

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 660th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 20.11.2020

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

Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon,
Transport Department
Mr David C.V. Ngu

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

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

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

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

Secretary

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms W.H. Ho

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

Opening Remarks

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

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 659th MPC Meeting held on 6.11.2020

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 659th MPC meeting held on 6.11.2020 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Items 3 and 4

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/825 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 (2)” Zone, 916-922 Cheung Sha Wan Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/825A)

A/K5/826 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 (2)” Zone, 924-926 Cheung Sha Wan Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/826)

4. The Committee noted that the two applications for proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) restriction for permitted non-polluting industrial use were similar in nature and the application sites were located adjacent to each other and within the same “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (2)” (“OU(B)2”) zone. The Committee agreed that they could be considered together.

5. The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) was one of the consultants of the applicant for both applications. Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had declared an interest on the items for being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA. As Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

6. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK,

presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Papers:

- (a) background to the applications;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction for permitted non-polluting industrial use (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of dangerous goods) on each of the sites;
- (c) departmental comments - departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 on each of the Papers;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a supporting comment and a comment expressing concerns from two individuals were received for application No. A/K5/825. For application No. A/K5/826, a supporting comment from an individual and two comments from a Shum Shui Po District Council (DC) member and an individual expressing concerns were received. The major views and concerns were set out in paragraph 10 on each of the Papers; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 on each of the Papers. The proposed developments were generally in line with the planning intention of the “OU(B)2” zone. The Development Bureau gave policy support to the applications and the proposed minor relaxation of PR generally followed the policy on revitalisation of the pre-1987 industrial buildings (IBs). On technical aspects, concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the applications. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L), PlanD considered that the proposed 2m-wide full-height building setback with canopy along Cheung Sha Wan Road and landscape treatment for each of the developments would promote pedestrian comfort and visual interests. With regard to sustainable building design, it was indicated in the applications that the relevant requirements of the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) in terms of building separation, building

setback and site coverage of greenery had been taken into account. Regarding the public comments received on each of the applications, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

7. Some Members raised the following questions:

Possibility of Integrated Development

- (a) whether the applicants had the intention to amalgamate the two application sites for an integrated development;
- (b) whether there would be more planning and design merits for an integrated development;
- (c) whether there was any mechanism to provide incentives for landowners to amalgamate sites for integrated development;

Building Design and Setback

- (d) the design of the two proposed developments and whether there were internal connections of the two buildings;
- (e) whether the location of ingress/egress of the two proposed developments could be combined to avoid two ingress/egress points within a short distance and enhance pedestrian safety;
- (f) whether the proposed setback had met the relevant requirement;

Internal Transport Facilities and Pedestrian Accessibility

- (g) details of the public comments regarding traffic issue;
- (h) the distance between the sites and the MTR station;

- (i) whether the glass canopies proposed at both developments were linked together to provide a continuous shelter for pedestrians;

Landscape Provision

- (j) whether recycled water would be used for irrigation in the proposed vertical greening (VG); and
- (k) whether there was any landscape provision in the setback area.

8. In response, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

Possibility for Integrated Development

- (a) the two applications were submitted by two companies with the same director. The two sites were intended to be developed concurrently and the applications were submitted at the same time. The owner of the sites considered that developing the two sites separately could allow greater flexibility, and there was no plan to amalgamate the sites for an integrated development at the moment;
- (b) while it was agreeable that a larger development site would have more room to achieve more design merits, the two sites were sandwiched between existing IBs with only one frontage on Cheung Sha Wan Road. Given that they were not corner sites, the room for providing a much enhanced design was limited;
- (c) while some “Residential (Group A)” zones in the Kowloon area had incorporated a ‘two-tier’ system with a higher building height for sites over 400m², there was currently no similar provision for the “OU(B)2” zone on the Cheung Sha Wan OZP. As such, the development restrictions would be the same (i.e. PR of 12) regardless of whether the sites were amalgamated for an integrated development or not. Hence, it would solely be the owner’s commercial decision to proceed with different development options;

Building Design and Setback

- (d) a building height of 27 storeys, with separate lift lobbies, loading/unloading bays and fire service lanes, was proposed for both developments. While there was a mirror design for the internal floor of the two proposed developments, there was no indication in the submissions that the two developments would be connected on various floors or the roof. General Building Plans (GBPs) for the proposed developments were required to be submitted to the Buildings Department (BD) for approval, and BD would refer the GBPs to PlanD for comment. PlanD would check against the schemes, if approved by the Committee, and provide comments to BD during the GBP submission stage to make sure that the proposed developments were in compliance with the schemes approved by the Committee;
- (e) it was noted that the ingress/egress of the two developments were designed with due regard to the ramp and layout of the basement carpark. An approval condition requiring 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 was proposed. Should the applicants consider it appropriate to modify the location of the ingress/egress after taking into account the Committee's concern, the revised design would be scrutinised by the Transport Department under the approval condition;
- (f) the proposed scheme for both sites had incorporated a full-height building setback of 2m along Cheung Sha Wan Road which was in accordance with the setback requirement under the draft Cheung Sha Wan and Sham Shui Po Outline Development Plan (ODP) (Northern Part) No. D/K5A/1B;

Internal Transport Facilities and Pedestrian Accessibility

- (g) there were two public comments providing views on the car parking provision. The supportive comment submitted by an individual

considered that the proposed development could help address the parking problem in the district, whereas the comment submitted by a DC member raised a general concern regarding insufficient car parking spaces in the district. The application sites were about 80m from the nearest exit of the Lai Chi Kok MTR station;

- (h) while glass canopies would be provided at different levels at both developments, they formed a continuous shelter and could enhance the pedestrian walking environment along Cheung Sha Wan Road;

Landscape Provision

- (i) the proposed landscape designs for both developments were similar and VG was proposed in both developments. According to the submissions, an automatic sprinkler system for irrigation of VG was proposed. Nonetheless, there was no mentioning of whether recycled water would be adopted for irrigation purpose; and
- (j) tree planting instead of planters was proposed at the setback area to allow more space for pedestrian passage.

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting during the question and answer session.]

Deliberation Session

9. Members generally had no objection to approving the two applications as the proposed minor relaxation of PR restrictions were in line with government policy on revitalizing IBs and there were planning and design merits in the proposals, including the provision of building setbacks of 2m in accordance with the ODP requirement, the provision of canopies along the building edges for weather protection, and the provision of greenery coverage of 20%.

10. Some Members considered that the planning and design merits of the proposed developments could be further enhanced and provided the following views:

- (a) while it was noted that whether the two sites could be amalgamated for an integrated development was solely a commercial decision due to various considerations, the owner of the sites was encouraged to explore the opportunity for an integrated design of the two developments which would not only achieve economies of scale for optimizing the use of land, but also bring more public benefits. For example, the ingress/egress of the two proposed developments could be combined into one to avoid having two ingress/egress points within a short distance and enhance pedestrian safety. In that connection, consideration could be given to providing more incentives to encourage amalgamation of small sites to facilitate more integrated developments;
- (b) the current landscape provision could be enhanced by exploring the opportunity to extend the coverage of VG. Considerations could also be given to the use of recycled water for irrigation for the cause of environmental protection; and
- (c) a continuous canopy at the same level with a greater span could be considered, which would further improve the pedestrian walking environment.

11. The Chairman concluded that Members generally had no objection to the two applications but considered that an integrated development covering the two application sites could achieve a better design and provide more public benefits. Should the applications be approved, it was suggested to advise the applicants to explore the feasibility of an integrated development could be added. As regards the use of recycled water for irrigation of greenery facilities as an environmentally friendly measure, the applicants of future similar applications could be requested to provide information on whether such had been considered in their proposals. Members' views regarding the provision of incentives to encourage amalgamation of small sites to facilitate integrated developments could be recorded for consideration in the future review on policies for revitalizing IBs.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join the meeting during the deliberation session.]

12. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). Each of the permissions should be valid until 20.11.2024, 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. Each of the permissions 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 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 Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (c) the implementation of the sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board.”

13. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV on each of the Papers and the following additional advisory clause for both applications:

“to explore the feasibility of amalgamating the sites under applications No. A/K5/825 and A/K5/826 for an integrated development to achieve a better design and provide more public benefits.”

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/827 Proposed Shop and Services (Fast Food Counter) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (4)” Zone, Unit No. 3A, G/F, Cheung Lung Industrial Building, 10 Cheung Yee Street, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/827)

Presentation and Question Sessions

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed shop and services (fast food counter);
- (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, two public comments were received from individuals with one supporting the application and one expressing concerns. 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 use at the premises was considered generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (4)” zone and not incompatible with other uses of the same industrial building. The proposed use in general complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D in that it would not induce adverse fire safety, traffic and infrastructural impacts on the uses within the subject building and the developments in the adjacent areas. Concerned government departments

had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Two applications for ‘Shop and Services’ use on the G/F of the subject industrial building were approved with conditions by the Committee in 2006 and 2010. There was no change in planning circumstances and the approval of the application was consistent with the previous decisions of the Committee on the similar applications.

15. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

16. 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 20.11.2024, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the submission and implementation of fire service installations before operation of the proposed use to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (b) if the above planning condition (a) is not complied with before operation of the proposed use, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

17. 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 Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho (STP/TWK) for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H15/284 Proposed School (Kindergarten and Nursery) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (1)” Zone, 2/F and 3/F of an Office Building at Aberdeen Inland Lot No. 360, Hong Kong

18. The Committee noted that the application was withdrawn by the applicant.

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

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K14/783 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Proposed Hotel Use in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 1 Tai Yip Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon (MPC Paper No. A/K14/783C)

19. The Secretary reported that Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had declared an interest on this item for having past business dealings with LD. As Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

20. 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 – during the consideration of the application on 18.9.2020, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application pending the applicant’s submission of supplementary information on the possibility of provision of basement level as well as the planning and design merits of the proposed scheme; and additional information to be provided by the Planning Department (PlanD) in relation to the planning and design merits of the approved similar applications in the vicinity;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) and building height (BH) restrictions for proposed hotel use;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 4 of the Paper, as well as paragraph 10 of Appendix F-1; and
- (d) PlanD’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 5 of the Paper. In response to the request of the Committee, the applicant had further refined the proposed scheme with additional vertical greening (VG) for achieving a higher greenery of 28.7% and additional voluntary corner setback at the junction of Wai Yip Street and Tai Yip Street and provided elaborations of the planning and design merits of the proposed scheme to address Members’ concerns. The applicant also pointed out the technical constraints to provide majority of the E&M facilities at basement level which the concerned departments had no adverse comments on. The justifications put forth by the applicant might not be unacceptable. Also, given the small site area, there was limited available space at street level to enhance the quality of the public realm. The additional VG and other landscape features demonstrated the applicant’s efforts to soften the building edge, promote visual interest and enhance pedestrian comfort. The additional voluntary corner setback

would further enhance pedestrian circulation. Having considered the applicant's further information, the previous planning considerations and assessments as stated in paragraph 12 of MPC Paper No. A/K14/783B remained valid. The refinements to the proposed scheme and provision of voluntary corner setback might be considered as additional planning and design merits to support the application. A summary of the planning and design merits of approved similar applications in the vicinity, and a comparison with the Proposed Scheme were set out in paragraph 3 and Appendix F-V of the Paper for Members' reference.

21. Two Members enquired on the details regarding the additional planning and design merits under the refined scheme. In response, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, made the following main points:

- (a) as compared with the previous scheme, additional VG was proposed from 1/F to 2/F at the portion of the building façade facing Wai Yip Street, with an increase in the greening provision from 23.3% to 28.7%. Also, an additional voluntary corner setback from G/F to 3/F was proposed at the junction of Wai Yip Street and Tai Yip Street to further enhance pedestrian circulation;
- (b) according to the information provided by the applicant, the provision of additional corner setback would not result in any change in the proposed gross floor area and PR; and
- (c) a canopy for weather protection was proposed at the building frontage along Wai Yip Street which was the main pedestrian access. No information was provided by the applicant on why the canopy was not extended to cover the full frontage of the proposed development.

22. In response to two other Members' enquiries on the traffic arrangement and basement layout of the proposed development, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, made the following main points:

- (a) the car parking provisions were proposed in accordance with the

requirements set out in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. As compared with other commercial developments, the required car parking provision for hotel use was lower;

- (b) car parking provisions including taxi lay-bys, loading/unloading bays and disabled person's parking spaces were provided on G/F of the proposed hotel development. The main entrance of the proposed hotel would be provided at Wai Yip Street, which was separated from the vehicular ingress/egress at the back alley. Such arrangement could ensure vehicle/pedestrian segregation and reduce on-street loading/unloading activities;
- (c) a traffic impact assessment was submitted by the applicant. The Transport Department had no adverse comment on the car parking provisions nor traffic arrangement for the proposed hotel;
- (d) E&M facilities for fire services installations (including sprinkler and fire services water tanks and the associated pump room) were proposed at the basement level which would be served by a 'cat ladder' for maintenance purpose. Such provision was provided in accordance with the requirement under Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011. In that regard, the Fire Services Department had no adverse comment on the proposal; and
- (e) it was common that fire services installations such as water tanks were located at the lower floors of developments.

Deliberation Session

23. In response to a Member's question regarding the location of water tanks, another Member said that due to the loading of the water tanks, they were usually located at the lower floors of developments. With the installation of water pump, fire hydrant system and pressurised sprinkler system, water could be pumped up to the upper parts of buildings for fire-fighting purpose. Smaller water tanks for other uses such as toilet flushing were usually installed on higher floors. For special facilities such as swimming pool on roof top of a building, additional structural support would be required.

24. A Member said that while efforts had been made by the applicant to provide additional planning and design merits, the extent of the proposed canopy, which only covered the main entrance of the proposed hotel at Wai Yip Street and not extending to cover the whole building frontage might not be adequate to serve the function of weather protection and enhancing pedestrian walking environment. The Member said that while more details had been provided on the submitted diagrams for the basement, ground floor and first floor, there was a lack of details of the layout for the upper floors which were only illustrated by line diagrams. Besides, the description for the landscape features such as "planter" and "pocket green space" might not be able to accurately describe areas with plants. The terminology adopted should better tally with those under relevant guidelines such as BEAM Plus. Another Member suggested that reference could also be made to the terms adopted in the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG).

25. As there were no further views from Members, the Chairman summarised the discussion with the following main points:

- (a) the Committee in general had no objection to the application;
- (b) the applicant was advised to explore the possibility of extending the canopy to cover the whole building frontage along both Wai Yip Street and Tai Yip Street at the detailed design stage; and
- (c) in submitting planning applications, applicants were advised: (i) to adopt suitable terminologies under regulations/guidelines such as the Building (Planning) Regulations, BEAM Plus and SBDG when describing landscape features to facilitate the Committee's understanding of the relevant proposals; and (ii) to include sufficient details in the diagrams submitted to the Committee. While the level of detail required in general building plans submission was not expected at the planning stage, line diagrams were not preferred as they could not illustrate the design and layout concept clearly.

[Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

26. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 20.11.2024, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “ (a) the submission of a sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the sewerage impact assessment in condition (a) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) 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 Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) the submission of a revised traffic impact assessment and implementation of the mitigation measures, if any, identified in the revised traffic impact assessment, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (e) the design of vehicular access, vehicle parking/ loading/unloading facilities and manoeuvring spaces for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board.”

27. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at **Appendix F-VI** of the Paper with the following additional advisory clause:

- “ to explore the possibility of extending the canopy to cover the whole building frontage along both Wai Yip Street and Tai Yip Street at the detailed design stage.”

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/795 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Package Substation) in an area shown as 'Road', Government Land in Anderson Road Quarry Development, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/795)

28. The Secretary reported that CLP Power Hong Kong Limited (CLP) was the applicant of the application. Mr Alex L.H. Lai had declared an interest on the item as his former firm had business dealings with CLP.

29. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed public utility installation (package substation);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment providing views was received. Major views and concerns 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 package substation was an essential utility for the provision of electricity supply in support of the Anderson Road Quarry Development

(ARQD). In view of the small site area and the small scale of the installation, the proposed package substation would not affect the overall quality of the amenity planting in ARQD, obstruct sightline of vehicles nor affect pedestrian circulation. Concerned government departments had no objection or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comment received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant

31. A Member enquired about the purpose, function and service area of the proposed package substation. In response, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed package substation was a specially designed electrical equipment that was widely installed in different areas. It was a prefabricated design which was totally enclosed to accommodate the required equipment. Adverse health impact on nearby residents was not envisaged;
- (b) the installation was to provide reliable electricity supply to the planned public utilities and the pedestrian facilities, including lift towers, in ARQD. As it was not serving other developments in ARQD, it would be provided as a separate structure instead of integrating into the transformer room of the planned developments; and
- (c) electricity supply would be transmitted from the primary substation at Shun Lee Tsuen to the proposed package substation by underground cables. The proposed package substation, which would house one 1,000kVA transformer, one 11kV switchboard, one low voltage (380v or 220v) distribution board and associated accessories, would step down the voltage of the electricity for public utilities in the service area.

32. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) function of the proposed amenity area where the proposed package substation would be located;

- (b) whether there were any plans to incorporate the proposed package substation into nearby developments in future;
- (c) noting that the proposed package substation was installed right next to the footpath, whether alternative location had been explored to alleviate the potential visual impact; and
- (d) whether the outlook of the proposed package substation could be enhanced to tie in with the surrounding environment.

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

- (a) the subject amenity area in ARQD was intended for road side planting. Upon the completion of the site formation and associated landscape works, the concerned amenity area would be handed to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department for management and maintenance;
- (b) there was currently no building in ARQD. Whether the proposed package substation could be incorporated into nearby developments was unknown at the moment. According to the latest proposal, the proposed package substation was a permanent use at the subject site. Whether the proposed installation could be incorporated into nearby developments in future would be subject to further liaison between CLP and relevant government departments;
- (c) in the site selection process for the proposed package substation, a number of factors had been taken into account including the avoidance of obstruction to pedestrian flow and cycling activities, impacts on the roadside plantings and underground utilities installations, as well as fire safety concerns. Upon liaising with the concerned government departments, the Site was considered as the most suitable location for the proposed package substation; and
- (d) as the package substation had adopted a standard design, the outlook of the proposed package substation would largely be similar to the one illustrated

in the reference photos submitted by the applicant at Drawing A-3 of the Paper.

Deliberation Session

34. Whilst acknowledging the functional need for the provision of the package substation in ARQD, some Members were of the view that the location of the proposed package substation was not appropriate. With its location right next to the footpath and situated in the amenity area, as well as its non-appealing design, the structure was considered visually obstructive and would hinder the function of the amenity area in enhancing the quality of the environment. During the discussion, Members noted that there were some constraints to move the proposed package substation further into the amenity area as no planting of trees was allowed within a 4m buffer of the facility. However, Members generally considered that the location for the proposed package substation should not be constrained by its functional need, but a more holistic approach taking into account the surrounding facilities and environment in coming up with an integrated design. Given that the proposed installation was permanent in nature, the applicant should explore the possibility of adjusting the location of the proposed package substation and integrating its design with the adjacent facilities such that it could become more compatible with the surrounding area. Considerations might be given to integrating the design with the nearby bicycle parking area. The applicant could make reference to other good examples of utility installations which were more compatible with the surrounding environment.

35. The Chairman concluded that while the Committee acknowledged the functional need of the proposed package substation and had no objection to the proposed use, the applicant failed to provide strong justifications for site selection and how the design of the facility could be integrated with the surrounding environment. The Committee considered that further information should be provided by the applicant to substantiate the application including justifications for site selection, the possibility of adjusting the location of the proposed package substation to reduce adverse impacts on the surrounding area; and how the design of the proposed package substation could be integrated with the surrounding environment, including the amenity area and the bicycle parking area.

36. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application, pending the applicant's submission of further information on (i) justifications for site

selection; (ii) the possibility of adjusting the location of the proposed package substation; and (iii) how the design of the proposed package substation could be integrated with the surrounding environment to address Members' concerns.

[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 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K18/337 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Educational Institution (Academic Complex) in "Government, Institution or Community (7)" Zone and an area shown as 'Road', 224 Waterloo Road (Part), Kowloon Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/337A)

37. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kowloon Tong and the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU). Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD), MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) and WSP (Asia) Limited (WSP) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being a council and court member of HKBU;

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a court member of HKBU,
and being a director of a company which
owned properties in Kowloon Tong;

Professor Jonathan W.C. - being an employee of HKBU;

Wong

- Mr Franklin Yu - his firm having current business dealings with HKBU;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having business dealings with HKBU and WSP;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with MVA and past business dealings with LD; and
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - living in the quarters of the City University of Hong Kong in Kowloon Tong.

38. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. The Committee noted that Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Stanley T.S. Choi and Franklin Yu, Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong were direct, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. As the residence of Dr Lawrence W.C Poon had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

39. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 9.11.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had been actively liaising with relevant departments to address their concerns.

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

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K10/264 Proposed Comprehensive Residential (Flat), Commercial (Shop and Services) and Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) Development with Minor Relaxation of Non-domestic Gross Floor Area Restriction in "Comprehensive Development Area (3)" Zone, Kowloon Inland Lots 6342, 6344, 7427, 7629, 7630, 7631 and 7632, Mok Cheong Street and Sung Wong Toi Road, Ma Tau Kok, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K10/264A)

41. The Secretary reported that the Planning Department (PlanD) had recommended deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for relevant government departments to provide comments on the further information, which was only submitted by the applicant on 6.11.2020. The justifications for deferment request met the criteria for deferment as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No.33) in that more time was required for relevant government departments to examine the further information and provide comments, the deferment period was not indefinite and the deferment would not affect the interests of other relevant parties.

42. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application for two months as recommended by PlanD. The Committee also agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months. If the further information could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration.

Agenda Item 11

Any Other Business

43. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:05 a.m..