

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 662<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 18.12.2020**

#### **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

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Mr C.H. Tse

Chief Traffic Engineer /Kowloon, Transport Department  
Ms Annisa K.W. Ng

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

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

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department  
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

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

Secretary

**In Attendance**

Deputy Director of Planning/Territorial  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

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  
Ms Anita M.Y. Wong

## **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 661<sup>st</sup> MPC Meeting held on 4.12.2020**

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 661<sup>st</sup> MPC meeting held on 4.12.2020 were confirmed without amendments.

## **Agenda Item 2**

### **Matters Arising**

[Open Meeting]

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

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting]

Y/TW/14                      Application for Amendment to the Notes of the “Government, Institution or Community (2)” Zone on the Approved Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/33, to Relax the Maximum Gross Floor Area, Building Height and Site Coverage for the Application Site, Lot 1236 RP in D.D. 453 and Extension Thereto, Lo Wai, Tsuen Wan, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. Y/TW/14C)

---

4.            The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan. Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) and WSP (Asia) Limited (WSP) were two of the consultants of the applicant.    The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau                      -    being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA;
  
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai                         -    his former firm having business dealings with WSP;
  
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi                    -    his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and
  
- Professor John C.Y. Ng                 -    his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.

5.            The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application.    As Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau and Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application and the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi’s spouse and Professor John C.Y. Ng’s spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

6. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 27.11.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to update the Water Supply Impact Assessment (WSIA) to address the comments of Water Supplies Department (WSD). It was the fourth time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had been liaising with WSD to obtain the water supply information for updating the WSIA.

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

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

**Agenda Item 4**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K3/590                      Proposed Flat, Shop and Services with Minor Relaxation of Domestic Plot Ratio Restriction in “Residential (Group E)” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, 25-29 Kok Cheung Street, Tai Kok Tsui, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K3/590A)

---

8.                      The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Mong Kok and one of the applicants was Asia Turbo Development Limited, which was a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD). Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA), LWK & Partners (HK) Limited (LWK) and WSP (Asia) Limited (WSP) were three of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Alex T.H. Lai                      -    his former firm having business dealings with HLD, LWK and WSP;
  
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau                      -    being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA; and
  
- Mr C.H. Tse                                      -    owning a flat in Mong Kok.

9.                      As Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application and the property owned by Mr C.H. Tse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

10.                      With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Clement Miu, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) the proposed flat, shop and services with minor relaxation of domestic plot ratio (PR) restriction;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, five public comments were received, including one comment from an individual objecting to the application and four comments from a Yau Tsim Mong District Council member and individuals expressing concerns on the application. 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 set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed use was in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) zone, was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses, and concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application. However, the proposed increase in domestic PR from 7.5 to 8.55 deviated from the recommendations of the Kowloon Density Study (KDS) Review on PR control for “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone (i.e. a maximum PR of 7.5 for a domestic building or a maximum PR of 9.0 for a partly domestic and partly non-domestic building) and that there should be no provision for further transfer of PR from non-domestic to domestic use as that would jeopardise the aims of PR control. Sites within the “R(E)” zone were subject to PR control similar to that of the “R(A)” zone. Whilst there might be scope for relaxation of PR in large-scale urban restructuring scheme, the subject application only involved redevelopment of an individual site. With regard to the government policy on increasing housing land supply as announced in the 2014 Policy Address (2014 PA), it should be noted that such policy did not apply to the north of Hong Kong Island and Kowloon Peninsula which were more densely populated. In that regard, it was considered that the minor relaxation of domestic PR restriction was not in line with the Government's initiatives to achieve a more balanced spatial development pattern for the

territory. There were no previous and similar applications for minor relaxation of PR restriction in Mong Kok or Kowloon areas with a resultant domestic PR exceeding 7.5. Approval of the subject application would jeopardise the intention of imposing domestic PR restriction in the KDS Review and would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would undermine the PR control of a wider area and overstrain the capacity of the existing and planned infrastructure and result in adverse impacts on the provision of community facilities in the Kowloon area. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

11. Some Members raised the following questions:

*Flat Size and Car Parking Provision*

- (a) the average flat size, the distribution of flat with different sizes, and the estimated population of the proposed development;
- (b) whether there was planning control on the minimum flat size in residential developments;
- (c) whether the small units could be combined by removing the wall between the units;
- (d) the reason for the decrease in number of parking spaces for private cars despite an increase in the number of flats;

*The KDS Review and the Government Policy on Increasing Housing Land Supply*

- (e) the area covered by the KDS Review and the PR restriction for the “R(E)” zone;
- (f) whether there was provision for application for minor relaxation of PR



restriction to exceed the domestic PR of 7.5 and whether there were similar applications rejected by the Committee on the grounds of deviation from the recommendations of the KDS Review;

- (g) noting that the KDS Review was conducted in 2002, whether there was any plan to update the findings; and
- (h) whether the increase in maximum domestic PR by 20% as announced under the 2014 PA was applicable to the application site.

12. In response, Mr Clement Miu, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

*Flat Size and Car Parking Provision*

- (a) the applicants proposed to increase the number of flats from 636 under the previously approved application No. A/K3/585 to 704 under the current application. The average flat size of the proposed development, which was calculated by dividing the total domestic gross floor area by the total number of flats, was about 30.4m<sup>2</sup>. The applicants had not provided a detailed breakdown of the number of flats with different sizes. However, according to the traffic impact assessment submitted by the applicants, among the 704 flats, 703 flats had a size of less than 40m<sup>2</sup> while only one flat had a size between 70m<sup>2</sup> to 100m<sup>2</sup>. With reference to the typical floor plan in Drawing A-7 of the Paper, majority of the flats were one-bedroom units with some studio and two-bedroom units. The proposed development had an estimated population of about 1,170 persons.
- (b) there was currently no planning control under the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) on the minimum flat size in residential development;
- (c) if there was any alteration and addition works to remove the partition walls to combine two adjoining units into one in future, approval from the Building Authority was required;

- (d) the parking requirement was calculated taking into account factors including flat size. As the flat size in the proposed development was reduced, a lower parking standard rate for smaller flats would result in a decrease in the required number of parking spaces (i.e. decreased from 53 in the previous application (No. A/K3/585) to 38 under the current application). However, the number of private car parking spaces proposed under the application was in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), in which a higher end of the requirements was adopted. The Commissioner for Transport had no adverse comments on the parking provisions;

*The KDS Review and the Government Policy on Increasing Housing Land Supply*

- (e) the KDS Review completed in 2002 covered the Kowloon and New Kowloon area. KDS Review confirmed the PR control for the “R(A)” zone, i.e. a maximum PR of 7.5 for a domestic building or 9.0 for a partly domestic and partly non-domestic building, and the PR of the domestic part of any building should not exceed 7.5. Sites within the “R(E)” zone were subject to PR control similar to that of the “R(A)” zone;
- (f) according to the Notes of the “R(E)” zone, minor relaxation of PR restriction might be considered by the Town Planning Board on application under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance. No similar planning application for minor relaxation of domestic PR restriction exceeding 7.5 was received;
- (g) land use reviews to meet the changing circumstances of an area would be undertaken from time to time. In view of the high development density, ageing building stock and growing problem of urban decay in the Yau Tsim Mong area, the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) had commenced a District Study for Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok (the Yau Mong Study) in 2017, which covered an area of about 212 hectares. A Master Renewal Concept Plan (MRCP) would be formulated to identify areas with redevelopment potential and ways to enhance land use efficiency. It was anticipated that

the MRCP would be completed in 2021 and the stakeholders would be consulted on the findings in due course; and

- (h) the Government policy on increasing housing land supply by increasing the domestic PR by 20% as announced in the 2014 PA did not include areas in the northern part of Hong Kong Island and Kowloon Peninsula which were more densely populated. As the application site was located in the Kowloon Peninsula, the policy was not applicable to the application site.

13. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on whether there were any technical or infrastructural concerns raised by relevant government departments, Mr Clement Miu, STP/TWK, said that relevant government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

14. Some Members did not support the application as there were no strong justifications provided to justify a deviation from the recommendations of the KDS Review. It would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications, noting that there was insufficient information to assess the impact of relaxing the domestic PR beyond the recommendations of the KDS Review. A Member considered that whether the domestic PR of 7.5 could be exceeded should take into account the findings of the Yau Mong Study.

15. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Chairman remarked that the KDS was first undertaken in early 1990s to devise a basis for control on building density in the Kowloon and New Kowloon areas after the relocation of Kai Tak Airport, when the airport height restrictions would be lifted. It aimed to assess the development capacity of Kowloon and New Kowloon areas, and recommended that the maximum domestic PR should be 7.5 after taking into consideration the infrastructure and environmental constraints. The KDS Review was carried out in late 1990s/early 2000s to assess whether it was possible to increase the PRs in Kowloon and New Kowloon areas. The review confirmed the need to maintain PR control and the recommended maximum domestic PR should be kept at 7.5. A total of 16 OZPs, including the Mong Kok OZP, had been amended and incorporated the recommendations of the KDS Review in 2002. As the Yau Mong Study carried out by the

URA covered nearly one-third of the Kowloon Peninsula, its findings would provide insight on whether the maximum PR in Kowloon could be relaxed.

16. Some Members said that the information on the average flat size would not truly reflect the actual flat sizes in the proposed development and had concerns that such small flat sizes would affect living quality and aggravate social inequality. The Chairman said that the Government had previously rolled out land sale sites with restrictions on flat sizes and/or number of units, and there were relevant provisions under the building regime to ensure the basic sanitary and safety requirements of living quarters. For future applications, the applicant would be advised to provide more information on the flat sizes and its distribution to facilitate Members' consideration.

17. With regard to the concern on car parking provision, Members noted that the parking requirements were formulated by the Transport Department (TD) based on a global parking standard (i.e. 1 car parking space per 6 to 9 flats) multiplied by several adjustment ratios relating to flat size, proximity to railway station and the domestic PR of a development. As for the adjustment ratio relating to flat size, for units with flat size of 40m<sup>2</sup> or less, 0.4 car parking space was required, while for units with flat size between 70m<sup>2</sup> and 100m<sup>2</sup>, 2.1 car parking spaces were required. The car parking provision for the proposed development was derived based on the above formula taking into account the adjustment ratios. Ms Annisa K.W. Ng, Chief Transport Engineer (Kowloon), TD, supplemented that TD had been carrying out a review on the standards for parking facilities which was largely completed and would be promulgated soon. Members noted that the relevant standards in HKPSG would be amended in due course.

18. The Chairman summarised that while the proposed minor relaxation of domestic PR from 7.5 to 8.55 would not have any land use compatibility, technical and infrastructure concerns, Members in general did not support the application as it deviated from the planning intention for specific PR control as recommended by the KDS Review and no strong justifications to deviate from such intention had been provided.

19. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reasons were:

- “(a) the proposed domestic plot ratio (PR) of 8.55 deviates from the planning intention for specific control on PRs in consideration of the overall transport, environmental and infrastructural constraints, as well as the adequacy in the provision of community facilities envisioned in the Kowloon Density Study Review. No strong justification has been provided by the applicants for the proposed minor relaxation of domestic PR restriction; and
- (b) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the “Residential (Group E)” and “Residential (Group A)” zones with similar PR control in Mong Kok and other Kowloon area. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications will undermine the PR control of a wider area and overstrain the capacity of the existing and planned infrastructures in the area and have adverse impact on the provision of community facilities.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr Clement Miu, STP/TWK for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung joined the meeting at this point.]

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

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

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

---

20. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan and the application was submitted by Tippon Investment Enterprises Limited, which was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK). Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD) and AECOM Asia 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 SHK and AECOM and past business dealings with LD;
- Mr Franklin Yu - his spouse being an employee of SHK;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having business dealings with SHK and AECOM;
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and
- Professor John C.Y. Ng - his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.

21. The Committee noted that Mr Franklin Yu had yet to join the meeting. As the interests of Mr Thomas O.S. Ho was direct, he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily. As Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application and the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi’s spouse and Professor John C.Y. Ng’s spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

22. Mr K.S. Ng, STP/TWK, drew Members' attention that a replacement page (page 1 of Appendix VI) was tabled at the meeting. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, he then presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed comprehensive residential development (Amendments to Approved Master Layout Plan (MLP));
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, 31 public comments from individuals were received, with 26 supporting, one objecting to and four providing views on the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 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 12 of the Paper. The proposed use was the same as that in the previously approved application No. A/TW/452 which comprised four development sites (i.e. Sites A to D) to be implemented in four phases. The proposed development was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Comprehensive Development Area (3)” (“CDA(3)”) zone. Compared with the previously approved MLP, the proposed scheme mainly involved amendments to the proposed development at Site A in Phase 1, with an increase in the number of storeys, number of flats and private open space, and reduction in the number of towers from two to one. The overall maximum building height of 100mPD and plot ratio (PR) of 5 of the proposed development remained unchanged. Various setbacks with

landscape treatment proposed under the current scheme were the same as those under the previously approved scheme. Besides, the layout design and building disposition of Site A had been revised to visually enhance the integration and linkage of private open space within Site A with the adjacent Wang Wo Tsai Street Garden (WWTSG) to its immediate east. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD opined that the above measures could promote visual interests and pedestrian comfort for open space users at WWTSG. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

23. The Vice-chairman and some Members raised the following questions:

*The MLP*

- (a) whether the land owners of the other three sites in the subject “CDA(3)” zone would be required to follow the scheme under the revised MLP to effect their proposals;
- (b) noting that seating areas would be provided in the voluntary setbacks abutting the public lane to the north and west of the application site, whether those facilities would be made available for public use;
- (c) noting from Drawing A-4 of the Paper that the entrance plaza at Site A would be relocated from the north-western corner to the east when compared with the approved MLP, whether the open space would be open for public use and whether such change in the location would affect the design and integrity of the central plaza originally located in the middle of the four development sites within the “CDA(3)” zone;
- (d) whether the owners of Sites B to D were involved in the current amendments to the approved MLP and whether they had any comments on the current scheme;



*Provision of Social Welfare Facilities*

- (e) noting that the applicant had indicated that it was technically infeasible to accommodate the social welfare facilities requested by the Social Welfare Department (SWD), how such facilities would be provided to serve the local residents in the district;
- (f) whether the provision of social welfare facilities in the application site would be accountable for PR calculation;
- (g) whether SWD would be consulted on the need of social welfare facilities in new development projects;

*Parking Provision*

- (h) clarification on the provision of parking spaces which was more than the high end as required under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), and whether the additional car parking spaces under the current application would lead to adverse traffic impact.

24. In response, Mr K.S. Ng, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

*The MLP*

- (a) as the MLP covered the entire “CDA(3)” zone, land owners of the other three sites would need to follow the revised MLP to develop their sites. However, the land owners could, similar to the subject application, submit an application to the Town Planning Board to make amendments to the approved MLP if necessary;
- (b) the setbacks abutting the public lane to the north and west of the application site were private open space with landscape planting and street furniture. As those facilities were located outside the boundary fence of Site A, they

would be available for public use and the applicant would be responsible for the maintenance and management of the facilities;

- (c) the current amendments to the MLP involved Site A only, without any changes to the layouts of Sites B, C and D. With reference to Drawing A-8 of the Paper, the applicant proposed to consolidate the open space to the eastern portion of Site A with a view to enhancing visual integration and linkage with WWTSG. The open space was private open space for the use of the future residents of Site A only. There was no change to the setback provision along the public lanes as compared with the previously approved MLP;
- (d) there was no known programme for the owners of Sites B to D to develop their respective sites. They were not involved in the submission of current amendments to the approved MLP and no comments were received from them during the statutory public inspection periods;

*Provision of Social Welfare Facilities*

- (e) SWD noted the applicant's explanation that as the application site was small and areas had already been fully utilised to meet basic and minimum provision of different requirements, there was no scope to meet the new request for provision of social welfare facilities. Moreover, the existing and planned provision of government, institution and community (GIC) and social welfare facilities in the Tsuen Wan planning scheme area were generally sufficient, except day care centre for the elderly and child care centre. It should be noted that there was a standalone day care centre for the elderly in the adjoining Sheung Chui Court, which had a site area of approximately one hectare. The Government was currently adopting a multi-pronged approach to provide more GIC and social welfare facilities to meet the demand, such as incorporating appropriate facilities in public housing developments, redevelopment projects in built-up area and land sale sites;

- (f) according to the Notes of the “CDA(3)” zone, any floor space constructed for GIC or social welfare facilities, as required by the Government, should be included for PR calculation;
- (g) in general, for applications involving a relatively large site area and with potential to incorporate premises-based social welfare facilities in terms of site location and land use compatibility, SWD would be consulted on whether provision of social welfare facilities was required; and

*Parking Provision*

- (h) according to HKPSG, 22 to 33 car parking spaces were required for the proposed development at Site A, taking into account the increase of 63 flats. In response to concerned department’s comments, the applicant proposed to provide 37 car parking spaces to tie in with the requirements as stipulated under the lease with 10% design/demand flexibility. The traffic impact assessment conducted by the applicant concluded that the current scheme would not have adverse traffic impact on the critical junctions. The Transport Department had no objection to the application and relevant approval condition on the design and provision of parking facilities was recommended.

25. In response to a Member’s enquiry regarding the use of recycled water for irrigation of landscape areas, Mr K.S. Ng, STP/TWK, said that the applicant had not indicated whether recycled water would be used for irrigation.

Deliberation Session

26. Members generally had no objection to the proposed changes in development parameters in the subject application. However, some Members were of the view that changes to the layout and building disposition, in particular the central plaza, had fundamentally changed the spatial design of the approved MLP. The revised MLP was considered inferior to the previously approved scheme in terms of massing, design and integrity of the central plaza, and hence affecting the quality of the open space provision.

27. Some Members were also concerned about the non-provision of social welfare facilities at the application site and considered that opportunity should be taken to encourage developers to provide such facilities in undertaking the proposed development. Members noted that the applicant had submitted another planning application (No. A/TW/515) at the same site for the same use with minor relaxation of PR (from 5 to 6) and building height (BH) (from 100mPD to 113.5mPD) restrictions which was yet to be submitted to the Committee for consideration.

28. The Chairman summarised that Members in general considered that the proposed changes to the development parameters in the subject application was acceptable, but had reservations on the amendments to the layout and design of the approved MLP. Members also considered that the applicant should further explore the possibility for the provision of social welfare facilities. Given that the applicant had submitted another scheme for minor relaxation of PR and BH restrictions for the same site, the Committee considered that the applicant should be requested to review the scheme comprehensively, taking into account Members' concerns on retaining the design merits of the previously approved MLP and further exploring the possibility for the provision of social welfare facilities at the application site.

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

“the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed amendments to the approved master layout plan (MLP) would not adversely affect the design merits of the approved MLP. There is insufficient planning and design merits to support the proposed amendments to the approved MLP.”

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

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting at this point. Mr Stanley T.S. Choi left the meeting at this point.]

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

## **Agenda Item 6**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

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

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

30.                      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 shop and services (showroom for garments and ancillary storage);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment was received; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use was in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone and was considered not incompatible with other uses of the same building which comprised showrooms and shops on the ground floor and industrial-related offices and trading firms on the upper floors. The applied use in general also

complied with the Town Planning Board (TPB) Guidelines No. 22D (TPB PG-No. 22D) in that it would not induce adverse fire safety, traffic and infrastructural impacts on the developments within the subject building and the adjacent areas. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The aggregate commercial floor area approved by the Committee on the ground floor of the subject industrial building would be 452.566m<sup>2</sup> which was within the maximum permissible limit of 460m<sup>2</sup> for an industrial building with sprinkler system.

31. In response to a Member's enquiry regarding the maximum aggregate commercial floor areas on the ground floor of an industrial building, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, PlanD, explained that according to TPB PG-No. 22D, owing to fire safety concern, the Fire Services Department considered that the aggregate commercial floor areas on the ground floor of an existing industrial/industrial-office building with and without sprinkler systems should as a general principle not exceed 460m<sup>2</sup> or 230m<sup>2</sup> respectively. As there was currently no other commercial use on the ground floor of the subject building, the proposed shop and services use with a floor area of 452.566m<sup>2</sup> complied with the requirements of TPB PG-No. 22D.

#### Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) no retailing activities within the showroom premises will be permitted;
- (b) the submission and implementation of fire service installations, within six months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 18.6.2021;
- (c) if the above planning condition (a) is not complied with, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and

(d) if the above planning condition (b) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

### **Agenda Item 7**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/828                      Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (2)”  
Zone, Portion of Workshop C2, G/F, Block C, Hong Kong Industrial  
Centre, 489-491 Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/828)

---

34. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 4.12.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

**Agenda Item 8**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

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

---

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

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

37.            The Committee noted that Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had yet to join and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting. As Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau 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

38. 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 residential institution (student hostel) with minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 and Appendix II of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 2,006 public comments were received, with 464 supporting comments from individuals including the students, staff and alumni of PolyU; 1,465 objecting comments from individuals including the residents and the representative of Owners' Committee of Mount Beacon; 44 comments from individuals expressing concerns; and 33 comments including one from the Vice-chairman of the Sham Shui Po East Area Committee did not indicate any views. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone and was considered not incompatible with the surrounding residential and student hostel developments. The Secretary for Education and the University Grants Committee (UGC) Secretariat had provided policy support to the application as the proposed student hostel development could meet part of PolyU's hostel shortfall. With regard to the minor relaxation of BH restriction from 112mPD to 136mPD, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD considered that the proposed development would unlikely induce significant adverse effects on the visual character of

the surrounding townscape. The proposed landscape treatment would promote visual interest, soften the development edges and enhance pedestrian comfort. The building gaps with at least 15m wide under the proposed scheme would promote building permeability and bring about some localised improvement to the immediate surrounding wind environment as compared with the baseline scheme. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting during the presentation session.]

39. Some Members raised the following questions:

*The Application Site and Surroundings*

- (a) the reason of earmarking the application site, which was far away from PolyU, for the development of PolyU's student hostel;
- (b) noting that the application site was in proximity to the City University of Hong Kong (CityU) and the Baptist University, whether those universities would also need to construct new student hostels;
- (c) the topography of the application site and the surrounding area, and the BH of the existing developments in the area;

*The Proposed Student Hostel Development*

- (d) whether student hostel was a Column 1 use in the "G/IC(7)" zone;
- (e) the required ratio of hostel spaces to number of students and the current number of hostel spaces available for PolyU students;
- (f) whether there would be shuttle bus services between the application site

and MTR Kowloon Tong Station which was about 800m away;

- (g) as the proposed hostel was located far away from PolyU's main campus, what facilities would be provided in the proposed development to enrich students' hostel experience;
- (h) the rationale for adopting a relatively low plot ratio (PR) for the proposed hostel development;
- (i) noting from Drawing A-11 of the Paper, the application site was not efficiently used for hostel development as the lower floors would be used as non-domestic purposes mainly for circulation. Whether there were any site constraints rendering the need for such design and whether minor relaxation of BH restriction was required to take forth the proposed development;

#### *Landscape Provision*

- (j) details of the proposed landscape treatment to compensate for the loss of greenery at the application site;
- (k) whether recycled water would be used for irrigation of landscape areas of the proposed development;

#### *Public Consultation and Comments*

- (l) noting that there were public comments on inadequate consultation, whether the project proponent and PlanD had carried out proper public consultation for the proposed development; and
- (m) noting that there were over 1,400 public comments objecting to the application, whether complaints from residents in the nearby residential developments on the existing hostels in the area were received.

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

*The Application Site and Surroundings*

- (a) the application site was previously reserved for the development of a joint universities' soccer pitch. However, due to the lack of land for new student hostel development within the universities' campuses, the Education Bureau and UGC had to explore off-campus sites for student hostel development. It was considered that the application site, which had a relatively large site area and was well-served by public transport, could be better utilised for student hostel development. As there were insufficient hostel spaces in PolyU and the application site was within walking distance of MTR Kowloon Tong Station, and could be connected to PolyU via East Rail, the site was earmarked for PolyU's student hostel development;
- (b) based on the information available, a site to the west of the application site was earmarked for student hostel development for CityU. Upon formulation of the development scheme, a planning application would be submitted to the Town Planning Board for consideration in due course;
- (c) with reference to Plan A-2 of the Paper, the application site was a sloping site previously occupied by the Cornwall Street Temporary Housing Area (THA), with two major platforms at about 95mPD and 103mPD. The proposed entrance to the application site at Tat Hong Road had a level of 72.2mPD, while Lung Cheung Road located to the north of the site had a level of about 121mPD. The areas between the Lung Cheung Road Lookout and the application site were natural slopes. The CityU Student Residence and Mount Beacon to the south and east of the application site had BHs of 75mPD to 131mPD and 86mPD to 109mPD respectively;

*The Proposed Student Hostel Development*

- (d) student hostel was regarded as 'Residential Institution' which was a Column 2 use in the "G/IC(7)" zone and planning permission from the

Town Planning Board was required;

- (e) under the Government's student hostel policy, all local undergraduate students should be given the opportunity to stay in a student hostel for at least one year during their studies, and all non-local students and students with special needs should also be provided with hostel places. While there was no information on the available hostel spaces for PolyU students at hand, it was noted that the shortfall of hostel spaces in PolyU was about 2,900;
- (f) the applicant had not indicated that shuttle bus services between the application site and the MTR Kowloon Tong Station would be provided. The walking environment between the application site and the MTR Kowloon Tong Station was comfortable, and there was provision of indoor walkways and escalators within the proposed development. The Commissioner for Transport had not raised concern on this aspect. Moreover, the application site was well-served by public transport;
- (g) while the applicant had not provided detailed information regarding measures to enrich students' hostel experience, it was noted that the proposed development would include various communal facilities, such as outdoor recreational space, ancillary function rooms, meeting rooms and dining hall, which could facilitate interaction among the students;
- (h) there was no PR restriction in the "G/IC(7)" zone. The development intensity and BH for the proposed development were comparable to the existing student hostels in the area;
- (i) the application site was situated on a slope with two major platforms and was subject to geotechnical constraints of high rock level. To avoid excavation and minimise potential impacts on the surrounding area, the proposed development had adopted a design by providing several levels of circulation space below some of the blocks, resulting in a raised platform in part of the site and the requirement of a BH of 136mPD for the proposed

development;

*Landscape Provision*

- (j) after the Cornwall Street THA was vacated in the 1990s, the site was left vacant and overgrown with vegetation. About 717 existing trees of common species were proposed to be felled due to conflict with the proposed development. A total of 220 compensatory trees were proposed to be planted at podium levels with terrace planters along the building edges. Vertical greening would also be provided at the building façade. According to the applicant, tree planting on the ground floor had already been maximised to strike a balance between providing ancillary facilities and open spaces for the students and maximizing greening provision. An overall greenery ratio of 20% was proposed at the application site;
- (k) the applicant indicated that a rainwater tank would be constructed to collect rain water for irrigation of landscape features but the details would only be available at the detailed design stage;

*Public Consultation and Comments*

- (l) regarding the concern on inadequate public consultation, it referred to the consultation carried out by the project proponent in identifying the site for student hostel development rather than the public consultation for the subject application. While the proposal had not been discussed in the Sham Shui Po District Council (DC), it was noted that the applicant had liaised with the stakeholders prior to the submission of the subject application, including holding meetings with DC members and Owners' Committee of Mount Beacon in February and March 2020. Public consultation for the subject application had been carried out in accordance with the Town Planning Ordinance and relevant guidelines, including publishing newspaper notice, posting site notices at prominent locations near the application site, and sending letters to the Owners' Corporations of nearby buildings as well as the concerned DC members; and

- (m) there was no information at hand on whether there were complaints from residents in the nearby residential developments on the existing hostels in the area.

41. A Member asked whether the proposed mini-soccer pitch to the north-west of the application site would be opened for public use. In response, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, with reference to Plan A-2 of the Paper, said that a site to the northwest of the application site had been identified for the provision of a mini-soccer pitch. The Education Bureau and UGC Secretariat would liaise with relevant universities on the provision of the mini-soccer pitch and the detailed arrangements would be confirmed at a later stage.

#### Deliberation Session

42. A Member said that while the development of student hostel was supported, the application site might not be suitable for the development of PolyU's student hostel as it was located far away from PolyU's main campus. The Member considered that there was insufficient information provided by the applicant on the relationship between the proposed student hostel and PolyU's other off-campus student hostels, and how the proposed student hostel could enrich students' hostel experience.

43. Two Members did not support the application as there were no strong justifications provided by the applicant for using the application site for the development of PolyU's student hostel. The proposed development with a low PR of about 4 and an inefficient design with several levels of circulation spaces had not optimised the valuable land resources for the provision of more hostel spaces to meet the shortfall. Besides, the proposed development involved extensive tree felling and the tree compensation and greenery proposals were not satisfactory.

44. Some Members, however, supported the application as the proposed development was in line with the planning intention of the "G/IC" zone and compatible with the surrounding developments, the proposed BH had followed the topography of the area and minor relaxation of BH restriction was required to overcome site constraints, and there were no adverse comments from government departments on the technical aspects.

Notwithstanding that, they agreed that the building design and landscape treatment could be improved such that the site could be used more efficiently and the adverse landscape impact could be minimised.

45. The Vice-chairman also supported the application and remarked that as student hostel development was subject to funding approval under the Hostel Development Fund, there might be financial constraints on the provision of more hostel spaces in the proposed development.

46. A Member said that it was not uncommon for the provision of off-campus student hostels in other countries due to limited spaces in the main campus, and the students' hostel experience would depend on the software such as hostel management and organization of activities rather than the location of the hostel. Another Member concurred that if the application site was considered not suitable for PolyU's student hostel development due to physical distance, it would be even more difficult to find another site that would be better than the current site.

47. The Chairman summarised that majority of the Member supported the application but opined that the building design of the proposed development should be improved with a view to using the site more efficiently and providing more hostel spaces. The applicant was encouraged to take into account Members' views on the need to provide more hostel spaces, enhance students' hostel experience, and improve landscape treatment in the design of the student hostel. Besides, the future applicant for CityU off-campus student hostel development was advised to provide more information to substantiate the application, including the rationale for site selection, relationship between the off-campus student hostel and the main campus, and measures to enhance students' hostel experiences.

48. 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 18.12.2024, 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 an updated Noise Impact Assessment and the



implementation of 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 an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development in condition (b) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission and the implementation of translocation proposal of any amphibian species of conservation importance within the application site before commencement of any preparatory works including site clearance and tree felling at the application site to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the TPB; and
- (e) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

[Mr T.W. Ng and Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, Senior Town Planners/Hong Kong (STPs/HK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Item 9**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

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

---

50.                      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 have declared interests on the item:

- Mr Raymond K.W. Lee                      - his spouse owning a workshop in an industrial building in Chai Wan;  
(the Chairman)
  
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho                      - having past business dealings with LD; and
  
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai                      - his former firm having business dealings with Aedas.

51.                      The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the property owned by Mr Raymond K.W. Lee’s spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

52.                      With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr T.W. Ng, STP/HK, 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;

- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 and Appendix III of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, five public comments were received from individuals objecting to the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone. The proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction generally followed the policy on revitalisation of pre-1987 industrial buildings and the Secretary for Development had provided policy support to the application. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Various planning and design merits, including a public pedestrian access connecting Lee Chung Street and Chai Wan Park/MTR Chai Wan Station, two-tier building height profile, building separation with the adjacent industrial building, weather canopy, edge planting, vertical greening and podium garden were proposed to improve the general environment and pedestrian amenity. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon joined the meeting at this point.]

53. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether a canopy would be provided in the proposed development;
- (b) pedestrian connection between the proposed development and the MTR Chai Wan Station,

- (c) the possibility of connecting the existing footbridge to the proposed development to provide a direct connection between the application site and MTR Chai Wan Station;
- (d) whether there was barrier-free access to the existing footbridge;
- (e) noting that the requirement on the provision of public pedestrian access on ground floor of the proposed development connecting Lee Chung Street and Chai Wan Park/MTR Chai Wan Station might not be incorporated in the lease, how would such planning merit be enforced; and
- (f) the width of the pavement at Lee Chung Street outside the application site.

54. Mr T.W. Ng, STP/HK, made the following responses:

- (a) a weather canopy above the building entrance along Lee Chung Street would be provided for the proposed development;
- (b) with reference to Drawing A-13 of the Paper, there was an existing footbridge connecting MTR Chai Wan Station to Ning Foo Street. With the proposed public pedestrian access on ground floor of the proposed development, a more direct access from the footbridge to Lee Chung Street could be provided via the application site;
- (c) the application site had a small site area of about 621m<sup>2</sup> with electrical and mechanical facilities on 1/F of the proposed development. Whilst the staircase landing of the existing footbridge was adjacent to the application site, there might be technical constraints to directly connect the existing footbridge to 1/F of the proposed development given the small floor plate to accommodate the required circulation spaces and associated supporting structures;
- (d) there was currently no barrier-free access to the existing footbridge

connecting to MTR Chai Wan Station. The Government had been implementing a retrofitting programme to gradually provide barrier-free access, such as lifts, to existing public footbridges without such facilities;

- (e) there was no requirement under lease for the provision of public pedestrian access on ground floor of the proposed development. If the subject application was approved, the provision of such access, which would benefit the workers/tenants of the proposed development as well as the general public, could be monitored at the building plan submission stage; and
- (f) the pavement at Lee Chung Street was about 2.5m wide.

#### Deliberation Session

55. Members generally supported the application and considered that the proposed public pedestrian access on ground floor of the proposed development connecting Lee Chung Street to Chai Wan Park was a planning gain. However, some Members considered that pedestrian access to the site was not satisfactory. They considered that the applicant should be encouraged to explore the provision of a direct connection from the proposed development to the existing footbridge connecting to the MTR Chai Wan Station to enhance pedestrian connectivity. A Member also suggested that the applicant should be encouraged to use recycled water for irrigation of the proposed landscape areas.

56. A Member said that the entrance of the public pedestrian access and the run-in/out of the proposed development located near the hammerhead of Lee Chung Street with a narrow pavement might create pedestrian safety problems. The Member suggested that the design of the proposed public pedestrian access should be improved.

57. The Chairman summarised that Members in general supported the application but considered that the applicant should be encouraged to explore ways to enhance the pedestrian connectivity, including improvements to the design of the public pedestrian access and exploring the provision of a direct connection between the application site and MTR Chai Wan Station, while recognising that there might be site constraints rendering it difficult to put

forth a feasible proposal. In that connection, the Chairman suggested and Members agreed to revise approval condition (a) to include the design and provision of pedestrian access to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board.

58. 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 18.12.2024, 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, pedestrian access, car parking and loading/unloading facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of a land contamination assessment and remedial plan and implementation of the agreed remedial actions, as proposed by the applicant, prior to commencement of construction for the proposed development 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.”

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

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

**Agenda Item 10**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H9/80                      Proposed Hotel with Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction and Building Height Restriction in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 8 A Kung Ngam Village Road, Shau Kei Wan, Hong Kong

(MPC Paper No. A/H9/80C)

---

60.                      The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Shau Kei Wan. Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) and Z Design Limited (Z Design) were two of the consultants of the applicant.    The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | - being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA;                                 |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai   | - his former firm having business dealings with Z Design;   |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law | - being a committee member of the Boys’ & Girls’ Clubs Association of Hong Kong which had a service unit in Shau Kei Wan; and |
| Mr Simon S.W. Wang | - having family members living in Shau Kei Wan.   |

61.                      The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the interest of Ms Lilian S.K. Law was indirect and the residence of Mr Simon S.W. Wang’s family members had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

62. 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 hotel with minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) and building height (BH) restrictions;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 5,542 comments were received, with 124 supporting comments from locals and individuals, and 5,418 comments from an Eastern District Council member, Incorporated Owners of a nearby building, political party/concern group, company, locals and individuals objecting to or expressing concerns on the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone to facilitate transformation of the A Kung Ngam Industrial Area (AKNIA) from industrial to business/commercial uses and was considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments. The proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction generally followed the policy on revitalisation of industrial buildings (IBs) and the Secretary for Development had provided policy support to the application. The Antiquities and Monuments Office considered that the proposed BH was not in line with the explanatory statement of the Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan and the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD considered that the proposed minor relaxation of PR and BH restrictions would, to a certain extent, affect the visual openness between the former Lei Yue Mun



Barracks and the Sing Tao New Corporation Building. To address the concerns on visual impact, the applicant had reduced the proposed PR from 14.4 to 13.5 and the proposed BH from 98mPD to 86.15mPD and incorporated various vertical greening and façade treatment to soften the perceivable mass. It was considered that the proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction might be tolerated having considered the policy/planning intention of promoting revitalisation of IBs and transformation of the AKNIA against the overall visual impact brought about by the proposed development. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application. Various planning and design merits, such as full-height setbacks from the lot boundary along Tung Kin Road and vertical green wall on G/F, were proposed to improve the streetscape and street-level walking environment. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

63. A Member enquired whether the proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction of the application site would set an undesirable precedent for other similar redevelopments in the AKNIA. With reference to Plan A-5 of the Paper, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, STP/HK, said that majority of the IBs in the AKNIA had been redeveloped or had undergone wholesale conversion, with the highest building (i.e. Sing Tao News Corporation Building to the north-west of the application site) having a BH of about 85mPD completed before imposition of BHR on the OZP. For the remaining IBs, according to the 2014 Area Assessment for Industrial Land in the Territory, they were of fragmented ownership and redevelopment of those buildings might take time. Besides, any redevelopment exceeding the BH restriction of 80mPD for the subject “OU(B)” zone would require planning permission from the Town Planning Board and each application would be considered based on its individual merits. For the subject application, efforts had been made by the applicant to reduce the proposed BH from 98mPD to 86.15mPD by reducing the floor-to-floor height of the typical floors, reducing the total number of storeys by 2 and reducing the podium structure from 3 storeys to 2 storeys so as to minimise the visual impact.

## Deliberation Session

64. 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 18.12.2024, 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:

“the design and provision of vehicular access, parking spaces, loading/unloading facilities and traffic management measures at Tung Kin Road for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Transport or of the TPB.”

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

## Agenda Item 11

### Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H9/82                      Religious Institution in “Residential (Group A) 2” Zone, Shop No. 2, 1st  
Basement, Marina House, 68 Hing Man Street, Shau Kei Wan, Hong  
Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H9/82)

---

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

Ms Lilian S.K. Law                      -    being a committee member of the Boys’ &  
Girls’ Clubs Association of Hong Kong which  
had a service unit in Shau Kei Wan; and

Mr Simon S.W. Wang - having family members living in Shau Kei Wan.

67. As the interests of Ms Lilian S.K. Law was indirect and the residence of Mr Simon S.W. Wang's family members had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

68. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr T.W. Ng, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed religious institution;
- (c) 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 from an individual expressing concerns on the application was 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 applied use was considered generally in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group A)2” zone and was considered not incompatible with the uses within the same building and surrounding residential neighbourhood with retail and commercial uses. The application premises was the subject of a previous application (No. A/H9/77) for the same use which was approved on a temporary basis by the Committee in 2017. The internal layout including access arrangement was basically the same as that of the last approved scheme, with the only difference being the applied use was on a permanent basis in the current application. Concerned government departments had no objection to or

adverse comments on the application. Regarding the public comment, the comments of concerned departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

69. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting within six months from the date of the approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 18.6.2021; and
- (b) if the above planning condition is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr T.W. Ng and Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, STPs/HK, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

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

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 12**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K11/238 Proposed Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture, Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) with Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction in minor area within “G/IC” zone and permitted Playground in “Open Space”, “Government, Institution or Community” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’, Kai Tak East Playground bound by Sze Mei Street, Tsat Po Street and Luk Hop Street, San Po Kong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K11/238)

---

72. The Secretary reported that AECOM Asia Company (AECOM) 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 AECOM;  
and

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

73. The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

74. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr William W.L. Chan, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed place of recreation, sports or culture, public vehicle park (PVP) (Excluding Container Vehicle) with minor relaxation of building height

(BH) restrictions in minor area within “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone and permitted playground;

- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a total of 18 public comments from individuals were received, including six comments objecting to the application and 12 comments expressing concerns/providing suggestions to the proposed development. 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 proposed development was to redevelop the existing Kai Tai East Playground (KTEP) into an integrated development to improve the existing facilities at the application site. The at-grade basketball/football/handball courts which were considered as ‘playground’ use were always permitted in the “Open Space” (“O”) zone, while the proposed sports centre and PVP required planning permission from the Town Planning Board. The proposed sports centre was generally in line with the planning intention of the “O” zone and the proposed uses were considered not incompatible with the surroundings. Moreover, the underground PVP would help address the parking demand in San Po Kong area. As the proposed 5-storey sports centre only slightly encroached into the “G/IC” zone with BH restriction of 1 storey, the minor relaxation of BH restriction from 1 to 5 storeys for that strip of land was considered acceptable. The proposed development would unlikely cause any significant visual and air ventilation impacts on the surrounding areas. Concerned government departments had no objection to or not adverse comments on the application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

75. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) details of the proposed PVP and whether bicycle parking spaces would be provided at the application site;
- (b) pedestrian accessibility to the application site; and
- (c) future use of the “G/IC” site to the immediate east of the application site.

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

- (a) with reference to Drawings A-2 and A-3 of the Paper, two levels of underground PVP were proposed in the basement covering the entire application site, where conventional and automated parking systems would be provided. No bicycle parking space was proposed at the application site;
- (b) there were a series of at-grade pedestrian crossings connecting the application site and MTR Diamond Hill Station via the San Po Kong Business Area. In addition, there were footbridges and subways connecting the application site to the Kai Tak area including MTR Kai Tak Station; and
- (c) the “G/IC” site to the immediate east of the application site was currently occupied by the Kai Tak East Sports Centre (KTESC). The proposed development was to re-provision the facilities in the existing KTEP and KTESC. KTESC would cease operation upon completion of the proposed development. The future use of that “G/IC” site was being reviewed by the Government.

#### Deliberation Session

77. A Member supported the application and advised that as a children’s playroom was proposed at the application site, pedestrian connectivity to the site should be improved so as to provide a more family-friendly access.

78. Another Member also supported the application but noticed that the applicant had not provided details on the landscape treatment of the proposed development. Members noted that as the applicant had advocated green building design in the district, green building elements would likely be incorporated in the proposed development during the detailed design stage.

79. The Chairman summarised that Members generally supported the application but considered that the applicant should explore ways to improve the pedestrian connectivity and green building design should be incorporated in the proposed development.

80. 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 18.12.2024, 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 condition:

“the design and provision of vehicular access, vehicle parking and loading/unloading facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB.”

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

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



**Agenda Item 13**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K15/127                      Proposed Residential cum Commercial Development in “Residential (Group E)” Zone, 8 Sze Shan Street, Yau Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/127)

---

82.            The Secretary reported that CYS Associates (HK) Limited (CYS) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest on the item as his former firm had business dealings with CYS. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

83.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 27.11.2020 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 first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

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

**Agenda Item 14**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/787            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, 33 Hung To Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/787B)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the 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 and Appendix III of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 12 comments were received with 11 submitted by occupiers of the adjoining Fun Tower and individuals objecting to the application and one comment supporting the application without providing reason. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone. The proposed

minor relaxation of PR restriction generally followed the policy on revitalisation of industrial buildings and the Secretary for Development had provided policy support to the application. The Director-General of Trade and Industry had no objection to the application given that it would put the application site into optimal use to provide more industrial space. Various planning and design merits were proposed, including the provision of full-height building setbacks along Hung To Road and the back alley in accordance with the requirements of the adopted Kwun Tong (Western Part) Outline Development Plan (ODP), voluntary setback at the southern corner of the application site, and provision of planting areas, sky garden, and vertical greening (VG) which would result in a high greenery provision of about 45.5%. The back alley concerned was identified as part of Energising Kowloon East Office's 'Back Alley Project @ Kowloon East' and VG was incorporated at the building façade facing the back alley to enhance its attractiveness. In that regard, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, 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 comments on the application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

86. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that the landscape features proposed under the application were located at higher levels of the proposed development, whether those features were accessible by the public;
- (b) whether the greenery provision was in accordance with the sustainable building design guidelines (SBDG);
- (c) whether there were any trees proposed at the setback area; and
- (d) whether the applicant would consider using recycled water for irrigation of

the landscape features.

87. In response, Mr K.K. Lee, STP/K, made the following main points:

- (a) there were two landscape features that were located at the higher levels of the proposed development, including greenery areas proposed at the sky garden on 16/F and at the roof floor. Whilst the roof floor would not be opened for access and the sky garden would only be opened for occupiers of the building, the landscape features on G/F and 1/F could be accessible by the public;
- (b) as the site area of the application was less than 1,000m<sup>2</sup>, the SBDG in respect of site coverage of greenery was not applicable. Notwithstanding that, the applicant had demonstrated efforts to improve the building design by introducing a high greenery provision of about 45.5%;
- (c) tree planting was not proposed at the 3.4m-wide building setback area along Hung To Road which would be surrendered to the Government in accordance with the requirement of the ODP. However, a tree was proposed to be planted at the voluntary setback area at the southern corner of the application site; and
- (d) the applicant indicated that they had no plan to use recycled water for irrigation of the landscape features.

#### Deliberation Session

88. Some Members supported the application as the applicant had made efforts to provide planning and design merits including full-height building setbacks and a high greenery provision. The proposed development was in line with the policy of revitalisation of industrial buildings

89. A Member opined that the applicant should be encouraged to use recycled water for irrigating the landscape features. Another Member also shared the same view. In that

regard, the Chairman suggested and Members agreed that the suggestion could be included in the advisory clause for the applicant's consideration.

90. 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 18.12.2024, 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 Traffic Impact Assessment and implementation of the traffic management plan and mitigation measures, if any, identified in the revised traffic impact assessment, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) 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;
- (c) 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;
- (d) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection 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 submission of land contamination assessments and 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.”

91. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper and 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 Mr K.K. Lee, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 15**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K14/794 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, 119-121 How Ming Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/794)

---

92. 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;
Mr Franklin Yu		and
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	-	his former firm having business dealings with ARUP.

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

94. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 9.12.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

### **Agenda Item 16**

#### **Any Other Business**

96. Since it was the last Metro Planning Committee chaired by Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, the Director of Planning, before his retirement, the Vice-chairman on behalf of Members extended a vote of thanks to Mr Lee for his contributions to the Committee and wished him a happy and healthy retirement. Mr Lee thanked Members for their support over the past years and expressed gratitude for their dedication to the Committee's work.

97. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:05 p.m.