

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 750th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 20.9.2024

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Gary C.W. Tam

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

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

Secretary

Absent with Apology

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

In Attendance

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

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

Assistant Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Alanna W.H. Chan

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 749th MPC Meeting

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 749th MPC meeting conducted by way of circulation of papers to all Members were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/K14S/2 Application for Amendment to the Approved Kwun Tong (South) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K14S/26, To rezone the application site from “Commercial (1)” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” to “Commercial (3)”, 90 Hung To Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. Y/K14S/2A)

3. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicants’ representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

Mr Ernest C.M. Fung	-	District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)
Ms Florence Y.S. Lee	-	Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)
Ms Charlotte P.S. Ng	-	Town Planner/Kowloon

Applicants’ Representatives

Merry Gain International Limited

Mr Kenny S.M. Kong

DF Consultancy Company Limited

Mr D.F. Lam

DeSPACE (International) Limited

Ms Rebecca F.Y. Lau

Mr Mario K.H. Li

Mr C. Ma

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

4. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the background of the application.

5. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, STP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed rezoning of the application site (the Site) from "Commercial (1)" ("C(1)") and "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" ("OU(B)") to "Commercial (3)" ("C(3)") to facilitate the partial in-situ conversion of an existing commercial building to a proposed social welfare facility (SWF) (residential care home for people with disabilities (RCHD)) with ancillary office and staff quarters, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application.

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

6. The Chairperson then invited the applicants' representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Messrs Mario K.H. Li, Kenny S.M. Kong and D.F. Lam, and Ms Rebecca F.Y. Lau, the applicants' representatives, made the following main points:

Background

- (a) *Location* – the Site was located at the fringe of Kwun Tong Business Area (KTBA) near Tsui Ping River, Laguna City and Laguna Park, and accessible by various public transport. The Site fell within areas zoned "C(1)" (about 85%) and "OU(B)" (about 15%) on the approved Kwun Tong (South) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K14S/26 (the OZP). As the "OU(B)" portion of the Site was too small to be developed independently, rezoning the entire site to "C(3)" would align with the lot boundary and allow the

Site to be developed as a whole;

- (b) *Major Development Parameters* – according to the indicative scheme, 8 storeys of the existing commercial building would be converted to RCHD on 1/F to 5/F, staff quarters for care workers on 6/F to 7/F, and an ancillary office on G/F of the building. Approximately 120 to 180 beds would be provided in the RCHD;

- (c) *Challenges for the Supply of RCHD* – there were two types of residential care services, including residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) and RCHD. About 612 RCHEs (with 16,800 persons on the waiting list) and 63 RCHDs (with 11,068 persons on the waiting list) were available in the market, reflecting a disparity of nearly tenfold. From 2022 to 2024, there was only one RCHD development approved by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee of the Town Planning Board (the Board). The current submission was the only application for RCHD processed by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board. The limited supply of RCHD stemmed from various challenges, including (i) opposition from the Owners' Corporations against the provision of RCHD; (ii) social resistance due to misunderstandings about the social impacts of RCHD; and (iii) the lower turnover rate of residents in RCHD compared to RCHE, resulting in even fewer available places in the market. Nevertheless, the provision of RCHD was essential to the society and the trained professionals, including health workers, personal care workers, nurses and social workers, in RCHD provided professional care to those in need;

- (d) *Site Selection* – unlike most of the visitors to RCHE, who were often posterities of the residents, visitors to RCHD were primarily the parents of the residents and tended to be older. Most of the existing RCHDs were located in rural areas, making them less convenient for elderly visitors to travel there. As such, more RCHDs should be provided in urban areas for better meeting the needs of these visitors. Whilst the applicants owned some properties that could be developed as RCHD without planning permission, they did not have sufficient proportion of ownership on the use

of the building and opposition from other owners might be encountered. For the Site, the applicants held a sufficient proportion of the ownership (i.e. 61%), allowing them to pursue the development of an RCHD. As the proposed use was not permissible under the existing zonings, a rezoning application under section 12A (s.12A) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) was submitted to the Board for consideration;

Justifications

- (e) *Land Use Compatibility* – given the changing planning circumstances in KTBA since 2001, the surrounding area had been transformed into a business area predominantly occupied by commercial and office buildings. The proposed RCHD was not incompatible with the surrounding area. The Site's convenient location could lessen the commuting time and pressure for care workers and visitors. Besides, 6/F and 7/F of the existing building were currently used for domestic purposes which were allowed under the lease and included in the Occupation Permit when the building was completed in 1965. As the domestic use was already in existence before the gazettal of the first OZP, it should not be regarded as a new use;
- (f) *Meeting the Urgent Social Demand* – about 11,068 persons were on the waiting list of RCHD and about 55 RCHDs were required to meet the demand. The proposal could help address the service shortage problem of RCHD. In-situ conversion of the existing building could save construction costs and time, enabling an early provision of RCHD to meet the imminent demand;
- (g) *Echoing the Government's Initiatives* – the private sector was encouraged to provide RCHD in the recent Policy Address, Budget and Legislative Council (Panel on Welfare Services) paper. The Government's initiatives were to increase residential care service places for persons with disabilities, encourage private developers to construct and operate RCHD in their development projects, and include RCHD/RCHE in urban redevelopment projects. Despite the promulgation of a Practice Note on 'Incentive

Scheme to Encourage Provision of RCHD in New Private Developments’ by the Lands Department in 2023, no new application was made for private RCHD premises so far. Only one new private RCHD commenced through a wholesale conversion of an existing building in 2023. The current proposal was in line with the government policy to increase RCHD supply in urban areas;

- (h) *Compliance with Licencing Requirement in terms of Bed Space* – the indicative scheme was prepared in accordance with the design guidelines of the Social Welfare Department (SWD). About 19.1m² bed space per person would be provided in the proposed RCHD, which was more than the requirement set out by SWD (i.e. 9.5m² bed space per person);
- (i) *Response to the Changing Community Needs* – according to the Master Schedule of Notes (MSN) for the “C” zone, ‘SWF’ was a Column 1 use which was always permitted. The current application primarily aimed to seek flexibility for the provision of RCHD by rezoning the Site from “C(1)” and “OU(B)” to “C(3)”, with ‘SWF (excluding those involving residential care, except on land designated for “C(3)” only)’ as a Column 1 use to align with the MSN. The rezoning proposal would not jeopardise the interests of the other owners at the Site;
- (j) *No Significant Impacts on the Surrounding Area* – the proposal would not generate significant adverse traffic impact on the surrounding area. The Transport Department and Highways Department had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Concerns from relevant government departments about the technical aspects, including air, noise, drainage and sewerage, would be addressed at the section 16 (s.16) application stage in the future, should the proposed use be included in Column 2 of the “C(3)” zone; and

Conclusion

- (k) the proposed RCHD echoed the Government’s initiatives to promote the

provision of private RCHDs to alleviate their pressing demand. The proposal was compatible with the immediate surroundings and the design of RCHD would comply with the technical and licencing requirements of relevant government departments. The Board was urged to provide more flexibility in the planning regime to facilitate the provision of RCHD at the Site.

7. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicants' representatives were completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

Land Use Compatibility

8. Noting that KTBA was still undergoing transformation into a business area, a Member enquired whether the proposed RCHD for mentally disabled persons would be compatible with the surrounding area. In response, Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, STP/K, said that the Site was located at the fringe of KTBA and largely surrounded by commercial/office buildings, with the residential development of Laguna City to its east across Tsui Ping River and Kwun Tong Bypass. The Chairperson further enquired whether the industrial buildings adjacent to the Site (i.e. Ray Centre and Yue Xiu Industrial Building) would create adverse impacts on the proposed RCHD. In response, Ms Florence Y.S. Lee said that a temporary waiver for commercial use for Ray Centre had been terminated and its nature as an industrial building was maintained. According to a recent site visit conducted by PlanD, apart from a workshop located on G/F of Ray Centre, Ray Centre and Yue Xiu Industrial Building were mainly used for offices and storages without polluting industrial uses. Hence, the industrial and residential interface issue was considered not significant at the Site.

Planning Control

9. A Member enquired about the differences between putting 'SWF' use involving residential care in Column 1 and Column 2 of the Notes for the "C" zone. In response, Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, DPO/K, and Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, STP/K, explained that if 'SWF' use without any restriction was put under Column 1 on land designated for "C(3)" on the Notes of the OZP, all social welfare facilities (SWFs) including those providing residential care services such as RCHD and RCHE could be developed at the Site without planning

permission from the Board. On the other hand, if the Column 1 use was specified as ‘SWF (excluding those involving residential care)’ while ‘SWF’ use involving residential care was put under Column 2 on land designated for “C(3)” only, any SWFs involving residential care at the Site would require planning permission from the Board. As the technical feasibility of the proposed development had not been ascertained, the use was recommended to be put under Column 2 such that any future development proposal could be scrutinised by the Board at the s.16 application stage. In response to a Member’s question, Mr Ernest C.M. Fung said that planning permission should be obtained before the applicants applied for a licence for RCHD from SWD.

Design Aspect

10. The Vice-chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:
 - (a) noting that 120 to 180 beds were proposed in the RCHD, whether sufficient spaces would be reserved for the provision of ancillary facilities (e.g. disabled toilets and showers, kitchen, day care activity areas, outdoor areas and visitor rooms) to cater for the needs of the residents; and whether sunlight and fresh air could enter the proposed RCHD;
 - (b) apart from in-situ conversion, whether there were any other plans for a more comprehensive development of RCHD, such as relaxing the building height (BH) of the existing building or redeveloping the entire building;
 - (c) the uses of the remaining portions of the building not included in the proposed RCHD;
 - (d) noting that the building was erected in the 1960s, whether the building structure and facilities, such as the lifts, could support the operation of the proposed RCHD in the coming decades; and
 - (e) the arrangement of shared access in the building.
11. In response, Messrs Mario K.H. Li and Kenny S.M. Kong, the applicants’

representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) while 120 to 180 beds were proposed in the indicative scheme, the number of beds would be adjusted to provide sufficient day care activity areas and ensure that sunlight and fresh air could enter the RCHD. The proposed design would comply with SWD's relevant guidelines and licencing requirements;
- (b) the foundation of the existing building might not be able to support additional loading. Thus, relaxing the BH of the existing building was considered technically infeasible. If the Site was redeveloped for a higher building, the allowable site coverage would be reduced. Given that SWFs should be located below 24m of the building for fire safety reasons, the available floor area for the proposed RCHD might be reduced;
- (c) apart from the proposed RCHD to be located on 1/F to 5/F, an ancillary office to support the operation of the RCHD would be located on G/F and staff quarters for the care workers of the RCHD were proposed on 6/F and 7/F of the building. The main portion of G/F and the mezzanine floor (M/F) of the building were currently used as a restaurant;
- (d) the building had recently undergone a mandatory building inspection as required by the Buildings Department. The building structures were considered to be in good condition. Besides, the two lifts in the building were newly replaced in 2020 and were able to support the operation of the RCHD; and
- (e) the staircases and lifts would not form part of the licenced area for RCHD (i.e. 1/F to 5/F) and would be regarded as shared areas of the building. All floors of the building were accessible via lifts and staircases, whilst the eating place on M/F could be accessed by an additional separated staircase.

12. A Member enquired about the major concerns of relevant government departments regarding the environmental, sewerage and drainage aspects of the proposal. In response, Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, DPO/K, said that the applicants had not provided sufficient information in the Air Quality Impact Assessment and Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) for the consideration of relevant government departments. No Sewerage Impact Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment had been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed RCHD would not generate adverse impacts on the surrounding area. Mr Gary C.W. Tam, Assistant Director (Environment Assessment), Environmental Protection Department, supplemented that assessments on sewerage and drainage impacts would be required due to the change of uses at the Site. Since Kwun Tong had not fully transformed into a business area, some industrial uses and rooftop coolers still existed in the area. As the Site was located on King Yip Street with a setback of less than 5m, mitigation measures would be required to address the potential air and noise impacts. Nevertheless, those technical issues might not be insurmountable subject to the provision of suitable mitigation measures. Should the Committee agree to the current application, the proposed use could be included as a Column 2 use under the “C” zone such that the technical issues could be addressed at the s.16 application stage.

13. Noting that the site was located adjacent to Kwun Tong Bypass and might be subject to adverse air and noise impacts, a Member enquired about the mitigation measures to be adopted and their technical feasibility. In response, Mr Kenny S.M. Kong, the applicants’ representative, said that appropriate mitigation measures, including the provision of acoustic windows on the side of the building facing Tsui Ping River, would be adopted according to the findings of the NIA to reduce the potential noise impact generated by the adjacent Kwun Tong Bypass and nearby roads.

Operational Aspect

14. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the operational mode of the proposed RCHD, including the types of disabilities of the residents and the required level of care;
 - (b) the service fee for potential residents. If the proposed number of beds

could not be accommodated at the Site, whether it was still financially viable to rent the premises for RCHD;

- (c) whether the potential operator would terminate their current operation elsewhere if the Site was allowed for RCHD;
- (d) the social impacts of the proposed development; and
- (e) noting that there were difficulties in hiring professional care workers for residential care services, whether the issue would become even more challenging in the future and would affect the operation of the proposed RCHD.

15. In response, Messrs Kenny S.M. Kong and D.F. Lam, the applicants' representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) the Site would be rented to a privately operated RCHD, which was primarily providing services to persons who were mentally disabled and needed medium to intense care. As the RCHD was privately operated, persons with different types of disabilities and levels of care would also be included but might be accommodated on different floors;
- (b) the service fee would be around \$5,000 per month to serve those from grassroots families. With the provision of about 120 to 180 beds, the rental income from the RCHD would be similar to that from eating places;
- (c) the potential operator would maintain their current operation and establish a new RCHD at the Site;
- (d) it was very rare to receive strong local objection after the establishment of an RCHD. In most cases, the public would understand that RCHDs would cause no harm to the community. Although local resistance was a challenging issue for the establishment of RCHDs, RCHDs in public housing developments were unlikely to be opposed by the residents based

on previous experience; and

- (e) the Government had taken initiatives to ease the shortage of care workers, including relaxing the special scheme to import care workers for residential care homes to allow more foreign labour to work in Hong Kong. The staff quarters on 6/F and 7/F, which provided accommodations for the care workers, could provide incentives for foreign workers in the RCHD.

Others

16. In response to the Chairperson's question on the arrangement of loading/unloading (L/UL) activities at the Site, Messrs Mario K.H. Li and Kenny S.M. Kong, the applicants' representatives, explained that according to the land lease, the setback area of the Site abutting the back alley was designated as an L/UL area. According to the traffic review conducted for a proposed hotel under a previous application at the Site, the designated L/UL area would be able to meet the L/UL needs of that proposed hotel development. Given the similar nature of hotel and RCHD, the L/UL area could also satisfy the L/UL need of the RCHD. Staff could be arranged to manage the L/UL activities at the Site if necessary. The Chairperson further enquired whether the L/UL activities at the back alley would affect the adjacent building. In response, Mr Kenny S.M. Kong, the applicants' representative, said that the building next to the Site (i.e. Ray Centre) had its own L/UL area and the existing public back alley along the L/UL area would still be maintained, the L/UL activities of Ray Centre would not be affected.

17. A Member enquired whether there were any concerns from other owners about the use of the Site. In response, Mr Mario K.H. Li, the applicants' representative, said that the applicants had complied with the 'Owner's Consent/Notification' requirements under s.12A of the Ordinance. As there was no provision for public comment on s.12A applications, no comments from the other owners had been received so far. It was expected that public views and comments would be collected at the plan amendment and s.16 application stages. Moreover, the proposed amendment to the Notes of the "C" zone would not affect other Column 1 and Column 2 uses of the "C" zone.

18. As the applicants' representatives had no further points to raise and there were no

further questions from Members, the Chairperson informed the applicants' representatives that the hearing procedure of the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicants of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representatives from PlanD and the applicants' representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

19. The Chairperson recapitulated that according to the planning intention of transforming Kwun Tong Industrial Area into a business area, all domestic-related uses, inter alia, residential care of 'Social Welfare Facility', were explicitly excluded from Column 1 and Column 2 of the "OU(B)" and "C(1)" zones of the OZP to reinforce the character and intention of KTBA as an economic and employment hub. As the Site was mainly surrounded by commercial/office buildings without major industrial/residential interface problem, the proposed RCHD with 'living-in' element might be considered not incompatible with the surrounding area. The Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office of the Development Bureau had no adverse comment on the application. The subject application sought to introduce greater flexibility in the "C" zone for developing an RCHD at the Site. Given that the technical feasibility of the proposed RCHD had not yet been ascertained, PlanD recommended that the application might be partially agreed by including the proposed use as a Column 2 use such that the future development proposal would be submitted to the Committee for approval at the s.16 application stage.

20. Members generally supported the application to rezone the Site from "C(1)" and "OU(B)" to "C(3)" to facilitate the provision of RCHD. A Member expressed the view that the proposed use could be permissible under Column 1 use for the "C(3)" zone, as Kwun Tong had gradually transformed into a commercial area and the Site was located at the fringe of KTBA. SWF with 'living-in' element at the Site was not incompatible with the surrounding area. If the proposed use was included as a Column 2 use, it might discourage the potential operator from pursuing the RCHD due to the planning application process involved.

21. Majority of Members considered that it would be more appropriate to include the proposed use as a Column 2 use for the following reasons:

- (a) as the technical assessments submitted by the applicants had yet to address the concerns of relevant government departments, the proposed use should be put under Column 2 such that the applicant would need to demonstrate the technical feasibility of the proposed RCHD at the s.16 application stage for consideration by the Board;
- (b) since RCHD required adequate space for day care activities of the residents, a larger site that allowed for better design and provision of sufficient facilities was necessary before it could be considered as an always permitted use in the “C” zone; and
- (c) having considered the relatively small site and its surrounding environment, while the Site might not be very ideal for the provision of RCHD, the private sector’s initiative to provide more RCHDs to meet the imminent needs of the society should be encouraged. The Site, which was located at the fringe of KTBA and adjacent to Tsui Ping River, was suitable for a pilot project of RCHD.

22. Some Members also expressed the view that there were limitations for the Government to provide sufficient SWFs, including RCHDs, to meet the enormous demand in the society. Therefore, the private sector should be encouraged to provide more RCHDs for the community, with increased support from the Government.

23. The Chairperson concluded that the provision of RCHD was regulated by SWD, including situated at a height not exceeding 24m due to fire safety concerns, as well as requirements on space per person and building design. The Government had adopted a facilitating and collaborative mindset in processing land development-related applications with the promulgation of a technical circular recently. PlanD had encouraged potential planning applicants to make good use of a pre-application enquiry mechanism through which pre-submission enquiries would be passed to relevant government departments for comments, and relevant advice would be provided to the applicants for follow-up actions at an early stage before formally submitting the planning applications. The Chairperson also remarked that if the Committee agreed to the current application, the plan-making procedures for

rezoning the Site to an appropriate zoning would proceed.

24. After deliberation, the Committee decided to partially agree to the application. The relevant proposed amendments to the Kwun Tong (South) Outline Zoning Plan, together with the revised Notes and Explanatory Statement, would be submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break]

Hong Kong District

[Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK) and Mr Jacky C.L. Lee, Town Planner/Hong Kong, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H25/23 Temporary Shop and Services (Motor-vehicle Showroom) for a Period of 5 Years in “Open Space” Zone, Part of Basement Level B1 of the Car Park Complex, Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (Phase 1), 1 Harbour Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H25/23A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

25. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, STP/HK, 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.

26. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

27. The Chairperson recapitulated that while the applicant sought temporary approval for shop and services (motor-vehicle showroom) use at the application permits for 5 years, a shorter approval period of 2 years was recommended by PlanD, having regard to the Commission for Transport's comments that the car parking supply and demand might change with the developments in the Wan Chai North area, and the parking requirement for the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre should be timely reviewed.

28. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 2 years until 20.9.2026 instead of 5 years sought, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

[Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), Ms Florence Y.S. Lee and Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au, Senior Town Planners/Kowloon (STPs/K), and Ms Charlotte P.S. Ng and Ms Helen K.W. Ip, Town Planners/Kowloon (TPs/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/831 Proposed Shop and Services (Fast Food Counter) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Unit F (Part), G/F, Kwun Tong Industrial Centre Phase 3, 448-458 Kwun Tong Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K14/831)

Presentation and Question Sessions

29. With the aid of some plans, Ms Charlotte P.S. Ng, TP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

30. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

31. In response to a Member’s enquiry, the Chairperson remarked that the subject application sought planning permission for shop and services (fast food counter) use on G/F of an industrial building on a permanent basis. As it was a Column 2 use in the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone, planning permission from the Town Planning Board was required.

32. 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 20.9.2028, 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 applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K18/347 Proposed Religious Institution (Redevelopment of Bethel Bible Seminary with in-situ Preservation of Sun Hok Building) in “Government, Institution or Community (12)” (“G/IC(12)”) Zone, 45-47 Grampian Road (Part), Kowloon City, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/347C)

33. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Kowloon Tong and Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had declared an interest on the item for his spouse being the director of a company which owned properties in Kowloon Tong. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

34. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au, STP/K, 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 had no objection to the application.

35. Noting a public comment raising the concern that the safety of Munsang College’s students could be at risk due to the increased traffic near the Site, the Vice-chairperson enquired whether the comment was raised by Munsang College. In response, Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au, STP/K, said that the public comment was raised by one of the Incorporated Owners of the nearby residential developments.

Deliberation Session

36. The Chairperson recapitulated that despite the Site was zoned “Government, Institution or Community (12)”, Sun Hok Building (SHB), which was a Grade 2 historic building, should be preserved in-situ. Any new development or redevelopment of the buildings in the remaining part of the zone required planning permission from the Town

Planning Board to ensure that the design of new building(s) would be compatible with the setting of SHB. The proposed development parameters complied with the development restrictions stipulated in the relevant Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). Relevant government departments had no objection to or adverse comment on the application subject to imposition of the approval condition as stated in the Paper.

37. Members noted that a previous application (No. A/K18/322) submitted by the applicant was approved by the Committee in 2017. Compared with the previously approved scheme, the current application mainly involved adjustment of non-domestic and domestic uses in the new seminary block, as well as a new ingress/egress arrangement. As the proposed development parameters complied with the restrictions on the OZP, the major planning consideration was whether the design of the new block was compatible with SHB. Members generally considered that the design of the new block adopted suitable measures to preserve the identity of SHB.

38. 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 20.9.2028, 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 condition stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K22/38	Proposed Comprehensive Development including Flat, Shop and Services and Eating Place, and Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction in “Comprehensive Development Area (4)” Zone, Kai Tak Area 2A Site 2, Kai Tak Development, Kowloon (MPC Paper No. A/K22/38)
----------	---

39. The Secretary reported that AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) and

LWK & Partners (HK) Limited (LWK) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item.

- | | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| Dr Tony C.M. Ip | - | having current business dealings with AECOM; and |
| Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu | - | he/his firm had current business dealings with LWK. |

40. As Dr Tony C.M. Ip and Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu had no involvement in the application, they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

41. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, DPO/K, 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.

42. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the reason for zoning the application site (the Site) as “Comprehensive Development Area (4)” (“CDA(4)”);
- (b) noting that the maximum non-domestic gross floor area (GFA) for the Site was 6,670m² under the lease while the proposed non-domestic GFA in the current application was 6,270 m², the reason for the difference; and
- (c) whether the minor relaxation on building height restriction (BHR), if approved, would still be applicable if Modular Integrated Construction (MiC) was not adopted for the future development of the residential block.

43. In response, Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, DPO/K, made the following points:

- (a) the main reason for zoning the Site as “CDA(4)” was to ensure that the disposition and design of the proposed development would be in harmony with the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Preservation Corridor (LTSBPC) located to the immediate north of the Site;
- (b) according to the lease, the maximum non-domestic GFA of the Site and two sessions of underground shopping street (USS) outside the Site was 6,670m². The difference in non-domestic GFA of 400m² was allocated to the USS not forming part of the Site; and
- (c) there was flexibility on the adoption of MiC at the Site. If MiC was not adopted in the residential block, the original BHR of 125mPD would need to be complied with.

44. A Member enquired about the design measures incorporated in the current scheme to help preserve LTSBPC. In response, Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, DPO/K, said that a Planning Brief (PB) prepared to guide the proposed development in the “CDA(4)” zone was agreed by the Committee in 2022. The planning requirements in the PB included the provision of a 2-storey retail belt, a building setback of 3m on G/F, designated ingress/egress and vertical connections in the form of lifts and escalators. The requirements of the PB were incorporated in the current scheme to help preserve LTSBPC. Noting that electrical and mechanical (E&M) plant rooms were proposed at B2 level of the proposed development, the Member enquired whether there was any design requirement to enhance the connectivity between the USS at B3 level and LTSBPC at grade. In response, Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, DPO/K, explained that the vertical connection between USS and LTSBPC would be provided in the form of lifts and escalators. The pedestrian openings to LTSBPC would be located at B1 level and on G/F of the proposed development. The public could access the LTSBPC from the USS via vertical connections within the building.

45. A Member enquired whether it was a general practice to approve minor relaxation of BHR for projects adopting MiC. The Chairperson explained that it was the Government’s policy to encourage the adoption of MiC in various construction projects. According to Joint Practice Note No. 8, to facilitate the adoption of MiC, favourable consideration might be given to an increase of building height up to 4% of the total storey

height to provide flexibility for its implementation.

Deliberation Session

46. A Member, while having no objection to the application, expressed the view that more thoughtful uses and improved design of the vertical connections in the basement levels of the proposed development should be considered to enhance the visitor experience as they transited from the USS and LTSBPC at grade. In particular, the proposed E&M facilities at B2 level were undesirable and could lead to negative experiences for visitors. More sensible design, such as small courtyards and sunlight access, should be explored to align with the planning intention of the PB of pursuing a design compatible with the LTSBPC setting. Members noted that there would be shopping facilities and pedestrian corridors in the USS, and the connectivity between the Site and its surroundings, such as the USS and LTSBPC, would be refined at the detailed design stage.

47. 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 20.9.2028, 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 applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 8

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

48. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:10 p.m.