

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 652<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 10.7.2020**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Vice-chairman

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 Tony K.T. Yau

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

**Absent with Apology**

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Charlotte P.S. Ng

## **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 651<sup>st</sup> MPC Meeting held on 26.6.2020**

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 651<sup>st</sup> MPC meeting held on 26.6.2020 were confirmed without amendments.

## **Agenda Item 2**

### **Matters Arising**

[Open Meeting]

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

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

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/KC/467                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Non-Polluting Industrial Use (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of Dangerous Goods) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 132-134 Tai Lin Pai Road, Kwai Chung, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/467B)

---

4.                      The Secretary reported that BMT Hong Kong Limited (BMT) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had declared an interest on the item as his firm had past business dealings with BMT. As Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

5.                      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) restriction for permitted non-polluting industrial use (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of dangerous goods);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of three public comments, with two comments expressing concerns from an individual and one opposing comment from the Incorporated Owner of Mai Sik Industrial Building, 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. As the existing 8-storey building was wholesale-converted for ‘eating place’ and ‘office’ uses in 2015, the Secretary for Development (SDEV) advised that the present industrial building (IB) revitalisation policy was not applicable to the subject building. Nevertheless, taking into account that there were no adverse impacts on infrastructure/technical aspects and the planning/design merits that would be brought by the proposed development, SDEV was in support of the current application from site optimising perspective. The Director-General of Trade and Industry had no objection to the application given that it would put the site into optimal use in producing industrial space to support industrial development. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L) of PlanD considered that the proposed design measures, including setback proposals, vertical and periphery greening, a sky garden and other landscaping treatments, represented the applicant’s effort in promoting visual interest and improving the pedestrian environment. The Commissioner for Transport advised that the traffic impact assessment (TIA) submitted demonstrated that the proposed development would not generate adverse traffic impact on the adjacent road network. Other relevant 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.

6. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) clarifications on the ownership of the setback area on Tai Lin Pai Road, whether the setback proposal was voluntary, and the maintenance and management (M&M) responsibility of the setback area;

- (b) noting that the setback area on Tai Lin Pai Road was proposed for pedestrian walkway in the application, what the setback area would be used for under the Government's road widening proposal;
- (c) why the proposed setback area of Million Group Centre was oblique under the Kwai Ching Outline Development Plan (ODP);
- (d) how the proposed development could be accessed by the public from Kwai Hing and Kwai Fong MTR Stations and whether the applicant's setback proposals could enhance the walking environment in the area;
- (e) the proposed uses after redevelopment of the existing building, and the general uses of redeveloped IBs in the Kwai Chung district;
- (f) given the application was located at a street corner, whether the applicant had explored the possibility of including an all-weathered canopy to improve the pedestrian environment; and
- (g) whether the increase of PR to optimise site utilisation could be regarded as a planning merit to warrant support of the application.

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

- (a) while the setback area along Tai Lin Pai Road was privately owned, it was reserved for future road widening as shown on the ODP and it would be surrendered to the Government upon request. In the interim period, the M&M responsibility of the setback area, including all landscaping works and paving of pedestrian walkway, would be borne by the applicant;
- (b) the details and implementation programme of the road widening of Tai Lin Pai Road were not available at the moment, but it was likely that the setback area would remain a pedestrian walkway before the setback area was surrendered to form part of the future road widening works;

- (c) the setback areas as shown on the ODP were based on relevant government developments' advice to guide future developments to meet the planning intention for long-term road widening;
- (d) with reference to Plan A-5, the proposed development could be accessed from Kwai Hing MTR Station through a footbridge connected to the Kowloon Commerce Centre and then walked along Tai Lin Pai Road. When accessing from Kai Fong Station, pedestrians could cross Kwai Foo Road and Kwai Chung Road on two footbridges before reaching Tai Lin Pai Road;
- (e) the proposed development was for permitted non-polluting industrial use (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of Dangerous Goods). Some aged IBs in the Kwai Chung district had been redeveloped for non-polluting industrial use, office and data center uses;
- (f) in response to the comments of CTP/UD&L of PlanD, the applicant had undertaken to explore the possibility of providing weather protection measures along the development edges in the building plan submission stage; and
- (g) not only would the minor relaxation of PR restriction of the proposed development increase supply of industrial floor space to support industrial development, other planning/design merits, including setback proposals and greening measures, had been proposed by the applicant with a view to improving air ventilation and enhancing the pedestrian environment.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong arrived to join the meeting during the Question and Answer Sessions.]

#### Deliberation Session

8. Given the application site was located at a street corner with setback proposals on three sides, some Members considered that an all-weathered canopy could improve the

comfort and safety of pedestrians and suggested that the applicant should include it in the building design. The Committee agreed that an advisory clause should be added to suggest the applicant to explore such possibility.

9. A Member expressed concerns on whether the M&M of the setback area along Tai Lin Pai Road would be satisfactorily executed by the applicant in the interim period before the area was surrendered to the Government for road widening purpose. Another Member expressed concern on the continuity of pedestrian access to the application site as the road widening work on Tai Lin Pai Road had yet to be carried out. The Chairman said that the transformation process of an industrial area would take time to realise but every opportunity should be seized and any traffic and environmental problems should be properly addressed during the process.

10. A Member said that the PR restrictions, among others, as stipulated on the OZP had already taken into account all relevant planning consideration, including the needs of various land uses, and optimisation of industrial floorspace might not be a strong reason to justify the application as it would be applicable to all types of development. Nevertheless, application might be supported on consideration of the planning intention, planning and design merits and technical aspect.

11. The same Member considered that if there was a need to increase the industrial floorspace, a comprehensive district-wide assessment should be undertaken. The Chairman responded that PlanD was currently undertaking a Study on the Area Assessments of Industrial Land in the Territory. The findings of the Study would provide necessary information for such an assessment, if it was required to be undertaken.

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting during the Deliberation Session.]

12. 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 10.7.2024, 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 at his own cost, 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) in relation to (c) above, the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development 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 prior to development of the site to the satisfaction of Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB.”

13. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper and the additional advisory clause as below:

“to note the comment of the Committee that the applicant should explore the provision of an all-weathered canopy at the setback area on G/F of the proposed development to enhance the pedestrian environment.”

[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 4**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/518                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Non-polluting Industrial Development (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of Dangerous Goods) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Lot 301 RP in D.D. 355, Pun Shan Street, Tsuen Wan, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/518)

---

14.                      The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan. Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA), SYW & Associates Limited (SYW) and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited (MMHK) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho                      -    his company having current business dealings with MMHK;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai                        -    his former firm had business dealings with SYW and MMHK;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau                      -    being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA; and
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi                    -    his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan.

15.                      As Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Alex T.H. Lai and Daniel K.S. Lau 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.

16. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 19.6.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as 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.

17. 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.

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

**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H15/283                      Proposed Comprehensive Residential and Commercial Development, Rail Station and Depot, Public Transport Interchange, Social Welfare Facilities and Bus and Public Light Bus Termini and Minor Relaxation of Maximum Domestic Gross Floor Area (Amendments to Approved Master Layout Plan) in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone, Wong Chuk Hang Comprehensive Development Area, bounded by Heung Yip Road, Police School Road and Nam Long Shan Road, Hong Kong  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/283)

---

18.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (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 former firm had business dealings with MTRCL and Arup; and
- Mr Franklin Yu                            -    having past business dealings with ARUP.

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

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

20.            Mr Vincent W.Y. Wong, STP/HK, drew Members’ attention that a replacement page (P.8 of the Main Paper) incorporating the latest comments from the Lands Department had been tabled at the meeting for Members’ reference.    With the aid of a PowerPoint

presentation, he then presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed comprehensive residential and commercial development, rail station and depot, public transport interchange (PTI), social welfare facilities, and bus and public light bus (PLB) termini and minor relaxation of maximum domestic gross floor area (amendments to approved master layout plan (MLP));
- (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 11 public comments, with three supporting comments from individuals, seven opposing comments from the Central & Western Concern Group, Designing Hong Kong Limited and five individuals (four were in the form of a standard letter), and one providing both positive and adverse comments from a Southern District Council (SDC) member, 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 application was to seek planning permission for proposed amendments to the previously approved MLP under application No. A/H15/254 which was approved in 2013 (2013 Scheme). The major development parameters of the 2013 Scheme had remained unchanged in the current application and the development of the application site (the CDA Site) would be divided into six phases (i.e. Sites A to F). Under the current application, the applicant proposed an increase in the number of flats by 500 units with corresponding decrease in the average flat size (-7m<sup>2</sup>), an increase in the provision of private open space by 1,506m<sup>2</sup> to cater for the increase in anticipated population, and an increase in the number of car parking spaces to comply with the requirements as per the Hong Kong

Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and the endorsed planning brief (PB). The applicant had submitted a traffic impact assessment (TIA). The Commissioner for Transport advised that although the proposed number of car parking and loading/unloading spaces was considered acceptable as it was within the range of HKPSG provision, feasible way to provide more parking spaces should be further explored. Other concerned government departments had no adverse comment on the application and relevant approval conditions were recommended to address their technical concerns. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

*Additional flats at Sites E and F of the proposed development*

21. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the number of units originally planned at Sites E and F;
  - (b) range of flat sizes of the additional flats;
  - (c) type of facilities that needed to be additionally provided due to the increased population;
  - (d) with no change proposed to the commercial development, why there was an increase in the provision of commercial car parking space, and whether the increase would affect the building bulk; and
  - (e) any possible adverse traffic impact on Heung Yip Road generated by the increased population.
22. In response, Mr Vincent W.Y. Wong, STP/HK, made the following main points:
- (a) the applicant proposed to increase the number of flats from 4,700 units to 5,200 units and the additional 500 units would be accommodated at Sites E and F of the proposed development. A total of 1,300 units were originally

planned at Sites E and F. After incorporation of the additional 500 units under the current application, there would be a total of 1,800 units at Sites E and F;

- (b) the flat size of the CDA development would range from 58m<sup>2</sup> to 77m<sup>2</sup> while the average flat size would be reduced from about 76m<sup>2</sup> to 69m<sup>2</sup>;
- (c) with the anticipated increase in population arising from the additional 500 flats, additional provisions of 1,506m<sup>2</sup> private local open space and 121 parking spaces for private cars and 9 for motorcycles had been proposed to comply with the requirements as per HKPSG and the endorsed PB;
- (d) the applicant aimed to provide more parking spaces in order to meet the high-end of HKPSG provision while the additional car parking spaces would be accommodated by optimising internal arrangement within the approved building bulk; and
- (e) according to the TIA submitted by the applicant, all junction improvement works had been completed except the one at T4 junction at Heung Yip Road and Police School Road. Relevant approval conditions were recommended to ensure satisfactory compliance of the Transport Department's (TD) requirements.

23. Mr Tony K.T. Yau, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban) of TD, supplemented that the proposed development would not cause adverse traffic impact subject to completion of all traffic mitigation measures.

*Public open space and Government, Institution and Community (GIC) facilities*

24. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) details of the performing space, public open space, and private open space as proposed by the applicant;

- (b) with reference to the public comments made, whether the applicant had consulted the SDC on the provision of public open space;
- (c) any provision of community hall in the Southern District;
- (d) noting that two social welfare facilities would be provided in the proposed development, whether those facilities were requested by the public, and whether other GIC facilities as requested in the public comments would be provided at the proposed development; and
- (e) with reference to the public comments made, whether the 1,500m<sup>2</sup> commercial gross floor area (GFA) to be reserved in the shopping centre for the use of social enterprises as required under the PB had been indicated in the current scheme.

25. In response, Mr Vincent W.Y. Wong, STP/HK, made the following main points;

- (a) an indoor venue of about 300m<sup>2</sup> for district events would be provided on the ground floor of the shopping centre near the mall entrance adjacent to the at-grade public open space (POS). The at-grade POS of about 1,300m<sup>2</sup> would be provided in the northwestern part of the CDA Site and opened to the public on a 24-hour basis. With reference to Drawing A-10 of the Paper, two types of private open space on the podium level of the residential portion were proposed, namely the private open space for individual phases and the two central gardens located at the centre of the podium for enjoyment of all residents. All private open spaces in the development would not be opened for public use;
- (b) the applicant had briefed the SDC at its meetings on the progress and design details of the public open space;
- (c) a site located to the south of the CDA Site across Lam Long Shan Road next to the San Wui Commercial Society Chan Pak Sha School had been reserved for development of a community hall. The provision of



community hall was under the policy purview of the Home Affairs Department and there was no implementation programme at the moment;

- (d) an Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Services Centre (IVRSC) and a Hostel for Moderately Mentally Handicapped Persons (HMMHP) were formerly provided at the ex-Wong Chuk Hang (WCH) Estate and the reprovision of those facilities within the CDA Site was requested by the Social Welfare Department and set out in the PB. The applicant had indicated that those facilities would be located at Site A of the proposed development to ensure their early provision. Whilst the public comments did not specify the type of GIC facilities requested, it was understood that they preferred a community hall. In that connection, a site had been reserved for community hall to the south of the CDA Site; and
- (e) the applicant would reserve 1,500m<sup>2</sup> of commercial GFA in the shopping centre for the use of social enterprises and details of which would be illustrated in the general building plan submission.

26. Given the increase of 500 additional flats and an anticipated population increase of 1,506, a Member remarked that GIC facilities would be required to serve the new households, and enquired the types of GIC facilities that were in shortfall in the Southern District. In response, Mr Vincent W.Y. Wong, STP/HK, said that taking into account the existing and planned provision of GIC facilities in the Southern District, there was no deficit except in the provision of child care centres and community care centres. Nevertheless, the shortfall of those GIC facilities could be alleviated by provision in the neighbouring districts. The Member opined that family-based facilities, including child care centres and community care centres, should be provided in the neighbourhood.

#### *Others*

27. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) comparison of the permitted non-domestic GFA under the endorsed PB and the proposed non-domestic GFA under the current scheme;

- (b) whether a footbridge connection between the proposed shopping centre and Shum Wan Road as requested by the SDC and local residents would be provided by the applicant;
- (c) how the podium level of the proposed development would be accessed by the emergency vehicular access (EVA);
- (d) how the proposed development would be accessed by the public from the WCH MTR station; and
- (e) whether there would be any government support to facilitate community making.

28. In response, Mr Vincent W.Y. Wong, STP/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) a maximum non-domestic GFA of 121,800m<sup>2</sup> was allowed in the PB, while the scheme under the current application had a total non-domestic GFA of not more than 106,440m<sup>2</sup>. As set out in the PB, the commercial use (i.e. shopping centre) should not exceed 47,000m<sup>2</sup> which should include the provision of 1,500m<sup>2</sup> for social enterprises and a venue of 300m<sup>2</sup> for district events. The PB specified a total internal floor area of not less than 1,598m<sup>2</sup> for the IVRSC and HMMHP and according to the applicant, 1,440m<sup>2</sup> and 1175m<sup>2</sup> GFA was planned for the two facilities respectively in the current scheme. The PB did not specify the GFA requirements for railway and transport facilities, including the MTR station, depot, PTI, and the covered bus and PLB termini, and 58,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA was planned for those facilities under the current scheme;
- (b) following the land lease requirement, the applicant had reserved a connection point for the proposed footbridge across Shum Wan Road. Relevant government departments would conduct feasibility study for implementation of the footbridge at an appropriate time;

- (c) the ingress/egress points of the EVA were located at Police School Road and Nam Long Shan Road. The EVA would lead to the landscape deck on the podium level of the development by internal roads;
- (d) a direct access to WCH MTR station was located on level 3 of the shopping centre. Visitors could access the social welfare facilities and bus and PLB termini located at the southern part of the CDA Site through internal walkways in the shopping centre; and
- (e) community making activities could be promoted through the provision of public spaces. In that connection, a POS, a performing venue for district event, and GIC facilities would be provided under the current application.

#### Deliberation Session

29. The Chairman said that comparison tables of major development parameters among the endorsed PB, previous approved schemes and current scheme were at Appendices II and V of the Paper which provided a clearer overview for Member's consideration. Members noted that the non-domestic GFA permitted under the PB was not fully utilised since the first approved 2013 scheme and 200 additional flats were already approved in 2019 by the Director of Planning under the delegated authority of the Board. Compared with the 2019 scheme, the current scheme was mainly to cater for an increase of 300 flats with reduced flat size. Noting that the major development parameters including the domestic and non-domestic GFA, number of towers and building height profile under the previously approved schemes had remained unchanged in the current scheme, Members in general had no objection to the application.

30. However, some Members raised concerns on the potential impacts resulted from the increase of 500 additional flats which would be concentrated at Sites E and F of the proposed development. Despite the provision of the IVRSC and HMMHP which were required to be provided in the PB, some Members considered the applicant should enhance the provision of GIC facilities, especially family-based GIC facilities like child care centres and community care centres, at the CDA Site to cater for the increase in population arising from the 500 additional flats. Moreover, given the scale of the development and its strategic

location next to the WCH MTR station, some Members suggested that the applicant should fully utilise the amount of non-domestic GFA permitted in the PB for provision of more GIC facilities to facilitate community making. A Member also considered that the GFA of the social enterprise as required under the PB might not be sufficient and suggested that the area reserved for such use should be increased. Regarding the planned community hall to the south of the CDA Site, a Member said that the Government should be urged to expedite the implementation.

31. Some Member opined that the proposed development, which included a shopping mall and a transport hub with limited provision of GIC facilities, appeared to be self-contained and segregated from the neighbouring areas. A Member suggested that the applicant should refine the current scheme and incorporate more GIC facilities to optimise the use of land resource. Similarly, a Member suggested that the applicant should adopt innovative design in the proposed development to enhance the diversity of land use.

32. A Member raised concern that the applicant had not adequately addressed the potential impact arising from adding 500 flats at Sites E and F, and opined that the EVA might pose a possible site constraint on the utilisation of the podium deck as a quality open space. The same Member pointed out that there was a lack of cohesion among the public spaces in the development as there were no proper linkages to connect the private open space on the landscape deck, the performance space in the shopping mall, the at-grade POS, and the proposed GIC facilities located to south of the CDA Site. Another Member opined that community cohesion and a sense of belonging could be achieved by strengthening the connection between people and the places they shared. In that connection, a Member used the Quarry Bay Park and its promenade as an example to illustrate how a well-established public space could foster interaction between residents and visitors and pointed out that a well-designed public space was key to encourage community making.

33. The Chairman concluded that Members generally had no objection to the application as most of the major development parameters in the current application remained unchanged when compared to the approved MLP. Regarding the concerns raised by Members in relation to the design and arrangement of public spaces having regard to population increase associated with the concentration of all additional flats at Sites E and F, the provision of more GIC facilities to fully utilising the non-domestic GFA permitted in the

PB, and the provision of more GFA for social enterprise, the Chairman suggested and Members agreed that suitable advisory clauses should be added to remind the applicant to address the concerns as appropriate.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting during the 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 10.7.2024, 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 and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan including a revised development schedule taking into account the approval conditions as stipulated in conditions (b) to (k) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the provision of wider building gaps for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (d) the design and provision of not less than 1,300m<sup>2</sup> at-grade open space to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (e) the design and provision of the canopy above the at-grade open space to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (f) the design and reduction of the height and extent of the noise barriers to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (g) the design and provision of noise mitigation measures to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;

- (h) the design and provision of vehicular access, pedestrian circulation system, car-parking, loading/unloading and lay-by facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (i) the submission of a traffic review and the implementation of traffic improvement measures to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (j) the provision of connection points in the design of the shopping centre to cater for a potential footbridge between the shopping centre and the opposite side of Nam Long Shan Road to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB; and
- (k) the submission and implementation of a revised development programme indicating the timing and phasing of the comprehensive development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

35. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VIII of the Paper and the additional advisory clauses as below:

“to note the comments of the Committee that

- (a) the applicant should review the design and arrangement of public spaces taking into consideration the population increase associated with the concentration of additional flats at Sites E and F;
- (b) the applicant should explore the possibility to provide more government, institution and community facilities in the proposed development to fully utilise the non-domestic gross floor area as permitted in the Planning Brief; and
- (c) the applicant should explore the possibility to increase the area reserved for the use of social enterprise in the shopping centre.”

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

### **Agenda Item 6**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H20/195                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Non-polluting Industrial Use in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone, 14-16 Lee Chung Street, Chai Wan, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H20/195)

---

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

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

Mr Alex T.H. Lai                         -    his former firm had business dealings with Aedas.

37.            The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferral of consideration of the application and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. 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 24.6.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments and for respective government departments to review the application. 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.

[Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 7**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H25/20                      Temporary Shop and Services (Motor-vehicle Showroom) for a Period of 5 Years in "Open Space" Zone, Part of Basement Level B1 of the Car Park Complex, Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (Phase 1), 1 Harbour Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H25/20)

---

40.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Automall Limited, which was a subsidiary of New World Development Company Limited (NWD). Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) was one 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 Automall and NWD; and                            |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | - | being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA. |



41. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

42. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary shop and services (motor-vehicle showroom) for a period of five years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four public comments from individuals objecting to the application were received. Major objection 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 on a temporary basis for a shorter duration of two years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Although the applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Open Space” (“O”) zone, the aboveground area of the subject “O” zone was developed as a public open space and its underground space had been developed as a 3-storey car park (with two basement levels) to meet the car parking requirement of the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC). The applied use, being in operation within basement level B1 of the underground car park since 2003, would not affect the public open space on top of the car park and was considered not unacceptable from the land use point of view. Whilst the Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development (SCED) advised that the applied use would reduce the number of parking spaces available to HKCEC visitors, the Parking

Demand Study (PDS) submitted by the applicant concluded that there were adequate parking spaces at the HKCEC (Phase 1) car park during major events even with the applied use and there would be sufficient private car parking provision in Wan Chai up to 2025. The applied use would not induce major adverse traffic impact on the vicinity given that the motor vehicles at the application premises were for display and would not move in and out frequently. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had no comment on the findings of the PDS but advised that the parking requirement for HKCEC should be timely reviewed in view of the impact of future development in its vicinity. A shorter approval period of two years was recommended to address the concerns of SCED and C for T. Approval conditions had been recommended to address the technical concerns of relevant government departments. Previous applications for the same or similar uses had been approved by the Committee and approval of the application on a temporary basis of two years was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the adverse public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

43. Three Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether the applicant had provided a business plan of the motor-vehicle showroom;
  - (b) whether the impact of HKCEC expansion would affect car parking demand in the Wan Chai North area; and
  - (c) whether information on the provision of monthly public parking space in the Wan Chai North area was available;
44. In responses, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, STP/HK, made the following main points:
- (a) prior to 2018, the temporary motor vehicle showroom took up the entire basement level B1 of the HKCEC (Phase 1) car park complex. The

applicant had reduced the scale of the showroom under the last application (No. A/H25/19) which was approved by the Committee in 2018 while the scale had been further reduced under the current application. Given that showroom would take up car parking spaces at HKCEC, a shorter term of the temporary planning permission of two years was therefore recommended to allow the government to monitor possible changes in the future demand for car parking spaces in the Wan Chai North area;

- (b) 1,070 car parking spaces, of which 670 for short-term public parking, at HKCEC (Phase 1) car park complex were required to be provided under the lease. While the showroom under the current application would take up 195 out of the 670 short-term public parking, a total of 2,461 car parking spaces were provided within different commercial developments along Harbour Road and Convention Avenue in the Wan Chai North area. The government would review and address the parking requirements generated from the redevelopment of Wan Chai Government Offices for convention and exhibition facilities; and
- (c) the HKCEC (Phase 1) car park complex had provided some monthly rental parking spaces. According to the PDS submitted by the applicant, there were vacant parking spaces during mega exhibitions and only on several occasions that all the parking spaces were fully occupied. Hence, sufficient parking spaces were available at the car park complex to satisfy different parking needs.

#### Deliberation Session

45. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of two years, instead of 5 years sought, until 10.7.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no motor shows or car fairs or any related events should be undertaken at the application premises;

- (b) the number of cars to be parked at the car parking area of the application premises shall not exceed 184 at any time;
- (c) the number of visitors allowed at the car parking area of the application premises shall not exceed 300 at any time;
- (d) to employ an independent professional to monitor the mechanical monitoring system to control the number of visitors to the car parking area of the application premises and prepare monitoring reports on a monthly basis;
- (e) to employ an Authorised Person to conduct audit checks on the monitoring system and the monitoring reports on the number of visitors to the car parking area of the application premises on a bi-monthly basis;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, to submit the audit reports every two months highlighting any non-compliance on the number of visitors to the car parking area of the application premises to the satisfaction of the Director of Buildings or of the TPB;
- (g) the provision of fire service installations within three months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 10.10.2020;
- (h) if any of the above planning conditions (a) to (f) 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; and
- (i) if the above planning condition (g) 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.”

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

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

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

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

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 8**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K13/316 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. 33 Tai Yip Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K13/316A)

---

47. The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) and AIM Group Limited (AIM) 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 AIM; and   |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | - being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA. |

48. The Committed noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

49. Mr William W.L. Chan, STP/K, drew Members' attention that a replacement page (P.2 of Appendix IV) incorporating the comment from the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of the Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had been tabled at the meeting for Members' reference. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, he then 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 statutory publication periods, a total of five public comments from individuals objecting to the application were received. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed uses were in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone and the transformation taking place in Kowloon Bay Business Area from industrial to business/commercial uses. The existing industrial building (IB) at the application site could be regarded as an eligible pre-1987 IB under government's policy on revitalising IBs and the Development Bureau had given policy support to the application in optimising utilisation of the existing industrial stock and making better use of the valuable land resources subject to demonstration of technical feasibility. The proposed minor relaxation of PR (20%) generally followed the policy on revitalisation of pre-1987 IBs and the proposed relaxation of BH (9.9%) restriction sought was not unreasonable. Regarding the ground floor setbacks and greenery provision proposed by the applicant, CTP/UD&L of PlanD advised that the design features might

help improve the pedestrian environment and promote visual interest, and represented the applicant's efforts in improving the building design. The Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office had no adverse comment on the proposed setback from the pedestrian environment perspective. Other relevant government departments had no adverse comments on the application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

50. In response to a Member's enquiry on the details of the proposed vertical greening system, Mr William W.L. Chan, STP/K, with reference to Drawings A-10, 11 and 15 of the Paper, said that the applicant had proposed landscape treatments in terms of vertical greening and planters on G/F, 2/F, 3/F and R/F of the proposed development. Supporting frames and water pipes would be stabled on the concrete wall of the proposed development, and green wall panels, composed of plants, soils and fertilizers, would be installed on the frame. In response to the same Member's further question, Mr. Chan said the applicant had not adopted a grey water irrigation system in the proposed development.

#### Deliberation Session

51. In response to a Member's observation, the Committee agreed that an advisory clause should be added to advise the applicant to explore the possibility of reusing grey water for irrigating landscaping features in the proposed development.

52. 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 10.7.2024, 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 provision of parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces, vehicular access, internal driveway, efficiency of the car lift system and the impact on the public road for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board; and

- (b) the submission of land contamination assessment in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures prior to development of the site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board.”

53. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV of the Paper and the additional advisory clause as below:

“to note the comment of the Committee that the applicant should explore the possibility of reusing grey water for irrigating landscaping features in the proposed development.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr William W.L. Chan, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]



**Agenda Item 9**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K13/318 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/K13/318)

---

54. The Secretary reported that Townland Consultants Limited (Townland) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong limited (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;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm had business dealings with Townland and Arup; and
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with Arup.

55. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferral of consideration of the application and Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

56. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 24.6.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time to address the comments from government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

57. 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.

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

### **Agenda Item 10**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/788                      Shop and Services in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone,  
G/F, Peter Leung Industrial Building, 103 Wai Yip Street, Kwun Tong,  
Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/788)

---

58.            The Secretary reported that Centaline Property Agency Limited (CPAL) was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung<br>(Vice-chairman) | - | being the Chairman of the Hong Kong Dance Company which had obtained sponsorship from CPAL before; and |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai                       | - | his former firm had business dealings with CPAL.   |

59.            The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the interest of the Vice-chairman was indirect, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

### Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the shop and services;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use at the premises was considered in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone and compatible with the changing land use character of the Kwun Tong Business Area. The applied use at the premises complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D in that it would not induce adverse fire safety and environmental impacts on the uses/developments within the subject building and the adjacent areas. Concerned government departments had no adverse comment on the application and relevant approval conditions were recommended to address their technical concerns.

61. Members had no question on the application.

### Deliberation Session

62. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission and implementation of fire safety measures within six months from the date of approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 10.1.2021; and
- (b) if the above planning condition (a) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

63. 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 Mr Chesterfield K.K. Lee, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 11**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K18/336                      Proposed Religious Institution (Buddhist Temple) in “Residential (Group C) 1” Zone, 61 Cumberland Road, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/336)

---

64. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kowloon Tong. Townland Consultants Limited (Townland) was one 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 Townland;                             |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - living in the quarters of the City University of Hong Kong in Kowloon Tong; and  |
| Mr Stanley T.S. Choi  | - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Kowloon Tong. |

65. The Committee noted that the request for deferral of consideration of the application was made by the Planning Department (PlanD) and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the residence of Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon 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.

66. The Secretary reported that the deferral of consideration of the application was recommended by PlanD. As more time would be required for relevant government departments to provide comments on the further information (FI) submitted by the applicant, especially those relating to traffic and pedestrian assessments that were only submitted on 30.6.2020, it was pre-mature for PlanD to make recommendations and for the Committee to consider the application.

67. The justification for deferment met the criteria for deferment as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 33) in that more time was required for relevant government departments to examine the FI, the deferment period was not indefinite and the deferment would not affect the interest of other relevant parties.

68. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by PlanD. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months.

## **Agenda Item 12**

### **Any Other Business**

69. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:55 a.m.