

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 653<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 21.8.2020**

#### **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 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 (Regional 1), 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 Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Miss Carman C.Y. Cheung

## **Opening Remarks**

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

## **Agenda Item 1**

### **Matters Arising**

[Open Meeting]

2. The Secretary reported the following:
  - (a) the regular MPC meetings originally scheduled for 24.7.2020 and 7.8.2020 had been rescheduled in the light of the situation of COVID-19 and the special work arrangement for government departments;
  - (b) Members agreed by circulation on 22.7.2020 and 3.8.2020 to adjourn the consideration of three section 12A applications (No. Y/TW/13, Y/TWW/5 and Y/K9/13) under section 12A(20) of the Town Planning Ordinance, and to defer consideration of eleven section 16 applications (No. A/TW/517, A/K3/589, A/K5/816, A/K5/817, A/K11/236, A/TW/511, A/TY/143, A/TY/144, A/K13/319, A/K14/783 and A/K18/337) to another date. The respective applicants/agents of the applicants had been informed of the MPC's decision, and a meeting date would be fixed to consider the applications. Applications No. Y/TWW/5, A/K5/816, A/K5/817 and A/K11/236 originally scheduled for 24.7.2020 were rescheduled for consideration by MPC at this meeting; and
  - (c) the draft minutes of the 652<sup>nd</sup> MPC meeting were confirmed by circulation on 24.7.2020 without amendments.

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 2**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/K10/3                      Application for Amendment to the Draft Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K10/25, To rezone the application site from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Commercial Development with Public Vehicle Park” to “Residential (Group A)4”, 128 Carpenter Road, Kowloon City, Kowloon  
  
(MPC Paper No. Y/K10/3)

---

3.            The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kowloon City. Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP), Wong Tung & Partners Limited (WT) and MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                   |   |  |
|-------------------|---|--|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with ARUP and MVA;        |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai  | - | his former firm had business dealings with ARUP and WT;    |
| Mr Franklin Yu    | - | having past business dealings with ARUP; and               |
| Mr C.H. Tse       | - | co-owning a car parking space with spouse in Kowloon City. |

4.            As Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Alex T.H. Lai and Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, and the interest of Mr C.H. Tse was indirect, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. The Committee noted that Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

5.            The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the

applicant were invited to the meeting at this point:

*PlanD*

Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)  
Mr Mak Chung Hang - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)

*Good Focus Holdings Limited*

Mr Jacky Yu ]  
Mr Yu Chung Lai ]

*ARUP*

Ms Theresa Yeung ]  
Ms Carmen Chu ]  
Ms Karen Chan ]  
Ms Aileen Cheng ] Applicant's Representatives  
Mr Tianyu Zhao ]  
Ms Hope Chen ]

*Lu Tang Lai Architects Limited*

Mr Rembert S.K. Lai ]  
Mr Ka Wah Fan ]  
Mr Joseph M.K. Tang ]

6. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the background of the application.

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed rezoning of the application site (the Site) from "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Commercial Development with Public Vehicle Park" to "Residential (Group A)4" ("R(A)4") on the draft Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K10/25 to facilitate a proposed private residential development with retail facilities and a public vehicle park (PVP) subject to a maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) of 7.5 and total PR of 9.0 for

a building which was partly domestic and partly non-domestic, and a maximum building height (BH) of 100mPD;

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, 321 public comments were received with 33 supporting comments mainly from members of the public including business operators in the area. The remaining 288 comments from a Kowloon City District Council member of the Lung Tong constituency, trades/organisations operating in Kowloon City and individuals objected to the application. Their major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the PlanD's views – PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. In considering the previous rezoning application (No. Y/K10/2) in November 2019, the Committee, whilst generally having no in-principle objection to the proposed rezoning, decided not to agree to the application and considered it pre-mature to rezone the Site which was originally planned and implemented as a PVP with commercial uses to serve the local neighbourhood, as no practical measure was provided to address the demand for public parking spaces during the demolition and construction stages. Under the current application, apart from providing the same number of public car parking spaces (i.e. 449) as the existing PVP upon redevelopment, the applicant put forth a proposal to provide not less than 60 public car parking spaces during the demolition and construction stages in order to address the Committee's previous concern. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had no objection to the application, including the interim parking arrangement. However, it was recommended that the requirement for a PVP on the Site should be specified in the Notes of the OZP, rather than in the Explanatory Statement (ES) as proposed by the applicant. Besides, the applicant's proposal to include an exemption clause for underground parking in the Notes was considered unnecessary as it would be subject to

consideration under the building regime. The provision of interim public car parking should be clearly stated in the ES, rather than accepting the applicant's proposal that interim public car park would be provided only 'as far as technically feasible'. Relevant technical assessments had been conducted to demonstrate that the proposed development was technically feasible and would not cause insurmountable problems, and 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.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

8. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Theresa Yeung, Mr Rembert S.K. Lai and Mr Joseph M.K. Tang, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

*Background*

- (a) the rezoning proposal comprised a residential development with retail facilities and a PVP subject to a maximum domestic PR of 7.5 and total PR of 9 and a maximum BH of 100mPD;
- (b) the applicant had previously submitted a rezoning application (No. Y/K10/2) with the same development parameters and zoning designation, but the Committee decided not to agree to the application for the reason that it was pre-mature to rezone the Site that was planned and implemented as a PVP with commercial uses to serve the local neighbourhood but no practical measure was provided to address the demand for public parking spaces during the demolition and construction stages. As a result, the Consultants had reviewed the rezoning proposal and included an interim public car parking proposal in the current application;

*Interim Public Car Parking Proposal*

- (c) in order to provide an interim public car park for the neighbourhood, a three-stage redevelopment programme was proposed with an aim to achieve continuous/seamless provision of public car parking spaces during demolition and construction stages. It was proposed to divide the existing building of the Kowloon City Plaza (KCP) into two portions (eastern and western portions);
- (d) during Stage 1, while the existing 449 public car parking spaces on 5/F and R/F would be retained, alteration and addition works would be carried out to enable a self-contained public carpark at B3 of the western portion and two temporary car lifts to access to the temporary car park would be constructed. During Stage 2, a temporary public car park with 60 parking spaces would be provided at B3 of the western portion, while the entire eastern portion would be demolished and redevelopment of the eastern portion (including a permanent PVP in basement levels) would commence. During Stage 3, not less than 60 public car park spaces would be provided at the basement of the new development in the eastern portion, and the existing building in the western portion would be demolished and redeveloped. Upon redevelopment, a total of 449 public car parking spaces would be provided;
- (e) C for T had no adverse comment on the application and the interim public car parking proposal, and the provision of 60 car parking spaces during the interim would address the concerns on the traffic issues previously raised by the Committee;

*Increasing Number of Car Parking Spaces*

- (f) apart from reprovisioning of the existing number of 449 public car parking spaces, 45 ancillary parking spaces would be provided for the retail use while 139 ancillary parking spaces would be provided for the residential portion of the development;

*Better Enhancement with the Park*



- (g) as shown in the indicative scheme, the proposed development would promote pedestrian connectivity, visual interest and building permeability through the following measures: (i) a 4.45m-wide setback along the western boundary of the Site abutting an unnamed lane (extending north of Fuk Lo Tsun Road) up to 15m above street level to enhance the walking environment as well as wind penetration along the lane; (ii) an internal public corridor of not less than 6m wide on G/F connecting Carpenter Road and the Carpenter Road Park; (iii) a 15m-wide building separation between the two residential towers above G/F to facilitate wind and visual penetration; (iv) a 9.5m-wide setback from the eastern boundary, which included an internal driveway with a width of not less than 7.3m; (v) a 30m-wide building separation on 3/F; and (vi) a varying northern façade and green terraces on 1/F and 2/F facing Carpenter Road Park with setback ranging from 1m to 3m from the site boundary to enhance the interface of the proposed development with the Carpenter Road Park and mimicking the old Kowloon Walled City building fabric; and

#### *Multiple Use*

- (h) besides the provision of a PVP, the proposed development would be a mixed use development providing residential flats and retail facilities to meet the needs of the neighbourhood. The proposed development would also enhance better integration with the existing Parks in the vicinity. Relevant government departments had no in-principle objection to the application.

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join and Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung joined the meeting during the presentation of the applicant's representatives.]

9. As the presentations of the representatives from PlanD and the applicant were completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

#### *Car Parking*

10. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) original intention of providing a PVP at the Site;
- (b) whether the interim public car parking proposal would be effective to mitigate the traffic issues such as illegal parking in the neighbourhood;
- (c) mechanism for implementing the interim PVP;
- (d) implementation mechanism to ensure the proposed number of public parking spaces would be used by the public rather than future residents;
- (e) whether the construction of car lifts in the interim PVP would create traffic impact on Carpenter Road, and technical feasibility for seamless provision of the interim PVP;
- (f) how the proposed parking design would improve the existing condition where there were always vehicle tailback onto Carpenter Road;
- (g) what would happen if the interim PVP could not obtain a temporary occupation permit (OP);
- (h) how long the interim PVP would be operated, and whether there were other parking provisions in the area during the demolition and construction stages; and
- (i) whether the provision of 139 ancillary car parking spaces was sufficient for the residential use.

11. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, made the following main points:

- (a) since 1982, the requirement for providing a PVP at the Site had already been stipulated on the relevant Outline Development Plan, which was then reflected in the then “Government, Institution or Community” zone under the OZP in 1987. The PVP at the Site was intended to meet the parking needs in the neighbourhood and therefore the Site was subsequently rezoned

to “OU” annotated “Commercial Development with Public Vehicle Park;”

- (b) C for T had no adverse comment on the interim PVP proposal with not less than 60 car parking spaces as proposed by the applicant. A car parking survey conducted by the applicant showed that about 20% of the car parking users (i.e. about 89 car parking spaces) did not use the shopping mall’s free car parking coupon. As KCP would be demolished, those 89 car parking spaces would be required for reprovisioning. Given that there were about 40 public car parking spaces in the vicinity, the proposed 60 temporary public car parking spaces were considered sufficient by C for T;
- (c) any demolition and construction would require submission of general building plans (GBPs), and the need to maintain an interim PVP requirement would be conveyed to the Buildings Department. Also, lease modification would be required as the proposed development included residential use which was not allowed under the current lease. Detailed requirements on the implementation of the PVP, including the interim arrangement as appropriate, could be dealt with at the lease modification stage; and
- (d) the requirement for provision of a PVP to the satisfaction of C for T could be specified in the Notes, and the minimum number of public parking spaces might be stated in the ES of the OZP. The number of parking spaces of the PVP would also be proposed to be stipulated under the lease. For reference, one of the current lease conditions specified a minimum percentage (80%) of car parking spaces to be charged on an hourly basis, which would normally apply to public car parking.

12. In response, Mr Rembert S.K. Lai, Ms Theresa Yeung and Ms Carmen Chu, the applicant’s representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) there were sufficient spaces for vehicles waiting for car lift to the interim PVP inside the building after entering from Carpenter Road, and the design of car lift would also facilitate smooth direction with no yielding from opposite direction. A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) had been

conducted by the applicant, which confirmed that the interim PVP proposal was feasible and demonstrated that with mitigation measures, vehicles would not queue on Carpenter Road. The Transport Department (TD) had no adverse comment on the proposal;

- (b) the design of the ramp of the existing KCP was poor as it was used by vehicles on both directions, and requiring them to yield. Moreover, the existing drop gate was located too close to Carpenter Road, so vehicles might tail back on the road. Under the interim PVP proposal, there would be more spaces for vehicles waiting inside the Site after entering from Carpenter Road and the car lift would also eliminate the need for vehicles yielding in the opposite direction. Upon completion of the proposed development, vehicles would also not need to queue on Carpenter Road as the placing of the drop gate in the lower floors of the basement would allow sufficient space in the internal driveway, drop off areas and ramp inside the proposed development for vehicles to line up within the Site. Besides, the number of available public car parking spaces would also be shown on TD's smart parking platform to reflect the real time availability of public parking spaces;
- (c) if the temporary OP for the eastern portion could not be obtained, the western portion would not be demolished, meaning that the PVP at the western portion would still be in operation. The western portion would be demolished only when the PVP at the eastern portion was completed and with the temporary OP issued;
- (d) the construction period for the whole redevelopment would last for about 70 months, whilst the interim PVP of 60 parking spaces would be provided seamlessly. Regarding the parking provisions in the area during the construction period of the proposed development, the URA Kai Tak Road/Sa Po Road Development Scheme would provide about 300 public car parking spaces and there were also public car parking in Kai Tak Development Area (KTDA). Based on the car parking survey conducted by the applicant, as KCP would be demolished, the temporary provision of 60 public car parking spaces was considered sufficient to meet the parking needs in Kowloon City;

and

- (e) according to the TIA, the provision of 139 ancillary car parking spaces for residents was calculated based on the high end requirement under the Hong Kong Planning Standard and Guidelines (HKPSG) and TD had no objection to the proposal.

*Building Design, Atrium Plaza and Interface with the Surrounding Environment*

13. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) apart from making reference to the architectural style of the Kowloon Walled City, whether other design considerations had been taken into account in the design of the northern façade of the podium;
- (b) whether the proposed internal corridor at the atrium would be opened to the public 24 hours daily, and which party would be responsible for the management of such public space;
- (c) whether there was public request for a gathering place/performance venue at the Site, and whether there was such space reserved at the Site to meet the public needs, if any;
- (d) whether Carpenter Road would be widened under the proposal;
- (e) the opening hours of the Carpenter Road Park and Kowloon Walled City Park; and
- (f) the interface issues such as privacy between the proposed residential towers and the adjoining school.

14. In response, Mr Joseph M.K. Tang and Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) in addition to respecting the cultural and historical context of the Kowloon Walled City, the proposed scheme would also enhance its integration with the Parks by providing partial recess at podium and vertical greening at the northern boundary of the Site and an internal corridor at the atrium to connect Carpenter Road and the Carpenter Road Park to improve pedestrian connectivity;
- (b) the internal corridor would be opened to the public 24 hours daily and would be managed by the future operator of the shopping mall. As such, the management and maintenance responsibilities would be borne by the operator of the shopping mall;
- (c) the existing KCP had not been used as a community centre nor venue for public facilities and there was no requirement for providing such facilities therein. The Tung Tau Community Centre and Kai Tak Community Hall were located about 500m and 900m respectively from KCP, and each had provided multi-function hall/rooms with performance stage which could accommodate 450 persons. Under the proposed scheme, the atrium at the internal corridor could be a new gathering point with an area of about 600 ft<sup>2</sup> to 700 ft<sup>2</sup> that could be used for performance (e.g. singing contest and musical performance), and the design of the internal corridor would also enhance connectivity and integration between Kowloon City core and the Parks. The applicant would consider more options for providing venue for gathering/performance at the atrium; and
- (d) although the pedestrian sidewalk of Carpenter Road would be of the same width, the proposed scheme had included three design measures; (i) a 4.45m-wide setback along the western boundary of the Site abutting an unnamed lane (extending north of Fuk Lo Tsun Road) up to 15m; (ii) an internal public corridor of not less than 6m wide on G/F connecting Carpenter Road and the Carpenter Road Park; and (iii) a 9.5m wide setback from the eastern boundary at the entrance plaza. Such design measures would improve the pedestrian environment and create public realm to serve as gathering point.

15. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, made the following main points:
- (a) the Carpenter Road Park was opened 24 hours daily while the Kowloon Walled City Park was opened from 6:30am to 11 pm every day, with the exhibition halls inside closed earlier; and
  - (b) residential developments were considered as compatible with school uses. For the current case, no objection to the proposed development was received from the adjoining school.

*Planning Standards, Assessments and Others*

16. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) what the main planning considerations for s.12A application were;
  - (b) whether there would be additional requirements for community facilities under the HKPSG brought about by the increased population of the proposed residential development;
  - (c) the difference between the previous application No. Y/K10/2 and the current application;
  - (d) whether there were standards or guidelines governing the minimum age of buildings proposed for redevelopment;
  - (e) the reasons why PlanD recommended the Committee to “partially agree” to the application;
  - (f) utilisation rate of the existing KCP and the difference between the existing KCP and the proposed development in terms of provision of retail facilities; and
  - (g) average flat size of the proposed residential development.

17. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, made the following main points:
- (a) when considering a s.12A application that was for amendment to the zoning of a site, the relevant planning considerations included the proposed land uses and compatibility with the surrounding land uses, the key development parameters including PR and BH, unique requirements such as re-provisioning of PVP on the subject site. The existing KCP had a PR of 8.08 and the proposed development would have a total PR of 9, resulting in an increase in PR of about 1. In addition, the current proposal would achieve a better utilisation of land by providing residential units to increase housing supply whilst retaining the PVP. Relevant technical assessments had been conducted to demonstrate the technical feasibility of the proposed development and relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application including the visual and air ventilation aspects. Although there was a reduction in the provision of retail floor space as compared with the existing KCP, the URA's Kai Tak Road/Sa Po Road project and developments in KTDA would also provide additional retail facilities in the vicinity;
  - (b) the proposed development with 850 residential units would accommodate a population of about 2,000. Such population level would not trigger requirements for extra community facilities as required under HKPSG. Currently, there was a deficit in the provision of elderly facilities and child care centre facilities within the planning scheme area of the OZP. In the next stage of OZP amendment, the government, institution and community facilities requirements for the area under the HKPSG would be submitted to the Committee for consideration;
  - (c) compared with the previous application No. Y/K10/2, the key development parameters and proposed uses were similar, but the current application included an interim PVP proposal to address the car parking demand during the demolition and construction stages, and there were proposed measures to enhance the interface with the Parks to the north of the Site;



- (d) KCP was completed in 1993 and had been in existence for 27 years. Currently, there was no regulation restricting the building age whereby a building could be allowed for demolition and it was purely a commercial decision. From environmental perspective, the Director of Environmental Protection had advised the applicant to minimise generation of construction and demolition materials by reusing and recycling;
- (e) PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application in terms of the proposed land use zoning and key development parameters. The ‘partial agreement’ to the application was recommended as the details to be incorporated into the applicant’s proposed Notes and ES of the OZP would need to be reviewed and be submitted to the Committee for consideration before gazetting should the application be approved; and
- (f) based on the approved GBPs of the existing KCP, it had a total gross floor area (GFA) of about 40,000 m<sup>2</sup> for retail use but according to the applicant, only 9,000m<sup>2</sup> was active commercial GFA. The proposed scheme would have 8,810m<sup>2</sup> of commercial GFA, and in addition, there would be about 8,000m<sup>2</sup> of non-domestic GFA in the URA Kai Tak Road/Sa Po Road Development Scheme and about 65,000m<sup>2</sup> and 88,000m<sup>2</sup> of retail GFA in the “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” and “Commercial (6)” zones of KTDA respectively.

18. In response, Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant’s representative, made the following main points:

- (a) there was no updated utilisation rate of the existing KCP due to the social unrest last year and the COVID-19 since early this year. The utilisation rate of the existing KCP had been quite low and only about 9,000 m<sup>2</sup> of retail GFA had been actively used (e.g. a supermarket and a Chinese restaurant); and
- (b) the proposed average flat size was about 50m<sup>2</sup>.

19. As the applicant's representatives had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairman informed the applicant's representatives that the hearing procedure for the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representatives from PlanD and the applicant for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

20. Noting that Mr Rembert S.K. Lai, who was the Council Member of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (HKPolyU) and the Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU), was one of the applicant's representatives, Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung (the Vice-chairman), Mr Stanley T.S. Choi and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong declared interests on the item with the former two being the Council Members of HKPolyU and the later being a Council Member of HKBU. As Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung, Mr Stanley T.S. Choi and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had not discussed the application with the applicant's representative and their interests were indirect, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

21. Members noted the proposed interim parking arrangement and enhanced development scheme under the current application as compared with that under the previous application. Members generally agreed to the proposed rezoning as the proposed residential use was considered not incompatible with the surroundings while optimising the use of land to increase housing supply, the proposed development parameters (i.e. PR and BH) would be in line with that permissible under the "R(A)2" zone in the Kowloon City area, the proposed development was technically feasible and relevant government departments had no objection to or adverse comment on the application. Members noted that the interim parking proposal was considered acceptable to TD and the proposed scheme would help improve the pedestrian walking environment and the connectivity with the adjoining Carpenter Road Park. In that regard, Members appreciated the applicant's efforts in revising the proposal to address Members' previous concern on interim parking and improve the building design measures to bring about more public benefits as compared with the previous application.

22. A Member, whilst noting the adoption of a better design for integrating the proposed development with the parks and surrounding developments, suggested that the

applicant could further strengthen the design concept by making reference to the uniqueness and identity of Kowloon City in the detailed design stage. Members considered that the atrium at the centre of the proposed development could be developed as a gathering place or informal performance venue to meet the public needs and some space inside the shopping mall could also be reserved for provision of community facilities, which would not only bring benefits to the public but also help strengthen the sense of place in the area.

23. Whilst the applicant had proposed the interim parking arrangement at the Site and to maintain the existing number of public parking spaces upon redevelopment, a Member considered that it would be the Government's responsibility to explore other measures to address the parking demand in the area. Upon the Chairman's invitation, Mr Tony K.T. Yau, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), TD explained that congestion might occur at some junctions during peak hours like Kowloon City roundabout which was due to the traffic entering or leaving Kowloon City and buses approaching at the nearby bus stops. TD would continue to explore and implement local traffic improvement works in the district. With the Sun Wong Toi MTR Station to be opened in 2021, the traffic and transport to the area would be significantly enhanced. The parking facilities provided in KTDA would also serve the Kowloon City district, as the pedestrian subway connecting the new MTR station would enhance the connectivity between Kowloon City and KTDA.

24. To facilitate a better understanding of planning in the Kowloon City area and KTDA, a Member proposed and the Chairman agreed that information on the overall planning of the area could be shared with Members during the processing of some new development or redevelopment projects when opportunity arose.

25. The Chairman concluded that Members in general had no in-principle objection to the subject rezoning application subject to some revisions to the proposed Notes and ES of the OZP. The applicant should also consider opening up the atrium as a gathering place/performance venue free of charge for public use, and reserving some space within the shopping mall for community use.

26. After deliberation, the Committee decided to partially agree to the application by rezoning the application site to an appropriate sub-zone of "Residential (Group A)" with a maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) of 7.5 and total PR of 9.0 for a building which is partly

domestic and partly non-domestic, and a maximum building height (BH) of 100mPD, or the PR/BH of the existing building, whichever is greater. Amendments to the draft Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K10/25 would be submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.

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

#### **Agenda Item 3**

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

[Open Meeting]

Y/TWW/5                      Application for Amendment to the Approved Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/33, To Rezone the application site from “Government, Institution or Community” to “Residential (Group A) 5”, Lots 99, 100, 101 RP, 110 RP, 171C and 183 in D.D. 390 and Adjoining Government Land, Sham Tseng, Tsuen Wan West, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. Y/TWW/5)

---

27.                      The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 19.6.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

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

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

#### **Agenda Item 4**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/816                      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, 121 King Lam Street, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/816)

---

29.                      The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) and LWK & Partners Architects (LWK) were 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 ARUP and LWK; and |
| Mr Franklin Yu    | - | having past business dealings with ARUP.                     |

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

##### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio restriction for permitted non-polluting industrial use (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of dangerous goods);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, three public comments from an individual and the representative of Tai Cheong and Hang Cheong Factory Buildings Owners' Corporations expressing concerns 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 assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed redevelopment was generally in line with the planning intention of the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone and the proposed building height (BH) of 130mPD complied with the BH restriction stipulated under the Outline Zoning Plan. The Secretary for Development gave policy support to the application to optimise utilisation of the existing industrial stock and make better use of valuable land resources. Apart from the provision of a 2m building setback from King Lam Street in accordance with the Outline Development Plan's requirement, an additional 0.5m voluntary setback would be provided, resulting in a 2.5m-wide full-height setback from King Lam Street for improving pedestrian circulation. In addition, the proposed development would incorporate a voluntary 1.5m-wide full height setback from the eastern boundary of the application site along the existing right-of-way to facilitate manoeuvring of vehicles to the proposed development and the neighbouring factory building. A podium garden on 3/F and greenery on G/F, 3/F and the roof were proposed, achieving a greenery provision of 76.75m<sup>2</sup> (i.e. greenery coverage of about 15%). Concerns from the Director of Environmental Protection on sewerage impact and land contamination could be addressed by imposing approval conditions and other 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.

32. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, STP/TWK, said that the proposed scheme had taken into account the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines requirements in terms of building separation, building setback and greenery, and the applicant intended to apply for Building Environmental Assessment Method (BEAM) assessment to achieve a sustainable building design with improved air ventilation to the surrounding environment. She further explained that according to the applicant's proposal, the greenery on ground level and podium garden with vertical greening and planters would improve pedestrian environment, soften building edges and enhance streetscape. The vertical greenery would be irrigated by an automatic system two times a day and the general maintenance would be provided every three months. There was no information on whether grey water would be used for irrigation.

#### Deliberation Session

33. A Member suggested that the applicant should adopt more green building design measures such as the use of recycled materials and water in the redevelopment proposal. The Member also considered that the Government should do more in the area of recycling in Hong Kong. The Chairman said that a briefing for Members on various environmental initiatives of the Environmental Protection Department would be organised.

34. The Committee noted that the applicant intended to apply for BEAM assessment but the proposed scheme in fact had not yet achieved an accredited level and the application did not provide much information on which aspects or categories under the BEAM assessment the building design would be aimed to achieve for sustainability purpose. In that regard, the Committee considered that the applicant's mere intention to apply for BEAM assessment could not help demonstrate compliance with the green building design measures unless at least a prerequisite achievement under the BEAM assessment had been obtained. That said, Members in general had no objection to the subject application.

35. A Member enquired the mechanism for ensuring the implementation of the proposed setbacks and greenery features should the application be approved by the Committee.

In response, the Secretary explained that as the application was for redevelopment of the industrial building, general building plan (GBP) submission to the Buildings Department would be required and PlanD, when vetting the GBP, would ensure the provision of setbacks and greenery as per the approved scheme. Should the GBP submission not complying with the approved scheme, PlanD would recommend that section 16(1)(d) of the Buildings Ordinance be invoked to reject the GBP.

36. 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 21.8.2024, 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;
- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works 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; and
- (d) the submission of a land contamination assessment 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.”

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



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

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/817                      Shop and Services (Showroom for Garments and Ancillary Storage) in  
"Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business (2)" Zone, Portion of  
Workshops B3 and B4, G/F, Block B, Hong Kong Industrial Centre, 489-  
491 Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/817A)

---

38.            The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 15.7.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow more time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had negotiated with the Fire Services Department regarding their comments.

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. Since it was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for the preparation of submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Agenda Item 6**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K4/71 Proposed Residential Institution (Student Hostels) with Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction in “Government, Institution or Community (7)” Zone, Tat Hong Avenue, Shek Kip Mei, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K4/71A)

---

40. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Shek Kip Mei and the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (HKPolyU). Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) and MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                       |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau    | - | being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society, which had business dealings with KTA; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho     | - | having current business dealings with MVA;   |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai      | - | his former firm had business dealings with HKPolyU; and                                      |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - | living in the quarters of the City University of Hong Kong in Kowloon Tong.                  |

41. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau and Thomas O.S. Ho had no involvement in the application and the residence of Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

42. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 5.8.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow more time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information on 3.7.2020.

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

### **Hong Kong District**

#### **Agenda Item 7**

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

[Open Meeting]

A/H20/193                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Non-polluting Industrial Use in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone, 18 Lee Chung Street, Chai Wan, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H20/193B)

---

44. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Chai Wan. 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 Raymond K.W. Lee<br>(the Chairman) <i>as the<br/>Director of Planning</i> | - | his spouse owning a workshop in an industrial building in Chai Wan; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho  | - | his firm having current business dealings with LD; and              |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai   | - | his former firm had business dealings with Aedas.                   |

45. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative had requested deferment

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 and the property owned by Mr Raymond K.W. Lee's spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

46. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 28.7.2020 and 13.8.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had been reviewing the design merits of the proposed development including internal layout and supporting facilities, provision of car parking and loading/unloading spaces and other associated requirements.

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

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 8**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K11/236            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, 20-24 Tai Yau Street, San Po Kong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K11/236A)

---

48.            The Secretary reported that the application site was located in San Po Kong. Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had declared an interest on the item as his spouse was a director of a company which owned a property in Wong Tai Sin.

49.            The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the property owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi’s spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

50.            The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 7.7.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the second time that the applicants requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicants had submitted further information including responses to departmental comments, revised plans and technical assessments (including traffic impact assessment, sewerage impact assessment and air quality assessment) to address departmental comments.

51.            After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicants pending the submission of further information from the applicants. 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 applicants. If the further information submitted by the applicants 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 applicants 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 preparation of submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

### **Agenda Item 9**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K10/266                      Proposed Flat, Eating Place and/or Shop and Services in “Residential (Group E)” Zone, 17 Yuk Yat Street, To Kwa Wan, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K10/266)

---

52.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 13.8.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

53.            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 one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Mr Mak Chung Hang, 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/K18/335            Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction to Allow for One Storey of Basement for Permitted House Use in “Residential (Group C) 1” Zone, 14 Kent Road, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/335A)

---

54.            The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kowloon Tong. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- 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.

55.            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.

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a)    background to the application;
- (b)    proposed minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction to allow for one storey of basement for permitted house use;
- (c)    departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d)    during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, five public

comments from residents of the nearby lots with two objecting to the application and three providing views were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed addition of a basement floor for three car parking spaces, one loading/unloading bay and some ancillary plant room use, with the above ground portion of the building remaining at three storeys was in line with the general BH profile of the adjacent developments and would not cause any adverse impacts on the existing trees or deteriorate the distinctiveness of the area as a garden estate. The applicant proposed to set back the house from Kent Road by 6m to comply with the non-building area requirement under the Outline Development Plan. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. 14 similar applications involving 13 sites were approved, which were supported by planning and design merits, while four similar applications involving one site were rejected. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

57. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) details of the landscape proposal, including the number of trees that would be transplanted or felled, and their existing conditions, and the mechanism to ensure its implementation;
- (b) the assessment of the proposed development with reference to the criteria for considering applications for minor relaxation of BH restriction for one storey of basement; and
- (c) whether facilities such as the loading/unloading bay for light goods vehicle (LGV) and sprinkler water tank were considered essential to be placed at basement.



58. In response, Mr Mak Chung Hang, STP/K, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the applicant's submission as shown on Drawings A-4 and A-5 of the Paper, amongst the eight existing trees within the application site, two at the north-western corner would be retained in-situ, five along the northern boundary would be transplanted, and one (T8) at the southern boundary would be felled and compensated with three new trees at the north-eastern corner of the site. A soil depth of 1.2m was proposed for the tree planting area. The existing condition and location of the trees were shown on Plan A-3 of the Paper. Having considered the tree survey and Master Landscape Plan submitted by the applicant, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape Section, PlanD had no objection to the application. In general, tree felling and transplanting would be governed by a tree preservation clause under lease, as appropriate;
- (b) as compared to the approved similar applications, the proposed basement size (with a relative size of 104% to the total floor area of the above ground portion) under the current application was at the top end of those previously approved applications. For the 14 approved similar applications, the relative basement size ranged from 26% to 104%, while for the four rejected similar applications involving one site, the relative basement size was about 112% to 141% which was considered excessive. Besides, in some similar applications, greenery would also be provided on 2/F and 3/F or terraces/flat roof areas, while for the subject application, greening was proposed on the ground floor open area only. A set of general building plans (GBPs) for a proposed 3-storey detached house (including one storey of basement) utilising the permitted PR at the application site was approved by the Building Authority (BA) in August 2018. The current application for a house with 4 storeys (including one storey of basement) was proposed based on the applicant's choice of design rather than the need to achieve the permissible PR due to specific site constraints; and
- (c) according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, one loading/unloading bay for LGV was required for the proposed development

but there was no requirement for it to be provided within an indoor area. As for the other ancillary facilities such as car park and plant rooms, there was also no specific requirement on their locations.

### Deliberation Session

59. The Chairman recapitulated the relevant site context to facilitate Members' consideration. He said that the application site was located to the west of Waterloo Road in Kowloon Tong, which was subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 0.6 and a maximum BH of 3 storeys (i.e. inclusive of any storey to be provided at basement level). As the application was for a proposed development with 3 storeys above ground and one additional storey of basement, planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board) for the minor relaxation of BH restriction was required while the PR had not exceeded 0.6 as stipulated under the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). According to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, for consideration of application to provide an additional basement storey, the construction of the basement should not cause any adverse impacts on the existing trees or deteriorate the distinctiveness of the area as a garden estate.

60. Members noted that a set of GBPs which complied with the OZP restrictions was approved by BA in August 2018. However, the detailed information of the approved GBPs was not included in the applicant's submission, and Members could not compare the differences between the approved GBPs and the proposed scheme under the current application.

61. A Member considered that putting ancillary facilities such as car parks and plant rooms on basement was a matter of the applicant's choice rather than a statutory requirement or an essential need. Noting that the proposed site coverage was about 45% while the basement would cover almost the whole application site, a Member was concerned whether the proposed scheme had optimised the use of the above ground storeys, and opined that it might be possible to place those ancillary facilities on the above ground storeys. Members generally considered that the applicant had not provided strong justifications for the proposed basement size under application. In addition, in comparison with the previously approved similar applications in the area, some Members considered that the planning gain of the current application (i.e. greenery provision) was minimal, if any. A Member further pointed out that there was no strong reason to propose felling T8 tree and there might be scope to enhance the

landscape proposal. Members generally considered that the applicant had not yet provided sufficient information to support the proposal, and considered it prudent to defer a decision on the application pending the applicant's submission of supplementary information.

62. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application pending the applicant's further information on justifications for the proposed extensive basement, planning gains that might be brought about by the proposal such as a better landscape proposal and details of the approved GBPs for the Committee's further consideration.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Mak Chung Hang, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Lilian S.K. Law and Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong 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 11**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/791            Shop and Services (Convenience Store) in "Other Specified Uses"  
annotated "Business" Zone, Unit 3A, G/F, Century Centre, 44-46 Hung To  
Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/791)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

63. 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) shop and services (convenience store);

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment was received; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Use” annotated “Business” zone and was compatible with the changing land use character of Kwun Tong Business Area. The applied use also complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No.22D (TPB PG-No.22D) in that it would not induce adverse fire safety, traffic and environmental impacts on the developments within the subject building and the applied use was not subject to the maximum permissible limit for aggregated commercial floor area on the G/F under TPB PG-No.22D. Relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. As the applied use had been in operation on the premises and that the previous permission granted for the same use was revoked due to non-compliance with the approval condition on the submission and implementation of the fire safety measures within the specified time limit, a shorter compliance period of three months for submission and six months for implementation was recommended to monitor the progress of compliance.

64. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

65. 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 of a proposal on the fire safety measures within three months from the date of approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 21.11.2020;
- (b) in relation to (a) above, the implementation of the 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 21.2.2021; and
- (c) if any of the above planning conditions (a) or (b) is not complied with by the specified dates, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 12**

#### Any Other Business

67. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:40 p.m.