

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 657<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 9.10.2020**

#### **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 (R1), Lands Department  
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Secretary

**In Attendance**

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Miss Denise M.S. Ho

**Agenda Item 1**

**Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 656<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 18.9.2020**

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 656<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 18.9.2020 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

**Matters Arising**

[Open Meeting]

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

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting]

Draft Development Brief for the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Tourism Related Uses to include Commercial, Hotel and Entertainment” Zone on the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (MPC Paper No. 3/20)

---

3. The Secretary reported that AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants for the draft Development Brief (DB). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with AECOM;  
and

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

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

5. The following representatives from the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) and the Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting at this point:

EKEO's representatives

Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk - Senior Place Making Manager (Planning)/EKEO  
(SPMM/EKEO)

Ms Yoko Cheung - Associate Director, Urban Planning (AD/UP),  
AECOM

PlanD's representative

Mr K.K. Lee - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)

6. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM/EKEO, presented the draft DB for the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Tourism Related Uses to include Commercial, Hotel and Entertainment" ("OU(TRU)") zone (the Site) including the background, the Site and its surroundings, major development parameters and setback requirements, open space, urban design, landscape and greening requirements, transport facilities, pedestrian connections and other requirements, as detailed in the Paper.

7. As the presentation by Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM/EKEO, was completed, the Chairman invited comments and questions from Members.

8. In response to the Chairman's request, Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM/EKEO, explained that according to the Notes of the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), all uses on land designated "OU(TRU)" required planning permission and the applicant was required to prepare a layout plan including various technical assessments for consideration by the Town Planning Board (the Board). The DB was prepared to provide guidance for the future developer to prepare the layout plan submission.

[Mr Franklin Yu, Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong joined the meeting at this point.]

### *Building Height Restrictions*

9. In response to a Member's question on the rationale for stipulating a building height (BH) restriction of 100mPD for the "OU(TRU)" zone with reference to the surrounding area, Mr K.K. Lee, STP/K, said that the development sites in the runway area generally featured an undulating and varied BH profile, with the highest BH restriction of 120mPD in the middle portion and descending to 95mPD at the north-western end towards the Metro Park and to 95mPD/108mPD at the south-eastern end towards the Site/Kai Tak Cruise Terminal (KTCT). In the wider context, the BH restriction stipulated for the sites along the Kwun Tong waterfront was generally of 100mPD and that for Kowloon City area was set at 80mPD to 100mPD.

### *Overall Design Concept*

10. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) noting that the Site was for tourism development, whether the future development was targeted to serve any specific groups of tourists;
  - (b) as a prominent waterfront site in Hong Kong, whether there was any design requirement for visual connection with the Victoria Harbour;
  - (c) noting that future development at the Site was also intended to attract international tourists, whether specific requirements to achieve this aim had been set out in the draft DB;
  - (d) how the "Healthy City" concept had been reflected in the requirements of the draft DB; and
  - (e) whether the requirement for future development to achieve BEAM Plus certification with Provisional Gold Rating or above as stated in paragraph

5.3(g) of the Paper was for BEAM Plus New Buildings or for BEAM Plus Neighbourhood.

11. In response, Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM/EKEO, made the following main points:

- (a) the planning intention of “OU(TRU)” zone was for the provision of tourism-related uses and the target groups included both international and local tourists;
- (b) to the east of the Site was the Kai Tak Runway Park (KTRP) with a vehicle-free environment, which would provide a green space for tourists to enjoy the harbour view;
- (c) the design merits in the ‘Kai Tak Fantasy International Ideas Competition on Urban Planning and Design’, including the promotion of healthy city concept and low-carbon lifestyle, had been incorporated into the draft DB. Apart from hotel use which would serve the international tourists, entertainment and leisure uses would also be provided in the future development to enhance the vibrancy of the Site;
- (d) the concept of sustainable healthy city had been incorporated into the draft DB by introduction of outdoor/indoor integrated spaces and outdoor green spaces for public enjoyment. An extensive cycle track network, the GreenWay, was planned to link up major attractions in Kai Tak. Under the “Urban Design Considerations” section of the draft DB, creating a people-oriented and eco-friendly environment for healthy living and leisure experience was one of the key considerations; and
- (e) the required BEAM Plus certification with Provisional Gold Rating or above was for BEAM Plus New Buildings.

*Traffic and Transport*

12. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether traffic improvement measures would be introduced to enhance accessibility to the Site;
  - (b) whether the local road network could cater for the additional traffic generated by the proposed development at the Site; and
  - (c) the car parking provision for the proposed development at the Site.
13. In response, Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM/EKEO, made the following main points:
- (a) Shing Fung Road had been widened to increase its capacity to cater for additional traffic in association with the proposed development at the Site. At the cross districts transport level, the strategic Route 6 comprising Central Kowloon Route, Trunk Road T2 and Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel (TKO-LTT), which was under construction for completion in a few years' time, would be able to divert through traffic and alleviate the current traffic congestion in the East Kowloon area;
  - (b) according to the transport and traffic review under the Planning and Urban Design Review for Developments at Kai Tak Runway Tip (KTRT) – Feasibility Study, the proposed road network could cater for the vehicular and pedestrian traffic flows generated by the proposed development at the Site; and
  - (c) according to the car parking requirements for commercial uses in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), a total of about 1,000 private car parking spaces, 38 public coach parking spaces and 15 coach pick-up/set-down spaces and 100 public car parking spaces for private cars would be provided to serve the KTRT area.

*Pedestrian and Cycling Connectivity*

14. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether pedestrian and cycling routes were planned to enhance connectivity of the Site; and
  - (b) whether bicycle parking spaces would be provided within the Site.
15. In response, Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM/EKEO, made the following main points:
- (a) a 13-km cycle track network on a shared-use basis with pedestrian walkways, the GreenWay, was planned for Kai Tak. It would link up the major attractions in Kai Tak including the Station Square, Kai Tak Sports Park, other public open spaces and the Site. As shown on Plan 4 of the draft DB, the cycle track would pass through the northern part of the Site to KTRP for both cyclist and pedestrian use. To enhance pedestrian connectivity, the requirements for the provision of a 24-hour barrier-free access and age-friendly design passageways, and a landscape corridor with a width of not less than 25m and not less than 30% covered area were stipulated in the draft DB; and
  - (b) about 100 to 120 ancillary bicycle parking spaces would be required to be provided at the Site. In addition, bicycle rental facilities were proposed in KTRP.

*Design of the 45m Setback Area*

16. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) details on the connection between the Site and KTRP;



- (b) the reason for allowing minor relaxation of the minimum 45m setback requirement;
- (c) whether flexibility would be provided for the future developer to re-design the connection point of the elevated pedestrian walkway connecting to the KTCT;
- (d) it was noted on Plan 3 of the draft DB that the pool at the Entry Plaza, the water channel within the 45m setback area and the River Valley to the east of the Site were not connected while there was a roundabout between the water channel and the River Valley as shown on Plan 2 of the draft DB. Whether there was any requirement in the draft DB to improve the design of the water bodies; and
- (e) whether design requirement had been incorporated into the draft DB to ensure that a pleasant space for public enjoyment would be provided in the 45m setback area.

17. In response, Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM/EKEO, made the following main points:

- (a) as shown on Plan 5 of the draft DB, a pedestrian walkway was proposed in the 45m setback area to provide linkage to KTRP Phase 2A. A landscaped corridor would also be provided to connect the ‘public open space in private development’ (POSPD) within the Site with KTRP Phase 2B. In addition, the draft DB had set out the requirement to provide water channels within the Site which should be visually connected with the water features proposed at the Entry Plaza and extending towards the River Valley in KTRP Phase 2A;
- (b) a minimum building setback of 45m from the zoning boundary abutting the adjacent “OU” annotated “Cruise Terminal to include Commercial Development and Landscape Deck Above” zone had been stipulated on the OZP. This building setback area would become an important visual

corridor along KTRT and an outdoor destination adjoining KTRP, which would contribute to the vibrancy of the overall Tourism Node and KTRT developments. The provision for minor relaxation of the setback restriction on the OZP was to provide flexibility to address possible technical issues during the detailed design stage;

- (c) two openings were reserved at Level 1 and the roof level of KTCT for footbridge connections to the Site. While the location of the footbridge connection points was defined, the width and design of the proposed footbridges would be subject to future design. The draft DB had stated that the footbridges should be in harmony with the Tourism Node development and respect the vista of Lei Yue Mun. No column of the footbridges should be constructed within the 45m setback area;
- (d) the roundabout near the River Valley as shown on Plan 2 of the draft DB was an existing road feature, which would be subject to revision to suit the future design. Subject to future design, the provision of visually connected water channels was required under the draft DB; and
- (e) the requirements for the provision of tree planting and stepped down water edge within the 45m setback area had been incorporated in the draft DB to provide a pleasant space for public enjoyment.

*Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter Area and Marine Access*

18. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the Kai Tak OZP had covered the water body between Kwun Tong Ferry Pier and KTRT and whether there was any plan for promoting water activities in the area;
- (b) whether water quality of the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter was suitable for water recreation activities given that the area had been subject to pollution from the previous operations of the Kwun Tong Industrial Area; and

- (c) whether harbour tour service would be provided for the KTRT.

19. In response, Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM/EKEO, made the following main points:

- (a) the water body between Kwun Tong Ferry Pier and KTRT was the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter. It was part of the study area of the Planning and Engineering Study on Kwun Tong Action Area – Feasibility Study. While the Kai Tak OZP did not cover the said water body, there were proposals for using the water body for carrying out water recreation activities to enhance the vibrancy of the area in the long term;
- (b) the proposed water recreation activities referred to secondary contact activities such as rowing and dragon boat racing. Swimming was not recommended. Regarding the concern on possible poor water quality in the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, the Environmental Protection Department and the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) were closely monitoring the water quality and had carried out mitigation works including dredging and bio-remediation; and
- (c) the pier to the north of the Site had landing steps facilities to facilitate the provision of ferry service. The commissioning of water taxi service plying KTRP Pier, Tsim Sha Tsui and West Kowloon was under preparation by the Transport Department.

*Land Disposal and Implementation Arrangements*

20. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there were measures to incentivize developers for bidding the Site for development;
- (b) whether there were measures to monitor the future design of the Site such

as incorporating the design requirements under the lease;

- (c) whether the government would adopt the two-envelope system for disposal of the Site to ensure that the design concept of the Site would be adopted in the future development; and
- (d) whether landscape plan would be required to be submitted under the lease.

21. In response, Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM/EKEO, made the following main points:

- (a) the planning intention of the “OU(TRU)” zone was for the provision of tourism-related use with commercial, hotel and entertainment facilities as well as a public observation gallery, with a maximum GFA of 229,400m<sup>2</sup>. It was believed that adequate incentive had been provided to attract developers to develop the Site with such a critical mass in the prominent urban location;
- (b) the DB aimed to set out the broad planning parameters and development requirements to facilitate the preparation of layout plan submission for the proposed development. It would be attached to the land sale conditions for the Site. With regard to the concern on the design aspect, the future developer was required to submit a visual impact assessment and an air ventilation assessment as part of the layout plan submission for the consideration of the Board;
- (c) the Site was included in the land sale programme of 2020-2021. Having taken into account various considerations, including exercising development control through the land lease and the planning permission mechanism, as well as the attractiveness of the Site to the market, conventional land tender approach would be adopted for disposal of the Site; and
- (d) as the future developer was required to submit a landscape master plan as

part of the layout plan submission for the Board's consideration, landscape plan submission under the lease might not be required.

#### *Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS)*

22. In response to some Members' questions on EFLS, Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM/EKEO, said that the findings of the EFLS Study would be announced by CEDD by end 2020. Sufficient flexibility had been provided in the open space design of the proposed Entry Plaza and the 45m setback area to cater for the possible alignment of the EFLS. The provision of about 1,000 ancillary car parking spaces in association with the proposed development at the Site, with reference to the HKPSG requirements, was based on the without EFLS scenario.

#### *Consultation*

23. In response to a Member's question, Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM/EKEO, said that the Tourism Board and the Tourism Commission had been consulted in particular on the pedestrian linkage between the Site and the adjoining KTCT. Their views had been incorporated into the draft DB as appropriate.

#### *Sense of Place*

24. A Member was of the view that 'sense of place' was an important element of urban design requirement for the Site. Whilst the draft DB only mentioned sense of place under the landscaping aspect, this element should also be included under the urban design consideration aspect. The overall urban design of the future development should achieve a strong sense of place at such a prime waterfront location. All Members agreed.

25. Another Member remarked that in view of the strategic importance of the Kai Tak Tourism Node, the Government should closely monitor the implementation process of the development. The same Member also suggested the Government, after gaining more experience, to review the land disposal mechanism for strategic sites with a view to adopting the most suitable approach, i.e. conventional land tender or the two-envelope system in achieving the intended design of the Site.

26. After deliberation, the Committee agreed to endorse the draft DB at Appendix I of the Paper subject to the incorporation of the sense of place element into the Urban Design Considerations section (Item C 11).

[The Chairman thanked Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM/EKEO, Mr K.K. Lee, STP/K and Ms Yoko Cheung, AD/UP, AECOM, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

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

#### **Agenda Item 4**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/468 Proposed Shop and Services and Office (Wholesale Conversion of an Existing Industrial Building) in "Industrial" Zone, Valid Industrial Centre, 13-15 Wing Kei Road, Kwai Chung, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/468A)

---

27. The Secretary reported that MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) 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 MVA; and

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

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

29. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 17.9.2020 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government

department. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

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

### **Agenda Item 5**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/511 Proposed Wholesale Conversion of an Existing Industrial Building for Eating Place, Shop and Services, Office, Art Studio (excluding those involving direct provision of services or goods), Information Technology and Telecommunications Industries and Research, Design & Development Centre in "Industrial" Zone, Nos. 12-16 Fui Yiu Kok Street, Tsuen Wan, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/511C)

---

31. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and

Professor John C.Y. Ng - his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.

32. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi's spouse and the property owned by Professor John C.Y. Ng's spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

33. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 15.9.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months for further consulting the Transport Department on the technical assessments. It was the fourth time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment, new Chimney Survey Report, supplementary traffic analysis and revised floor plans to address departmental comments.

34. 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 fourth deferment and a total of eight months had been allowed for preparation of the further information, it was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted.

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



**Agenda Item 6**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TW/517            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, 46-48 Pak Tin Par Street, Tsuen Wan, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/517A)

---

35.            The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi            -    his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and

Professor John C.Y. Ng            -    his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.

36.            As the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi’s spouse and the property owned by Professor John C.Y. Ng’s spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

37.            Mr Ng Kar Shu, STP/TWK said that the replacement page 1 of the Paper had been issued to Members to rectify a typo. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Kar Shu 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 first three weeks of the statutory publication period, three public comments from the same individual expressing concern on the application were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone. The Development Bureau gave policy support to the current application and the proposed minor relaxation of PR generally followed the policy on revitalisation of the pre-1987 industrial buildings. On technical aspects, concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) considered that the proposed 2m-wide full-height building setback along Pak Tin Par Street and greening treatment at the building's low zone would enhance the pedestrian environment and visual amenity along the building frontage. With regard to sustainability building design, whilst the Site was less than 1,000m<sup>2</sup>, such that the minimum requirement on greenery coverage under Sustainable Building Design Guidelines was not applicable, the applicant had demonstrated effort in building design improvement by introducing greenery provision of about 177.8m<sup>2</sup> (about 24.634% of the total site area). Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

38. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) Whether there was any reason for minor relaxation of PR restriction of 16% only instead of 20%;
- (b) whether the proposed site coverage and building height were maximised in accordance with the relevant restrictions;

- (c) compatibility of the proposed development with the surroundings;
- (d) whether the voluntary 2m-setback area would be surrendered to the government; and
- (e) whether there was setback area in the adjacent development for connection with the voluntary setback proposed for the Site.

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

- (a) there was no information from the applicant for not seeking minor relaxation of the PR restriction to 20%;
- (b) for the site coverage, the upper portion of the development was 58.11% (from third floor to 25th floor) which was within the maximum site coverage as stipulated in the Buildings (Planning) Regulations while that for the lower portion (from ground floor to second floor) was about 84.29%, as the applicant had voluntarily provided the 2m setback on street level. Regarding the proposed building height, the main roof level was below 100mPD, which was within the building height restriction stipulated on the outline zoning plan;
- (c) to the east of the Site was the new commercial/office building with shops at the street level and office use above, which was now under construction. To the south of the Site was an old industrial building. To its north was the Mills which was a revitalization project of old industrial buildings with innovative design and was a popular spot in the district;
- (d) the setback area was within the lot boundary which would not be dedicated for public use and hence would not be surrendered to the government; and
- (e) the proposed voluntary setback at the Site was purely for streetscape improvement at the frontage of the Site and not intended for enhancing

pedestrian circulation. The adjacent building to its east was a commercial/office building under construction without setback along the same street.

### Deliberation Session

40. 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 9.10.2024, 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 Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission of an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works as identified in the updated SIA for the proposed development in condition (b) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (d) the submission of land contamination assessments in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to development of the Site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board.”

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

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

### **Agenda Item 7**

#### **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/518A)

---

42.                      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 having business dealings with KTA; |
| Mr Stanley T.S. Choi   | - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and        |
| Professor John C.Y. Ng | - his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.   |

43. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. Members noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho 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 and the property owned by Professor John C.Y. Ng's spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

44. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 5.10.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for one month pending for departmental comments on further information submitted on 28.9.2020 and submission of further information to address the departmental comments to be received. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

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

**Agenda Item 8**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/519 Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development (Amendments to Approved Scheme) in “Comprehensive Development Area (3)” Zone, Tsuen Wan Town Lots 126, 137, 160 and 363, and adjoining Government Land, Tsuen Wan, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/519)

---

46. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan. The application was submitted by Tippon Investment Enterprises Limited, which was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK). Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD) and AECOM Asia Co. Limited (AECOM) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members have declared interests on this item:

- |                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho      | - having current business dealings with SHK and AECOM and past business dealings with LD; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai       | - his former firm had business dealings with SHK and AECOM;                               |
| Mr Franklin Yu         | - his spouse being an employee of SHK;  |
| Mr Stanley T.S. Choi   | - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and       |
| Professor John C.Y. Ng | - his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.  |

47. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. Members noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Franklin Yu were direct, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. As the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi’s spouse and the property

owned by Professor John C.Y. Ng's spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

48. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 14.9.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

49. 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.



**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 9**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K15/126                      Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development (Amendments to an Approved Scheme) in “Comprehensive Development Area (3)” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, Yau Tong Inland Lots 4 S.B and 9, Yau Tong Marine Lot 57 and adjoining Government Land, Tung Yuen Street, Yau Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/126)

---

50.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Charm Smart Development Limited, Glory Mission Development Limited, Hoover (China) Limited and Lucken Limited, which were subsidiaries of Yuexiu Property Company Limited (Yuexiu). Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared interest on the item as his former firm had business dealings with Yuexiu.

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

52.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 21.9.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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 two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further

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

**Agenda Item 10**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K14/793            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, 77 Hoi Yuen Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon

---

54.            The Committee noted that consideration of the application was rescheduled.

**Agenda Item 11**

**Any Other Business**

55.            There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 10:25 a.m.