

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 661<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 4.12.2020**

#### **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

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Mr C.H. Tse

Chief Traffic Engineer / Hong Kong,  
Transport Department  
Mr Alex Au

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

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

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

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

**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  
Ms Charlotte P.S. Ng

## **Opening Remarks**

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

## **Agenda Item 1**

### **Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 660<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 20.11.2020**

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 660<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 20.11.2020 were confirmed without amendments.

## **Agenda Item 2**

### **Matters Arising**

[Open Meeting]

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

[Ms Katy C.W. Fung, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon (DPO/TWK), and Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon (STP/TWK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/KC/470                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Hospital Use in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, Lai King Building, Princess Margaret Hospital, 10 Lai Kong Street, Kwai Chung, New Territories  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/470)

---

4.                      The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hospital Authority (HA). Meinhardt Infrastructure and Environment Limited (MIE) and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

Mr Alex T.H. Lai                      -    his former firm had business dealings with HA, MIE and AECOM.

5.                      As the interest of Mr Thomas O.S. Ho was direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

6.                      The Committee noted that a replacement page (p.7 of the Paper) rectifying editorial errors had been sent to Members before the meeting. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of building height restriction (BHR) for permitted hospital use;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 2,831 public comments, with five supporting comments from individuals, 223 expressing concerns or providing views from individuals, and 2,603 opposing comments from two Kwai Tsing District Council (K&T DC) members, the Incorporated Owners of Highland Park and individuals, 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 assessment made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The application site was zoned “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) which was intended primarily for the provision of GIC facilities. The proposed new block (the New Block) for Lai King Building (LKB) at the Princess Margaret Hospital (PMH) was part of the HA's first 10-year Hospital Development Plan (HDP). The minor relaxation of BHR could facilitate the LKB to provide extra hospital beds (an addition of 562 to 582 beds) to enhance the capacity of medical services, address the community needs of the Kowloon West Cluster (KWC) and the wider district and meet the decanting needs for the redevelopment of PMH. The Secretary for Food and Health supported the application from the policy perspective. The proposed development with a building height of 12 storeys (excluding basement) was not incompatible with the adjacent GIC and residential developments. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L) of PlanD considered that the proposed development would unlikely induce significant adverse effect on the visual character of the surrounding townscape while the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2 of the Architectural Services Department considered that the proposed development might not be incompatible with the surrounding

development and had no comment from visual point of view. The CTP/UD&L of PlanD also considered that the various design elements and landscaped treatments proposed at the New Block would promote visual interest and building permeability. Relevant technical assessments had been conducted, and 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.

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

7. The Chairman and some Members raised the following questions:

*PMH and the LKB Expansion*

- (a) proposals for KWC in HA's first and second 10-year HDP;
- (b) types of medical services proposed in the New Block of LKB;
- (c) types of clinical support facilities proposed on the lower floors of the New Block;

*Accessibility*

- (d) how the LKB site could be accessed by the public;
- (e) whether traffic mitigation measures were proposed by the applicant to address the public concerns on the potential traffic impacts to be generated during construction stage and after the LKB expansion;
- (f) the existing and proposed car parking facilities for visitors within the LKB site;

- (g) whether any direct public transportation services were available for patients from Lantau which fell within the catchment area of KWC;

*Building Design*

- (h) whether the headroom proposed could be reduced so as to lower the overall BH of the New Block;
- (i) whether the New Block had fully utilised the site coverage (SC) allowed on the OZP;
- (j) how the drainage reserve would impose constraint on the building design of the New Block;
- (k) whether any green building designs were adopted by the applicant;
- (l) whether the rehabilitation garden would be re-provided;

*Proposed Building Height*

- (m) the background of imposing BHR on the application site;
- (n) to what extent the BHR could be relaxed;
- (o) a comparison of the BH between the New Block and its surrounding developments;

*Air Ventilation and Natural Lighting*

- (p) whether adverse impact on air ventilation would be generated by the New Block;
- (q) whether there would be sufficient natural lighting to the New Block;

*Public Consultation*

- (r) whether consultation with the local residents regarding the relocation of GMB stops had been conducted; and
- (s) responses to the public comment on the lack of proper public consultation procedures.

8. In responses, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/TWK, made the following main points:

*PMH and the LKB Expansion*

- (a) the expansion of LKB and PMH was included in the HA's first and second 10-year HDP respectively as announced in the 2016 and 2018 Policy Addresses. The expansion of LKB was part of the first 10-year HDP and the original proposal was for an OZP-compliant 7 storey New Block which could only provide an addition of 400 beds. After consultation with K&T DC, the Legislative Council's Health Services Panel and the Public Works Subcommittee of the Finance Committee in 2019, HA was asked to further study the feasibility of increasing the number of beds and storeys of the proposed block. Hence, the current proposal involving a minor relaxation of BHR from 7 storeys to 12 storeys was put forth so as to provide an additional of 162-182 beds as compared to an OZP-compliant scheme. Meanwhile, the expansion of PMH was anticipated to provide an additional of 710 beds under the second 10-year HDP. Similarly, an application for minor relaxation of BHR (from 110mPD to 120mPD) for the expansion of the Kwai Chung Hospital (KCH), also under the first 10-year HDP to provide an additional of 80 beds compared to the OZP-compliant scheme, was submitted and approved with conditions by the Committee in 2018;
- (b) regarding the medical services provided by the hospitals in the area, KCH provided comprehensive psychiatric care while PMH provided emergency, acute, specialist and infectious medical services. The New Block of LKB would mainly provide rehabilitation and convalescent services while the



care and rehabilitation services for the geriatric patients could be enhanced at the existing LKB;

- (c) the expansion of LKB formed part of the decanting arrangements for the redevelopment of PMH as certain facilities at PMH would be permanently accommodated in the LKB. According to the available information, clinical support facilities including rehabilitation service store, pathology store, pharmacy office and store, cluster human resources department office, cluster supplies store, linen store and finance store would be relocated to the lower floors of the New Block;

#### *Accessibility*

- (d) LKB was located on Lai King Hill and served by a number of green minibus (GMB) routes with direct connections to the Lai King, Mei Foo, Tsuen Wan, Kwai Fong and Sham Shui Po MTR Stations. According to the traffic impact assessment (TIA) submitted by the applicant, the travel pattern of passengers relating to the LKB expansion would be in general in an opposite direction to that of the local residents at peak hours. Hence, the existing GMB services could absorb the additional demand according to the Transport Department (TD). Regarding pedestrian accessibility to LKB, TD's consultant was reviewing the assessment mechanism for implementation of hillside escalator links and elevator systems (HELs) in the territory. The HELs included a proposal from Lai Cho Road and Lim Cho Street to Lai Kong Street. The review was near completion and TD would start consulting the respective DCs to confirm the priority of HELs for implementation. Besides, a consultancy study on another HEL project connecting Lai King Hill Road and Lai Cho Road was commissioned by the Highways Department in November 2020. Whilst the alignments of those HELs were still being studied with implementation programme yet to be confirmed, they would facilitate pedestrian linkage from Lai King MTR Station to Lai Kong Street. The accessibility to LKB would be enhanced and a pedestrian-friendly environment would be fostered upon completion of the HELs;

- (e) a temporary traffic management scheme would be submitted to TD and other concerned government departments to ensure that the potential traffic impacts that might be generated during the construction stage would be mitigated. Meanwhile, the traffic improvement works as proposed by the applicant in the TIA, including the improvement works at the Lai King Hill Road/Kwai Chung Interchange, were long-term mitigation measures to ensure that the proposed development would not induce insurmountable traffic impact on the adjacent road network. Relevant approval conditions would be imposed and the proposed traffic improvement works would subject to the satisfaction of TD;
- (f) five car parking spaces for visitors were currently provided in the existing LKB. While all car parking facilities would mainly be accommodated in the New Block upon completion, the applicant did not provide a breakdown of the number of car parking spaces to be allocated to the hospital staff and the visitors;
- (g) according to the available information, the majority of the population in the catchment area of KWC could access LKB by GMB with direct connections to Lai King, Mei Foo, Tsuen Wan, Kwai Fong and Sham Shui Po MTR Stations. The North Lantau Hospital would also provide emergency and various out-patient services to cater for the medical needs of those living on Lantau. It was expected that TD would explore the possibility to strengthen the coverage of public transportation services, as and when required;

#### *Building Design*

- (h) as the New Block was a special design building, the applicant had to comply with specific design requirements including sufficient headroom to meet its operational needs and relevant government regulations and requirements while taking into account the relevant criteria for consideration of the application for minor relaxation of BHR;

- (i) there was no SC restriction for the application site under the OZP. The application site was a Class B site where buildings would be subject to a maximum SC of 62.5% under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) and the SC of the proposed scheme complied with the B(P)R. The proposed SC of the upper portion of the New Block was about 57%, taking into account the lighting and other operational requirements;
- (j) the existence of the drainage reserve area and the high rock head level made extensive excavation technically difficult, which posed constraints on the building design of the New Block;
- (k) the applicant had undertaken to fulfil the requirements as stipulated under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines. Apart from the provision of landscaping features, the applicant would also adopt permeable design for fence walls and seize the opportunity for tree planting along the site boundary;
- (l) greenery was proposed at street level, the podium garden on 2/F and 11/F such that more greenery could be provided to the patients, visitors and hospital staff;

*Proposed BH*

- (m) according to the BH review conducted for the Kwai Chung area in 2012, BHR of 7 storeys imposed on the application site was to reflect the existing BH of LKB. Based on the findings of the air ventilation assessment (AVA) conducted to facilitate the BH review, the application site was not situated at a major air path and hence no special design measures were imposed on the application site;
- (n) while minor relaxation of BHR might be considered by the Committee on application based on individual merits, there was no absolute limit on the extent of BH relaxation that could be allowed. The subject application was for minor relaxation of BHR from 7 storeys to 12 storeys with a

building design to maximise the site utilisation under specific site constraints, including the long and elongated shape of the site, difficulty in extensive excavation due to high rock head level, and presence of a drainage reserve area underneath and the existing LKB;

- (o) the New Block with a proposed BH of about 206mPD was surrounded by existing residential developments with higher BH. The application site was surrounded by Highland Park to its northwest and the Lai King Disciplined Services Quarters to its immediate east, with both subject to a maximum BH of 260mPD. Besides, a site planned for private residential development was located to its immediate north with a BHR of 240mPD;

*Air Ventilation and Natural Lighting*

- (p) the AVA submitted by the applicant demonstrated that the general wind environment, both the annual and summer prevailing winds, of the assessment area under the OZP-compliant scheme and the proposed scheme would be very similar. Nevertheless, a slight improvement in air ventilation could be achieved during the summer prevailing wind. The applicant had also proposed two design features, including a building gap of 15m between the New Block and the existing LKB and a permeable loading bay on 1/F of the New Block, to enhance air ventilation;
- (q) to allow sufficient lighting, SC of the upper portion of the New Block was kept to 57% after duly considered the provision of natural lighting for patient rooms located on the upper portion. While information regarding the potential sunlight impact on the residential developments nearby was not available, those residential developments were higher than the New Block. The applicant would also consider adopting further building setback from the nearby residential developments to minimise potential impact at the detailed design stage;

*Public Consultation*

- (r) the relocation of GMB stops along Lai Kong Street into the LKB site was one of the traffic improvement works as agreed by the applicant. While the exact location was under study and subject to detailed design of the proposed development, it would be monitored by TD under relevant approval conditions subject to the satisfaction of TD; and
- (s) whilst the public comment did not specify which public consultation procedure was inadequate, the application, as well as the further information submitted by the applicant, had been published for public inspection in accordance with the Town Planning Ordinance. Besides, the K&T DC had been consulted on the proposal at its meeting in July 2020. Further public consultation with relevant stakeholders, including the DC, would be conducted by the project proponent at the detailed design stage of the proposal.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung joined the meeting during the Presentation and Question Sessions.]

Deliberation Session

9. Members generally supported the proposed minor relaxation of BHR from 7 storeys to 12 storeys to facilitate the development of the New Block at the LKB site of the PMH as it could enhance the provision of hospital beds to cater for the acute needs in the KWC, but considered that the potential impacts generated by the LKB expansion should be minimised.

10. As the New Block was mainly surrounded by residential developments with higher BH, a Member opined that the visual, air ventilation and lighting impacts arising from the proposed development would not be substantial. Another Member suggested that more greening features, including vertical greenings and sky garden/terraces, could be incorporated into the New Block to compensate for the loss of the existing rehabilitation garden and minimise the visual impact. A Member appreciated the applicant's effort in addressing the local concern by exploring the possibility of further setback of the New Block from the surrounding residential developments.

11. Members in general considered that there was a need to enhance the accessibility to the New Block and the vehicular and pedestrian traffic within the whole PMH development. A Member remarked that the cumulative effect of the LKB expansion and the planned housing site to its immediate north on the traffic network would have to be duly considered to minimise the adverse traffic impact on the residents. Some Members considered that relevant government departments should expedite the provision of HELs to support the expansion of LKB and PMH and enhance walkability in the area as a whole. A Member who raised concern on the accessibility to the proposed development for patients from Lantau opined that relevant policy bureau could consider providing subsidy to patients who had to travel from a long distance.

12. Noting the concerns expressed by the local residents, some Members were of the views that the applicant should duly address their concerns early to minimise objection at a later stage since the proposed LKB expansion would inevitably generate nuisance to the locals. Members noted that relevant government departments had no adverse comment on the application and further public consultation with relevant stakeholders would be conducted by the project proponent at the detailed design stage.

13. The Chairman summarised that Member generally had no objection to the minor relaxation of BHR sought noting that the BHR on the OZP for the site was imposed to reflect the height of the existing development. Some Members also had the following observations:

- (a) consideration could be given to further increase the BH so as to accommodate more hospital beds and medical facilities, subject to no adverse impacts on traffic, air ventilation, visual and lighting aspects;
- (b) the building design could be further enhanced by incorporating more greening features, e.g. vertical greening, green terrace and green building design, at the detailed design stage;
- (c) due consideration should be given to the temporary traffic arrangement during the construction stage, the internal vehicular and pedestrian traffic arrangements within PMH, and improvement to the accessibility of LKB

and PMH. Suitable measures, such as providing subsidy, could be explored to facilitate patients from remote area but within the catchment area of KWC to have easy access to medical facilities in PMH; and

- (d) further consultation with the local residents should be undertaken when details of the New Block were formulated.

14. 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 4.12.2024, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the design and provision of vehicular access arrangement, parking facilities, and loading/unloading spaces for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and implementation of the traffic improvement works, as proposed/agreed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission of land contamination assessments in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to the development of the site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB.”

15. 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, DPO/TWK, and Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Thomas O.S. Ho returned to join the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Ng Tak Wah, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Hong Kong District**

#### **Agenda Item 4**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

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

---

16.            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) | - | his spouse owning a workshop in an industrial building in Chai Wan; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho                     | - | having past business dealings with LD; and                          |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai                      | - | his former firm had business dealings with Aedas.                   |

17.            As the property owned by the Chairman’s spouse had no direct view of the application site, and 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.



Presentation and Question Sessions

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Tak Wah, STP/HK, 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 further information and clarification on building design and landscaping treatment especially within the setback area at pedestrian level under the proposed scheme;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) restriction for permitted non-polluting industrial use;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 4 of the Paper, as well as paragraph 9 of Appendix F-I; and
- (d) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 5 of the Paper. The application was for minor relaxation of PR restriction from 12 to 14.4 (i.e. +2.4 or +20%) for the redevelopment of an existing industrial building (IB) at the application site into a 30-storey IB for non-polluting industrial use. In response to the request of the Committee, the applicant had submitted further information to justify the building design, enhance the landscape treatment and address departmental comments. The applicant clarified that in the revised scheme, the setback area on G/F would be free of steps or other structure, and the recessed steps and access/facilities for persons with disability would be accommodated at the entrance lobby of the proposed development. The applicant had proposed enhanced greening measures such as vertical greening on building façade, extension of the edge planters, and enlargement of the podium roof planters. In that regard, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of PlanD considered that the additional provision of greening/landscape treatment on G/F and 3/F and articulations to the façade would enhance amenity at the pedestrian

level. The applicant also explained that the proposed building height profile stepping down towards Minico Building was to breakdown the building masses and contribute to more sunlight penetration into the dead-end area of Lee Chung Street. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

19. Some Members enquired on the details regarding the additional planning and design merits under the revised scheme. In response, Mr Ng Tak Wah, STP/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) an increase in greenery provision from about 15.26m<sup>2</sup> to about 194.5m<sup>2</sup> was proposed by the applicant in the form of vertical greening, edge planter and a podium garden. The overall greening ratio was about 20%;
- (b) a canopy for weather protection was proposed at the building frontage along Lee Chung 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;
- (c) the proposed staircases under the original scheme, which traversed onto the 7.5m-wide voluntary setback along Lee Chung Street, were removed. In the revised scheme, the setback area would be free of steps or other structure. The applicant would set aside a portion of the entrance lobby on G/F to accommodate the recessed steps and access/facilities for persons with disability;
- (d) the podium garden would be opened to tenants of the proposed development only;
- (e) there was no mentioning of whether recycled water would be used for irrigation purpose; and

- (f) the possibility of tree planting along the voluntary setback on Lee Chung Street was limited as there was an existing basement car park underneath the street level.

### Deliberation Session

20. Members generally considered that the further information submitted by the applicant could address the Committee's previous concerns. In particular, Members noted the voluntary full-height setbacks and enhanced greening measures as proposed by the applicant in the revised scheme. Regarding the possibility of tree planting along the setback area on Lee Chung Street, some Members considered that the voluntary setback would enhance the pedestrian environment by widening the walkway while planting of trees might take up the space available for pedestrian movement. For the purpose of more environmentally friendly, a Member suggested that the applicant could explore the possibility of using recycled water for irrigating the landscaping features in the proposed development. Another Member suggested that the proposed canopy along Lee Chung Street could be further extended to cover the whole building frontage so as to enhance the pedestrian environment. Members considered that the two suggestions could be included in the advisory clauses for the applicant's consideration, as appropriate.

21. The Chairman concluded that Members in general supported the application and agreed that the applicant should be advised to consider using recycled water for irrigation of greenery and landscaping facilities as an environmentally friendly measure and providing canopy covering the full frontage of the proposed development along Lee Chung Street. Also, whilst noting that there might be various constraints for tree planting in the built-up area, the opportunity of tree planting could be explored by private developers and relevant government departments upon redevelopment of individual sites, where circumstance permitted.

22. 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 4.12.2024, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the design and provision of vehicular assess, car parking and loading/unloading facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (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 the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

23. 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 clauses:

- “(a) to explore the possibility of extending the canopy to cover the full frontage of the proposed development along Lee Chung Street at the detailed design stage; and
- (b) to explore the possibility of using recycled water for irrigating the landscaping features in the proposed development.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr Ng Tak Wah, STP/HK, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

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

**Agenda Item 5**

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H6/90                      Proposed Shop and Services in “Residential (Group B)” Zone, Shop B3,  
G/F., 16 Tai Hang Road, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H6/90)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

24.            The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tai Hang. Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had declared an interest on the item as she was self-occupying a flat on Tai Hang Road. The Committee agreed that Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed shop and services;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, 25 public comments, with 11 supporting comments from nearby residents and individuals and 14 opposing comments from the owners’ corporation (OC) of the subject building, nearby residents and individuals, were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The ground floor (G/F) of the building (including the subject premises) was

intended to be used as garage, but had been converted into shops without valid planning permission. There was no strong planning justification for the change of uses in the area which was primarily for residential uses. There were eating places or convenience stores selling fast food located at Lai Tak Tsuen to the northeast uphill or area around Wun Sha Street to the north downhill. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications, in particular in the remaining part of the G/F of the subject building. The cumulative impact of approving such applications would result in changing the residential character of the neighbourhood. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

26. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) details of the public comments, in particular the one submitted by the OC of the subject building;
  - (b) whether submission of general building plans (GBP) was required for change of use in the subject premises;
  - (c) whether shops selling snack food were found in the vicinity;
  - (d) types of shops located next to the subject premises;
  - (e) whether the proposed shop and services use at the subject premises could continue to be operated without a valid planning permission; and
  - (f) whether the real estate agency shops at the remaining part of the G/F were subject to enforcement action or in contravention with the existing legislations.
27. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, STP/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) a total of 25 public comments, with 11 supporting comments from nearby residents and individuals and 14 opposing comments from the OC of the subject building, nearby residents and individuals, were received during the statutory publication period. The OC of the subject building objected to the application mainly on the grounds that the proposed shop and services use would breach the Deed of Mutual Covenant (DMC) of the subject building which was restricted for residential use. In that regard, the Lands Department advised that the applicant might take into consideration any possible implication of the relevant DMC for the proposed change of use of the subject premises to the proposed use;
- (b) with reference to the comments from the Buildings Department (BD), the applicant would be required to submit a set of GBP on compliance with the Buildings Ordinance (BO) upon obtaining planning permission;
- (c) some eating places and convenience stores selling fast food were located at Lai Tak Plaza and Wun Sha Street which were about 263m and 388m away respectively from the subject premises to serve the nearby residents;
- (d) the subject premises, which was a snack food shop, along with the real estate agencies located on the ground floor of the subject building were operating without valid planning permissions;
- (e) proper licence/permit issued by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) was required if there was any food business/catering service/activities for the public under the Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance and other relevant legislation for the public. In order to obtain a food factory licence (FFL) from FEHD to legally operate the snack food shop at the subject premises, a valid planning permission must first be obtained by the applicant. Should the application be rejected by the Committee, the FEHD would be notified and the applicant might not be able to obtain a FFL; and
- (f) changes in use of land and buildings were mainly regulated by the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO), land leases, BO and other relevant regulatory

legislations. As far as the subject application was concerned, enforcement action could be taken under the BO. In gist, the TPO did not provide the Planning Authority with enforcement power against unauthorised developments in area covered by outline zoning plans in the urban and new town areas. Besides, the Lands Department commented that the proposed shop and services use was not in conflict with the lease condition governing the subject premises. BD advised that the subject premises did not have immediate building safety and fire hazard concerns, and they had been following the established policies to tackle unauthorised building works (UBWs) and accord priority to those requiring immediate enforcement, covering mainly UBWs which constituted obvious or imminent danger to life or property. However, BD stressed that although no immediate enforcement action was taken at the subject premises, it should not be taken to imply that no UBWs were found within the subject premises.

#### Deliberation Session

28. A Member did not support the proposed shop and services use at the subject premises and agreed with PlanD's assessment that there was no strong planning justification for the change of uses in the area which was primarily for residential uses and the cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in changing the residential character of the neighbourhood. Another Member did not support the application and considered that the subject premises should be reverted back to car parking use. Regarding some Members' concern on the enforcement action against the existing snack food shop at the subject premises without valid planning permission, the Chairman explained that since the Planning Authority did not have direct enforcement power in urban areas, the change of use in such areas could be regulated through land leases, GBP submissions and relevant licensing requirements. As far as the subject case was concerned, shop and services use at the concerned premises could be enforced under the BO, though BD might only accord priority to cases which constituted obvious hazard or imminent danger. In addition, operation of the snack food shop would be regulated by the licensing requirement of FEHD.

29. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reason was:



“there is no strong planning justification for the change of uses in the area which is primarily for residential uses. The approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in changing the residential character of the neighbourhood.”

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

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

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

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting]

Draft Planning Brief for the “Comprehensive Development Area(5)” Zone in Kai Tak Development

(MPC Paper No.4/20)

---

30. The Secretary reported that the “Comprehensive Development Area (5)” (“CDA(5)”) site was allocated for public housing development to be implemented by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had declared an interest for being an ex-employee of HKHS. As Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

31. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Helen H.Y. Chan, STP/K, presented the draft Planning Brief (PB) for the “CDA(5)” site, including the background, the site and its surroundings, major development parameters and planning and other requirements, as detailed in the Paper.

32. As the presentation by Miss Helen H.Y. Chan, STP/K, was completed, the Chairman invited comments and questions from Members.

33. Some Members raised the following questions:

*The Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Preservation Corridor (LTSBPC)*

- (a) whether the design of the LTSBPC had been finalised;
- (b) whether future development at the “CDA(5)” zone needed to match the design elements of the LTSBPC;

*Development Intensity*

- (c) reasons for limiting the non-domestic plot ratio (PR) requirement to not less than 0.3;
- (d) whether the potential of the site had been maximised;

*Design and Place Making*

- (e) whether the PB had suggested design consideration focussing on the cultural and heritage aspects of the LTSBPC;
- (f) any requirement for the future development to achieve BEAM Plus certification with Provisional Gold Rating or above, and whether the relevant requirement stated in the PB was for BEAM Plus New Buildings or for BEAM Plus Neighbourhood;
- (g) any technical drawings or specific development parameters were included in the PB to ensure that the future design of the proposed development could integrate with the ambiance of the LTSBPC;
- (h) whether any facilities could be reserved for non-government organizations (NGOs) and social enterprises;

*Others*

- (i) submission requirement of Master Layout Plan (MLP) at the “CDA” sites in the Kai Tak area; and
- (j) clarification on the distribution of sites with significant conservation value in the Kai Tak area.

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

*LTSBPC*

- (a) the detailed design of LTSBPC at Kai Tak had been substantially completed with extensive consultation with the general public, the concerned District Council and Public Works Subcommittee of the Legislative Council by the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD). Construction work was expected to commence in 2021 for completion in 2025 tentatively. The LTSBPC was a preservation corridor for public appreciation and leisure purpose as well as for displaying the LTSB remnants and exhibits with a water feature along the open space and a continuous pedestrian walkway along the corridor;
- (b) the planning intention of the “CDA(5)” zone was to ensure that the future development would be in harmony with the LTSBPC. Some key design elements were formulated as advised by ArchSD, including a building setback of 3m from the site boundary on ground floor and adoption of a cantilever design, to facilitate an all-weathered and complimentary pedestrian environment for the LTSBPC;

*Development Intensity*

- (c) development at the “CDA(5)” site was subject to a maximum PR of 6.8 according to the Notes of the OZP. The PR indicated under the PB for domestic/non-domestic uses of 6.5/0.3 was to guide the detailed design of the future development, including the provision of a vibrant retail belt, while leaving some design flexibility to HKHS to maximise the provision of domestic flats. PlanD had estimated that the provision of a vibrant retail belt along the northeast and southeast boundaries could be accommodated within a non-domestic PR of 0.3;
- (d) optimisation of the development potential of residential/commercial sites in Kai Tak had been studied having regard to the traffic and other

infrastructural capacities and the PR of the potential sites were increased twice in 2015 and 2017. The “CDA(5)” site was one of those sites with maximum PR increased;

*Design and Place Making*

- (e) the cultural and heritage aspects of LTSB would be preserved in the form of a public open space with a preservation corridor (i.e. the LTSBPC). The LTSBPC would provide a 30m-wide and 320m-long rectilinear open space for the public to comprehend and appreciate the history of the LTSB and its remnants. The walkways alongside and across the LTSB would facilitate viewing at different distances and from different angles. ArchSD and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department would be responsible for the construction works and management of the LTSBPC respectively. While the “CDA(5)” site abutted the LTSBPC, the PB stipulated the requirement that development on the site should be compatible and congruous with the surrounding developments and settings, with harmony and continuity of design with the LTSBPC as well as provision of access points to LTSBPC. Relevant design measures were included in the PB to ensure that the proposed development in the “CDA(5)” site would be compatible with the ambience of the LTSCPC;
- (f) types of BEAM Plus certification required could be specified if considered appropriate;
- (g) since the detailed design of the LTSBPC had been formulated, technical drawings (Plans 6a and 6b of the PB in Appendix I of the Paper) were included in the PB to guide the future developments within the retail belt at the “CDA(5)” site. Furthermore, other developments at the “CDA(3)” and “CDA(4)” sites abutting the LTSBPC would be subject to similar design requirements in separate PBs under preparation to ensure the unity of design. For example, a minimum clear headroom of 4.2m and setback of 3m at the G/F frontage at these sites would have to be provided for a covered unobstructed public pedestrian passageway abutting LTSBPC. In

relation to the interpretation of ‘ambience’, various urban design considerations, including provision of at-grade public accesses, facade design and disposition were included in the PB to guide the design of the lower levels of the development;

- (h) there was no specific restriction regarding the types of shop and services use that could be accommodated in the retail belt;

*Others*

- (i) pursuant to the Town Planning Ordinance, all development within the “CDA” zone would require planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board), and the applicant shall prepare a MLP together with relevant technical assessments to support the application. The endorsed PB for the “CDA(5)” Site would provide guidance to HKHS in preparation of a MLP for approval by the Board. Similarly, PBs for the “CDA(3)” and “CDA(4)” sites, which were located to the northeast and northwest of the “CDA(5)” site on the two sides of the LTSBPC, would also be prepared and submitted for the Board’s consideration separately. Certain design elements at the “CDA(5)” site would also be adopted in the PBs of the “CDA(3)” and “CDA(4)” sites to ensure unity of design along the LTSBPC, including building setback, headroom, bulk of retail belt, building façade and connections to LTSBPC; and
- (j) two sites along the Kai Tak river were designated as “CDA(1)” and “CDA(2)” located to the far east end at Kai Tak. The PB and the MLP of “CDA(1)” site had been approved by the Board and construction had already commenced on the site. Similarly, “CDA(3)”, “CDA(4)” and “CDA(5)” were designated on both sides of LTSBPC to ensure that the future developments would be in harmony with the LTSBPC. A subway was under construction by government to link up the underground shopping street with the Urban Renewal Authority’s Development Scheme at Sa Po Road while another subway would be constructed to connect the northern end of LTSBPC with Shek Ku Lung Road Playground in Kowloon City.

The archaeological park was located further west near Sung Wong Toi Station.

35. Apart from seeking clarifications on the development parameters in the PB, some Members suggested that the cultural and historical elements of the LTSBPC should also be specified in the PB to guide the future development at the “CDA(5)” site. Some Members considered that the concept of ‘ambience of the LTSBPC’ might be hard to grasp and were concerned about the final execution of the future development. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, said that technical drawings were attached to the PB to guide the building designs on the lower floors along the retail belt abutting the LTSBPC. Besides, HKHS would need to submit a section 16 planning application with a MLP for the Board’s approval to demonstrate that the proposed residential development could complement the intended ambience. The Committee agreed that the PB could be suitably amended to address Members’ concerns on heritage preservation and BEAM Plus requirement as appropriate.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung left the meeting during the Question and Answer session.]

36. After deliberation, the Committee agreed to endorse the draft PB at Appendix I of the Paper subject to the incorporation of the element on preservation of cultural and heritage character of the area and the BEAM Plus requirement in the PB (Section 11 on Urban Design Considerations and Section 21 on Green Building Design and Smart Requirements), as appropriate.

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

**Agenda Item 7**

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

---

37.            The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 16.11.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address comments from the Transport Department. It was the third time that the applicants requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicants had submitted further information including revised plans, new photomontage, a revised traffic impact assessment and responses to departmental comments.

38.            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 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.

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





technical concerns. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

40. In response to a Member's enquiry on the development parameters and the setback provision of the proposed development, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant had fully utilised the domestic plot ratio (PR) of 7.5 while the non-domestic PR was not more than 0.68. While the non-domestic uses, i.e. retail facilities, were accommodated in the lower portion of the proposed development, two building voids on G/F and from 1/F to 2/F were incorporated to improve air and visual permeability and reduce the floor area for other non-domestic uses. Besides, the proposed provision of private open space of not less than 1m<sup>2</sup> per person in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines would be complied with. The private open space would be provided in both covered and open areas; and
- (b) the applicant had voluntarily proposed two setback areas including a 2.4m full-height setback from the lot boundary abutting Yuk Yat Street and a 3m-wide aboveground setback at the back lane of the proposed development.

41. In response to another Member's enquiry on the public consultation procedure, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, said that the subject application had duly complied with the statutory publication requirements under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO). In general, all information included in section 16 planning applications would be made available for public inspection and the public might submit comment on the application within the first three weeks of the publication period in accordance with the statutory requirements under the TPO. The Town Planning Board (TPB) would publish a notice in local newspapers while a site notice would be posted in a prominent position on or near the application site during the statutory publication period. As an administrative measure, the notice would also be

uploaded to the TPB's website and a copy of the notice would be posted at PlanD's Planning Enquiry Counters. In addition, notification would also be sent to relevant district council members and the Owners' Corporation(s) or other committee(s) of the buildings within 100 feet from the application site. In parallel, the notice and relevant information of the application would be forwarded to concerned District Office for public inspection.

### Deliberation Session

42. The Committee noted that the proposed development fell within an area zoned "R(E)" with the planning intention to encourage redevelopment of obsolete industrial buildings to phase out industrial uses in the area subject to addressing the industrial/residential interface issue. A Member observed that some redevelopment of industrial buildings into residential use had taken place in the area since three sites in the vicinity had been redeveloped into residential buildings between 2001 and 2015. Whilst noting that the permitted non-domestic PR had not been fully utilised, the Member considered that the application could be supported, having regard to the various planning and design merits, including the provision of voluntary setbacks and voids to enhance air and visual permeability, as proposed by the applicant. Another Member echoed the supportive views but expressed concern that the average flat size of the proposed development would be minuscule. With eight residential units on each floor while some bathrooms were enclosed with no window, the Member was concerned that the living quality of the proposed development might not be very desirable. The Chairman remarked that the development had to comply with the Buildings Ordinance (BO) and its regulations and the applicant would need to submit general building plans for the Building Authority's approval to ensure that all requirements as stipulated under the BO would be fully complied with, should the application be approved.

43. 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 4.12.2024, 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 revised noise impact assessment and the implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (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 the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of a revised sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (d) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading works identified in the revised sewerage impact assessment in condition (c) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (e) the design and provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

**Agenda Item 9**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

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  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/793)

---

45.            The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

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

46.            The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) 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 periods, nine public comments, with five supporting comments from a member of the Kwun Tong Centre Area Committee (KTCAC) of the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC), the Incorporated Owners' Cooperation of the Good Year Industrial Building and an individual, and four opposing comments from a member of the KTCAC of KTDC, one of the owners of the subject industrial building (IB) and an individual, 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 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 application site (the Site) was occupied by an eligible pre-1987 IB under government's policy on revitalising IBs and the Development Bureau provided policy support to the application subject to the applicant's compliance with all technical requirements. The Director-General of Trade and Industry had no objection to the application given that it would put the Site into optimal use to provide more industrial space. Various measures were proposed to enhance the pedestrian environment along Hoi Yuen Road. The back alley concerned was identified as part of the Energizing Kowloon East Offices ‘Back Alley Project @ Kowloon East’, and vertical greenings and feature walls were incorporated at the façade facing the back alley to enhance its attractiveness. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of PlanD advised that the design measures might help improve the pedestrian environment and promote visual interest. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application, and relevant approval conditions were recommended to address their technical concerns. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments

and planning assessments above were relevant.

48. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether approval of the application would contravene the compulsory sale process of the subject IB, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, said that applications for compulsory sale of land would be considered by the Land Tribunal under the Land (Compulsory Sale for Redevelopment) Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Land Tribunal would assess the redevelopment potential of the lot as submitted by the owners of the lot, and hear and determine the dispute in case any minority owner of the lot lodged any objection or dispute with the value of any property as assessed in the application submitted by the majority owner under the Ordinance. Another Member sought clarification related to the permeability of the proposed development. In response, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, said that a large void that extended from the podium garden on the 2/F to 5/F of the buildings would allow wind penetration and cross ventilation from Hoi Yuen Road to the back alley. In response to a Member's enquiry on the traffic aspect, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, said that the car parking and loading/unloading (L/UL) spaces would be provided to meet the 'high-end' requirement under the prevailing Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. Based on the traffic impact assessment submitted by the applicant, the Transport Department (TD) confirmed that the proposed development would not generate adverse traffic impact on the surrounding area. She further explained that relevant approval conditions were recommended regarding the design of parking facilities, L/UL spaces and vehicular access for the proposed development, as well as the provision of traffic management plan and its mitigation measures, which had to be complied with to the satisfaction of TD. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, clarified that the applicant had not undertaken to use recycled water for irrigating the landscaping features in the proposed development.

#### Deliberation Session

49. Members generally had no objection to the proposed development with minor relaxation of PR restriction as the application was in line with the revitalisation of industrial building policy. Some Members considered that the applicant had demonstrated substantial planning and design merits by incorporating voluntary setback, greening features and green building designs to improve the pedestrian environment and minimise the visual and air ventilation impacts. A Member suggested that the applicant should explore the possibility

of using recycled water for irrigating the landscaping features in the proposed development. Members agreed that the suggestion could be included in the advisory clause for the applicant's consideration, as appropriate. Regarding the objecting public comment submitted by one of the owners of the subject lot raising concerns on the legal dispute with the applicant as well as some land use and technical issues, the relevant comments had been addressed by the relevant government departments as stated in paragraphs 9 and 11 of the Paper. Members also noted that the legal dispute between the applicant and other owner(s) of the subject lot could be resolved under the land administration regime.

50. 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 4.12.2024, 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 revised sewerage impact assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (b) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection identified in the revised sewerage impact assessment in condition (a) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of land contamination assessments in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to development of the site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of a revised traffic impact assessment and implementation of the traffic management plan and the mitigation measures, if any, identified in the revised traffic impact assessment, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB; and



- (e) the design 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.”

51. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper with the following additional advisory clause:

“to explore the possibility of using recycled water for irrigating the landscaping features in the proposed development.”

[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 10**

#### **Any Other Business**

52. The Secretary reported that at the Town Planning Board (TPB) meeting on 27.11.2020, Members agreed that there was no need to table hard copy of the draft minutes which had already been sent to Members via email before the meeting. To align with the practice of the TPB, the hard copy of the draft minutes of the Committee meeting would not be distributed to Members with immediate effect unless upon request. Members noted.

53. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:15 p.m.