

**Minutes of 913th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 13.6.2008**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mr. Raymond Young

Chairman

Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. David W.M. Chan

Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen

Professor David Dudgeon

Mr. Tony C.N. Kan

Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung

Professor N.K. Leung

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Dr. C.N. Ng

Dr. Daniel B.M. To

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Mr. Alfred Donald Yap

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. B.W. Chan

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. Y.K. Cheng

Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong

Professor Paul K.S. Lam

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Mr. Timothy K.W. Ma

Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)

Transport and Housing Bureau

Ms. Ava Chiu

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection

Dr. Michael Chiu

Director of Lands

Miss Annie Tam

Director of Planning

Mrs. Ava Ng

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Dr. James C.W. Lau

Professor Edwin H.W. Chan

Mr. Rock C.N. Chen

Dr. Ellen Y.Y. Lau

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department
Ms. Margaret Hsia

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Mr. S. Lau

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms. Christine K.C. Tse

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr. W.S. Lau

Opening

[Open Meeting]

1. The Chairman reminded Members to stay behind after the meeting to take group photos of the Board.

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 912th Meeting held on 30.5.2008

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The Chairman said that a replacement page for page 14 of the draft minutes of the 912th meeting held on 30.5.2008 with amendment to paragraph 25 was tabled by the Secretariat for Members' information. The minutes were confirmed subject to the amendment.

Agenda Item 2

[Closed Meeting]

Matters Arising

3. The minutes of the item were recorded under separate confidential cover.

[Miss Annie Tam, Dr. Daniel B.M. To and Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Study Framework for Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study
(TPB Paper No. 8114)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

4. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting:

Mr. Raymond Lee	Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research (CTP/SR), PlanD
Ms. Sally Fong	Senior Town Planner/Studies & Research (STP/SR), PlanD

5. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited them to brief Members on the Paper.

Presentation Session

6. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms. Sally Fong did so and made the following main points:

- (a) the objective of the Study was to formulate a comprehensive plan for enhancement of the Hong Kong Island East harbour-front areas to an active, accessible, vibrant and sustainable waterfront for public enjoyment;
- (b) the Study area was about 115 ha in land area. It stretched from the “Comprehensive Development Area” site at Oil Street up to the eastern limit of Victoria Harbour at Shau Ki Wan;
- (c) the possibility of creating a continuous waterfront promenade along the Study area and streetscape enhancement proposals including temporary enhancement measures would be examined in the Study;

- (d) the Study could be divided into four stages:
 - (i) baseline review – to review the baseline conditions of the Study area and to identify opportunities and constraints for enhancement;
 - (ii) option generation – to formulate development options on enhancement proposals;
 - (iii) plan consolidation – to evaluate the development options and formulate the preferred development option; and
 - (iv) final reporting – to finalize the enhancement proposals and prepare a final report;
- (e) to allow for early public participation and facilitate building public consensus on the study proposals, a 3-stage public engagement programme would be carried out as part of the Study; and
- (f) the Study would commence in late 2008 for completion in 20 months by mid-2010.

[Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan and Professor David Dudgeon arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Discussion Session

- 7. The comments/questions raised by Members were summarized as follows:
 - (a) the objective of the Study to enhance the waterfront of the Hong Kong Island East for public enjoyment was welcome and supported. The waterfront should not be planned on its own but should link up with the new waterfront in Causeway Bay and Wan Chai;

- (b) the provision of a continuous boardwalk under the Island East Corridor (IEC) should be explored in the Study. Measures to overcome the technical constraints imposed by the slip roads of IEC (such as at Tong Shui Road) and pumping stations along the waterfront should be considered;
- (c) the Study should take into account the building height control of developments along the waterfront;
- (d) there should be good public accessibility to the waterfront particularly for the elderly and disabled. The provision of travellator at appropriate locations should be examined to enhance accessibility;
- (e) noting that some enhancement proposals for the waterfront in the Eastern District had been proposed in previous occasions, a Member suggested that some projects such as the waterfront promenade could be identified for early implementation in the Study;
- (f) regarding the study programme of 20 months commencing in late 2008, a Member asked if it could be speeded up. Another Member was concerned if the study programme of 20 months would be too tight to allow for public consultation. Focus groups and engagement workshops should also be included in public consultation;
- (g) the consensus view of the public collected in the public participation process of the Study should be highlighted in the study report in order to clearly indicate public support for certain proposals.

[Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau and Professor Bernard V.W. F. Lim arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

8. In response, Mr. Raymond Lee made the following main points:

- (a) one of the Harbour Planning Principles was to enhance the accessibility along the Harbour. The waterfront in the study area would be integrated with the proposed waterfront open space in Causeway Bay and Wan Chai. The study findings of the Planning and Urban Design Review for Wan Chai Development Phase II Planning and Engineering Review on the planning of the new waterfront would be integrated into the Study;
- (b) the technical feasibility of a boardwalk under the IEC and the implications on reclamation would be examined in the Study;
- (c) building height control at the waterfront was considered under the review of the respective Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The building height restriction stipulated in the OZP would be included as input to the Study;
- (d) the enhancement of pedestrian accessibility to the waterfront from the hinterland was an objective of the Study. Various types of facilities to facilitate access to the waterfront would be considered;
- (e) quick-win projects would be identified in the Study for early implementation; and
- (f) the Study was scheduled to commence in late 2008 as it needed time for preparation of the study brief and selection of consultant. There was little room to compress the study programme of 20 months as the 3 stages of public consultation had already taken up 5 months. However, consideration could be given to start the preparatory work earlier.

9. In conclusion, the Chairman said that the views expressed by Members should be duly taken into account in the Study.

10. The Chairman thanked the representatives of PlanD for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen and Ms. Starry W.K. Lee arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Review of Application No. A/TWW/89

Proposed House Development at Plot Ratio of 1.2, Lots 414RP and 415 in DD 399, Ting Kau, Tsuen Wan

(TPB Paper No. 8117)

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese.]

Declaration of Interest

11. The following Members expressed an interest on the item:

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Mr. David W.M. Chan | - being the District Councillor for the subject area; |
| Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang | - owning a property near Wai Tsuen Road; |
| Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim | - had worked on a project with a representative of the applicant; |
| Dr. Daniel B.M. To | - had worked on a project with a representative of the applicant; |
| Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong | - acquainted with a representative of the applicant; and |
| Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen | - served with a representative of the applicant in the Hong Kong Institute of Landscaped Architects. |

12. Members considered that their interests were indirect and remote and agreed that they could stay in the meeting and join the discussion.

Presentation and Question Session

13. Ms. Heidi Chan, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon of the Planning Department (PlanD) and the following applicant's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr. Kenneth To
Mr. Daniel Kwan
Mr. Patrick Lau
Ms. Kwan Sau-king
Mr. Wilson Wong
Mr. Wilkie Lam
Ms. Annie Wong
Mr. Remus Woo
Mr. Eric Chih
Ms. Irene Chiu
Ms. Kitty Wong

14. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained briefly the procedures of the review hearing. The Chairman then invited Ms. Heidi Chan to brief Members on the background to the application.

15. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms. Heidi Chan did so as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant sought planning permission for house development at a plot ratio of 1.2 in an area zoned "Residential (Group C)2" ("R(C)2");
- (b) the reasons for the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) to reject the application on 22.2.2008 were set out in paragraph 1.2 of the Paper;
- (c) no supplementary information was submitted by the applicant to support the review application;
- (d) departmental comments – Government departments had no objection to

the application;

- (e) public comments – at the s.16 application stage, there was 1 public comment expressing concerns on drainage and sewerage arrangements and possible environmental impact and nuisance from the development. No public comment was received for the review application; and
- (f) PlanD's view – PlanD did not support the application for reasons stated in paragraph 8.1 of the Paper. The layout of the proposed development was unsatisfactory and the proposed landscaped areas were too narrow for proper landscape planting.

16. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Kenneth To made the following main points:

- (a) there were no adverse comments from all Government departments on the application;
- (b) the detailed landscape proposal submitted to the meeting proved that quality greening could be achieved with the current layout of the proposed development;
- (c) the site was covered by Government Notification 364 which allowed for a residential development of 2 storeys and 25 feet in height, a site coverage of 66.6% and a plot ratio of about 1.33 at the site;
- (d) according to the Notes of the Tsuen Wan West OZP, although developments within the "R(C)2" zone were restricted to a maximum plot ratio of 0.4 and a maximum building height of 3 storeys including car park, the restriction could be relaxed to a maximum plot ratio of 1.2 and maximum building height of 3 storeys above 1 level of car park if the noise impact from Castle Peak Road on the proposed development could be satisfactorily mitigated. Such provision allowed the

landowner to develop the site under the entitlement of the lease. The Explanatory Statement of the OZP set out the requirement that in addition to the need to address the traffic noise impact, the design of residential building within the “R(C)2” zone should blend in well with the surroundings, in particular with due regard to tree preservation and fresh air ventilation in the development proposal;

- (e) the site was subject to severe development constraints as a result of the Castle Peak Road improvement works. Part of the site was resumed in 2001 for the road improvement works. As a result of the road works, the site was also split into two levels when it was temporarily occupied by Government. The original platform at 43.5mPD which occupied 75% of the site area was significantly reduced to 35% and a new platform at 34.5mPD was formed; and
- (f) when the site was handed back to the applicant in 2004, it was cleared of vegetation. The concrete retaining wall along the southern side of the site and the bare residual area between the site and the retaining wall were owned by the Government. The applicant was prepared to landscape the residual area subject to Government’s consent. Their landscape proposal would effectively allow the development to blend in with the surroundings.

17. Mr. Patrick Lau carried on to illustrate the landscape proposal which was tabled at the meeting and made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed development provided the opportunity to rehabilitate the spoilt landscape caused by the road widening works of Castle Peak Road;
- (b) the greening ratio of the proposed development was over 45%, which was high by international standard;
- (c) though the site comprised two split platforms, the landscape proposal

could overcome the constraints and provide greening from the back of the site down to Castle Peak Road through the development site;

- (d) there would be 3 stepped levels of greening. Vertical greening was proposed at the back of the site and roof-top greening was proposed at the upper and lower platforms; and
- (e) at the back slope of the site, some plant species which could grow in shady conditions would be introduced. On the roof-tops, small to medium size plant species were proposed. The tree pits were at least 1.2m in depth to allow for proper growth of trees. There were also new greening measures introduced at the roof-tops such as grass paving on plastic ring and timber trellis. Tall tree species were proposed on the ground floors of the two platforms to maximize the greening effect.

18. Mr. Patrick Lau then showed a computer simulation on the greening effect of the landscape proposal.

19. With the aid of some plans and documents tabled at the meeting, Mr. Daniel Kwan elaborated the site history further and made the following additional points:

- (a) the site was reduced by 1,751 ft² from its original area of 30,000 ft² to 28,249 ft² after land resumption for Castle Peak Road widening;
- (b) as the two platforms formed by the Government during the temporary occupation of the site were not large enough for construction of buildings, the applicant had to carry out extensive slope and site formation works to form two proper platforms for building development; and
- (c) all spaces that could be used for planting within the site had been covered in the landscape proposal. The landscape proposal would bring benefits to both the public and the residents in the development.

20. Mr. Kenneth To concluded the presentation and made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed development scheme was in compliance with the development restrictions under the OZP and there was no need for lease modification to implement the scheme;
- (b) the landscape proposal was carefully designed and was practical;
- (c) the applicant was willing to plant and maintain trees on the slope behind the site as well as the adjoining Government land between the site and the retaining wall of Castle Peak Road;
- (d) with the proposed landscape measures, the residential development would blend in well with its surroundings; and
- (e) the applicant welcomed the Board's imposition of planning approval condition on the submission of landscape master plan to ensure proper landscape treatment for the development.

21. The questions raised by Members were summarized as follows:

- (a) whether PlanD considered the landscape proposal tabled at the meeting acceptable and whether Government departments had agreed to grant the piece of adjoining Government land to the applicant for landscaping purpose;
- (b) whether PlanD could confirm that the proposed greening ratio was 45% and whether the roof-top areas had been included in the calculation of greening ratio;
- (c) how would the applicant ensure that the proposed greening at the roof-tops and around the houses would be maintained by the future owners to achieve the proposed greening effect, and whether those areas

would be put under communal ownership;

- (d) whether the landscape proposal was feasible noting in particular that some future residents might not prefer the planting of bamboos at the narrow gap behind the houses;
- (e) noting that there were much constraints on the landscaping works in the current scheme of 2 storeys in height, whether the applicant had considered a scheme of 3 storeys high which would allow more space for landscaping;
- (f) whether the applicant had considered to reduce the number of houses from 11 to say 5 to increase the spaces available for landscaping;
- (g) whether it was the usual practice for Government departments to return a bare site to the landowner after temporary occupation for public works purpose;
- (h) whether the satisfactory mitigation of traffic noise impact from Castle Peak Road was the only consideration in the relaxation of plot ratio to 1.2 for development in the “R(C)2” zone; and
- (i) the reason for PlanD’s objection to the s.17 review noting that PlanD and other Government departments had no objection to the s.16 application.

22. In response, Ms. Heidi Chan made the following main points:

- (a) as the revised landscape proposal was only tabled at the meeting, she was not able to comment on the acceptability and feasibility of the proposal without the input from concerned Government departments. She had to consult the Lands Department to see if the piece of adjoining Government land south of the site could be granted to the applicant for landscaping;

- (b) PlanD would require detailed information from the applicant in order to ascertain whether the claimed greening ratio of 45% was correct. It was noted that the roof-top areas were included in the calculation of greening ratio;
- (c) on the management of sites temporarily occupied by Government for public works, the responsible department would normally consult other concerned departments and the land owner on the requirements;
- (d) under the Notes of the “R(C)2” zone, development with a maximum plot ratio of 1.2 and a maximum building height of 3 storeys above one level of car park might be permitted provided that the noise impact from Castle Peak Road could be satisfactorily mitigated. It was further set out in the Explanatory Statement that the design of residential building within “R(C)2” zone should also blend in well with the surroundings particularly on the aspects of tree preservation and air ventilation in the development; and
- (e) PlanD had no objection at the s.16 application stage as there was improvement in the design of the scheme as compared with the latest rejected and approved schemes. However, the MPC had raised concerns on the layout and the landscape proposal of the proposed development. As the applicant had not submitted any written representation in the review to address the concerns of MPC, PlanD did not support the review application.

23. Messrs. Kenneth To, Patrick Lau, Daniel Kwan and Eric Chih made the following main points in response to Members’ questions:

- (a) the calculation of greening ratio of the development only took the area within the private lot into account. The adjoining Government land south of the site was not included in the calculation. If the Government land would not be granted to the applicant for greening, Government should

landscape it properly. The roof-top areas with a soil depth of 1.2m were included in the calculation of greening ratio;

- (b) there was no set standard on the greening ratio. The proposed ratio of 45% was already a high standard internationally. In some residential neighbourhoods in the Mainland cities, the greening ratio was 30%;
- (c) the landscape proposal would be implemented before occupation of the development. The relevant requirements would be included in the Deed of Mutual Covenant (DMC) to ensure proper management and maintenance of the greening works. If the subject Government land were granted to the applicant for greening, its management and maintenance would also be included in the DMC;
- (d) the landscape proposal was implementable. Details on plant species, drainage arrangement and soil depth had already been provided to demonstrate the feasibility;
- (e) it was unfair to suspect that the proposed greening works on the podium and private gardens in the scheme would be removed by the future residents. On the other hand, such a concern was not unique to this application;
- (f) the site was intended for detached house development. The layout had balanced the lease restrictions, statutory requirements under the Buildings Ordinance, the requirements under the OZP and maximization of the development potential of the site. The separation distance of 1.5m between the retaining walls and the back of the houses satisfied the requirement under the Buildings Ordinance. Moreover, a separation distance of 2.4m between houses was designed to allow better air ventilation;
- (g) the current scheme should be considered on its own merits. It was unreasonable to compare it with another scheme of 3 storeys with a site

coverage of 40% with different landscape treatment;

- (h) the house size in the scheme was about 2000 to 3000 ft² which met the market demand. If the number of house was reduced to 5, the average house size would be over 6,000 ft² which would not be marketable; and
- (i) as the lease restricted the development to 2 storeys, a development of 3 storeys would require lease modification with premium implications.

24. As the applicant's representatives had no further points to make and Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairman informed them that the hearing procedures for the review had been completed and the Board would further deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the applicant's and PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

25. The Chairman invited Members' comments on the acceptability of the landscape proposal tabled at the meeting. He opined that if the landscape proposal was considered acceptable, Members' concern on the implementation of the landscape proposal and future maintenance of the green areas could be addressed through the imposition of approval conditions.

26. Members had diverse views on the application. The views of Members expressed were summarized below:

- (a) some Members considered that the feasibility of the landscape proposal was doubtful. As PlanD could not confirm its feasibility and acceptability in the meeting, it would be difficult for Members to make a decision. Comments from concerned Government departments particularly with regard to the claimed greening ratio of 45%, feasibility

of the various landscape measures as well as the proposed granting of the piece of Government land to the applicant for greening and future maintenance would need to be sought;

- (b) some Members expressed doubts on whether the proposed greening ratio of 45% would be achievable as the site coverage of the development, which excluded the emergency vehicular access and the two back lanes at the upper and lower platforms, had already reached 60% and hence there was not much area left for proper planting;
- (c) a Member considered that much of the greening areas were proposed at private gardens on the roof-tops. There was doubt on whether these areas were common areas that could be kept for landscaping purpose in the long term; and
- (d) a Member commented that according to international standards, at-grade planting should be the major component in the calculation of greening ratio. The distribution of at-grade, podium and roof-top greening was not provided in the submission.
- (e) some Members considered that as more information on the landscape proposal was submitted to the Board to address MPC's concerns, there was an improvement in the landscape proposal for the development and most greening measures were implementable;
- (f) some Members expressed that the concerns on satisfactory implementation of the landscape proposal and future maintenance of the green areas could be addressed through the imposition of approval conditions;
- (g) a Member considered that it was unfair to assume that the greening works would not be maintained by future house owners as there was no way to ensure the same problem would not arise in other approved projects;

- (h) some Members considered that the future maintenance of the greening areas could be achieved through the DMC. As the roof-top of the lower platform was proposed for car parking purpose, it would remain as an communal area. For the private gardens on the roof-top of the upper platform, they could also be included in the DMC to ensure compliance with the maintenance requirement;
- (i) a Member considered that the granting of the piece of Government land to the applicant as proposed for greening could be supported as it was a planning gain to the public and was beneficial to the future residents; and
- (j) a Member considered that the application had complied with all the development restrictions under the lease and the OZP. Given the development constraints on the site, the layout of the development, although not ideal, was acceptable.

27. The Secretary said that in consideration of the s.16 planning application, MPC had raised concerns on the layout and the landscape proposal. The key considerations of the Board were whether the building layout needed to be further improved and whether the landscape proposal tabled by the applicant at this meeting was acceptable. She added that there was no requirement for a greening ratio in landscape master plan, the acceptability of which should be assessed based on the greening measures proposed rather than a greening ratio. If Members considered the building layout and the landscape proposal acceptable, the application could be approved with relevant conditions to ensure compliance. If Members considered that comments from Government departments on the landscaping proposal tabled were required for consideration, a decision on the application should be deferred.

28. After discussion, some Members considered that the feasibility of the landscape proposal tabled at the meeting could not be ascertained and it would be prudent for the Board to defer the decision on the application to allow PlanD to seek the advice of concerned Government departments on the applicant's landscape proposal tabled at the meeting.

29. After further deliberation, the Board decided to defer a decision on the application pending the advice of concerned departments on the landscape proposal.

30. The meeting was adjourned for 5 minutes at 11:35 am for a short break.

[Professor David Dudgeon and Miss Annie Tam left the meeting while Mrs. Ava Ng, Mr. Walter K.L. Chan, Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim and Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Submission of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Anchor Street/Fuk Tsun Street Development Scheme Plan

(TPB Paper No. 8116)

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

Declaration of Interest

31. The Secretary said that as the draft Development Scheme Plan (DSP) were submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA), the following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mrs. Ava Ng as the Director of Planning - being a non-executive director of URA

Miss Annie Tam as the Director of Lands - being a non-executive director of URA

Ms. Margaret Hsia as the Assistant Director (2) of Home Affairs Department - being a co-opt member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of URA

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan - being a non-executive director of URA

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee - being a non-executive director of URA

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim - having current business dealings with URA

Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong - having current business dealings with URA

32. The Secretary reported that Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee and Ms. Margaret Hsia had tendered apologies for not attending the meeting. Members noted that Mrs. Ava Ng, Mr. Walter K.L. Chan, Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim and Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong had already left the meeting temporarily while Miss Annie Tam had left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Session

33. Ms. Heidi Chan, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon and Mr. C. K. Soh, Senior Town Planner/Yau Tsim Mong of the Planning Department (PlanD) and the following URA's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr. Hiroshi Ikegaya

Mr. Kenneth J. Li

Mr. Walter Kwong

34. The Chairman extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the meeting. He then invited Ms. Heidi Chan to brief Members on the background of the DSP.

35. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms. Heidi Chan did so as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points:

(a) background – on 26.3.2008, the URA submitted the Anchor Street/Fuk

Tsun Street DSP under section 25(5) of the URA Ordinance to the Board for consideration. The site was currently zoned “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) on the approved Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K3/24;

- (b) the scheme – the site was proposed to be rezoned to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Hotel” (“OU(Hotel)”) with a plot ratio restriction of 9 and maximum building height of 105mPD. According to the preliminary design submitted by URA, the proposed hotel was 26-storey high with a total gross floor area of 6,534m² (excluding back-of-house facilities) providing 184 guestrooms. The podium along Anchor Street would be set back from the scheme boundary to maintain a wider pavement for pedestrian circulation and possible landscaping. A corner splay at the tip of the site fronting Tong Mi Road and widening of the pavement of Fuk Tsun Street abutting the site were also proposed to enhance the walking environment;
- (c) Social Impact Assessment (SIA) – the SIA which contained the household information and the key findings of the survey were summarized in paragraph 5 of the Paper;
- (d) departmental comments – concerned departments had no objection to the DSP;
- (e) local views – District Officer/Yau Tsim Mong had consulted 32 local personalities. Of the 8 personalities who provided response, 4 agreed to the DSP; 3 objected and 1 had no comments. The 4 persons who agreed to the DSP considered that it would result in environmental improvement and creation of job opportunities. The grounds of objection were mainly preference to rehabilitation to preserve the character of the community, unreasonable compensation method and difficulty to find similar premises to continue with the existing business;
- (f) public comments – 8 public comments were received. 4 of them raised

objection while the other 4 expressed concerns/opinions on the DSP. The major objection reasons/concerns were related to poor air quality, suitability of the site for hotel development, already adequate supply of hotel in the vicinity, undesirable redevelopment of the buildings in good structural conditions, difficulty to find similarly convenient residence upon clearance, unreasonable compensation offered by URA and the need for the SIA to include the comments of residents in the area and the surrounding areas; and

- (g) PlanD's view – PlanD had no objection to the draft DSP for the reasons as set out in paragraph 12.1 of the Paper. The proposed hotel development was not incompatible with the surrounding developments. Rezoning the site from “R(A)” to “OU(Hotel)” with the same plot ratio restriction of 9 would not increase the development intensity. The proposed development would not create adverse traffic, environmental and drainage impacts. The proposed building height of 105mPD would not result in significant visual impact in the area. Implementation of the DSP would facilitate early redevelopment of the scheme area which would bring about environmental improvement in the area.

36. The Chairman then invited URA's representatives to elaborate on the DSP.

37. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Hiroshi Ikegaya made the following main points:

- (a) the site was occupied by six 6-storey high buildings with a building age of about 50 years. There were about 128 households, 257 residents and 17 shops;
- (b) there was a lack of proper fire safety installation and means of escape in the buildings. The living conditions were poor. 1 unit was used as cage homes providing 9 bedspaces and 8 units were used as cubicle apartments sub-divided into 2 to 14 rooms. There was a high degree of sharing in the domestic units;

- (c) the site was close to the West Kowloon Corridor and subject to severe traffic noise and air pollution. It was not suitable for residential redevelopment;
- (d) the proposed hotel development would meet the market demand. It was compatible with the surroundings and allowed for creation of unique architectural form to serve as a local landmark;
- (e) the proposed development intensity was lower than that in commercial zone and the building height would not obstruct public view to the Kowloon ridgeline; and
- (f) the project would bring about considerable planning benefits in terms of renewal of the old area, improvement of the living conditions of residents including about 60 households in caged homes or cubicle apartments, creation of jobs, boosting of the local economy and enhancement of the pedestrian environment.

38. A Member enquired about the height of buildings in the surrounding areas and how the living conditions of the 60 households in cage homes or cubicle apartments would be improved as a result of the redevelopment for hotel use.

39. In response, with the aid of Powerpoint, Ms. Heidi Chan showed a plan on the building age and storey height of buildings in the surrounding areas. She said that most of the buildings in the surrounding areas were 40 to 60 years old and were about 13 to 20 storeys high.

40. Mr. Kenneth J. Li replied that URA would provide assistance to the 60 households in cage homes or cubicle apartments to apply for public housing if they were so qualified. Besides, URA would make offers to the owners to acquire the affected premises based on existing policies.

41. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairman thanked PlanD's

and URA's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

42. The deliberation session was reported under confidential cover.

[Mrs. Ava Ng, Mr. Walter K.L. Chan, Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim and Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong returned to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

43. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:05 p.m.