

**Minutes of 1204th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 12.7.2019**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Mr Elvis W.K. Au

Director of Lands

Mr Thomas C.C. Chan

Chief Engineer (Works)

Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) 3

Transport and Housing Bureau

Mr Andy S.H. Lam

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr K.W. Leung

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms April K.Y. Kun

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Miss Annie H.Y. Wong

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1203rd Meeting held on 28.6.2019

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1203rd Meeting were sent to Members before the meeting and tabled at the meeting. Subject to no proposed amendment by Members on or before 15.7.2019, the minutes would be confirmed without amendment.

[Post-meeting Note: The minutes were confirmed on 15.7.2019 without amendment.]

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) New Town Planning Appeal Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 4 of 2019

Proposed Office, Shop and Services and Eating Place in “Residential (Group A)9”
Zone, 36 Gage Street, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong

(Application No. A/H3/436)

[Open Meeting]

2. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in the Sai Ying Pun and Sheung Wan area; and/or having affiliation / business dealings with Sino Land Company Limited (Sino), which was the parent company of the applicant, Sheen Honour Limited; Llewelyn Davies Hong Kong Ltd. (LD) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup), which were the applicant’s consultants:

Professor S.C. Wong
(Vice-chairperson)

- being a traffic consultant / engineering consultant of Arup, and having current business dealings with Arup;

- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with Sino and Arup;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai] their firm having current business dealings
Mr K.K. Cheung] with Sino and Arup;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with Arup and past business dealings with LD;
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with Arup;
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - his firm having past business dealings with LD;
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with LD and his company owning an office unit at Queen's Road Central; and
- Mr H.W. Cheung - his spouse owning a flat at Queen's Road West.

3. As the item was to report the receipt of an appeal case and no discussion was required, all the above Members could stay in the meeting. Members noted that Messrs K.K. Cheung, Alex T.H. Lai and Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Messrs Franklin Yu and Ricky W.Y. Yu had yet to arrive to join the meeting.

4. The Secretary reported that a Notice of Appeal was received by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) on 28.6.2019 against the decision of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 29.3.2019 to reject on review an application (No. A/H3/436) for a proposed development for office, shop and services and eating place at a site zoned "Residential (Group A)9" ("R(A)9") on the draft Sai Ying Pun and Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/32.

5. The review application was rejected by the Board for the reasons that the proposed office development was not in line with the planning intention of the “R(A)9” zone which was for high-density residential developments; the applicant had not demonstrated that there were sufficient justifications to deviate from the planning intention of the “R(A)” zone; approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the same “R(A)9” zone; and the cumulative effect of approving such applications could aggravate the shortfall in the supply of housing land.

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

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

(ii) Updated Appeal Statistics

[Open Meeting]

7. The Secretary reported that as at 4.7.2019, ten appeals were yet to be heard and one appeal’s decision was outstanding. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows :

Allowed	36
Dismissed	160
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	202
Yet to be Heard	10
Decision Outstanding	1
<hr/> Total	409

Sai Kung & Islands District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/SK-SKT/20

Proposed Temporary Minor Relaxation of Gross Floor Area Restrictions for a Period of 3 Years to Enable the Permitted Shop and Services Use in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Commercial Development (with Multi-storey Vehicle Park)” Zone, Lot 1140 in D.D. 215, 1A Chui Tong Road, Sai Kung

(TPB Paper No. 10560)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

8. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for having business dealings with the applicant, Albury Garden Investment Limited (AGL) and the applicant’s consultants, Townland Consultants Limited (Townland) and AIM Group Limited (AIM):

Mr K.K. Cheung]	their firm having current business dealings with AGL, Townland and AIM; and
Mr Alex T.H. Lai]	
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho	-	having past business dealings with Townland.

9. Members noted that Messrs Alex T.H. Lai, K.K. Cheung and Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting.

10. The following government representatives and the applicant’s representative were invited to the meeting:

Planning Department (PlanD)’s Representative

Ms Donna Y.P. Tam - District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands
(DPO/SKIs)

Transport Department (TD)'s Representative

Mr Stephen C.W. Ko - Senior Engineer/Housing & Planning/New Territories East (SE/H&P/NTE)

Applicant's Representative

Mr Arndt Borchert

11. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedure of the review hearing. She then invited DPO/SKIs, PlanD to brief Members on the review application.

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD briefed Members on the background of the review application including the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), departmental and public comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10560 (the Paper).

[Messrs Elvis W.K. Au, Franklin Yu and Ricky W.Y. Yu and Dr F.C. Chan arrived to join the meeting during the presentation.]

13. The Chairperson then invited the applicant's representative to elaborate on the review application. Mr Arndt Borchert made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant was looking for a 3-year wavier of the lease to convert 8/F and 9/F of the subject building into 'Shop and Services' use and the roof top level into a flat roof;
- (b) the public vehicle park within the subject building was underutilised on both weekdays and weekends, even on public holidays. The occupancy rate was low, and the maximum daily usage of the carpark was only about 200 vehicles;

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) the area of the application site (the Site) had been transformed from a former

industrial area to a commercial and residential area with increasing domestic population and new schools. Hence, there were fewer commercial and industrial vehicles using the subject carpark, with one to two vehicles per day for delivery purpose;

- (d) in view of the low occupancy rate of the carpark and the decreasing demand for commercial and industrial parking, and with the aim to make use of the building to serve the population within 30-minute driving distance, which covered Ma On Shan, Hang Hau and Tseng Kwan O, the applicant intended to carry out a plan called “Centro Designation Fun”. It would revitalise the existing commercial building, namely Centro, into a place with a variety of activities including workshop for kids on G/F, restaurants on 2/F, a bowling alley on 4/F and the proposed ‘Shop and Services’ use on 8/F and 9/F to support the local community and to meet the growth of Sai Kung;
- (e) while the government policy was to accord priority of parking spaces to commercial vehicles, such policy was not applicable to Sai Kung as it was not an industrial area and industrial facilities were limited; and
- (f) the application was to meet the increasing demand for shopping, dining and entertainment experiences in Sai Kung and to add value to the local community. The proposed conversion was temporary in nature and the applicant would review the market reaction and assess the impact on parking demand with actual data obtained from the implementation of the proposal. In this regard, he hoped the Board could give favourable consideration to the application upon review.

14. As the presentations of PlanD’s representative and the applicant’s representative were completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

15. In response to a Member’s question related to the justifications of the proposal and the benefits to the society, Mr Arndt Borchert, the applicant’s representative, said that there were increasing residential developments and number of schools in Sai Kung over the past few years while no new space for commercial and shop and services uses was available.

The proposed conversion could be an opportunity to cater for the growth of Sai Kung domestic population and to provide a place of enjoyment for them.

Planning Context

16. Some Member had the following questions:

- (a) the population of Sai Kung Town, and the parking facilities provided for the residential developments near the Site; and
- (b) the provision of shop and services and commercial uses in Sai Kung Town.

17. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) based on the 2011 Census, the population in Sai Kung Town was about 11,900. The planned population for the area was about 19,900. Recently, there were new residential developments completed near the Site. According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, ancillary parking spaces should be provided for the residents within the residential developments. In addition, given that the planning intention of Sai Kung Town was a centre serving the Sai Kung district and as a “Tourism Gateway” to other attractions in the sub-region, parking facilities in the area were required to serve not only local residents but also visitors; and
- (b) shops in Sai Kung Town were mainly located on the street level of the town centre. Sites for new commercial developments were planned in the northern part of Sai Kung Town with an intention to serve the town centre population and function as a gateway in the sub-region. Given that there were residential developments in the surrounding, the Site was also planned to cater for the local demand on retail and services.

Background of the Subject Carpark

18. In response to a Member's questions on the planning intention of the Site and whether the Site was required under the lease to provide public parking spaces, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD said that in view of the planning intention of Sai Kung Town as a tourism node and a gateway in the sub-region, the Site was planned in the late 1990s for a multi-storey carpark complex for local residents and tourists. It was a land sale site for the use of a commercial development with multi-storey public vehicle park. The minimum gross floor area for parking and the provision requirements of different types of parking spaces were restricted under the lease.

19. In response to Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Director of Planning's enquiry on the walking distance and connectivity between the subject carpark and Sai Kung Town, with the aid of visualiser, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD said that the whole Sai Kung Town Centre fell within 500m walking distance from the Site. Mr Stephen C.W. Ko, SE/H&P/NTE, TD supplemented that it took about 10 minutes' walk from the Site via Fui Yiu Lane and paths in the village to Sai Kung Hoi Pong Square, a place of popular tourist attraction.

Utilisation of the Subject Carpark

20. Some Members had the following questions:

- (a) the vacancy rate of the subject carpark;
- (b) the demand for monthly parking; and
- (c) whether there were changes in the monthly parking demand, hourly parking space utilisation and maximum daily occupancy in 2017 tabulated in Tables 2.4 to 2.6 respectively of the submitted Transport Impact Assessment (TIA).

21. In response, with the aid of visualiser, Mr Arndt Borchert, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the vacancy rate on weekdays and weekends was submitted in the application.

According to the data last month, the average occupancy on Saturdays and Sundays was about 165 vehicles per day. Most of them were short-term parkers mainly for visiting the supermarket at the Site and enjoying free parking offer;

- (b) monthly parking was provided at the Site which was only 20% of the parking spaces. It was because 80% of the parking spaces should be used for hourly parking in accordance with the lease requirement; and
- (c) the parking demand and occupancy data had been changed compared to the data provided in the TIA. For monthly parking record in Table 2.4, the recent data showed that the demand decreased to 54 and 58 spaces in the past two months while it might slightly increase to 60 spaces this month. With regard to hourly utilisation record in Table 2.5, the data was stable and the recent data was mostly in line with that in October 2017. The data included the monthly parking vehicles. There were about 33 hourly parking vehicles per day on weekdays and below 100 vehicles per day on weekends. Referring to Table 2.6, the maximum daily occupancy in October 2017 was basically in line with the recent occupancy which was about 26% on weekdays and 34% on weekends.

Marketing Strategy of Centro

22. The Chairperson and some Members had the following questions:

- (a) the parking charges of the subject carpark at Centro;
- (b) whether the operator had considered promoting the public usage and increasing the demand by lowering the parking charges;
- (c) whether there was promotion strategy for the carpark such as providing signage, and whether the promotion was applicable to commercial vehicles; and
- (d) whether the applicant would consider and apply for converting some parking

spaces for commercial vehicles by private cars.

23. In response, with the aid of visualiser, Mr Arndt Borchert, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) comparison tables of hourly and monthly parking rates as at 29 December 2018 between Centro and other car parks in Sai Kung Town were presented. The hourly rates of Centro on weekdays and weekends were \$20 and \$25 respectively despite the vehicle type while those at the Wilson Parking at Sai Kung Town Centre were \$32 and \$38 correspondingly. For monthly parking, the charge of Centro ranged from \$2,650 to \$4,000, subject to the location and size of the parking spaces. The higher floor the parking space was located, the lower the monthly rate was. Drivers were willing to pay premium for more convenient parking spaces as the monthly parking spaces for private car on the ground floor were on demand and fully occupied. Though the parking spaces on 5/F or above ranged from \$2,500 to \$3,000 per month, the occupancy rate was lower. By comparing with the other car parks in Sai Kung Town, the charge of Centro was in the middle of the range;
- (b) the monthly parking charges of Centro fluctuated over years. The lowest charge was about \$2,000 per month. Taking into account the running cost and labour cost of the car park, the charges could not be too low;
- (c) the promotion strategy included posting a large advertisement of Centro at a building in the square of the town centre, offering 1-hour free parking without any consumption requirement at Centro, and posting advertisements online and in magazines targeting local residents and families with cars in other places such as the mid-level. Besides, flyers of Centro were distributed at the main roads to Sai Kung Town. Furthermore, there would be a promotion campaign from mid-July 2019 by reducing the hourly parking charges to \$10 and \$15 on weekdays and weekends or public holidays correspondingly, and offering an extra hour of free parking up to 2 hours and coupons of 10% discount for consumption at Centro. A similar campaign was carried out in August 2016 and applicable to all types of vehicles including goods vehicles and coaches;

and

- (d) if the upcoming promotion campaign was successful and private car parking was more in need, the application under lease for conversion of some parking spaces for use by private cars would be considered.

24. In response to the Chairperson's questions on the vehicle types of the rates shown in the comparison tables of different carparks in Sai Kung and whether it was a like-with-like comparison in each of the tables, Mr Arndt Borchert said that the vehicle types in other carparks were uncertain. The rates in the first table were mainly hourly rates shown in the signage at the main entrances of those carparks while the monthly rates in the second table were private car rates.

25. In response to the Vice-chairperson's enquiries on the parking charges of the subject carpark and the traffic signs for carparks in Sai King, Mr Stephen C.W. Ko, SE/H&P/NTE, TD made the following main points:

- (a) details of parking charges in the area were not in hand. As mentioned in paragraph 4.2.1 (e) of the Paper, the monthly parking charge of Centro was more than \$5,000 as indicated in some public comments. Regarding the parking charges of Centro, there were discrepancies between the information provided by the applicant in Table 2.3 of the TIA submitted and the rates tabled at the meeting by the applicant. It should be noted that the rates of private car and commercial vehicles charged in Centro were different; and
- (b) with reference to the findings of a consultancy study commissioned by TD on reviewing and improving the traffic signs in Hong Kong, as an improvement measure in Sai Kung Town, traffic signs indicating all the 22 carparks including the carpark complex of Centro would be erected progressively from the second half of 2019.

Parking Demand and Parking Facilities in the Area

26. The Chairperson and some Members had the following questions:

- (a) the impacts of the proposed reduction in commercial parking spaces;
- (b) the parking facilities for coaches and goods vehicles provided in Sai Kung Town;
- (c) the reasons of excessive demand in parking in Sai Kung Town but low occupancy at Centro even when there was a promotion;
- (d) the seriousness of illegal parking of commercial vehicles in Sai Kung Town, and the enforcement actions taken against the illegal parking; and
- (e) whether there was policy to increase the parking provision in the area.

27. In response, with the aid of visualiser, Mr Stephen C.W. Ko, SE/H&P/NTE, TD made the following points:

- (a) there were five industrial buildings near the Site and loading and unloading activities were observed in June 2019. Taking into account the industrial buildings and residential developments near the Site and the role of Sai Kung as a tourism node, it was required to provide various types of parking spaces at the Site for both commercial vehicles (i.e. goods vehicles and coaches) and private car. There was no change in the circumstance. Besides, the provision of various types of parking spaces at the Site tallied with the Government's current policy in according priority of parking spaces to commercial vehicles. Furthermore, with the completion of road widening works at Hiram's Highway from one lane to two lanes and the growth in population, it was foreseen that the traffic flow and parking demand in Sai Kung would increase. The proposed conversion of existing public vehicle park to shop and services use was hence not supported. Regarding the low occupancy rate of the carpark, it could be resulted from a number of factors including commercial considerations of the operator;
- (b) a total of 46 parking spaces for coaches were available in two carparking

areas in Sai Kung Town including 22 spaces at Fuk Man Street and 24 spaces at the Site. On weekends, due to excessive demand on coach parking spaces in Sai Kung Town, there was temporary on-street parking especially for picking up and setting down tourists near Sai Kung Hoi Pong Square. Besides, there were two car parks in Sai Kung Town providing spaces for light goods vehicles including the carpark at Hong Tsuen Road and Centro;

- (c) the occupancy of the carpark would be affected by a number of factors such as parking charges and marketing strategy which were commercial considerations of the operator. According to TD's observation, the occupancy of Centro was unreasonably low amongst the 22 carparking areas in Sai Kung while there was parking demand in the district. Regarding the promotion of Centro, there was no indication that the promotion was applicable to commercial vehicles;
- (d) while he had no readily available information on the number of fixed penalty tickets on illegal parking issued by the Hong Kong Police Force (the Police), his comments on the application regarding the seriousness of illegal parking of commercial vehicles in Sai Kung Town were still valid. Besides, concerns of illegal parking were raised by the Sai King District Council and enforcement actions were taken by the Police; and
- (e) to enhance the parking provision and utilisation of the parking spaces, "smart parking system" would be promoted as a long-term strategy after the implementation of a pilot scheme at a carpark under a short term tenancy in Tsuen Wan.

28. Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD supplemented that according to TD's comments on the application stated in paragraph 4.2.1 (f) of the Paper, on a typical Sunday, TD observed that the illegally parked vehicles in Sai Kung Town included 223 private cars, 9 light goods vehicles, 29 medium/heavy goods vehicles and 1 coach. Mr Stephen C.W. Ko, SE/H&P/NTE, TD said that there was no readily available information about the illegal parking at Chui Tong Road.

29. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application. The Chairperson thanked the government representatives and the applicant's representative for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

[Dr Lawrence K.C. Li left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

Deliberation Session

30. The Chairperson said that the Site was intended to be a complex for providing various types of parking spaces in the area and such planning intention had not been changed. Besides, the Commissioner for Transport did not support the application given that there was commercial parking demand in the district and illegal parking was serious in the area. The applicant in fact could enhance the measures to increase the public's awareness of the carpark at the Site. While there would be an upcoming promotion campaign, the applicant did not clearly demonstrate that the promotion was targeted at commercial vehicles, which was the main area of concern in the application. Members might consider whether there were grounds that warranted a departure from the RNTPC's decisions.

31. Some Members considered that the planning intention of the Site remained unchanged and the applicant failed to demonstrate the need for minor relaxation of gross floor area (GFA) restrictions to accommodate the conversion of car parking space for shop and services use. Members were generally of view that there was no major change in the planning circumstances since the consideration of the subject application by the RNTPC on 23.4.2019. Regarding the low occupancy rate, the applicant should adopt better management and enhance the measures to promote the use of the carpark.

32. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review for the reason that no information was provided in the application to demonstrate any planning merit for the proposed relaxation of GFA restrictions which would result in reduction in the provision of public vehicle park in the area.

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferment of Review of Application No. A/H6/87

Proposed 'Flat' use (access road for residential development and pedestrian link) in "Green Belt", "Residential (Group A) 1" and "Residential (Group B)" Zones and an area shown as 'Road', 4-4C Tai Hang Road (Part) and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Hang Road, Hong Kong

(TPB Paper No. 10562)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

33. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in Causeway Bay area; and/or having business dealings with Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA), which was the applicant's consultant:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan
(Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department) | - | close relative owning a flat and a carparking space at Broadwood Road; |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | - | being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had current business dealings with KTA; |
| Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong | - | self-occupying a flat at Tai Hang Road; and |
| Dr Lawrence K.C. Li | - | co-owning with spouse a flat at Tai Hang Road. |

34. Members noted that Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members agreed that as the interest of Mr Daniel K.S. Lau was indirect, he should be allowed to stay in the meeting. Members also agreed that as the properties of Mr Martin W.C. Kwan's close relative and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li and his spouse did not have a direct view of the site, they should also be allowed to stay in the meeting.

35. The Secretary reported that the applicant's representative requested on 4.7.2019 deferment of the consideration of the review application for two months so as to allow time for the applicant to prepare further information (FI) to address departmental comments. This was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the review application.

36. After deliberation, the Board agreed to defer a decision on the review application, as requested by the applicant, pending the submission of FI by the applicant. The Board also agreed that the review application would be submitted to the Board for consideration within three months upon receipt of FI from the applicant. If the FI submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the review application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Board's consideration. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant that the Board had allowed two months for preparation of submission of FI, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferment of Review of Application No. A/K14/764

Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Office, Shop and Services & Eating Place Uses in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone, 32 Hung To Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon

(TPB Paper No. 10561)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

37. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for having business dealings with Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and/or WSP Hong Kong Limited (WSP), which were the consultants of the applicant:

Professor S.C. Wong (Vice-chairperson)		being a traffic consultant / engineering consultant of Arup, and having current business dealings with Arup;
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho]	having current business dealings with Arup;
Mr Ivan C.S. Fu]	
Mr K.K. Cheung]	their firm having current business dealings with Arup and WSP; and
Mr Alex T.H. Lai]	
Mr Franklin Yu	-	having past business dealings with Arup and WSP.

38. Members noted that Messrs Alex T.H. Lai, K.K. Cheung and Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting. Members agreed that as Professor S.C. Wong and Mr Ivan C.S. Fu had no direct involvement in the application and the interest of Mr Franklin Yu was indirect, they should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

39. The Secretary report that the applicant's representative requested on 3.7.2019 deferment of the consideration of the review application for two months so as to allow time for the applicant to prepare further information (FI) in support of the planning and design merits of the proposed minor relaxation of building height restriction. This was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the review application.

40. After deliberation, the Board agreed to defer a decision on the review application, as requested by the applicant, pending the submission of FI by the applicant. The Board also agreed that the review application would be submitted to the Board for consideration within three months upon receipt of FI from the applicant. If the FI submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the review application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Board's consideration. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant that the Board had allowed two months for preparation of submission of FI, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

41. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 10:54 a.m.