

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 747<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 2.8.2024**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr C.K. Yip

Chairperson

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Assistant Commissioner/Urban,  
Transport Department  
Mr B.K. Chow

Chief Engineer (Works),  
Home Affairs Department  
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Dr Karen K.M. Lee

Assistant Director/Regional 1,  
Lands Department  
Ms Catherine W.S. Pang

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Timothy T.C. Kau

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 746<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 16.7.2024

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 746<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 16.7.2024 were confirmed without amendment.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

## Deferral Case

### Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

### Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Committee noted that there was one case requesting the Town Planning Board to defer consideration of the application. Details of the request for deferral were in **Annex**.

### Deliberation Session

4. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information, as recommended in the Paper.

[Mr Derrick S.M. Yip joined the meeting at this point.]

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

[Mr W.C. Lui, 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/TY/148                      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Asphalt Plant for a Period of 5 Years in “Industrial” Zone, Tsing Yi Town Lot No. 108 RP (Part), Tsing Yi, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TY/148)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

5.                      With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr W.C. Lui, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

6.                      Members had no question on the application.

**Deliberation Session**

7.                      The Chairperson recapitulated that the application was for a renewal of the temporary planning approval. The renewal application complied with the relevant assessment criteria as stated in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on renewal of planning approval (TPB PG-No. 34D) and relevant approval conditions were recommended to minimise its potential impacts on the surrounding environment.

8.                      Noting that ‘Asphalt Plant’ was a Column 2 use in the “Industrial” zone, a Member asked about the rationale for applying for temporary planning approval instead of a permanent one and the planning considerations between the two options. In response, the Chairperson explained that while the applicant could apply for permanent planning approval



## Presentation and Question Sessions

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

11. A Member enquired about the intention for imposing a site coverage (SC) restriction of 25% in the subject “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) zone on the Stanley Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). In response, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, STP/HK, said that the “R(C)” zone was subject to development restrictions in terms of plot ratio (PR), building height (BH) and SC. As the number of storeys used for domestic purposes increased, the corresponding maximum PR would be higher and the maximum SC would be lower. For a building with 3 storeys used for domestic purposes, the maximum SC was 25% under the OZP. The SC restriction was intended to provide sufficient open area for landscaping and building separation, with a view to preserving the general character and amenity of the area. The Chairperson supplemented that a number of “R(C)” zones on OZPs were subject to a combination of development restrictions including PR, BH and SC. There was a fixed three-way relationship among the three parameters to control the built form and development intensity with a view to maintaining the character and amenity of an area. Considering that there might be scope for a relaxation of SC control to allow more flexibility in building design, a review of domestic SC restriction for “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) and “R(C)” zones on statutory plans (the Review) was conducted in 2000. In March 2000, the Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) agreed to adopt a general guideline to relax the maximum domestic SC for sites falling within Residential Zone 2 (“R2”) and Residential Zone 3 (“R3”) in the Metro and New Town areas to 66.6% and 50% respectively, among others. There was scope for minor relaxation of SC restriction for sites in “R2” and “R3”, provided that the PR and BH restrictions remained unchanged and certain criteria could be fulfilled. Under the general guideline, the SC of the application site (the Site) in “R3” might be relaxed up to 50%.

12. Another Member enquired whether other similar applications for minor relaxation of SC restriction would warrant favourable consideration by the Committee should the application be approved. In response, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, STP/HK, said that as

agreed by the Board in 2000, applications for minor relaxation of SC restriction in “R3” in the Metro Area could be favourably considered, provided that they were in line with the criteria stated in paragraph 4 of the Paper and considered acceptable by the concerned government departments. The Chairperson remarked that the current application only involved minor relaxation of SC restriction from 25% to 33%, with the PR and BH restrictions remained unchanged. Based on the general guidelines, a number of similar applications had been approved by the Committee on Hong Kong Island and in other districts since 2000.

13. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed development would affect the nearby road/pavement as mentioned in an objecting public comment; and
- (b) noting from Plan A-8 of the Paper that the proposed development might block the views of nearby residential developments, whether there was any guideline to assess the potential visual impact induced by the proposed development.

14. In response, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, STP/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the objecting public comment was concerned that the minor relaxation of SC restriction would result in a larger building footprint which might encroach onto the nearby public road/pavement outside the Site. According to the applicants, the proposed development would be confined within the private lot, and the nearby public road/pavement would not be affected. The Transport Department had no objection to the application; and
- (b) according to the TPB Guidelines on visual impact assessment (TPB PG-No. 41), visual impact should take into account public views from key strategic or popular local vantage points, instead of private views. As such, the viewpoints adopted for assessment should be easily accessible and popular



to the public or tourists (e.g. the view from Stanley Main Beach for the current application). The proposed development adopted a stepped BH profile and complied with the BH restriction in the “R(C)” zone. Significant visual impact on the surrounding area was not anticipated.

### Deliberation Session

15. The Chairperson recapitulated that the application for minor relaxation of SC restriction was to allow design flexibility for the proposed development, with the maximum PR and BH remained unchanged. The application was in line with the general guideline in the Review which was agreed by the Board in 2000 and relevant government departments had no adverse comment on the application.

16. Members generally had no objection to the application. A Member said that the existing building at the Site, which was a 2-storey development, might have an SC larger than 25%. The proposed SC of 33% complied with the requirements under the Building (Planning) Regulations for a Class B site. Besides, the minor relaxation of SC restriction could provide design flexibility (e.g. introducing a stepped BH profile) for the proposed development.

17. Another Member opined that while the original SC restriction of 25% for development with 3 storeys used for domestic purposes could allow for a larger separation between buildings, minor relaxation of the SC restriction to 33% at the Site was considered acceptable to provide greater design flexibility to meet the latest design requirements. The Member pointed out that the considerations of approving the current application might be applicable to other similar applications in the planning scheme area. In response, the Chairperson said that the Board, when agreeing to adopt the general guideline for relaxation of SC restrictions in “R2” and “R3” in the Metro and New Town Areas in 2000, had struck a balance between design flexibility and retaining sufficient open areas for landscaping. As a number of similar applications had been approved since 2000, approval of the current application was in line with the Board’s previous decisions.

18. In response to two Members’ questions regarding the mechanism to ensure the implementation of the proposed design features in the approved scheme, the Chairperson said

that should the application be approved, PlanD would ensure that the key design features, in particular those planning/design merits in support of the application, were duly incorporated in the proposed development at the building plan submission stage. Any amendment to the approved scheme would also be assessed in accordance with the TPB Guidelines on Class A and Class B Amendments to Approved Development Proposals (TPB PG-No. 36C).

19. Another Member observed from Plan A-8 of the Paper that the level of details of the photomontages for the ‘OZP Compliant Scheme’ and the ‘Proposed Scheme’ was different, i.e. façade treatment was incorporated in the ‘Proposed Scheme’ but not in the ‘OZP Compliant Scheme’. The Member considered that the photomontages should have the same level of details to facilitate comparison. The Committee noted that the photomontages were submitted by the applicants and PlanD would convey Member’s view to the applicants of similar applications in the future.

20. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 2.8.2028, 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 approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD’s representative for attending the meeting. She left the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 6**

### Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

21. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 9:40 a.m.