

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 649<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 29.5.2020**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Vice-chairman

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

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

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Mr C.H. Tse

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

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department  
Mr Gavin C.T. Tse

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

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

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

Secretary

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Ms Lily Yam

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Ryan C.K. Ho

## **Opening Remarks**

1. The Chairman said that the meeting would be conducted with video conferencing arrangement.

## **Agenda Item 1**

### **Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 648<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 15.5.2020**

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 648<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 15.5.2020 were confirmed without amendments.

## **Agenda Item 2**

### **Matters Arising**

[Open Meeting]

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

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

## **Agenda Item 3**

### **Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting]

Y/KC/15                      Application for Amendment to the Draft Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/KC/29, To rezone the application site from “Open Space” to “Government, Institution or Community”, Lot 984 RP in D.D. 450, Kwai Chung, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. Y/KC/15A)

---

4. The Secretary reported that AGC Design Limited (AGC) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest on the item as his

former firm had business dealings with AGC.

5. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

#### **Agenda Item 4**

##### **Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting]

Y/K15/5                      Application for Amendment to the Approved Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K15/25, To rezone the application site from “Comprehensive Development Area” to “Commercial (1)”, “Commercial (2)” and “Government, Institution or Community” and to amend the Notes of the “Commercial” Zone , Yau Tong Marine Lots 71, 73 and 74, New Kowloon Inland Lot 6138 and Adjoining Government Land in Yau Tong Bay, Yau Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. Y/K15/5)

---

6. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (ARUP) and ERM Hong Kong Ltd. (ERM) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Alex T.H. Lai            -    his former firm had business dealings with ARUP and ERM; and

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho        -    having current business dealings with ARUP.

7. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Thomas O.S. Ho had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K3/588                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Office and Shop and Services Uses in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 100-114 Bedford Road, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K3/588)

---

8.                      The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Mong Kok. Prime 18 Development Ltd. (Prime 18) and TKT Development Ltd. (TKT) were two of the consultants of the applicant.    The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr C.H. Tse                      -                      owning a flat in Mong Kok; and

Mr Alex T.H. Lai                      -                      his former firm had business dealings with Prime 18 and TKT.

9.                      As the property owned by Mr C.H. Tse had no direct view of the application site and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

10.                      With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Clement Miu, 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) restriction for permitted office and shop and services uses;
- (c)    departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d)    during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a total of

two public comments from a Yau Tsim Mong District Council Member and an individual were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone. The proposed minor relaxation of PR generally followed the policy on revitalisation of pre-1987 industrial buildings. The proposed design enhancements, including voluntary full-height setbacks and landscape features, could be regarded as planning and design merits attributed to the proposed development. No insurmountable traffic and environmental impacts were anticipated. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

11. Some Members raised the following questions :

- (a) why there was a difference in the proposed site coverage (SC) above 15m and below 15m;
- (b) the distribution of greenery provision in the proposed development, and whether any greenery measures were proposed in the setback area;
- (c) whether the proposed greenery ratio was a mandatory requirement for the site and what the monitoring and maintenance mechanism of the proposed greenery measures were upon completion of the development;
- (d) the overall building height (BH) of the proposed development, and whether any canopy and public utilities were proposed in the setback area;
- (e) any guidelines applicable to the parking spaces provision in the proposed development and whether high-end provision of parking spaces was

adopted in the proposal; and

- (f) whether the government encouraged site amalgamation in the redevelopment process and whether it was a material consideration in assessing the application.

12. In response, Mr Clement Miu, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed SC was in compliance with the permitted SC under the Building (Planning) Regulations;
- (b) the greenery provision of the proposed development mainly comprised a sky garden on 3/F with an area of about 116m<sup>2</sup>, flat roof with greenery area of about 80m<sup>2</sup> as well as a green wall from G/F to 3/F;
- (c) as the application site was less than 1,000m<sup>2</sup>, the requirement on greenery provision under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) was not applicable to the application site. Nonetheless, the applicant had made effort in introducing greenery provision of no less than 20% of the site area. The proposed greenery measures would be examined in the building plan submission stage, whilst the future management responsibility would rest with the developer in respect of the relevant requirements stipulated in the land lease;
- (d) the BH (at main roof level) of the proposed development was about 105.6mPD, which was in compliance with the BH restriction of 110mPD on the outline zoning plan. According to the development scheme, a canopy would be provided outside the entrance foyer on G/F;
- (e) the provision of parking spaces would be higher than the minimum requirement under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines whilst the provision of loading/unloading space would only meet the minimum requirement; and

- (f) though site amalgamation could generally provide greater flexibility and better design in the redevelopment process, it was purely a commercial decision of the developers.

[Ms. Sandy H.Y. Wong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

### Deliberation Session

13. A Member was of the view that site amalgamation could provide a better opportunity to improve the overall design of the proposed development in the redevelopment process. The same Member considered that the greenery provision of the proposed development was reasonable but it would be more desirable if the applicant could introduce greenery measures in the setback area on G/F to improve the pedestrian environment. Another Member expressed that a large canopy could be provided above the setback area to provide weather protection for pedestrians. The Chairman said that Members' views could be reflected as advisory clauses to the applicant as appropriate.

14. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether there was any incentive for the developers to amalgamate small lots for redevelopment, the Chairman said that to encourage amalgamation of sites, a higher maximum BH would be permitted for sites with an area of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more on selected statutory plans. Nonetheless, there was no such provision on the subject OZP.

15. 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 29.5.2024, 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 parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces and vehicular access for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed



development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and

- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works as identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development in condition (b) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

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

“the possibility of providing greenery measures and a canopy in the proposed setback area for enhancing the pedestrian environment should be explored.”

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

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

[Messrs Wilson Y.W. Fung and Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 6**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/KC/466                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Information Technology and Telecommunications Industries (Proposed Data Centre Development) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Nos. 2-16 Lam Tin Street, Kwai Chung, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/466A)

---

17. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (ARUP) and

Aurecon Hong Kong Ltd. (Aurecon) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item :

- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm had business dealings with ARUP and Aurecon; and
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with ARUP.

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

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) and building height (BH) restrictions for permitted information technology and telecommunications industries (proposed data centre development);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a total of five public comments objecting to the application were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone. The proposed minor relaxation of PR generally followed the policy on revitalization of pre-1987 industrial buildings, and the Development Bureau gave policy support to the application. The Office of the Government

Chief Information Officer (OGCIO) advised that the proposed floor-to-floor height of 5.5m was considered reasonable for high-tier data centre development. 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 landscape treatment would help enhancing the pedestrian environment and promoting visual interest. Relevant government departments consulted had no objection to/no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

20. Some Members raised the following enquiries:

- (a) whether the applicant had voluntarily provided setback in addition to the statutory requirements, and whether it could still be considered as having planning merit if no voluntary setback was involved in the proposed development;
- (b) whether the greenery provision was a requirement under the current policy;
- (c) details of greening measures in the proposed scheme;
- (d) example of other similar high-rise data centres, and whether the proposed floor-to-floor height of the proposed development was reasonable;
- (e) details of the energy efficiency measures to be adopted in the proposed data centre;
- (f) the major facilities that would be provided in E&M zone and raised floor;
- (g) definition of data centre and details of the supporting facilities, and whether there was concern on public health and safety arising from the proposed development; and

- (h) whether the applicant could change the proposed development to other uses under Column 1 of the “OU(B)” zone in future without seeking planning permission.

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

- (a) the applicant had made effort to comply with the outline zoning plan requirement in terms of incorporation of full-height setbacks along Chun Pin Street and Lam Tin Street, which was considered as a planning merit to cater for the long-term road widening proposal and enhance the air permeability of the area;
- (b) the requirement on greenery provision was set out in the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG). The proposed development had achieved a greenery ratio of over 20%, which complied with the SBDG for a claim of gross floor area concession;
- (c) the greenery provision would be mainly within the development site and there was constraint for the applicant to provide greenery in the proposed setback area in view of the future road widening programme;
- (d) with reference to the purposely built data centre in Kwai Chung, the typical floor-to-floor height was about 5.4m to 6m. It was considered that the proposed floor-to-floor height of 5.5m in the proposed scheme was reasonable;
- (e) in order to increase energy efficiency of the proposed data centre, window/louver openings were minimized on the façade of the development to maintain better thermal/humidity control within the building. Furthermore, greenery on flat roof could reduce heat island effect in the area;
- (f) the E&M zone mainly contained cable tray for power distribution unit as well as trunkings for various systems, including security and fire safety,

while the raised floor mainly comprised trunkings for IT rack and chilled water system;

- (g) generally, a data centre involved the accommodation of IT and telecommunications facilities and equipment, which was a critical infrastructure to facilitate digital development, such as cloud computing and big data. Regarding the concerns on public health and safety, relevant government departments consulted, including OGCIO and the Environmental Protection Department, had no objection to the application; and
- (h) should the application be approved, the applicant would need to submit general building plans in the next stage to ensure that the proposed development would follow the scheme approved under the planning application, while the proposed development could be changed to other uses under column 1 of the subject “OU(B)” zone in future without further planning permission subject to the compliance with the lease conditions and Buildings Ordinance.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join the meeting during the question and answer session.]

### Deliberation Session

22. Members generally supported the proposed data centre development. A Member, however, expressed that the proposed landscape treatments were limited and piecemeal, which would have minimal effect on enhancing the quality of the public realm at street level, and opined that there was room to improve the pedestrian environment in the proposed scheme.

23. Given the prominent portion of site as a corner site, a few Members considered that the applicant should spend more effort to improve the streetscape and greenery on G/F as well as the pedestrian environment.

24. A Member opined that the provision of more socially connected uses at street level could enhance street vibrancy and social interaction. A Member considered that the applicant could adopt a flexible design in the proposed development to cater for any further change in the use of the development. Another Member expressed concern on the potential adverse impacts on public health and safety arising from data centre development. A Member shared the experience that the high-tier data centres recently developed in Hong Kong generally adopted various energy efficient designs, which could significantly reduce energy consumption as well as the operation cost.

25. The Chairman said that more information on public health and safety aspects would be provided for Members' reference when considering similar applications, including data centre development, in future. Site visit for data centre development would be arranged for interested Members in due course.

26. 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 29.5.2024, 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 parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces and vehicular access for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and implementation of traffic measures as proposed by the applicant prior to occupation of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (d) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the updated Sewerage Impact Assessment in (c) above

to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and

- (e) the submission of land contamination assessments in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to development of the Site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB.”

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

‘the possibility of improving the streetscape and greenery on G/F for enhancing the pedestrian environment should be explored.’

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

### **Agenda Item 7**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/512                      Proposed Columbarium in “Government, Institution or Community (6)”  
Zone, Tung Lum Nien Fah Tong (Block 7 & Block 8), No. 29 Tung Lam  
Terrace, Lo Wai, Tsuen Wan, New Territories (Lot 1233 R.P. (Part) in  
D.D. 453)  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/512A)

---

28. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan. Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had declared an interest as his spouse was a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan.

29. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi’s spouse did not have a direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting

30. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 13.5.2020 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

31. 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 Ng Kar Shu, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 8**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TW/514                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Industrial Use in "Industrial" Zone, Tsuen Wan Town Lot 85 and Lot 486 in D.D. 443, Fui Yiu Kok Street, Tsuen Wan, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/514)

---

32. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan. Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTA) and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Ltd. (MMHK) 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 Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho his firm having current business dealings with MMHK;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm had business dealings with MMHK; and
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan.

33. As Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau, Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, and the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi's spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

34. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Kar Shu, 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) restriction for permitted industrial use;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, 15 supporting comments from individuals and 4 objecting comments from the representative of Indi Home Owners' Corporation and an individual were received; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the

application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Industrial” zone. The proposed minor relaxation of PR generally followed the policy on revitalization of pre-1987 industrial buildings, and the Development Bureau gave policy support to the current application. On planning and design merits, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, PlanD considered that the proposed setback and landscape treatment would enhance the pedestrian environment. Relevant government departments consulted had no objection to/no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

35. Two Member raised the following questions:

- (a) how the podium garden could facilitate wind penetration and improve micro-climate environment as well as thermal comfort at pedestrian level of Fui Yiu Kok Street;
- (b) noting that there was no statutory requirement for building setback at the site, whether there was an administrative plan to require building setback on the same street; and
- (c) whether the proposed development would be in compliance with the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG).

36. In response, Mr Ng Kar Shu, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the applicant’s submission, the proposed podium garden would be open on both sides, together with the provision of vertical greening, building setback and continuous glass canopy along the frontage, the pedestrian environment could be improved;
- (b) there was no building setback requirement on the outline development plan

covering the Tsuen Wan East Industrial Area; and

- (c) as the site area of the application site was less than 1,000m<sup>2</sup>, compliance with the SBDG was not applicable. Nonetheless, the applicant had made effort to introduce various building design and landscape measures to improve the proposed scheme.

### Deliberation Session

37. Noting that the site area was relatively small, a Member appreciated that the applicant had spent effort to provide building setback in the proposed scheme to improve the pedestrian environment, but doubted that the thermal comfort at street-level could be improved by the provision of podium garden in the proposed development.

38. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 29.5.2024, 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 parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces and vehicular access for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works as identified in the updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development in condition (b) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

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

set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

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

### **Hong Kong District**

#### **Agenda Item 9**

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

[Open Meeting]

A/H19/80                      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' in "Commercial (1)" Zone, 7 Stanley Market Road and 78 and 79 Stanley Main Street, Stanley, Hong Kong  
(Stanley Lots 427 and 428 and Stanley Inland Lot 124)  
(MPC Paper No. A/H19/80)

---

40.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Rostar Co. Ltd.. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest as his former firm had business dealings with the applicant.

41.            The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As Mr Alex T.H. Lai 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 23.3.2020 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Nevertheless, the site was the subject of five previous planning applications submitted by the same applicant for a similar development proposal. Three of them were subsequently withdrawn by the applicant before they were submitted to the Committee for consideration

and another two were also withdrawn by the applicant within four months from the date of their submissions. In view of the history of the previous planning applications for similar proposal at the site, it was recommended that the applicant be allowed a period of two months for submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted.

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, and no further deferment would be granted.

### **Agenda Item 10**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the approved Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H20/23  
(MPC Paper No.2/20)

---

44. The Secretary reported that one of the proposed amendment item was to facilitate proposed public housing development by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) and the Housing Department (HD) was the executive arm of HKHA. Another proposed amendment item was to take forward the decision of the Committee on a s.12A application No. Y/H20/4 and Urbis Ltd. (URBIS) was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item :

- |                   |   |  |
|-------------------|---|--|
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai  | - | his former firm had business dealings with HKHA and URBIS; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with HKHA and URBIS;      |
| Dr Lawrence W.C.  | - | his spouse being an employee of HD, but not                |

- Poon 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 Hong Kong Housing Society which was in discussion with HD on housing development issues.

45. The Committee noted that according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Board, as the proposed public housing development by HKHA in relation to the rezoning site was the subject of amendments to the outline zoning plan (OZP) proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of the Members in relation to the proposed amendment item would only need to be recorded. As Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Thomas O.S. Ho had no involvement in the application in relation to the other amendment item, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

46. The following representatives from PlanD were invited to the meeting at this point:

- Mr. Louis Kau - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK); and
- Ms Karmin Tong - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK).

47. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Karmin Tong, STP/HK, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

#### Background

- (a) the proposed amendments to the approved Chai Wan OZP No. S/H20/23 were mainly related to: (a) rezoning of a site at the junction of Sun Yip Street and Siu Sai Wan Road to take forward the decision of the Committee on s.12A application No. Y/H20/4 for the development of a composite building with ambulance depot and departmental quarters (DQ) for the Fire Services Department (FSD); and (b) rezoning of a site at Cheung Man Road for public housing development by HKHA;

Proposed Amendments to Matters shown on the OZP

- (b) Amendment Item A (about 2,356 m<sup>2</sup>) - rezoning the site at the junction of Sun Yip Street and Siu Sai Wan Road from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “G/IC(4)” with the stipulation of a building height (BH) restriction of 100mPD;
- (c) Amendment Item B1 (about 0.49ha) - rezoning a site at Cheung Man Road from “Green Belt” (“GB”) with a minor portion of an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) with the stipulation of a BH restriction of 135mPD;
- (d) Amendment Item B2 (about 638m<sup>2</sup>) - showing two strips of land near Cheung Man Road as areas shown as ‘Road’;

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

- (e) corresponding revisions to the Notes and ES had been proposed to take into account the proposed amendments and to follow the revised Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans promulgated by the Town Planning Board (TPB);

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

- (f) the planned provision for open space and various community facilities was generally sufficient in the planning scheme area except that there would be a shortfall in primary school classrooms, child care centres, and centre-based Day Care Centres/Units for the Elderly and Residential Care Homes for the Elderly (RCHE);
- (g) the shortfall in primary school classrooms in the area could be catered by the surplus of primary school classrooms in the surrounding area, in particular the Shau Kei Wan area which was within the same school net.

As for the child care centres, centre-based Day Care Centres/Units for the Elderly and RCHE, the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) requirements for the facilities, which were reintroduced recently, were long-term goals and the actual provision would be subject to the consideration of the Social Welfare Department (SWD) in the planning and development process as appropriate;

#### Consultation

- (h) the Planning, Works and Housing Committee (PWHC) of the Eastern District Council (EDC) was consulted on 24.4.2020 in respect of the proposed OZP amendments. PWHC in general supported the proposed amendments. A few EDC members considered that HD should ensure an appropriate flat mix for the new public housing development to meet the housing needs of small and large families, review the provision of day care centre for the elderly at the site given its accessibility, and consider providing retail facilities in the proposed development; and
- (i) the proposed amendments had been circulated to the relevant government departments for comments. Comments from relevant bureaux/ departments had been incorporated where appropriate. Other departments had no objection to or no comment on the proposed amendments.

48. As the presentation by PlanD' representative had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

#### Amendment Item A

49. Members generally had no objection to the subject proposed amendment item but raised the following questions:

- (a) the overall BH of the proposed development; and
- (b) whether there was any flexibility to provide 'shop and services' use, such as



convenience store, on the lower floors of the proposed development to serve the local residents and whether planning permission would be required.

50. In response, Mr. Louis Kau, DPO/HK, made the following main points:
- (a) according to the indicative scheme submitted by FSD, the proposed development had a BH of about 100mPD, comprising a 31-storey composite building; and
  - (b) as the lower floor of the proposed development would be mainly occupied by an ambulance depot, there would be no floor space available for the provision of shop and services use. According to the Notes of the OZP, 'shop and services' use was a Column 2 use in the "G/IC" zone and planning permission from TPB would be required. Besides, shop and services uses were available in the residential developments in the vicinity.

Amendment Items B1 and B2

51. A Member asked if there was any shortage of GIC facilities in the district and whether it was possible to accommodate more GIC facilities in the proposed public housing development. Mr. Louis Kau, DPO/HK, explained that the GIC facilities were generally sufficient except that there would be shortfall in child care centres, centre-based Day Care Centres/Units for the Elderly and RCHE. During the planning process, HD had consulted relevant government departments and agreed to provide a 60-place Day Care Centre for Elderly in the proposed public housing development. Given the site area was not large, there was little room to provide additional GIC facilities.

52. The same Member expressed grave concern on the inadequate provision of elderly facilities in the territory. The Chairman explained that the Government had promulgated the amendments to HKPSG in late 2018 reinstating the population-based planning standards in respect of elderly and child-care facilities. Such standards had already been applied to the new development areas. Mr. Louis Kau, DPO/HK, said that the Government had adopted a multi-pronged approach to provide social welfare facilities.

SWD had been maintaining close communication with departments concerned to identify suitable sites for social welfare facilities. The Government would also require private developers, through land sale conditions as appropriate, to design and construct bare-shell premises for proposed welfare facilities according to the specifications of SWD in private developments. Furthermore, the Government would purchase suitable premises for the provision of various types of welfare facilities and acquire places from privately owned facilities. The Chairman supplemented that, in light of the 2019 Policy Address, the Government was reviewing over 300 GIC sites currently earmarked for standalone public facility to optimize the use of the sites. A Member opined that the government should expedite the review process.

53. Another Member asked whether the proposed development had achieved an optimized mix of domestic and non-domestic gross floor area (GFA), and whether the development intensity was restricted by the Buildings (Planning) Regulation (B(P)R). Mr. Louis Kau, DPO/HK, said that there was no plot ratio restriction in the proposed “R(A)” zone on the OZP and the future development should be in compliance with the B(P)R. In consideration of the provision of GIC facilities at the site, one of the major concerns of HD was not to reduce the domestic GFA. In response to a Member’s question, Mr. Louis Kau, DPO/HK, said that a person per occupied flat ratio of 3 was assumed in HD’s development proposal and the flat mix of the development would be determined at the detailed design stage.

54. A Member considered that HD could also reserve floor area for undesignated GIC uses for non-government organizations to provide suitable social welfare facilities in future. Mr. Louis Kau, DPO/HK, said that the Member’s suggestion would be relayed to HD for further consideration.

55. Regarding a Member’s proposal of upgrading the classification of the site by the provision of a new street with a width of about 4.5m to the west of the site, Mr. Louis Kau, DPO/HK said that the rezoning proposal for the concerned area was mainly to reflect an existing 2.5m-wide staircase and the HD could be requested to examine the Member’s proposal at the detailed design stage. In response to a few Members’ questions on the potential interface issue arising from the industrial building and carriageway to the northwest of the site, Mr Louis Kau, explained that sufficient setback area had been incorporated into

the proposed development scheme. Noise impact assessment would be conducted and any necessary mitigation measures identified therein would be incorporated at the detailed design stage. For the industrial/commercial buildings to the southwest of the site, it was noted that a few redevelopment projects for modern industrial/commercial buildings were being processed under the planning application system.

56. Noting that no Old and Valuable Tree was identified and the loss of trees would be compensated at a ratio of 1:1, a Member asked about the detailed arrangement of tree compensation. In response, Mr. Louis Kau, DPO/HK, said that HD would follow the latest Development Bureau Technical Circular (Works) on Tree Preservation to provide compensation of affected trees at a ratio of 1:1 and all trees would be provided within the site as far as possible.

57. In response to a Member's question on local views on the proposed OZP amendments, Mr. Louis Kau, DPO/HK, said that PWHC of EDC had been consulted and was in general supportive of the proposed amendments.

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

58. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Chai Wan OZP No. S/H20/23 and that the draft Chai Wan OZP No. S/H20/23A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/H20/24 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised ES for the draft Chai Wan OZP No. S/H20/23A at Attachment IV of the Paper as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.

59. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if



address departmental comments.

63. 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.

[Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Stanley T.S. Choi left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K) and Mr William W.L. Chan, Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K) were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 12**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K11/237            Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Hospital Use in "Government, Institution or Community" Zone, Our Lady of Maryknoll Hospital, No. 118 Shatin Pass Road, Wong Tai Sin, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K11/237)

---

64. The Secretary reported that the application was located in Wong Tai Sin. The application was submitted by Hospital Authority (HA) and Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTA), MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA Systra Group) (MVA), Wong & Ouyang (Hong

Kong) Ltd. (WOL), WSP Consulting Engineers (WSP) and Urbis Ltd. (URBIS) were five of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm had business dealings with HA, MVA, WOL, WSP and URBIS;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being an ex-employee of Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with MVA and URBIS;
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with WOL; and
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned a property in Wong Tai Sin.

65. The Committee noted that Messrs Alex T.H. Lai, Thomas O.S. Ho and Stanley T.S. Choi had already left the meeting. As Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau and Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

66. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr William W.L. Chan, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction for permitted hospital use;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, ten public comments were received, including three supporting comments from DAB Wong Tai Sin Branch and individuals, and seven opposing comments from Our Lady's Primary School, Our Lady's College, St. Bonaventure College,

the Incorporated Owners of Chuk Yuen (North) Estate and an individual. Major grounds 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. The proposed hospital redevelopment was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone. The Secretary for Food and Health gave policy support to the proposed redevelopment. Although the application was for a minor relaxation of the BH restriction from 7 to 12 storeys, the proposed scheme only involved two additional storeys for hospital beds as compared with the conforming scheme (i.e. scheme based on the set of approved general building plans that conformed with the BH restriction), and the BH at main roof level only increased by 6.8m from 88.5mPD in the conforming scheme to 95.3mPD in the proposed scheme. The other additional floors were accountable due to technical interpretations, i.e. two floors between Lung Fung Street and Shatin Pass Road that were counted as basements in the conforming scheme were counted as two floors in the proposed scheme due to provision of direct pedestrian and vehicular access at the lower level Lung Fung Street, and the other floor was for the roof top structures that exceeded 10% of the overall height of the building. The proposed redevelopment with a BH of 95.3mPD at main roof level was not incompatible with the adjacent government, institution or community (GIC) and residential developments. The proposed scheme had incorporated several merits in terms of provision of additional hospital beds (additional 200 to 248 beds as compared to the current provision), enhanced pedestrian/vehicular accessibility, setback and greening. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD considered that the proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction would unlikely bring about significant adverse visual impact on the surrounding environment. Concerned government 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.

67. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) details of the objecting comments related to privacy and psychological concern of students/teachers in nearby schools;
  - (b) in view of the public comments on privacy issue, any potential overlooking impact on the surrounding schools that would be caused by the proposed development;
  - (c) as compared to the conforming scheme, any change to the floor-to-floor height in the proposed scheme;
  - (d) any adverse landscape impact on the existing trees on the site, in particular, the mature tree cluster at the southeastern corner of the site;
  - (e) the public transport facilities and pedestrian access to the hospital and details of the service access arrangement;
  - (f) apart from the BH restriction, whether there were any other limitations restricting the redevelopment to provide more hospital beds; and
  - (g) the role of the subject hospital in the concerned hospital cluster and whether there were any deficiencies in medical services within the same cluster, and any funeral/farewell services that would be provided in the proposed development.
68. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, made the following main points:
- (a) the psychological concern raised by some commenters was mainly related to the potential increased in ambulance and hearse traffic in association with the hospital redevelopment;
  - (b) the subject hospital had been in operation at the application site for more than 50 years. According to the applicant, privacy/overlooking concerns



would be taken into consideration in the detailed design for the façade and window of the proposed scheme and significant adverse impact on the surrounding uses was not anticipated;

- (c) the floor-to-floor height in the proposed and conforming schemes were similar;
- (d) according to the tree survey submitted by the applicant, the trees on the site were of low amenity value. Amongst the 56 trees surveyed, six trees would be retained, 11 trees would be transplanted and the loss of 39 trees due to the construction works would be compensated by 39 newly planted trees. The trees that would be retained were mainly near Shatin Pass Road, while the trees at the junction of Sheung Fung Street and Lung Fung Street would be felled but would be compensated within the setback area to be provided;
- (e) there were bus and green minibus stops on Sheung Fung Street and Shatin Pass Road. The pedestrian accessibility had been enhanced in the proposed scheme and the public could easily access the site mainly from Shatin Pass Road and Lung Fung Street. A separate service access for ambulance, hearse as well as refuse collection vehicle would be provided on Shatin Pass Road;
- (f) in responses to the local views and the latest need of medical services, two additional levels were proposed by HA to provide extra beds in the proposed scheme. The proposed scale of development was mainly determined by the level of clinical support services that could be provided by the hospital, and there may be additional traffic impacts arising from the hospital redevelopment; and
- (g) Our Lady of Maryknoll Hospital (OLMH) fell within the Hospital Authority's Kowloon Central Cluster and it was positioned as a non-acute community hospital with focus on ambulatory care services. Within the same cluster, the new Acute Hospital in Kai Tak Development Area would provide Accident & Emergency (A&E) services. Based on the HKPSG

standard, there had been deficiency in hospital beds (about 500 beds) based on the planning scheme area of the subject statutory plan and the proposed development could help address the deficiency. Supporting facilities for simple funeral services would usually be provided in some public hospitals but no detailed information on that aspect had been provided by the applicant for the proposed scheme.

### Deliberation Session

69. Noting that the redevelopment of OLMH was part of the first ten-year Hospital Development Plan (HDP), Member generally supported the application as the proposal could address the need of healthcare services in Hong Kong and the proposed BH for the redeveloped hospital was generally compatible with the surrounding developments.

70. A Member opined that the applicant should protect the mature trees at the site as far as possible. Another Member considered that the applicant could be advised to incorporate more greenery including vertical greening and sky garden in the proposed scheme, which could help alleviate the local concerns on the proposed development.

71. Regarding the local concerns on the hospital redevelopment, some Members considered that the applicant should have better communication with the relevant stakeholders in the area to ease their concerns during the redevelopment process. A few Members considered that the government should promote life and death education to students in primary and secondary schools and the subject hospital could form a platform to connect to the society, which might help break the taboo surrounding death.

72. A Member opined that HA should indeed take the golden opportunity to further optimise the use of the site by providing more medical/healthcare services facilities to alleviate the pressure over the overloaded public healthcare system. The Chairman remarked that HA had started the planning for the second ten-year HDP. Noting from the first ten-year HDP, as many of the hospital redevelopment projects had to take place in-situ, the complicated project-phasing had led to redevelopment constraints and unusually long lead time for redevelopment. Those experience from the first ten-year HDP would facilitate HA to better formulate the second ten-year HDP for hospital expansion to provide additional beds

and medical facilities in future.

73. 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 29.5.2024, 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 vehicular access arrangement, parking facilities, and loading/unloading spaces to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (b) the design and implementation of the improvement works identified in the Traffic Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K and Mr W.L. William Chan STP/K, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong and Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung left the meeting at this point.]

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

**Agenda Item 13**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/780            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, 107-109 Wai Yip Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/780A)

---

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

76.            As Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) and building height (BH) restrictions for permitted office, shop and services and eating place uses;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, six public comments were received, including one supporting comment from the owner of the Hay Nien Building to the southeast of the site and five objecting comments from the owner of International Trade Tower to the further southeast of the site and individuals. Major 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 assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone. The proposed minor relaxation of PR generally followed the policy on revitalization of pre-1987 industrial buildings (the Policy), and the Development Bureau (DEVB) gave policy support to the current application. The minor relaxation of BH restriction (15%) sought was generally proportionate to the applied minor relaxation of PR with reasonable floor-to-floor height adopted. The proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction to 115mPD at the site could be tolerated. On planning and design merits, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, PlanD considered that the proposed design measures, including vertical greening and other landscape treatments, could help improve the pedestrian environment and promote visual interest. Relevant government departments consulted had no objection to/no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

78. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the subject case was the first application for minor relaxation of BH restriction in the area;
- (b) the BH restriction for the residential developments to the north of Kwun Tong Road;
- (c) whether voluntary setback in addition to statutory setback requirement was proposed;
- (d) the significance of providing a public passageway at the back alley;

- (e) as on-street parking was commonly found along back alleys in the area, whether the proposed widening of the back alley would further encourage on-street parking; and
- (f) the visual impact arising from the proposed development.

79. In response, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, made the following main points:

- (a) whilst the Site was the subject of first application for minor relaxation of BH restriction on the concerned street block, similar applications were approved by the Committee within the same height band in close vicinity of the Site;
- (b) there was currently no BH restriction for the residential developments to the north of Kwun Tong Road;
- (c) the proposed building setback was in compliance with the adopted outline development plan (the ODP). While no additional setback was proposed, the applicant had provided a voluntary 4.4m-wide passageway on G/F to improve the pedestrian connectivity of the area;
- (d) the building setback requirement on both sides of the subject back alley was stipulated on the ODP. As a long term goal, the Energizing Kowloon East Office, DEVB had planned to uplift back alleys in Kwun Tong Business Area (KTBA) to enhance the pedestrian connectivity in the district;
- (e) many industrial buildings in KTBA were completed more than 50 years ago without insufficient on-site parking and loading and unloading (L/UL) facilities causing such activities to take place along the back alleys. Through the redevelopment process, on-site parking and L/UL facilities could be provided, which would alleviate the problem of on-street parking and L/UL facilities. Upon surrendering of the setback areas at the back alley to the Government, better management and maintenance would be anticipated; and

- (f) the applicant site had elongated frontage, and the development proposal had fulfilled the relevant requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines. The proposed scheme had also incorporated communal gardens on 1/F and 2/F, and landscape treatments in the form of vertical greening and planters on the lower floors, which might soften the building mass and offer visual interest to the cityscape.

80. In response to a Member's question, another Member shared that the ratio of male to female persons for the provision of sanitary fitments was stipulated in the buildings regulation.

### Deliberation Session

81. A Member appreciated that the applicant had provided a voluntary public passageway on G/F to improve the connectivity with the back alley, which could enhance the pedestrian environment in the long term, and considered that proposed BH was generally compatible with the surrounding environment.

82. 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 29.5.2024, 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 submission of a sewerage impact assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (b) the implementation of the sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the sewerage impact assessment in condition (a) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of land contamination assessments in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures





- Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung - being the chairman and vice-chairman of several sub-committees of HAD; and
- Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being a former member of one sub-committee of HAD.

85. The Committee noted that Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung had already left the meeting and the interest of Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong was indirect. As the interest of Mr Gavin C.T. Tse was direct, the Committee agreed that he should leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Mr Gavin C.T. Tse left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

86. 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 renewal of planning approval for temporary institutional use for a period of 5 years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments were received, including one supporting comment from an individual and one comment from another individual providing views on the application. Major 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 assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The renewal application generally complied with the relevant assessment criteria in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Renewal of Planning

Approval and Extension of Time for Compliance with Planning Conditions for Temporary Use or Development (TPB PG-No. 34C). All departments consulted had no objection to/no adverse comment on the application.

87. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the prevailing mechanism for handling vacant school premises (VSP) by the government;
  - (b) usage rate of the subject centre;
  - (c) whether assistance would be provided by HAD to the operator of the subject centre; and
  - (d) the monitoring mechanism for carrying out building works at the subject historical building.
88. In response, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, made the following main points:
- (a) in accordance with the Central Clearing House (CCH) mechanism, once the Education Bureau (EDB) had confirmed that the VSP was no longer required by the EDB for school or other educational uses, EDB would inform PlanD and other relevant departments (such as the Lands Department (LandsD) and the Housing Department (HD)) for consideration of suitable alternative long-term uses. If any organisation wished to use any VSP handled under the CCH mechanism for a specific government, institution or community (GIC) use, the applicant could make an application to LandsD with the support of the relevant policy bureau. The VSP under the subject application was under the management of the Kwun Tong District Office, HAD;
  - (b) according to the applicant's submission, over 200,000 students and members of the public had participated in guided tours, workshops, talks, and exhibitions arranged by the centre in the past years. The

tenancy/operation of the proposed uses at the Site was on a temporary basis and would be periodically reviewed by HAD to ensure it met the community needs;

- (c) the role of HAD was mainly a regulator to monitor the operation at the VSP. Besides, HAD would on behalf of the operator apply for planning permission; and
- (d) the subject building was pending grading assessment by the Antiquities Advisory Board. The current application was for a renewal of planning permission and no alteration and addition works was proposed. For any building works that might affect the subject building, the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) would be informed under the established monitoring mechanism.

#### Deliberation Session

89. A Member remarked that some VSPs were not properly used by the operators to serve the general public. Regarding the Member's views on more effective use of the centre, the Chairman said that such views would be relayed to HAD for consideration.

90. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years from 12.6.2020 to 11.6.2025, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the existing fire service installations implemented on the Site being maintained in efficient working order at all times;
- (b) maintenance of all existing trees within the Site in good condition within the planning approval period; and
- (c) if any of the above planning conditions (a) or (b) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease

to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice.”

91. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the comments of the Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments), AMO that the physical integrity of the subject building should not be adversely affected. Prior consultation with AMO would be required for any works that might affect the subject building, and appropriate protective, monitoring and mitigation measures should be proposed for AMO’s consideration and agreement before commencement of works.

[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 Gavin C.T. Tse returned to join the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 15**

Any Other Business

92. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 12:50 p.m..