

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 644th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 6.3.2020

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 Thomas O.S. Ho

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

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

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

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 Alex T.H. Lai

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Lily Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

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

Agenda Item 1

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

1. The Secretary reported the following:
 - (a) the regular MPC meetings originally scheduled for 7.2.2020 and 21.2.2020 had been rescheduled in light of the novel coronavirus infection and the special work arrangement for government departments;
 - (b) Members agreed on 6.2.2020 and 17.2.2020 by circulation to adjourn the consideration of one s.12A application (No. Y/K9/12) under section 12A(20) of the Town Planning Ordinance, and to defer consideration of 14 s.16 applications (No. A/K20/132, A/K3/582, A/KC/457, A/KC/463, A/KC/466, A/H6/89, A/H24/25, A/H9/80, A/TWW/116, A/K5/815, A/K13/313, A/K13/316, A/K14/781, A/K14/782) to another date. The respective applicants/agents of the applicants had been informed of the MPC's decision, and the meeting date(s) would be fixed later to consider the applications; and
 - (c) the draft minutes of the 643rd MPC meeting was confirmed by circulation on 6.2.2020 without amendments.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 2

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/K9/13 Application for Amendment to the Approved Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/26, To rezone the application site from “Residential (Group A) 4” to “Residential (Group A) 7”, 34-42B Baker Street, Hung Hom, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. Y/K9/13A)

2. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Hung Hom and the application was for rezoning the site from “Residential (Group A)4” to “Residential (Group A)7” with ‘columbarium’ as a Column 2 use. Cham & Co. Solicitors (CCS) was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang (<i>the Vice-chairman</i>)	}	being a member of the Private Columbaria Appeal Board (PCAB);
Mr Sunny L.K. Ho		
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	-	his firm having current business dealings with CCS; and
Mr Stanley T.S. Choi	-	owning a flat in Hung Hom.

3. The Committee noted that Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the interests of Messrs Lincoln L.H. Huang and Sunny L.K. Ho in relation to PCAB were indirect, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

4. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 24.2.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for 2.5 months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from the Transport Department.

It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information.

5. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant for two months instead of 2.5 months sought pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for the preparation of the further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K3/583 Proposed Petrol Filling Station at Ground Floor of a Permitted Office/Commercial Redevelopment in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone, 3 Sham Mong Road, Tai Kok Tsui, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K3/583A)

6. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Lindenford Ltd. (Lindenford). Townland Consultants Ltd. (Townland), AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM) and MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with Lindenford, Townland, AECOM and MVA;

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with MVA and AECOM and past business dealings with Townland; and
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with AECOM and MVA.

7. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

8. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 21.2.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including responses to departmental comments and revised technical assessments.

9. 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.

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

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

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/813 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Office, Shop and Services, and Eating Place Uses in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 822 Lai Chi Kok Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/813A)

10. The Committee noted that six replacement pages (P.9 of the Paper and Appendix II) rectifying editorial errors were tabled for Members’ reference.

11. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Glory View Properties Ltd, which was a subsidiary of Hang Lung Group Ltd. (HLG). Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

12. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) and building height (BH) restrictions for permitted office, shop and services and eating place uses;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, a total of 76 public comments were received, including 42 supporting comments from a property management company and individuals and 34 objecting comments from a District Council Member, the Banyan Garden Concern Group and individuals. 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 redevelopment was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone and the transformation taking place in the Cheung Sha Wan Industrial/Business Area (CSWIBA) from industrial to business/commercial uses. The proposed minor relaxation of PR generally followed the policy on revitalisation of pre-1987 industrial buildings, and the Development Bureau gave policy support to the current application. The Commissioner for Transport had no in-principle objection to the traffic impact assessment submitted by the applicant, and other relevant government departments had no adverse comments on the application. The proposed scheme generally met the criteria for considering application for minor relaxation of BH restriction. On planning and design merits, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, PlanD considered that the proposed setbacks and greenery would help enhancing the pedestrian environment and visual amenity along the building frontage. On the public concerns relating to glare and light pollution, the applicant proposed green building design

measures to reduce light pollution and glare to the surrounding areas. Regarding the adverse public comments on traffic, environmental, visual and air ventilation impacts, comments of concerned departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

14. Some Members raised the following enquiries:

Accessibility

- (a) the public transport serving the application site and the adjacent area, including the nearby residential cluster to the south across Lai Chi Kok Road;
- (b) pedestrian connectivity between the CSWIBA and the residential area to the south of the application site;

Building Setbacks

- (c) whether the applicant had any proposals in the setback area (e.g. provision of canopy along the pedestrian walkway) to provide 'better streetscape/good quality street level public urban space' as stated in the submission;
- (d) whether there was any plan to enhance the pedestrian environment connecting the stairway of the nearby footbridge to the proposed setback area;
- (e) the bonus plot ratio to be claimed by surrendering the setback area and the relevant control;

Green Features

- (f) apart from complying with the Overall Building (Energy Efficiency) Regulation and the Building Energy Code in promoting energy efficiency as stated in para. 2.10 of the Paper, whether there were other measures proposed by the applicant in terms of green building design;
- (g) whether the refuge floor was proposed on a voluntary basis;
- (h) whether the proposed flat roof with greenery on 3/F of the proposed development would be accessible by the public;
- (i) any assessment on the improvement of the at-grade microclimate as claimed by the applicant;

Others

- (j) the car parking provision in the proposed development;
- (k) the distance between the application site and the residential cluster to the south and the concern on the glare and light impacts as raised in the public comments; and
- (l) whether the residential cluster to the south of the application site was affected by traffic noise problem from the West Kowloon Corridor (WKC).

15. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

Accessibility

- (a) the area was served by various public transport. The application site was located close to the exit of the Lai Chi Kok MTR Station at Cheung Lai Street. While bus stops were mostly located along Cheung Sha Wan Road, a Public Transport Interchange was located at the nearby Cheung Sha Wan

Plaza with bus and minibus services to various destinations in the territory;

- (b) the Lai Chi Kok MTR station was connected to the commercial podium of the residential cluster located to the south of the application site by a subway. There were also an at-grade crossing underneath WKC and a pedestrian footbridge across Lai Chi Kok Road which provided options for pedestrian circulation;

Building Setbacks

- (c) other measures like installation of canopy to provide shelter along the 3.5m building setbacks would have implications on GFA calculations. The details of the treatment or any enhancement measures at the setback area would have to be further liaised with Buildings Department (BD) and Lands Department (LandsD) during General Building Plans (GBPs) submission and lease modification stage;
- (d) while the setback area would usually be paved by the developer of the respective lot, treatments including landscaping and installation of street furniture at setback areas were subject to views from relevant departments including BD, LandsD, TD and Highways Department;
- (e) the proposed bonus PR of 0.983 intended to be claimed by the applicant relating to the surrender of 3.5m building setback would be subject to the provision under section 22 of Building (Planning) Regulations and approval by the Building Authority during the GBPs submission stage;

Green Features

- (f) regarding the provision for green building design, the applicant had conveyed that the proposed development would be submitted for BEAM Plus Green Building Certification, but the applicant had not indicated under which performance classification the application would be submitted;

- (g) the refuge floor was proposed to comply with the fire safety requirements of BD. According to the applicant, a sky garden cum refuge floor design was adopted for enhancing building permeability, facilitating natural ventilation and providing social gathering place for users of the proposed development;
- (h) the flat roof on 3/F with greenery would not be opened to public;
- (i) no simulation or technical assessments had been submitted by the applicant regarding at-grade microclimate condition;

Others

- (j) the proposed car parking provision complied with the requirements set out in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), and that the applicant had already adopted the ‘high end’ of the required range of provision. Taking into account the proposed setback and the site constraints, it would be difficult for the applicant to provide more car parking spaces noting that a 4-storey basement carpark had already been proposed;
- (k) the distance from the residential cluster to the application site was more than 45.5m. The design of the proposed scheme would comply with the Practice Notes for Authorized Persons (PNAP) No. APP-2 in relation to the external reflectance of the glass used in the building, and would be subject to the approval of the BD at the GBPs submission stage; and
- (l) the residential cluster to the south of the application site was previously zoned “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”), and its development required permission from the Town Planning Board (TPB). Under the approved application, various technical assessments, including noise impact assessments, had been conducted and relevant government departments had no adverse comments on or objection to the development. After the completion of the development, the site was re-zoned to “Residential

(Group A)” to reflect the existing use.

[Mr Franklin Yu left the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

16. While Members in general had no objection to the application, some Members raised the following main points:

- (a) the proposed setback area along Lai Chi Kok Road was rather barren and the pedestrian environment was not pleasant. Should the walking environment of the footpath in the proposed building setback area be enhanced, more users would be attracted to use the footbridge across Lai Chi Kok Road, thereby enhancing the connectivity of the area and making the street life more vibrant;
- (b) the widened footpath incorporating the proposed 3.5m building setback at Lai Chi Kok Road and Cheung Lai Street was large in size, and there should be clear direction/overall plan to guide the future use and management of the area. The Government could explore ways to ensure the future enhancement of the widened footpath so that the space could be better utilised and bring benefit to the public; and
- (c) it would be more desirable to propose building setback along Cheung Yee Street to the north of the site as there was more pedestrian flow at Cheung Yee Street.

17. A Member said that while the proposed scheme was considered acceptable, design merits in the scheme were mostly outcomes of fulfillment of statutory and government requirements (e.g. provision of refuge floor and proposed building setback in accordance with the Outline Development Plan (ODP)). The Member considered that more planning gains should be provided to justify the additional BH of 5.7m. Another Member shared similar views and expressed that the proposed planning gains such as the sky garden could only be enjoyed by the tenants/visitors of the development but not the public. Efforts could be made

to provide more improvements at street level since measures like vertical greening could not bring much benefits to the public apart from providing visual relief.

18. A Member remarked that the developer of the proposed development had already fulfilled all the criteria and statutory requirements in applying for minor relaxation of PR and BH restrictions. In view of the relevant security and management consideration, it might not be possible for the developer to allow public access to the sky garden. Furthermore, requesting the owner of individual lots to contribute to improving the walking environment at the setback area would not be effective in the absence of a comprehensive framework. A comprehensive framework of such, if available, could shed light for the Committee's future consideration of similar applications and bring more benefits to the area as a whole.

19. Members noted that while the refuge floor, in general, was provided to meet the fire safety requirements of BD, planters were usually added to enhance the space for the enjoyment of the tenants/visitors of the development.

20. In response to a Member's enquiry regarding the noise impact of WKC on the nearby residential cluster, Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment), Environmental Protection Department, pointed out that the HKPSG had set out the required buffer distance of different types of road to the nearby uses to minimise the environmental impacts.

21. Noting some of the Members' concerns on the at-grade crossing across Lai Chi Kok Road, connectivity of the area as well as treatment of the surrendered setback area, Mr Michael H.S. Law, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), TD, at the invitation of the Chairman, made the following main points:

- (a) TD would further discuss with the developer at a later stage on the treatment of the surrendered building setback area;
- (b) while providing more tree planting might help create a more pleasant walking environment, the underground utility installation should be taken into account in considering its feasibility; and

- (c) TD would keep in view opportunities to improve the at-grade road crossing in the area taking into account future implementation of the building setback.

22. Regarding the setback requirement under ODP for the concerned section of Lai Chi Kok Road, Members noted that the whole setback area along the pavement would only be realised upon completion of the subject development as well as that of the adjacent lots. Normally the Government would request the developer of the concerned development to manage the respective building setback on a temporary basis before full implementation of building setbacks along that street block. In view of Members' concerns on the design and provision of the building setback before it was surrendered to the Government, the Chairman said that the Committee could consider including the requirement for design and provision of setbacks to the satisfaction of TD in the approval condition. Members agreed.

23. Regarding green building design, Members also agreed to advise the applicant to further explore the possibility of providing more green features and adopt BEAM Plus as a design reference for integration of green features into the proposed development.

24. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the TPB. The permission should be valid until 6.3.2024, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the design and provision of setbacks, parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces and vehicular access for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (b) the implementation of the local sewerage connection works identified in the accepted sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board.”

25. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as

set out at Appendix IV of the Paper and the following:

“ the applicant should further explore the possibility of providing more green features and adopt BEAM Plus as a design reference for integration of green features into the proposed development.”

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H14/82 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Hospital Use in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, 40 Stubbs Road, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H14/82)

26. The Secretary reported that WSP (Asia) Ltd. (WSP) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with WSP.

27. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Franklin Yu had already left the meeting.

28. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 19.2.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the departmental comments and concerns

from the neighbourhood. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H20/194 Proposed Shop and Services in "Other Specified Uses" annotated
"Business" Zone, Workshop 2A, G/F, Cheung Tat Centre, 18 Cheung
Lee Street, Chai Wan, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H20/194)

30. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Chai Wan and Mr Sunny L.K. Ho had declared an interest on the item for owning and co-owning with spouse properties in Chai Wan.

31. As the properties owned by Mr Sunny L.K. Ho and co-owned with his spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

32. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Karmin Tong, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed shop and services;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, no public comment was received; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed shop and services use was considered generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone and not incompatible with the general land use character of the surrounding area and the subject building. It generally complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D in that it would not significantly induce adverse fire safety, traffic or environmental impacts on the existing uses within the subject building and the existing developments of the adjacent area. Relevant government departments including the Fire Services Department had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The aggregate commercial area on the ground floor, including the proposed use of the application, was within the maximum permissible limit of 460m² for industrial buildings with a sprinkler system.

33. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

34. 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 6.3.2022, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the submission and implementation of fire safety measures including fire service installations, water supplies for firefighting and means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion within six months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 6.9.2020; and
- (b) if the above approval condition is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

35. 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 Karmin Tong, STP/HK for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K13/317 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Office, Shop and Services and Eating Place Uses in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, No. 20 Kai Cheung Road, Kowloon Bay, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K13/317)

36. The Secretary reported that Townland Consultants Ltd. (Townland) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup) were two 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 past business dealings with Townland;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with Townland and Arup; and
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with Arup.

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

38. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 21.2.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

39. 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 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K15/121 Proposed Residential Development in "Comprehensive Development Area (4)" Zone and an area shown as 'Road', Yau Tong Marine Lots 58, 59, 60, 61 and 62, and Adjoining Government Land, 18 Tung Yuen Street, Yau Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/121B)

40. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup) was one 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;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with Arup; and
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with Arup.

41. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Franklin Yu had already left the meeting. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the

application. As Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

42. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 26.2.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including responses to departmental comments, revised Environmental Assessment and revised architectural drawings.

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

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K22/28 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Proposed Hotel and Permitted Office and Commercial Development in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Stadium" Zone, New Kowloon Inland Lot No. 6607, Shing Kai Road, Kai Tak, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K22/28)

44. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup),

Llewelyn Davies Hong Kong Ltd. (LD) and AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

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

46. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 17.2.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 10

Any Other Business

48. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 10:30 a.m..