

**Minutes of the 1108<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 1.4.2016**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)

Chairman

Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Professor K.C. Chau

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)  
Mr C.W. Tse

Director of Lands  
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department  
Mr Martin K.C. Kwan

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transports)  
Transport and Housing Bureau  
Miss Winnie M.W. Wong

Director of Planning  
Mr K.K. Ling

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr H.W. Cheung

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr T.Y. Ip

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Louis K.H. Kau

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr T.C. Cheng

## **Opening Remarks**

1. The Chairman said that this was the first meeting of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for the term 2016-18. He was pleased to announce that Professor S.C. Wong had been appointed as the Vice-chairman of the Board, and Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang and Mr H.W. Cheung the Vice-chairman of the Metro Planning Committee and the Rural and New Town Planning Committee respectively. He then introduced the 12 new Members who joined the Board for the term and extended a welcome to them. Members noted that Dr C.H. Hau, Mr T.Y. Ip, Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

## **Agenda Item 1**

[Open meeting]

### **Confirmation of Minutes of the 1101<sup>st</sup> Meeting held on 11.3.2016**

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The minutes of the 1101<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 11.3.2016 were confirmed without amendments.

## **Agenda Item 2**

[Open meeting]

### **Confirmation of Minutes of the 1107<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 11.3.2016**

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

3. The minutes of the 1107<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 11.3.2016 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open meeting]

Matters Arising

- (i) Amendment to the Confirmed Minutes of 1099<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Town Planning Board (TPB) on 13.11.2015

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

4. The Secretary reported that a typographical amendment to paragraph 122 in page 77 of the confirmed minutes of Town Planning Board meeting held on 13.11.2015 was required. The revised sentence should read as follows :

‘(d) the provision and implementation of design and landscaping proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, **or** of the Town Planning Board.’

5. The Board agreed to the amendment to the confirmed minutes. The Secretary said that the revised minutes would be uploaded to the Board’s website and a revised approval letter would be sent to the applicant.

- (ii) Judicial Review lodged against the Decision of the Town Planning Board in respect of the So Kwun Wat Outline Zoning Plan (HCAL 254/2015)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

6. The Secretary reported that the following Members have declared interests in the item for having business dealings/affiliation with Henderson Land Development Company Limited (Henderson), the mother company of the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited (HKCGC) which had submitted a representation (R2) :

[Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- |                     |   |                                                                                                                                                       |
|---------------------|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu     | ] | having current business dealing with                                                                                                                  |
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai  | ] | Henderson                                                                                                                                             |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | ] |                                                                                                                                                       |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - | having past business dealing with<br>Henderson                                                                                                        |
| Professor S.C. Wong | ] | being employees of the University of Hong                                                                                                             |
| Dr Wilton W.T. Fok  | ] | Kong which received donation from a                                                                                                                   |
| Mr H.F. Leung       | ] | family member of the Chairman of<br>Henderson before                                                                                                  |
| Professor K.C. Chau | - | being an employee of the Chinese University<br>of Hong Kong which received donation<br>from a family member of the Chairman of<br>Henderson before    |
| Ms Christina M. Lee | - | being the Secretary-General of the Hong<br>Kong Metropolitan Sports Event<br>Association which obtained sponsorship<br>from Henderson before          |
| M Peter K.T. Yuen   | - | being a member of the Board of Governors<br>of the Hong Kong Arts Centre which<br>received donation from an Executive<br>Director of Henderson before |

7. Members noted that Mr H.F. Leung and Ms Christina M. Lee had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Ms Janice W.M. Lai had not yet arrived at the meeting. As the item was to report the judicial review (JR) application, it was agreed that those Members who had declared interests in the item should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

8. The Secretary reported that on 17.12.2015, a JR application was lodged by a representer in respect of the draft So Kwun Wat Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TM-SKW/12 (the Applicant) against the decision of the Town Planning Board (the Board) made on 22.9.2015 for not upholding the representations and not to amend the draft OZP to meet the representations.

9. The Applicant had made an application for Legal Aid, which was being processed by the Legal Aid Department. The Court had not yet granted leave to the above JR application. Members noted the JR application and agreed that the Secretary should represent the Board in all matters relating to the JR in the usual manner.

(iii) New Town Planning Appeal Received

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House) in  
“Green Belt” Zone, Government Land (near Lot 393) in D.D. 28, Lung Mei Village,  
Tai Po  
(Application No. A/NE-TK/559)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

10. The Secretary reported that a Notice of Appeal was received by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) on 10.3.2016 against the decision of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 11.12.2015 to reject on review an application for proposed House (NTEH – Small House) at the site. The site was zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) on the approved Ting Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-TK/19.

[Ms Janice W.M. Lai arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

11. The application was rejected by the Board for the following reasons :

- (a) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone which was primarily for defining the limits of urban

and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There was a general presumption against development within the zone;

- (b) the proposed development did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 for ‘Application for Development within “GB” zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ in that the proposed development would involve clearance of existing natural vegetation and affect the existing natural landscape on the surrounding environment;
- (c) the proposed development did not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories in that the proposed development would cause adverse landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (d) land was still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Lung Mei, Tai Mei Tuk and Wong Chuk Tsuen which was primarily intended for Small House development. It was considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services.

12. The hearing date of the Appeal was yet to be fixed. Members noted the Appeal and agreed that the Secretary would act on behalf of the Board in dealing with the appeal in the usual manner.

(iv) Appeal Statistics

13. The Secretary reported that as at 1.4.2016, a total of 12 cases were yet to be heard by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning). Details of the appeal statistics were as follows :



Allowed	:	34
Dismissed	:	142
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	:	192
Yet to be Heard	:	12
<u>Decision Outstanding</u>	:	<u>2</u>
Total	:	382

### **Sha Tin, Tai Po & North District**

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-LT/554

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House – Small House) in “Agriculture” zone, Lots 298 S.B ss.1 RP and 298 S.B ss.2 in D.D. 8, Tai Mong Che Village, Tai Po, New Territories

(TPB Paper No. 10088)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

14. The Secretary reported that the following Members have declared interests in the item :

Mr Michael W.L. Wong (Chairman) - co-owning a townhouse at Lo Fai Road with his spouse

Mr H.W. Cheung - owning a flat at Heung Sze Wui Street, Tai Po

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung - owning a flat at On Chee Road, Tai Po

15. Members noted that Mr H.W. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the properties owned by the Chairman and Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung did not have direct view on the site, Members agreed that they should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

16. The following representative from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant's representative were invited to the meeting at this point :

Mr C.K. Soh - District Planning Officer/Shu Tin,  
Tai Po & North (DPO/STN),  
PlanD

Mr Hui Kwan Yee - Applicant's Representative

17. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited DPO/STN to brief Members on the review application.

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr C.K. Soh, DPO/STN presented the review application and covered the following main points as detailed in the Paper :

(a) on 8.10.2015, the applicant sought planning permission to build a New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House (SH) at the site. On 4.12.2015, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to reject the application and the reasons were :

(i) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone for the area which was primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. It was also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There was no strong planning

justification provided in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and

- (ii) land was still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Tai Mong Che and Ma Po Mei which was primarily intended for Small House development. It was considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services;
- (b) the site was within the ‘village environ’ (‘VE’) of Tai Mong Che Village but entirely fell outside the “V” zone. It was situated within the upper indirect water gathering ground (WGG) near Tai Mong Chai, Tai Po and was accessible via a footpath connecting to a village road. It was flat with active agricultural activities. The surrounding area was predominantly rural in character with scattered village houses, agricultural land, vegetated fields and woodland trees. Tai Mong Che Village was about 120m to the west of the site while the nearest village houses were about 30m to the north;
- (c) on 7.1.2016, the applicant applied for a review of the RNTPC’s decision to reject the application. No justification was submitted by the applicant to support the review application;
- (d) the assessment criteria for SH development was relevant in considering the application :
  - (i) sympathetic consideration might be given if not less than 50% of the proposed SH footprint fell within the ‘VE’ of a recognised village and there was a general shortage of land in meeting the demand for SH development in the “V” zone in the village;

- (ii) the proposed development should not frustrate the planning intention of the particular zone in which the application site was located;
  - (iii) the proposed development should not encroach onto the planned road network and should not cause adverse traffic, environmental, landscape, drainage, sewerage and geotechnical impacts on the surrounding areas. Any such impacts should be mitigated to the satisfaction of the relevant government departments; and
  - (iv) the proposed development, if located within WGG, should be able to be connected to existing or planned sewerage system in the area except under very special circumstances;
- (e) a previous application submitted by the same applicant for SH development had been rejected by the RNTPC on 8.5.2015 for reasons of not being in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone, not complying with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/SH in New Territories (the Interim Criteria) in that the proposed SH would not be able to be connected to the sewerage system in the area, and having failed to demonstrate that the proposed development within the WGG would not cause adverse impact on the water quality in the area. In the current application, the applicant had demonstrated that sewerage connection from the site to the public sewer was feasible;

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (f) 9 similar applications involving 9 sites had been rejected by the RNTPC or the Board on review and 10 similar applications involving 7 sites had been approved with conditions;
- (g) departmental comments – comments from the relevant government departments were detailed in paragraph 4 of the Paper and summarised below:
  - (i) the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) maintained his view of not supporting the review application as there was active agricultural activities at the site and the site had potential for agricultural rehabilitation;
  - (ii) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L), PlanD had reservation on the review application as the approval would encourage similar applications for village developments outside the “V” zone, the cumulative impact of which would have adverse visual impact on the environment;
  - (iii) the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had reservation on the application and considered that SH development should be confined within the “V” zone as far as possible;
  - (iv) other government departments consulted maintained their views of having no objection to/no adverse comments on the review application;
- (h) no public comment was received in respect of the review; and
- (i) PlanD did not support the review application based on the planning considerations and assessments set out in paragraph 6 of the Paper. The proposed SH development was not in line with the planning

intention of the “AGR” zone, and land was still available within the “V” zone of Tai Mong Che and Ma Po Mei. It was considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed SH development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services.

19. The Chairman then invited the applicant’s representative to elaborate on the review application. Mr Hui Kwan Yee made the following main points :

- (a) a total of 9 similar applications were rejected mainly on the ground that sewerage connection could not be made at those application sites. Similarly, the previous application at the site was rejected for the same reason. It was now feasible to provide sewerage connection from the site to the public sewer. Consent from adjacent land owners had been obtained to provide the sewerage connection through their land, including land held by the Tso of the village, which was an indication that his application was supported by the local villagers;
- (b) as there was inadequate land within the “V” zone to meet the SH demand in the long term, it would be fair to approve his application;
- (c) the relevant government departments, including the Water Supplies Department, Fire Services Department, Civil Engineering and Development Department, and Highways Department had no objection to the application. Also, the Drainage Services Department and the Environmental Protection Department had no adverse comment on the proposed drainage and sewerage connection arrangement. The site was flat and accessible via a footpath with street lamp and there was no adverse traffic impact. In particular, those departments responsible for SH application including Tai Po District Office and Tai Po District Land Office had no objection to the application. The site fell within the ‘VE’ of Tai Mong Che and it

was perfectly acceptable to approve the SH development proposal submitted by an indigenous villager; and

(d) the Board should give favourable consideration to the application.

20. As the presentation of the applicant's representative was completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

21. A Member wondered why a site outside the "V" zone was chosen by the applicant and asked DPO/STN to give more information on the land availability for SH development within the "V" zone. In response, Mr C.K. Soh, DPO/STN referred to a plan showing the land still available for SH development within the "V" zone and said that the applicant claimed that the application site was the only piece of land he owned.

22. The Chairman noted that one of the rejection reasons for the application by the RNTPC was that the site fell entirely within the "AGR" zone. He asked whether the Board had approved any similar application for SH development within the "AGR" zone before and whether the rejection of the current application was unfair as claimed by the applicant. In response, Mr Soh said that applications for SH development within the "AGR" zone had been approved previously for reasons that they had met the Interim Criteria and had been located near a public road and existing village cluster. Also, several applications in the vicinity of the site had been approved previously for SH development as they had fallen partly within the "V" zone and in some cases, favourable consideration had been given because previous approval for SH developments had been granted.

23. A Member asked whether the approval of the current application would set a precedent for similar applications. In response, Mr Soh said that since the site of the current application involved active agricultural activities, its approval would set a precedent for similar applications on land with active agricultural activities.

24. A Member asked whether the current application was the only application within the "AGR" zone and its approval would set a precedent for other applications

within the same “AGR” zone and even for “AGR” zones in other areas. Mr Soh replied that most of the applications outside the “V” zone in Tai Mong Che Village were rejected except under special circumstances such as next to the village road. While each application would be considered on its individual merits, Mr Soh believed that the Board had been taking a cautious approach in considering applications for SH development, especially in areas with active agricultural activities and no previous planning approval.

25. A Member said that the applicant had not provided any justifications to address RNTPC’s reasons for rejection and asked whether any favourable consideration could be given. In response, Mr Soh said that the applicant’s representative had made his response and it would be up to the Board to consider whether the response was adequate.

26. A Member asked whether there was any changes in the living condition of the applicant that might compel him to apply for SH development at the site. In response, Mr Hui Kwan Yee said that the applicant was living with his sister in Ng Tung Chai Village. As the applicant had his own family, he wanted to have his own house. The applicant had already applied for a SH for over 10 years and only recently bought the site for SH development.

27. As there was no further question from Members, the Chairman informed the applicant’s representative that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would deliberate on the review application in his absence and inform the applicant of the Board’s decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the applicant’s representative and DPO/STN for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation

28. At the Chairman’s invitation, Mr K.K. Ling, the Director of Planning explained the difference between the “V” zone and the ‘VE’. He said that the ‘VE’ was drawn up in the 1970’s under the Small House Policy to demarcate the village cluster with a boundary drawn at 300 feet away from the edge of the outermost village house in that village cluster without any regard to the topographical features. The “V” zone was a



landuse zoning on the Outline Zoning Plan, having considered the site characteristics and compatibility of various types of development in an area. The “V” zone was often smaller than the ‘VE’ in terms of area.

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

29. Mr Ling said that for the applications of SH developments, RNTPC would generally assess them in accordance with the Interim Criteria. Furthermore, it had recently been noted that SH developments had been spreading outside the “V” zone and had affected areas with active agricultural activities. Generally speaking, while each case would be assessed on its own merits, RNTPC would often not support SH development outside “V” zone if there was adequate land within the “V” zone to accommodate outstanding SH applications, whether or not such land could also accommodate the 10-year SH demand forecast. As the site of the current application involved active agricultural activities and there was adequate land within the “V” zone to meet outstanding SH applications, the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the “AGR” zone. It had therefore been rejected by the RNTPC.

30. Some Members expressed their agreement with PlanD’s recommendation of rejecting the application and said that the applicant had not provided strong justification to convince the Board to depart from the RNTPC’s previous decision of rejecting the application.

31. Another Member asked whether the applicant, who was currently living in Ng Tung Chai Village, was entitled to build SH in Tai Mong Che Village. In response, Mr Ling said that, generally speaking, indigenous villagers could apply to build SH in another village under the same ‘Heung’ provided that there was no objection to his cross-village application from the receiving village. Applications for land grant for SH development were processed by the Lands Department (LandsD) under the Small House Policy, and the indigenous villager’s status would be verified by LandsD at that stage. The Board would focus on the land use compatibility of the proposed development in the area, instead of the status of the applicant vis-à-vis land grant, in considering SH applications.

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

32. The meeting noted that the site fell entirely within the “AGR” zone with active agricultural activities and land was still available within the “V” zone for SH development. There was no strong justification to depart from the RNTPC’s previous decision.

33. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review based on the following reasons :

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. It is also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification provided in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Tai Mong Che and Ma Po Mei which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.”

### **General**

#### **Agenda Item 5**

[Open meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Planning and Design Study on the Redevelopment of Government Sites at Sai Yee Street and Mong Kok East Station – Feasibility Study  
(TPB Paper No. 10089)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese and English]

34. The Secretary reported that the following Members have declared interests in the item :

Ms Christina M. Lee - owning properties at Nathan Road, Mong Kok

Professor S.C. Wong - being a traffic consultant of Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup), the Consultant of the Study

Mr Ivan S.C. Fu ]

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau ] having business dealing with Arup

Mr Franklin Yu ]

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealing with Arup

35. Members noted that Ms Christina M. Lee had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Since the item was only a briefing to Members as part of the Community Engagement exercise, the meeting agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

36. The following representatives from the government were invited to the meeting at this point :

Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan	- Chief Town Planner/Housing & Office Land Supply, Planning Department (CTP/HOLS, PlanD)
Ms Esther M.Y. Tang	- Senior Town Planner/Housing & Office Land Supply 1 (STP/HOLS1), PlanD
Mr Mario C.S Choy	- Chief Transport Officer/Kowloon, Transport Department (CTO/K, TD)
Mr Jeff C.W. Tse	- Engineer/Mong Kok and Yau Ma Tei, (E/MY) TD
Ms Carmen Chu	]
Mr Peter Chan	] Arup
Mr Chris Romanos	]
Mr Matthew Fung	]

37. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan, CTP/HOLS, gave a brief introduction to the Planning and Design Study on the Redevelopment of Government Sites at Sai Yee Street and Mong Kok East Station – Feasibility Study (the Study) and made the following main points :

- (a) PlanD completed the study on “Area Improvement Plan for the Shopping Areas of Mong Kok” in 2009 and one of the long-term recommendations was to redevelop the government sites at Sai Yee Street (the site) for a comprehensive development with a public transport terminus to accommodate the on-street public light buses (PLB) and cross-boundary coaches in the surroundings of Mong Kok, with other development atop;

- (b) in March 2015, PlanD commissioned Arup to undertake the Study to investigate the development potential of the site together with the adjoining decked-over platform (the Platform Area) of the KCRC Mong Kok East Station (the East Station) for a comprehensive development, and to make recommendations to enhance the public realm and public transport facilities in the area. Findings and recommendations of the Study would serve as a basis for subsequent Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) amendment and land disposal;
  
- (c) the site was located at the junction of Sai Yee Street and Argyle Street and had an area of about 1.18ha. It was currently occupied by the offices-cum-vehicle depot of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD), the Water Supplies Department (WSD) compound and a temporary public car park. The site was partly zoned “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”), partly “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Multi-storey Car/Lorry Park” subject to a building height restriction (BHR) of 6 storeys and partly “OU” annotated “Railway Station Development” subject to a BHR of 71mPD on the draft Mong Kok OZP No. S/K3/30. A 30m-wide building gap above 23mPD was designated on the OZP running across the northern part of the site to align with Mong Kok Road, creating an east-west air path for wind penetration in the area;
  
- (d) Luen Wan Street ran along the eastern boundary of the site, which was the only access to the adjacent Platform Area at about 22mPD to the further east, which fell within the land vested to Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation (KCRC) under the KCRC Ordinance (Cap. 372) for rail operation. While the KCRC freight yard was located at-grade, a public transport interchange (PTI), Mong Kok Government Offices (MKGO) and its ancillary car park, and a vacant site were located on the Platform Area;

- (e) areas to the north, west and south consisted of high-density mixed developments of commercial, residential and government, institution or community (GIC) uses. Local attractions such as ‘Goldfish Street’ and ‘Ladies Market’ at Tung Choi Street, ‘Sneaker Street’ and the street market at Fa Yuen Street, and the ‘Flower Market and Bird Garden’ at Prince Edward Road West/Flower Market Road were located nearby; and
- (f) the site was also located at a transport hub well served by a wide variety of public transport, e.g. the East Station and the PTI, the MTR Mong Kok and Prince Edward Station, on-street PLB stands and the cross-boundary coach termini and stopping points.

38. Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan then invited the representative of Arup to present the key findings of the Study. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Chris Romanos made the following main points as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) The following opportunities and constraints were identified :

Opportunities

- (i) Mong Kok Identity – the redevelopment of the site would provide opportunity to enhance the identity of Mong Kok as a tourist, shopping and entertainment destination;
- (ii) Prime Location for Commercial Development – the redevelopment of the site to Grade A office, hotel, shop and services and place of entertainment would complement the Grand Century Place and the Royal Plaza Hotel and enhance the identity of Mong Kok as a commercial node, tourist attraction and shopping centre, and create synergy to form an icon;

- (iii) Improvement to Public Realm – the redevelopment of the site would provide new land in that well developed urban area for the improvement of public realm in terms of traffic condition, living environment and provision of GIC facilities;
- (iv) Landscape Enhancement on Platform Area – while pursuing development involving KCRC vested land would require the resolution of legal issues, opportunities might be taken to explore the possibility of landscape enhancement, the provision of public open space and pedestrian connection on the Platform Area;

#### Constraints

- (v) Traffic Noise and Air Quality Impact – the site was subject to traffic noise and air quality impacts from Sai Yee Street, Argyle Street, the existing PTI on the Platform Area and the uncovered part of the East Rail. Careful planning and design with adequate mitigation measures would be required for air/noise sensitive users;
- (vi) Existing Road Capacity – road junctions at Sai Yee Street/Mong Kok Road and Sai Yee Street/Argyle Street would reach their full capacity by 2027 even without any redevelopment at the site;

#### Guiding Planning and Design Principles

- (b) guiding planning and design principles were formulated for the site for deriving the proposed development schemes. They included :
  - (i) Development Need – to optimise the development potential according to the site context and constraints and to

reprovision the existing public facilities affected by the redevelopment;

- (ii) Connectivity – to create a multi-level pedestrian network between the East Station, the MTR Mong Kok Station and the nearby local/tourist attractions and to enhance the walkability and connectivity of pedestrians;
- (iii) Meeting Community Demand – to provide GIC and social welfare facilities to serve the local community and to provide public transport facilities to improve the traffic condition;
- (iv) Good Urban Design – to promote visual and air permeability through the provision of visual and air corridors at strategic locations, reduce overshadowing and foster a strong sense of place, respect the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, and respect the 20% building free zone (BFZ) and views to the ridgeline of Beacon Hill and Lion Rock unless with sufficient justifications;
- (v) Provision of Open Space – to provide quality open space at convenient location with easy access for public enjoyment;
- (vi) Greening and Landscaping – to provide quality public realm and landscaped linkages with the surrounding open space, preserve the Old and Valuable Trees (OVTs) and observe the requirement on site coverage of greenery;
- (vii) Mong Kok Identity – to take into account Mong Kok's character and identity, promote liveliness in terms of activities at street level, and create a landmark and focal point;



- (c) taking into consideration the above opportunities, constraints and guiding principles, three development design schemes with a plot ratio (PR) of 12 for commercial development including Grade A office, hotel, shop and services and place of entertainment at the site were derived with the following common components :
- (i) a two-storey PTI with a total gross floor area (GFA) of about 8,000m<sup>2</sup>, for the provision of about 60 PLBs (at ground floor ingress/egress at Sai Yee Street) and 20 cross-boundary coach spaces (on the first basement floor with ingress/egress at Luen Wan Street) was proposed for the relocation of those on-street facilities. Sai Yee Street, Argyle Street and Luen Wan Street abutting the site were proposed to be widened and a public car park would be provided at basement. Multi-levels pedestrian connection to the existing and planned footbridge systems would be provided for efficient, comfortable and barrier-free connection. Two landscaped walkways across Luen Wan Street connecting the Platform Area with the site and another pedestrian walkway connecting the site with the planned footbridge along Argyle Street would be proposed;
  - (ii) GIC facilities including a day care centre for the elderly, a neighbourhood elderly centre, an integrated children and youth services centre, an integrated community centre for the mental wellness were proposed, and the existing public toilet at Luen Wan Street would be reprovisioned;
  - (iii) existing OVTs would be preserved in-situ and integrated into the public open space to be provided at the junction of Sai Yee Street/Argyle Street at-grade, at podium level and on the Platform Area;

- (iv) the 30m-wide building gap above 23mPD would be maintained as wind/view corridor for better ventilation and visual permeability;

#### Proposed Development Design Schemes

- (d) Scheme A – three commercial towers (about 30 storeys) on top of 3-storey of podium and 4-level of basement with a uniform building height (BH) of 145mPD were proposed. About 7,000m<sup>2</sup> would be proposed for open space use, including a public Piazza at the junction of Sai Yee Street/Argyle Street, an open space on the podium deck at 23mPD. The development would preserve the 20% BFZ. However, the BH profile would be monotonous and the built-form would be relatively bulkier. The relatively larger building footprint would form an almost continuous wall along Sai Yee Street blocking the view of Fife Street towards Kadoorie Hill. The northern block would overshadow the adjacent Hong Kong & Kowloon Chiu Chow Public Association Secondary (CCPAS) School on the north;
- (e) Scheme B – stepped building height concept with two commercial towers of 50 storeys (230mPD) and 35 storeys (165mPD), and a 5-storey GIC block (35mPD) on top of a part 3-storey and part single-storey podium was proposed. The 5-storey GIC block was proposed near the CCPAS School to address the overshadowing problem. When viewed from the two strategic viewpoints on Hong Kong Island, the proposed 165mPD tower would partially intrude into the 20% BFZ while the 230mPD tower, which was similar in height to Langham Place, would breach the ridgeline. At pedestrian level, the part single-storey podium would reduce the adverse impact on the streetscape and the pedestrian experience, and preserve the view along Fife Street towards Kadoorie Hill. The two tower design enabled the provision of a public open space of 1,600m<sup>2</sup> on podium level overlooking the Piazza at the junction of Sai Yee Street/Argyle Street.

The Piazza and podium-level open space would create a spatially unified public area and bring the total public open space under the Scheme to about 8,800m<sup>2</sup>;

- (f) Scheme C – the commercial GFA would be concentrated in a single tower and a podium configuration that followed a similar massing as that under Scheme B. Two lower blocks of about 4 to 6 storeys were proposed with GIC facilities and commercial uses for the northern and southern blocks respectively. A 75-storey tower would be located in the approximate centre of the site. It would breach the ridgeline when viewed from the strategic viewing points on Hong Kong Island and was expected to create a new, highly visible centre to mark a new heart for the district's commercial areas. The design would provide a total area of about 9,700m<sup>2</sup> for open space and further improve visual permeability and air ventilation at pedestrian level. With an area of 3,200m<sup>2</sup>, the proposed Piazza would envelop an area from Sai Yee Street to Luen Wan Street. A public open space of 2,000m<sup>2</sup> would be provided on podium level adjacent to the Piazza, further enhancing the sense of ground level openness and limited the adverse impacts of the building bulk on pedestrian. The Scheme would generate a new landmark building at a strategic location that would delineate the district's east edge while creating the opportunity for a new iconic skyline for Kowloon;

#### Visual Impact on the Ridgeline and Local Pedestrian

- (g) with reference to photomontages of the three Development Schemes, Scheme A would not have any adverse impact on the ridgeline and the 20% BFZ but its relatively larger building footprint would appear massive and block the views at local pedestrian level. The two commercial towers of Scheme B was compatible with that of Langham Place and would breach the 20% BFZ and the ridgeline, a larger open space could be provided and there was better visual and

air permeability at pedestrian level. The single tower design for Scheme C had the tallest BH and significantly protruded beyond the ridgeline. However, it could provide the largest open space and maximize the benefits of local users by providing more open space as well as visual and air permeability; and

#### Way Forward

- (h) consultation with Yau Tsim Mong District Council (YTM DC) was carried out on 31.3.2016 and local consultation with stakeholders would be carried out in the second quarter (Q2) of 2016 with the aim to derive a revised scheme taking into account the views of YTM DC, the Town Planning Board (the Board) and the public. Further technical assessments on the redevelopment proposal, rezoning for land disposal and recommendation on the implementation strategy would be carried out. The findings would be further reported back to the Board.

39. The Chairman invited comments/questions from Members. He noted that further public consultation would be conducted and a revised proposal taking into account the views of the public as well as that of the Members would be made. The Board would be consulted again on the revised proposal in due course.

#### *Development Design Schemes*

40. The following comments/questions were raised by individual Members :
- (a) whether the possibility of a pedestrian tunnel to connect the MTR Mong Kok Station with the East Station had been explored;
  - (b) whether a revised scheme could be derived to maintain the same level of GFA, but with a lower BH and more public open space;

- (c) as the traffic was very congested in the area, especially during weekends, and the air quality of the area was bad, it was doubtful whether the local residents would use the proposed open space at the junction of Sai Yee Street/Argyle Street. It might be better to locate the public open space near the East Station where the traffic was less busy. Otherwise, mitigation measures should be proposed to address the problems;
- (d) with massive podium and larger building footprints, Scheme A would have adverse impacts in terms of visual and air permeability. Hence, a taller building with more open space would be preferred;
- (e) both Schemes B and C would breach the ridgeline, which might be criticised strongly by the public, but Scheme C appeared to be more innovative and could provide more public open space. A balance between visual/air permeability and the ridgeline should be struck carefully;
- (f) Scheme C would be preferred as the proposed building could become a new landmark building near the East Station. Consideration should be given to providing public viewing platform/open space on the top floors of the building free of charge as a planning gain so as to gauge public support for a landmark building; and
- (g) the three schemes proposed were not appropriate as Scheme A was too dense while the excessively tall building in Scheme C was not compatible with the surrounding developments.

41. In response, Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan made the following main points :

- (a) the proposed Schemes were only preliminary proposals for public consultation. There was no detailed building design at this stage and Members' views on detailed design including public open space on

high levels and public viewing deck on or near the roof level would be taken into account at the next stage of the Study;

- (b) for the suggested pedestrian tunnel linking the railway stations, given Mong Kok was already well developed with its existing and planned pedestrian footbridge connections, it would be better to make improvement on the basis of the existing and planned systems. Besides, there would be complex technical issues to be addressed for the pedestrian tunnel in the area; and
- (c) the traffic congestion in the area would be relieved as there were road widening proposals for Sai Yee Street and Argyle Street under the redevelopment proposal and a number of on-street PLB and cross-boundary coach terminus cum stopping points in the area would be relocated within the redevelopment proposal.

42. A Member raised the following comments/questions:

- (a) the long podium of Scheme A would have adverse visual impact on the streetscape;
- (b) while commercial and GIC uses were proposed in the redevelopment schemes, whether residential use would be considered; and
- (c) whether the bus terminus, PLB and taxi stands at the existing PTI on the Platform Area would be affected, hence aggravating the traffic congestion in the area.

43. In response, Ms Pheobe Y.M. Chan made the following main points :

- (a) the existing PTI on the Platform Area would not be affected. In addition, a new PTI for PLBs (on G/F) and cross-boundary coaches (on B1/F) would be provided within the proposed schemes for the

relocation of those on-street facilities. The new PTI for PLBs and cross-boundary coaches would have separate ingress/egress points from that of the existing PTI on the Platform Area. Together with the proposed road widening at Sai Yee Street and Argyle Street abutting the site and the relocation of those on-street PLB and cross-boundary coach stands, the existing traffic congestion in the area would be relieved;

- (b) Mong Kok was one of the major shopping areas and entertainment destinations for locals and tourists. There was a traditional character of vibrancy with street activities. As the site was near a busy PTI hub, commercial development would be more compatible and could further enhance the vibrancy of the area; and
- (c) given the traffic noise from the nearby roads, PTI and the open-air railway line as well as the heavy pedestrian flow around the transport hub, commercial development was preferred to residential development at the site.

44. Some Members raised the following comments/questions:

- (a) Scheme A was not appropriate as the building bulk would have wall effect and blocked the air ventilation and views at the street level;
- (b) Scheme C would be preferred as it would provide more open space and better air ventilation and visual permeability. However, the excessive BH of the tower was intrusive as viewed from the vantage point at Pier No. 7 on Hong Kong Island, which should be tackled carefully. Reference should be made to The Shard in London for the design of the landmark building;

- (c) Langham Place and other tall buildings in Tsim Sha Tsui should not be used as a reference as each of them had their own consideration at the time of development;
- (d) as the proposed redevelopment would induce more traffic and pedestrian in the area, the traffic issues would need to be resolved. For better connectivity, more exits should be provided from the proposed development so that pedestrian from the Mong Kok Road pedestrian footbridge could readily access the podium open space that lead to the ground level;
- (e) open space should be provided at various levels so as to guide pedestrians from ground level to upper podium levels;
- (f) the building design should provide better air ventilation and visual permeability at pedestrian level and the landmark building would enhance the identity of Mong Kok; and
- (g) hotel use was also suitable for inclusion in the redevelopment of the site.

45. In response, Ms Carmen Chu, Arup, said that with the proposed road widening and relocation of PLB and cross-boundary coach stands to the proposed PTI, the traffic congestion in the area would be alleviated and the initial traffic assessment of the Study had indicated that the traffic generated from the proposed redevelopment with a PR of 12 could be accommodated. As hotel would generate less traffic than an office, the incorporation of hotel as a component in the proposed redevelopment would also be acceptable in traffic terms. Mr Chris Romanos, Arup, supplemented that for the distinctive shape of the proposed landmark building would have positive impact on the city's skyline. He said that currently Kowloon's skyline was dominated by buildings along Victoria Harbour waterfront and the new tower proposed under Scheme C would be unique as it would increase the spatial depth of the skyline and allow other buildings in the hinterland to participate in the skyline's profile. Regarding the provision of open space,



Mr Romanos said that the open areas on the building podium would be optimized to provide public open space at different levels for a well integrated and enhanced pedestrian connectivity with the existing/planned footbridge systems and the walkways on at-grade level.

*Objectives of the Schemes*

46. The following comments/questions were raised by individual Members :

- (a) how each of the three Schemes could blend in with the surrounding developments and enhance the general environment of Mong Kok;
- (b) how the guiding planning and design principles could be achieved through each of the three Schemes;
- (c) whether there was any preferred scheme and the rationale for choosing the preferred scheme;
- (d) how the proposed schemes could reflect the guiding planning and design principles of the Study, particularly the development need, community need, connectivity and Mong Kok identity;
- (e) there should be more components in the proposed scheme to reflect the character of Mong Kok; and
- (f) how the Mong Kok identity could be integrated in the proposed development.

47. In response, Mr Chris Romanos made the following main points :

- (a) the key differences in the three schemes were the massing of the buildings and the quantity of open space to be provided. Those

changes affected the visual and air permeability at pedestrian level, which was crucial to the local environment;

- (b) while Scheme A would not have any visual impact on the ridgeline when viewed from strategic viewing points, its podium and building mass would have the worst visual impact locally at pedestrian level. With taller building and smaller building footprint design, Schemes B and C would breach the ridgeline but have better local air and visual permeability and better integrated podium and at-grade open space;
- (c) the character of Mong Kok was mainly about the vibrant street activities. The common feature of the schemes was to maintain the vibrancy of the street level along the route between the MTR Mong Kok Station, the East Station and different local attractions by providing at-grade commercial activities along the proposed building podium;
- (d) the open space at the junction of Sai Yee Street and Argyle Street would provide a meeting place to cater for the community need and for the public to enjoy the OVTs preserved in-situ;
- (e) the redevelopment would extend the existing and planned footbridge systems into the development as well as the PTI deck, thus creating an internal corridor lined with shops. Pedestrians would enjoy and experience the vibrancy of Mong Kok along the corridor; and
- (f) all options approached the local context and Kowloon's cityscape in different ways. Scheme A did not breach the ridgeline but had detrimental effects on the surrounding urban context in terms of visual permeability, streetscape and air ventilation at pedestrian level. Scheme B breached the ridgeline while comparatively improving local air ventilation, visual permeability and provision of open space for public enjoyment. Scheme C also breached the ridgeline but it added

a memorable landmark structure that could participate in Kowloon's skyline while comparatively improving the local streetscape, visual permeability, open space provision and air ventilation than Schemes A and B.

48. Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan further supplemented the following main points :

- (a) apart from the proposed PTI, the proposed redevelopment would also provide social welfare facilities namely, a day care centre for the elderly, a neighbourhood elderly centre, an integrated children and youth services centre and an integrated community centre for the mental wellness, which could be regarded as planning gains to the community. Public car park and open space of different sizes and configuration under the three schemes would also be provided; and
- (b) for local residents and pedestrian, the visual permeability of the proposed development would be more important. Given the site with a maximum PR of 12, a balance had been struck in order to optimise the land uses and development intensity as permitted under the OZP taking into account the need to provide various public facilities including PTI, GIC facilities, open space, road-widening works etc as well as the scarce land resources. Members' views would be taken into consideration at the next stage of the Study.

*Public Light Buses (PLBs)*

49. Some Members raised the following comments/questions :

- (a) there was a need for a new PTI for the relocation of on-street PLBs stands in the surrounding area. A proposal should be worked out for the implementation of the relocation in the next round of consultation;

- (b) traffic congestion was a pertinent problem of Mong Kok, whether it could be resolved in the proposed redevelopment; and
- (c) whether the new PTI at the podium of the redevelopment scheme could accommodate all the on-street PLB stands.

50. In response, Mr Mario C.S. Choy, CTO/K, TD, made the following main points :

- (a) there were about 12 PLB stands with 16 PLB routes terminating in the study area, involving over 400 PLBs with about 8,000 trips per day. It was not possible nor efficient to accommodate all those PLB stands in the proposed new PTI; and
- (b) the proposed PTI would essentially accommodate the existing 7 PLB routes terminating at Tung Choi Street and Fa Yuen Street, involving 200 PLBs with about 4,600 trips per day, which constituted over half of the total daily PLB activities in the study area, and had attracted most of the traffic complaints from the public.

51. Some Members further raised the following comments/questions :

- (a) whether the 60 odd numbers of PLB spaces in the proposed PTI would be adequate for the relocation of over 200 PLBs operating/terminating at Fa Yuen Street and Tung Choi Street; and
- (b) although the traffic situation at PLB stands in Argyle Street was chaotic, the existing PLB operation seemed to be quite efficient in serving the passengers. After the relocation, the PLBs would need to line up at the PTI and that might affect the flexibility/efficiency of PLB operation and cause congestion at the ingress/egress of the PTI.

52. In response, Mr Mario C.S. Choy said that although more than 200 PLBs were involved in the operation at those 7 PLB routes to be relocated to the PTI, the majority of these PLBs were either stationed at the destinations of the routes or running on the road. The 60 odd PLB spaces designed within the proposed PTI had taken into consideration the actual PLB operation and were considered adequate.

### *Open Space*

53. Some Member raised the following comments/questions :

- (a) whether the amount of open space quoted in the development parameters for the three schemes had included the land area of the open space on the Platform Area;
- (b) while the approach of integrating facilities in the adjacent area into the redevelopment scheme for the general improvement of the environment was supported, whether the inclusion of open space outside the site would affect the green ratio calculation of the proposed redevelopment;
- (c) instead of providing the total land area of open space, a break-down of open space provision at-grade, on podium and the provision of Piazza for each Scheme should also be provided;
- (d) apart from providing the amount of open space in the development parameters, there was no information in the Paper on how those open space could be integrated with the surrounding area;
- (e) the existing sitting out area at Luen Wan Street, which was currently served as a buffer between the traffic lanes, should be better utilised; and

- (f) the Platform Area should be planned as a modern 'station square' while keeping the busy Mong Kok character at Sai Yee Street.

54. In response, Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan made the following main points :

- (a) the land areas of the Piazza in Schemes A to C were 2,500m<sup>2</sup>, 2,700m<sup>2</sup> and 3,200m<sup>2</sup> respectively. The open space calculation as presented in the Paper had included those open space within the site and that on the southern part of the Platform Area. About 1,350m<sup>2</sup> of open space was provided on podium at 23mPD in all three schemes and additional podium open space of 1,600m<sup>2</sup> and 2,000m<sup>2</sup> overlooking the Piazza was provided for Schemes B and C respectively;
- (b) in Schemes B and C, the single-level podium which was at similar level to the existing sitting-out area at Luen Wan Street was to enhance the connectivity between the East Station and the surrounding area via the open space at various levels; and
- (c) the Platform Area would be enhanced by relocating the existing ancillary car park located to the south of the MKGO for open space development.

#### *Development Intensity*

55. Some Members raised the following comments/questions :

- (a) whether all the redevelopment schemes should be based on a PR of 12. Different development intensity should be proposed in order to facilitate discussion on the optimal development scheme having regard to all the relevant factors such as BH and impacts on traffic, air ventilation and visual permeability;

- (b) the proposed redevelopment would induce more traffic and pedestrians in the area and the traffic issues would need to be resolved;
- (c) Mong Kok was very congested and densely packed with pedestrians at major transport nodes. Although road widening and PTI were proposed, there was doubt that the additional traffic and pedestrian flow generated by the proposed redevelopment could be accommodated. The acceptability of adopting a PR of 12 should be one of the subject matters for public consultation;
- (d) the three Development Design Schemes were not compatible with the surrounding developments as they were either too congested or that the ridgeline was breached. It was not convincing that a PR of 12 was suitable at the site despite it was necessary to fully utilize the scarce land resource; and
- (e) if an acceptable scheme with a PR of 12 could not be achieved, alternative schemes with a lower PR should be proposed.

56. In response, Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan said that land was scarce in Hong Kong and the Study had adopted the maximum PR permissible under the OZP (i.e. PR 12) to fully utilize the site including the provision of public facilities including PTI, GIC facilities, public car parks and open space to meet the community needs. Ms Carmen Chu supplemented that the initial traffic assessment of the Study had confirmed that a PR of 12 for the proposed redevelopment would be acceptable in traffic terms. The existing condition at the East Station would be improved as pedestrians could be dispersed via the proposed development to the pedestrian footbridges or to the street level. A more detailed traffic assessment would be carried out at the next stage of the Study to examine the vehicular and pedestrian traffic impacts as well as the impacts on the public transport system. As agreed by the Railway Development Office, Highways Department, given the wide catchment area of the East Station, the additional passengers generated from the

proposed redevelopment at the site would have no significant impact on its overall capacity.

57. A Member supported the redevelopment of the site to a maximum PR of 12 as there was a demand for commercial floorspace in Mong Kok. For Scheme C, the proposed development would provide a new landmark building and the open space provision would be better than that of Langham Place. Although the proposed tall tower would have adverse visual impact, the Member considered that there were many high-rise buildings in Mong Kok and the adverse visual impact was not as significant as those new buildings emerging along Prince Edward Road due to the BHR relaxation after the relocation of the airport from Kai Tak to Chek Lap Kok. The Member also considered that the traffic issue might not be resolved easily by relocating on-street PLB stands, as the busy shop fronts would also pose traffic problems.

*Mong Kok Government Offices (MKGO)*

58. A Member suggested that the possibility of joint development with the MKGO on the Platform Area should be explored. In response, Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan said that MKGO was situated on land vested to KCRC for railway operation. Legal issues related to development on vested land would need to be resolved.

59. Mr K.K. Ling, the Director of Planning, supplemented that PlanD had previously examined the possibility of incorporating the East Station into the Study for a more comprehensive redevelopment. However, complicated land matter would be involved as the station was vested to KCRC. In addition, the redevelopment of the railway station would affect the existing operation of the live East Rail. There were also issues relating to the structural capacity of the Platform Area. In view of the above, the Study focused on the relocation of the ancillary carpark of the MKGO and recommended to turn the area into a public open space on the Platform Area. As planning was an on-going process, Mr Ling said that the Study had focused on the redevelopment of the site first while any redevelopment proposal of the East Station would have to be dealt with under a separate study at a later stage.



60. Noting Members' diverse views on the three schemes, Mr Ling said that this had reflected the complexity involved in the development of the site. He further said that there was a demand for office accommodation in Mong Kok and commercial development at the site could generate jobs close to the East Station which would be convenient to future workers. As land was a scarce resource, the development potential of the site should be fully utilized if it was technically feasible. Regarding traffic which was a major concern in the area, he said that the Study had indicated that with the proposed road widening and traffic mitigation measures, e.g. relocation of PLB stands to the proposed PTI, a PR of 12 at the site could be accommodated, which was comparable to other commercial developments in Kowloon. Since Mong Kok was renowned for its busy street activities and market stalls, the ancillary carpark of the MKGO would be relocated to the proposed redevelopment and that carpark area and its adjacent vacant land could be developed as a public area for Sunday markets to enhance the Mong Kok identity.

61. On the building design, Mr Ling said that only the disposition of buildings was shown in all the development schemes and the building blocks were indicated by rectangular boxes to illustrate their physical bulk. Members' views on the building design would be taken into consideration at the next stage, and PlanD would examine carefully the BH issue in particular the breaching of the ridgeline. While it was mentioned in the Urban Design Guidelines that the ridgeline and the 20% BFZ should be preserved, flexibility on BH had been provided for iconic buildings at strategic locations. In the event that the proposed development at the site would breach the ridgeline, there would be a need to consider whether it would set a precedent for similar developments in the area. In that connection, it was unlikely that there would be another site of such scale available in Mong Kok for similar development. In gist, a taller building would have a smaller footprint and allow better air ventilation and visual permeability at pedestrian level. After the consultation exercise had been completed, the scheme would be suitably revised as appropriate for further consultation in due course. Should the revised scheme be acceptable to the Board, the proposed development parameters of that scheme would be incorporated into the OZP.

62. The Chairman reiterated that the purpose of the briefing was to solicit Members' views on the proposed schemes and Members were not expected to make any

decision on the schemes presented. Members' views on the proposed schemes would be well taken care of by PlanD in deriving a revised scheme.

63. A Member agreed that more open space should be provided in the densely populated Mong Kok but considered that in the design of the proposed open space, more elements should reflect the character of Mong Kok. As the site was also in close proximity to Sham Shui Po and Kowloon Tong, the Member asked whether a wider area than the YTM DC should be consulted. In response, Ms Pheobe Y.M. Chan said that she would liaise with the relevant District Offices if consultation with the concerned DCs would be required.

64. A Member reiterated his view that the maximum PR of 12 should not be applied rigidly and the development intensity of the site should be reviewed. Water features such as fountain in the open space and low-rise building blocks at the perimeters of the site could be incorporated in the scheme to mitigate the traffic noise and to maintain the Mong Kok character.

65. The Chairman said he believed that PlanD would take into account Members' views in working out a revised scheme for further consultation in due course. The Chairman thanked the government representatives and the Consultants for attending the meeting and they left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Patrick H.T. lau and Mr Philip S.L. Kan left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 6**

[Open meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Proposed Revisions to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 17 for Designation of "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") Zones and Monitoring the Progress of "CDA" Developments  
(TPB Paper No. 10091)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

66. The following representative from the Planning Department (PlanD) was invited to the meeting at this point :

Mr Louis K.H. Kau - Chief Town Planner/Town  
Planning Board 2 (CTP/TPB2),  
PlanD

67. Mr Louis K.H. Kau briefly introduced the Paper and said that the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Designation of “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) Zones and Monitoring the Progress of “CDA” Developments (TPB PG-No. 17) was promulgated in May 1999. It set out the criteria for designating “CDA” zones and the mechanism for monitoring the development within the “CDA” zones. The guidelines stipulated that a review on each “CDA” site would be conducted at the end of the third year since its designation and subsequent reviews would be made on an annual basis to monitor the progress of “CDA” developments

68. Mr Kau said that, on 22.5.2015, PlanD had briefed the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) and the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) on the results of the review of the “CDA” sites in the Metro Area and the New Territories for the year 2014/2015 respectively. During the meetings, Members of MPC and RNTPC had noted that the progress of implementation of “CDA” developments in a year’s time might not be significant, and had considered that the review of “CDA” sites could be carried out biennially instead of annually in order to streamline the workflow.

69. Mr Kau said that, having regard to Members’ views above, paragraphs 5.1 and 5.3 (b) of the TPB PG-No. 17 regarding the timing of the review of the “CDA” sites had been proposed to be revised from an annual basis to a biennial basis. Opportunity had also been taken to making other minor refinements to TPB PG-No. 17 to reflect the latest circumstances. Since the proposed revisions were minor and technical in nature, consultation with government departments was considered not necessary. The Planning Sub-committee (PSC) of the Land and Development Advisory Committee had been consulted on 14.3.2016 and the PSC had generally supported the proposed revisions.

70. A Member asked whether paragraph 3.3 of TPB-PG No. 17 should be further revised to delete the reference to urban improvement scheme (UIS) of Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) or Development Scheme of the Urban Renewal Authority (URA). In response, Mr Kau explained that the references to the Development Scheme of the URA and the UIS of the HKHS would still be appropriate as these schemes were still in existence.

71. In response to another Member's question on the rationale for revising paragraph 5.3 (b) regarding the timing for sending out proforma to developers to keep track on the progress of "CDA" implementation, Mr Kau said that since the "CDA" review would be carried out biennially, the request for updating the progress of "CDA" implementation from developers would also be revised to tie in with the review cycle.

72. Another Member said that as some "CDA" sites had been designated for a long time without much progress, PlanD should investigate in the biennial "CDA" review whether there were difficulties in developing these sites and propose measures to facilitate their implementation.

73. The Board agreed to the proposed revisions and endorsed the draft TPB PG-No. 17A for promulgation to the public for information.

### **Procedural Matters**

#### **Agenda Item 7**

[Open Meeting]

Application to the Chief Executive Under Section 8(2) of the Town Planning Ordinance for Extension of Time Limit for Submission of the Draft Kam Tin South Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-KTS/12 to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval  
(TPB Paper No. 10092)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

74. The Secretary reported that the draft Kam Tin South Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-KTS/12 involved the rezoning the MTR Kam Sheung Road Station site and the Pat Heung Maintenance Centre site for private residential development. The following Members had declared interests in the item for having business dealings with Henderson Land Development Company Limited (Henderson), which was the mother company of Super Asset Development Limited (R55), or the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) which managed the two West Rail sites :

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu	]	having current business dealings
Mr Patrick H.T. Lau	]	with Henderson and MTRCL
Ms Janice W.M. Lai	]	
Mr Franklin Yu	]	
Mr Stephen L.H. Liu	]	
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho	]	having current business dealings
Mr K.K. Cheung	]	with MTRCL
Mr Dominic K.K. Lam	-	having past business dealings with Henderson and MTRCL
Professor S.C. Wong	-	being an employee of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) which had received donation from a family member of the Chairman of Henderson; and the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil Engineering of HKU where MTRCL had sponsored some activities of the Department
Dr Wilton W.T. Fok	-	being an employee of HKU which had received donation from a family

member of the Chairman of  
Henderson

- Mr H.F. Leung - being an employee of HKU which had received donation from a family member of the Chairman of Henderson; and a convenor of the Railway Objections Hearing Panel
- Professor K.C. Chau - being an employee of the Chinese University of Hong Kong which had received donation from a family member of the Chairman of Henderson
- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen - being a member of the Board of Governors of the Hong Kong Arts Centre which had received a donation from an Executive Director of Henderson
- Ms Christina M. Lee - being the Secretary-General of the Hong Kong Metropolitan Sports Events Association which had obtained sponsorship from Henderson before
- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li - being the Treasurer of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University which had obtained sponsorship from Henderson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being the President of the Hong Kong Business Accountants Association which had obtained sponsorship from Henderson

75. Members noted that Mr H.F. Leung and Ms Christina M. Lee had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members also noted that the item was procedural in nature and no discussion was necessary, and agreed that the above Members should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

76. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 29.5.2015, the draft Kam Tin South OZP No. S/YL-KTS/12 had been exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the exhibition periods of the OZP and representations, a total of 55 representations and 330 comments had been received. After consideration of the representations and comments, on 11.3.2016, the Board had decided not to propose any amendment to the OZP to meet the representations. The minutes of the concerned deliberation session had been confirmed at the meeting today.

77. The Secretary said that, according to the statutory time limit, the draft OZP should be submitted to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval on or before 29.4.2016. Since more time was required to prepare the submission of the draft OZP to CE in C for approval, the plan-making process could not be completed within the 9-month statutory time limit. There was a need to apply to the CE for an extension of the statutory time limit for six months (i.e. 29.10.2016) to allow sufficient time to prepare the submission to the CE in C for approval.

78. The Board agreed that the CE's agreement should be sought under section 8(2) of the Ordinance to extend the time limit for submission of the Draft Kam Tin South OZP No. S/YL-KTS/12 to the CE in C for a period of six months from 29.4.2016 to 29.10.2016.

**Agenda Item 8**

Any Other Business

[Confidential Item. Closed Meeting]

79. This item was recorded under confidential cover.

80. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:50 a.m.