of First Instance handed down the Judgment allowing the JR and quashed the decision of the Committee. On 18.1.2019, the Committee reconsidered the application with further information submitted by the applicant, and decided to partially agree with the application by rezoning the site to an appropriate sub-zone of “R(A)” with stipulation of a BHR of 120mPD and the requirement for provision of a 24-hour public access through the site on the OZP;

Proposed Amendments to Matters shown on the OZP

- (o) Amendment Item C1 (about 401m²) – rezoning of the site at 1-7 Tak Sing Lane from “Open Space” (“O”), “R(A)8” and area shown as ‘Pedestrian Precinct/Street’ (‘PPS’) to “R(A)24” with stipulation of a BHR restriction of 120mPD and requirement for the provision of a 24-hour public passageway;
- (p) Amendment Item C2 (about 176m²) – rezoning of Tak Sing Lane from “O” to an area shown as ‘PPS’ to retain the remaining part of Tak Sing Lane as a public passageway;
- (q) Amendment Item C3 (about 61m²) – rezoning of a strip of land at Third Street from “R(A)8” to an area shown as ‘PPS’ to reflect the existing use of the concerned area;
- (r) Amendment Item C4 (about 58m²) – rezoning of a portion of the site at 83 Third Street from an area shown as ‘PPS’ to “R(A)8” and stipulation of a BHR of 120mPD to reflect the existing use of the concerned area;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes and Explanatory Statement of the OZP

- (s) corresponding revisions to the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) had been made to take into account the proposed amendments and to follow the revised Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans promulgated by the Board; and

Public Consultation

- (t) C&WDC would be consulted on the amendments prior to or during the exhibition period of the draft OZP depending on the meeting schedule of C&WDC.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai arrived to join the meeting during the presentation.]

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Messrs Wilfred Au and Francis Ngai, representatives of URA and SVhk, made the following main points in relation to URA's revitalization project:

- (a) there was strong local objection to the redevelopment project of Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Development Scheme in the past. The 2018 Policy Address announced that the area would be revitalized, instead of redeveloped, by URA and the emphasis was on place making and synergy with nearby revitalization projects, such as Former Police Married Quarters (PMQ) and Hong Kong News-Expo;
- (b) revitalization of the neighbourhood in the area would be the target for the current project, which was different from other URA projects in the past. The community making process mainly adopted bottom-up approach to gauge community aspirations, while observing the statutory procedures under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance);
- (c) CMS was conducted between January and May 2019 to understand the needs and aspirations of local community stakeholders, such as local residents, nearby schools, pedestrians, C&WDC members and concerned non-governmental organizations (NGOs) towards the future development of this neighbourhood including the proposed revitalization project;
- (d) four visions (Knowledge Common, Impact Common, Community Common and Wellness Common) and six directions including collaboration with community stakeholders to further explore community making, had been recommended by CMS for urban renewal of the study area;
- (e) for the existing residential properties owned by URA in the area, the residential use would be retained and some properties would be renovated or refurbished for provision of co-living spaces and some were for transitional housing with collaboration of the Hong Kong Council of Social

Service; and

- (f) regarding the concept of the proposed Community Hub to be built at the vacant site at 4-10 Shing Wong Street, there was no development scheme at the moment, and the detailed proposal would later be formulated based on the four visions and six directions and further design development to cater for cultural and community use.

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

Amendment Items A1 to A7

Place making and community making

- 12. Some Members raised the following questions:
 - (a) the definitions of place making and community making; and
 - (b) how place and community making could be achieved noting that there was no detail in URA's revitalization proposal, and how the OZP amendments could help facilitate the place and community making processes.

- 13. Messrs Wilfred Au and Francis Ngai made the following responses:
 - (a) URA was still acquiring experience on place and community making. Notwithstanding that, the idea of place making had been explored in the past two years at URA's projects at Graham Street (H18), H6 CONET at The Centre and Central Market. Place making focused on hardware elements, e.g. landscape. Community making focused on "life-scape" and human-centric elements, and it referred to the process where local stakeholders were actively engaged and their needs and perspectives embedded into the overall design including hardware facilities provided by URA; and

- (b) URA had been in liaison with the operators of the nearby revitalisation projects such as Hong Kong News-Expo with a view to formulating further ideas for community making and place making for the neighbourhood in the area. On the other hand, URA would also pay attention to the comments/views raised in the representations on the subject OZP later.

14. A Member expressed disappointment that there was no discussion on the target group of the community making process and considered that the historical, traditional and interpersonal relationships of the local community should be taken into account. In response, Mr Francis Ngai said that different stakeholders were involved in the community making process including organizers for traditional local activities such as Yu Lan Ghost Festival. Their views would be incorporated to support the ideation of community initiatives to reconnect and preserve the neighbourhood's rich cultural heritage.

Stepped street, public realm and green neighbourhood

15. Some Members raised the following questions/suggestions:
- (a) how the planning, design and enhancement works of Shing Wong Street, which was a stepped street, would facilitate the community making process;
 - (b) reasons for failure to reach consensus on the future use of the vacant site at 4-10 Shing Wong Street;
 - (c) how the concept of three-dimensional space could be used to explore the interfaces between the revitalization project, public realm and the high-rise developments in the vicinity in respect of the area along Shing Wong Street;
 - (d) how green neighbourhood, i.e. green spaces between buildings, could be achieved; and

- (e) the implementation of barrier-free access within the proposed revitalization project given that the revitalization project was located on sloping ground with a number of internal stepped streets.

16. Messrs Wilfred Au and Francis Ngai made the following responses:

- (a) Shing Wong Street formed part of the urban fabric and served as a resting point between Caine Road and Hollywood Road. It would be necessary to discuss with stakeholders regarding its future use, design and interface with URA's project. Nonetheless, not less than 50% of the total floor space of the proposed Community Hub would be reserved for cultural and community uses;
- (b) there were diverse views on whether the existing trees at the vacant site should be retained or removed for providing more floor space for future uses. Nonetheless, URA was committed to preserve the trees as far as possible subject to the findings of the tree survey and future design of non-domestic hub. The paving of anti-slippery emery coating on the steps along Shing Wong Street by the Highways Department also aroused strong local objections;
- (c) activities and shared space to be organized / provided in the proposed Community Hub for the local residents / pedestrians would help the revitalization project to interface with the existing developments in the vicinity. While there was no development scheme yet, the issues of interface and green neighbourhood could be further explored at the architectural design stage; and
- (d) a lift had been built at Hong Kong News-Expo to provide barrier-free access to Shing Wong Street which was in close proximity to the proposed Community Hub. Another barrier-free lift was also provided from Centre Point to 8 Wa In Fong East. Given the proposed Community Hub would also be barrier-free, it could help link up the northern and southern portions of the revitalization area.

Proposed uses

17. The Vice-chairman and a Member raised the following questions:
- (a) how the “non-SOHO” development approach for minimizing nuisance to the revitalization area could be implemented if ‘Eating Place’ was a use always permitted on the ground floor of the URA-owned properties or whether there would be any restriction on the type of ‘Eating Place; and
 - (b) differences between transitional housing and co-living spaces.
18. Messrs Louis K.H. Kau, Wilfred Au and Francis Ngai made the following responses:
- (a) ‘Eating Place’ was a Column 1 use which was always permitted within the proposed “OU(Cultural, Community, Commercial and Open Space Uses)” zone and on ground floor only at the “OU(Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses)” zone;
 - (b) while URA committed that no selling of alcohol would be allowed at URA-owned properties, the type of ‘Eating Place’ to be allowed had yet to be determined; and
 - (c) the objectives of the transitional housing and co-living spaces were different. Transitional housing would be provided on a temporary basis in collaboration with the Hong Kong Council of Social Service at URA-owned properties at Staunton Street for low-income families in need. Co-living space, which was yet to be implemented, was put forward by URA to promote and explore the concept of co-living, which might set a precedent for other districts.

Heritage aspect

19. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Louis K.H. Kau illustrated the locations of the heritage buildings in the vicinity of the revitalization project, including PMQ at Hollywood Road, the ex-Bridges Street Market (Hong Kong News-Expo) and the YMCA at Bridges Street, and Kam Tong Hall (Dr Sun Yat-sen Museum) to the further south. The stepped street at Shing Wong Street was pending for grading assessment by the Antiquities Advisory Board. A Member said that the nearby heritage revitalization projects should also be taken into account during the community making process, whereas another Member was of the view that the subject revitalization proposal could be complementary to nearby heritage revitalization projects.

Population and provision of GIC facilities

20. The Chairman and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the current population within the revitalization area and age distribution;
- (b) whether the provision of social welfare facilities was sufficient in the area;
and
- (c) whether social welfare facilities were permitted uses within the proposed revitalization scheme.

21. Mr Louis K.H. Kau made the following responses:

- (a) he had no information at hand regarding the population in the area. Notwithstanding that, the URA owned properties at Wing Lee Street were currently used by NGOs to provide rental accommodation under 'Light Home' scheme or transitional housing to their clientele;
- (b) referring to Attachment VII of the Paper, there was a shortfall of hospital beds within the OZP area but it could be addressed by the surplus provision of hospital beds in the Southern District which was within the same

hospital cluster. There would be shortfalls of 547 places and 167 beds for community care services and residential care homes for the elderly respectively. In the long term, the actual provision of these facilities would be subject to the consideration of the Social Welfare Department during the planning and development process as appropriate; and

- (c) 'Social Welfare Facility' was a Column 1 use always permitted within the proposed "OU(Cultural, Community, Commercial and Open Space Uses)" and "OU(Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses)" zones. A Neighbourhood Elderly Centre sub-base would be provided at the URA Queen's Road West / In Ku Lane Development Scheme site.

22. Mr Wilfred Au supplemented that about 20% of the population in the area were the elderly with reference to the 2016 By-census. While no less than 50% of the total GFA in the proposed Community Hub would be used for cultural and community uses, the exact level of GIC provision would be subject to the views of the relevant government departments and the local community.

Proposed BHR for Amendment Item A4

23. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the BH profile for the surrounding area of the proposed revitalization scheme; and
- (b) the rationale for the proposed BHR of four storeys for Amendment Item A4.

24. Mr Louis K.H. Kau made the following responses:

- (a) owing to the topography of the area, the BH bands increased progressively uphill with a stepped height profile. The surrounding area was predominantly occupied by high-rise residential developments within "R(A)" zone. The BHRs for "R(A)" zone along Hollywood Road and

Bridges Street were about 120-130mPD and 150-160mPD respectively and more than 160mPD to the south of Caine Road; and

- (b) the site of Amendment Item A4 was vacant and a BHR of four storeys was recommended given the existing buildings on Wing Lee Street and within the proposed revitalization area were predominantly four-storey high or less. Taking into account the BH of Koon Nam House to the immediate south-west was five storeys (75mPD) and the average 4m floor-to-floor height for residential use, the maximum BH of future development at the site (i.e. 16m) was equivalent to about 70mPD. A minor relaxation of BHR clause had also been recommended in the Notes for the proposed “OU(Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses)” zone.

25. Mr Wilfred Au supplemented that while the BHR of four storeys was not proposed by URA, it was in line with the indicative massing of the proposed Community Hub with POS submitted in March 2019. However, this indicative design notion was outdated and yet to be determined via community making processes.

26. Noting that the BHR for the surrounding residential developments varied from 120-160mPD and the current shortfall of social welfare facilities in the area, a Member asked whether new structures could be built on top of the existing tenement buildings in the revitalization area for providing more floor spaces for social welfare facilities while retaining the building facades. The Member also asked if any air ventilation assessment (AVA) was conducted.

27. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that while no AVA had been conducted for the current revitalization scheme, it should be noted that no adverse air ventilation impact was anticipated with reference to the previous redevelopment scheme with a higher BH of about 20 storeys proposed by URA.

28. Mr Wilfred Au supplemented that the technical feasibility of the proposed additional structures on top of the existing tenement buildings was yet to be ascertained by any technical assessment.

29. In view of the scarce land resources in the territory and the local need for GIC facilities in particular elderly facilities, a Member had reservation on the proposed BHR as it would pose restrictions for providing more GIC facilities. The Member suggested that the proposed BHR of four storeys could be more lenient to allow flexibility for creation of more floor spaces to provide facilities to meet local needs, as well as to facilitate place and community making. Noting that the BHR for the surrounding developments were imposed in terms of mPD and with reference to the estimated BH of future development at the site based on URA's indicative scheme submitted in March 2019, a Member suggested to impose a BHR of 70mPD for the site.

30. In view of absence of a concrete/detailed development scheme by URA, some Members concurred with the view that more flexibility should be allowed for creation of more floor spaces to meet local needs.

31. Noting that the BHR for the subject site of Amendment Item A5, which was proposed to be zoned as "R(C)", was 12 storeys, a Member suggested the same BHR could be imposed for Amendment Item A4.

32. Members noted that BHR in terms of number of storey, instead of mPD, was proposed by PlanD taking into account the special circumstances of the varied heights of the existing buildings on a sloping ground and the intention to maintain the low-rise character while keeping a stepped BH profile. BHR in terms of number of storeys would also allow flexibility as there was no restriction on the floor-to-floor height.

Conclusion

33. Members in general supported URA's visions/directions for the proposed revitalization project and appreciated the emphasis on community and place making. There were diverse views regarding the proposed BHR for Amendment Item A4. Members cast a vote on three options: (i) four storeys (as recommended by PlanD); (ii) 70mPD (equivalent to about four storeys at the subject site); and (iii) 12 storeys (with reference to the BHR of the adjoining site for Amendment Item A5 proposed to be zoned as "R(C)"). Members in the majority were in support of option (i), and agreed to impose a BHR of four storeys for the subject site of Amendment Item A4 as recommended in the Paper. Members also agreed to

Amendment Items A1 to A3 and A5 to A7.

Amendment Item B

34. Noting that the site was originally zoned “R(A)” and “R(C)” and the development parameters of the existing residential development exceeded those stipulated under “R(C)” zone on the OZP, a Member enquired whether the subject site was involved in any planning application. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that the site was the subject of planning applications for residential development approved in 1998, 2002 and 2009 respectively and the development was completed in 2011 in accordance with the approved scheme. Members agreed to Amendment Item B.

Amendment Items C1 to C4

35. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that in January 2019, the Committee decided to partially agree to the rezoning application (No. Y/H3/6), i.e. by rezoning the site to an appropriate sub-zone of “R(A)” with stipulation of a maximum BHR of 120mPD and the requirement for provision of a 24-hour public access through the site on the OZP. Members agreed to Amendment Items C1 to C4.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join the meeting during the discussion.]

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

36. Members had no comment on the proposed amendments to the Notes and ES of the OZP.

37. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

“(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/32 and that the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/32A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/H3/33 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for exhibition under section 7 of the Ordinance; and

- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/32A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and agree that the revised ES is suitable for publication together with the OZP.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, Ms Natalie L.Y. Luk, TP/HK, Messrs Wilfred Au, Mike Kwan and Francis Ngai for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H3/441 Proposed Office, Shop and Services/Eating Place in “Residential (Group A)” Zone, 3-6 Glenealy, Central, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/441)

38. The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had declared interest on the item for being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which was having current business dealings with KTA.

39. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that Mr Daniel K.S. Lau could stay in the meeting as he had no involvement in the application.

40. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 12.7.2019 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to demonstrate the feasibility and enforceability of the proposed pedestrian enhancement scheme. 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 further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

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

Agenda Item 6

Further Consideration of 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, Wong Chuk Hang, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/280A)

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

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

44. The Secretary also reported that a letter from a Southern District Council member was received on 17.7.2019, expressing, among others, dissatisfaction that his public comment on the application had not been truly reflected in the Paper and making suggestion that the recommended advisory clause on the implementation of the “School Bus Policy” should be made an approval condition. According to the Town Planning Ordinance, as the letter was submitted after the statutory publication period, it should be treated as not having been made. Nevertheless, his previous comment on the application had already been attached to the Paper.

Presentation and Question Sessions

45. 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) the proposed minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction from 80mPD to 91mPD for permitted school use. As the existing BH of the school was at 86mPD, the proposed increase in BH was about 5m;
- (b) background to the application – during the consideration of the application on 17.5.2019, the Committee decided to defer making a decision on the application as Members generally considered that more information from the applicant regarding the justification for the proposed floor-to-floor height of 5m for the new additional storey and the use of free-up floor spaces upon restructuring of the existing facilities should be provided to facilitate the Committee’s further consideration of the application;
- (c) on 31.5.2019, 12.7.2019 and 16.7.2019, the applicant submitted further information (FI) in response to the Committee’s concerns and departmental comments. Details of the applicant’s FIs were set out in paragraph 2 and F-Appendices III, IV and V of the Paper;

- (d) departmental comments – departmental comments on the FIs were set out in paragraph 3 of the Paper. Local views conveyed by the District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department were set out in paragraph 3.1.5 of the Paper. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD maintained its previous view of having no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 4 of the Paper. The proposed floor-to-floor height of 5m would consist of 0.5m for a raised transfer structure, 0.5m concrete structure, 0.2m for installation of finishing materials and 3.8m as effective floor height for the staff office. Concerned government departments had no adverse comment on the proposed floor-to-floor height of 5m from building structure and architectural perspectives, the consolidation of administration and management staff into a single area (about 261m²) at the new additional storey and the use of free-up space upon restructuring of the existing facilities. In view of the above, the planning considerations and assessments as set out in paragraph 10 of F-Appendix I were still valid.

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 19.7.2023, 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 fire fighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 7

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 Lots 427 and 428)

(MPC Paper No. A/H19/78B)

48. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Rostar Company Limited. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared interest on the item as his firm was having current business dealings with the applicant.

49. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

50. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 5.7.2019 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had liaised with concerned government departments on traffic-related issues.

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

preparation of submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K14/773 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Non-polluting Industrial Use (excluding Industrial Undertakings involving the Use/Storage of Dangerous Goods) and Eating Place (Canteen Only) Use in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 82 Hung To Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon (MPC Paper No. A/K14/773)

52. The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA), T.K. Tsui & Associates Limited (TKT) and AIM Group Limited (AIM) were three 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 was having current business dealings with KTA; and

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with TKT and AIM.

53. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

54. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 8.7.2019 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the

applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

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

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K22/24 Proposed Comprehensive Development for Office, Hotel, Shop and Services, Eating Place and Public Transport Terminus in "Comprehensive Development Area (1)" and "Open Space" Zones, New Kowloon Inland Lot 6556, Muk Yuen Street, Kai Tak, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K22/24)

56. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Rich Union Development Limited, which was a subsidiary of Nan Fung Development Limited (NFD), with Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup), Urbis Limited (Urbis) and Ronald Lu & Partners (HK) Limited (RLP) as 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 RLP; and his firm having current business dealings with NFD and Urbis;
-------------------	---

- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with Arup and Urbis; and
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with Arup, Urbis and RLP.

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

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed comprehensive development for office, hotel, shop and services, eating place and public transport terminus;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 and Appendix III 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, 11 public comments were received from individuals, with eight supporting the application and the remaining three raising concerns/views on the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was in line with the planning intention of the “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zone and in general complied with the planning and development requirements in the endorsed Planning Brief. The building disposition and broad internal layouts of the current scheme largely followed the approved Master Layout Plan of the previous

application (No. A/K22/20), except a hotel with a gross floor area (GFA) of 5,500m² and 73 guestrooms was proposed at the medium-rise portion of the Main Block. The major development parameters of the proposed development, including the total GFA/plot ratio, site coverage and building heights, remained unchanged. Significant adverse impacts from the proposed development were not anticipated. The same approval conditions of the previous application had been recommended for the subject application. Regarding the concerns/views raised in public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

59. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr K.K. Lee, STP/K, said that it was due to the change in the GFA of 5,500m² from office to hotel use, the number of car parking, loading/unloading spaces and lay-bys for the proposed development had been adjusted in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines.

Deliberation Session

60. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application and the Master Layout Plan under sections 4A and 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 19.7.2023, 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 submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan, taking into account the approval conditions (b) to (h) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a revised Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of a revised Traffic Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;

- (d) the design and provision of vehicular access, parking spaces, loading/unloading facilities and the public transport terminus to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (e) the design and provision of 24-hour public passageways in the proposed development to connect with the surrounding developments, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (f) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (g) the implementation of sewerage facilities identified in the revised SIA to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (h) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (i) the submission of a Glare Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Architectural Services or of the TPB.”

61. 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 K.K. Lee, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 10

Any Other Business

62. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 11:50 a.m..