

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 665th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 5.2.2021

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Chairman

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Vice-chairman

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Mr C.H. Tse

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),
Transport Department

Mr Patrick K.H. Ho

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Gavin C.T. Tse

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department

Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department

Mr Albert K.L. Cheung

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr Gary T.L. Lam

Opening Remarks

1. The Chairman said that the meeting would be conducted with video conferencing arrangement.

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 664th MPC Meeting held on 22.1.2021

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 664th MPC meeting held on 22.1.2021 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/K10/4 Application for Amendment to the Draft Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K10/25, To amend the building height restriction on a “Government, Institution or Community” site from 3 storeys to 45 metres above Principal Datum, 40 Lung Kong Road, Kowloon City, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. Y/K10/4)

4. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Ma Tau Kok. Mr C.H. Tse had declared an interest on the item as his close relative owned a flat in Ma Tau Kok. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the property owned by Mr C.H. Tse’s close relative had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

5. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 20.1.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments, including those from the Transport Department and Environmental Protection Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

6. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/33

(MPC Paper No. 1/21)

7. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments involved various sites in Tsuen Wan, including two private housing sites which were supported by an Engineering Feasibility Study (EFS) conducted by the Highways Department (HyD) with Aurecon Hong Kong Limited (AURECON) as one of the consultants of the study; two public housing sites to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) which were supported by EFSs conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) with Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited (B&V) and WSP (Asia) Limited (WSP) as the consultants of the two studies respectively; and a private housing site to take forward the decision of the Committee on a s.12A application No. Y/TW/13 which was submitted by ENM Holdings Limited (ENM), and Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA), Wong & Ouyang (HK) Limited (WOL) and Mott MacDonald HK Limited (MMHK) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|---|---|
| Mr Gavin C.T. Tse
(as Chief Engineer
(Works), Home Affairs
Department) | - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of the HKHA; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - his former firm had business dealings with HKHA, AURECON, B&V, WSP, ENM, WOL and MMHK; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - having current business dealings with HKHA and MMHK; |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - his spouse being an employee of the Housing Department (HD) (the executive arm of HKHA), but not involved in planning work; |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - being a member of Building Committee of |

HKHA and having current business dealings with WOL;

- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA and was involved in housing development issues in discussion with HD (the executive arm of HKHA);
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and
- Professor John C.Y. Ng - his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.

8. The Committee noted that according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the proposed amendments, including those for public housing developments, were the subject of amendments to the outline zoning plan (OZP) proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of Members in relation to HKHA mentioned above on the item only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting. As Messrs Alex T.H. Lai, Thomas O.S. Ho, Franklin Yu and Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in relation to the amendment items, and the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi's spouse and Professor John C.Y. Ng's spouse had no direct view of the amendment items, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

9. The following government representatives and the consultants were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

- Ms Katy C.W. Fung - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK)
- Mr Ng Kar Shu - Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK)
- Ms Cheryl H.L. Yeung - Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon
- Ms Rosa P.L. Tse - Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon

CEDD

- Mr C.F. Leung - Chief Engineer/Special Duties Works (CE/SDW)
- Mr K.W. Lee - Senior Engineer 5/Special Duties Works (SE5/SD(W))
- Ms Helen S.M. Szeto - Senior Engineer 4/Special Duties Works (SE4/SD(W))
- Mr Jackson K.P. Cheng - Engineer 6/Special Duties Works
- Mr P.S. Li - Project Coordinator/2(W)

HD

- Mr L.C. Chan - Senior Planning Officer/8
- Mr Billy K. Au Yeung - Planning Officer/15
- Ms Sumi S.Y. Lai - Planning Officer/31

HyD

- Mr T.W. Pang - Senior District Engineer/General (4) (SDE/G(4))
- Mr J.L. Huang - District Engineer/General (4)A

Transport Department (TD)

- Mr Daniel K.H. Chow - Senior Engineer/Tsuen Wan
- Mr Michael K.H. Cheung - Engineer/Tsuen Wan 2

Water Supplies Department (WSD)

- Ms Molly Kwan - Senior Engineer/Cost Estimate

The Consultants

- Mr C.H. Sze - Mannings (Asia) Consultants Limited
- Mr W.M. Li - AURECON
- Ms H.T. Ling - AURECON
- Mr Dennis M.H. Ngai - IRESC Hong Kong Limited
- Mr Edwin Lo - B&V

Mr Calvin C.W. Li - WSP

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Kar Shu, STP/TWK, PlanD presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

Background

- (a) to meet the pressing need for housing land supply, four potential housing sites were proposed, including two “Green Belt” (“GB”) sites in Yau Kom Tau (YKT) on the fringe of western Tsuen Wan New Town (Items A and B) for private residential developments, as well as a site near Cheung Shan Estate (Item C) and a vacant school site to the south of Kwok Shui Road (Item D) for public housing developments by the HKHA;
- (b) to take forward a section 12A application (No. Y/TW/13) partially agreed by the Committee on 1.9.2020, a site on Hilltop Road (Item E) was proposed to be rezoned for private residential development;
- (c) to re-designate six “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) sites (Item F) to reflect the completed developments;

Proposed Amendments to Matters shown on the OZP

- (d) Item A: rezoning of a site (about 4.92 ha) to the north of Tuen Mun Road near YKT Village from “GB” to “Residential (Group B)6” (“R(B)6”) for private housing development with a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 97,200m² and a maximum building height (BH) of 180mPD;
- (e) Item B: rezoning of a site (about 0.84 ha) to the south of Tuen Mun Road at Po Fung Terrace from “GB” to “R(B)7” for private housing development with a maximum GFA of 29,200m² and a maximum BH of 140mPD;

- (f) Item C: mainly rezoning of a site (about 6.42 ha) near Cheung Shan Estate from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”), “Open Space” (“O”) and “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) to “R(A)20” for public housing development with a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 5.15 and a maximum BH of 230mPD;
- (g) Item D: rezoning of the former Kwai Chung Public School site and its adjoining government land (about 1.41 ha) from “G/IC” to “R(A)21” for public housing development with a maximum PR of 6.7 and a maximum BH of 145mPD;
- (h) Item E: rezoning of a site (about 4 ha) currently occupied by the Hilltop Country Club on Hilltop Road from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sports and Recreation Club” to “R(B)8” for private residential development with a maximum GFA of 49,300m² and a maximum BH of 194mPD, 200mPD and 205mPD on three platforms respectively, and designation of a non-building area;
- (i) Items F1 to F9: re-designation of six “CDA” sites to suitable land use zonings to reflect their as-built conditions;
- (j) incorporation of the railway scheme of the Hong Kong Section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link (XRL) authorised by the Chief Executive in Council into the OZP for information;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP

- (k) corresponding revisions to the Notes and ES had been proposed to take into account the proposed amendments and to accord with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans promulgated by the Board;

Technical Assessments

- (l) EFSs and technical assessments on traffic, environmental, visual, air

ventilation, landscape, tree preservation and other aspects had been conducted for the four proposed housing sites (Items A to D) by the concerned government departments, which confirmed that the proposed housing developments would have no insurmountable technical problem with implementation of the appropriate mitigation measures;

GIC Facilities and Open Space

- (m) the existing and planned provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities and open space were generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population in accordance with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG);
- (n) according to the HKPSG, there would be shortfalls in the provision of secondary school classrooms, hospital beds, community care services facilities and child care centres. Shortfalls in secondary school classrooms and hospital beds could be addressed by provision in the adjoining areas. Relevant GIC facilities had been incorporated into the proposed public and private housing developments. The actual provision of social welfare facilities would be subject to the consideration of the Social Welfare Department (SWD) in the planning and development process, as appropriate;

Departmental Comments

- (o) relevant government bureaux and departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed OZP amendments;

Consultation

- (p) the Tsuen Wan District Council (TWDC) had been consulted on the proposed amendments on 9.10.2020. TWDC passed a motion unanimously objecting to the submission of the proposed amendments for

consideration by the Committee, and urged PlanD to fully address their concerns including tree conservation, traffic capacity and housing mix, and consult TWDC again before the Committee's consideration. TWDC also passed another motion unanimously objecting to Items A and B. Subsequently, the Development Bureau (DEVB) issued a letter to TWDC on 1.2.2021 in response to the two motions and provided responses to their concerns; and

- (q) the Tsuen Wan Rural Committee (TWRC) had been consulted on the proposed amendments on 4.11.2020. TWRC raised concerns mainly on the technical issues in relation to Items A, B, D and E, and suggested that provision of social welfare facilities in Item D including a permanent venue for TWRC be explored.

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung arrived to join the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

11. As the presentation by PlanD's representative had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

Items A and B (Proposed Private Housing Sites near YKT Village and at Po Fung Terrace)

12. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the basis for proposing the two "GB" sites for private housing developments;
- (b) delineation of the site boundary of Items A and B;
- (c) any restriction and flexibility on the number of flats in the future land sale for the two private housing sites;
- (d) any landscaping requirements for the two private housing sites;
- (e) the potential impacts of the proposed development under Item A on the

nearby Tai Lam Country Park and “GB” area;

- (f) the potential impacts of the proposed housing development on the adjacent catchwater to the north of Item A, and whether buffer area would be reserved for the catchwater;
- (g) traffic concerns raised by the TWDC members and the pedestrian accessibility and public transport arrangement of the sites, and the parties responsible for the proposed road improvement works;
- (h) whether the YKT Village was an indigenous village, and any Small House application was received in recent years;
- (i) whether the ancestral hall of YKT Village would be affected by the proposed development under Item A;
- (j) any specific requirements for the social welfare facilities proposed under Items A and B, and whether there were any precedents and potential issues regarding management of those facilities within private housing developments;
- (k) differences between the hostel for severely mentally handicapped persons and the supported hostel for mentally handicapped persons to be proposed under Items A and B respectively;
- (l) the latest position of the TWDC on Items A and B; and
- (m) whether noise barrier would be constructed by the Government to mitigate the noise impact on the proposed developments at source.

13. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/TWK, PlanD, Mr Ng Kar Shu, STP/TWK, PlanD, and Mr T.W. Pang, SDE/G(4), HyD made the following main points:

- (a) to meet and expedite housing land supply in the short and medium terms,

the Government had been carrying out various land use reviews on an on-going basis, including reviews on government land with different short-term uses, as well as the review on “GB” sites, with a view to identifying more suitable sites for residential development. The two “GB” sites were identified in the second stage of the review on “GB” sites based on its proximity to urban areas and existing infrastructures, and lower conservation value. Relevant technical assessments had been conducted for the two sites;

- (b) the site boundary of Item A generally followed the existing features and natural terrain, including the existing catchwater and servicing road to the north, private land and the YKT Village to the west, Tuen Mun Road and natural terrain to the south, and an obsolete footpath and natural terrain to the east; while the site boundary of Item B was delineated by Po Fung Road to the east, existing private development to the south and the natural terrain to the west and north;
- (c) the proposed flat number was only an estimation based on the indicative scheme. No flat number restriction would be imposed on the future land sale conditions for the two housing sites. Flexibility would be allowed for the developers to determine the flat number and size subject to the detailed design and land sale conditions;
- (d) both sites would be subject to relevant tree preservation and landscaping clauses stipulated in the land sale conditions;
- (e) the minimum distance between Item A and the Tai Lam Country Park was about 86m and the area between the site and Country Park would be retained as “GB” zone to serve as a buffer area. It was anticipated that there would be no adverse impact on the Country Park and the area zoned “GB” further north of the catchwater;
- (f) in general, natural stream with high conservation value would be preserved as far as practicable if it was located within a development site, and the

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) would be consulted on reserving buffer areas for the stream. For Item A, the adjacent catchwater was not a natural stream and did not have high conservation value. Both AFCD and WSD had been consulted and had no objection to the proposed development and its site boundary. The requirement of conducting a Water Supply Impact Assessment would be included in the land sale conditions of Item A to assess and mitigate the impact, if any, on the catchwater;

- (g) the two sites were connected to the existing Po Fung Road and additional connections to other roads were considered not feasible due to site and topographical constraints without affecting the adjacent YKT Village. To cater for the additional traffic flow induced by the two proposed developments, road improvement works were proposed to widen Po Fung Road from approximately 5m to 7.9m with additional 2m-wide footpath on both sides of the road in general. Detailed implementation of the road improvement works proposed would be further investigated. The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) conducted by HyD demonstrated that the traffic impact generated from both proposed developments was considered acceptable. Lay-bys for public transport were proposed at both sites and the future residents could reach the nearby residential developments (e.g. Belvedere Garden and Bayview Garden) for other public transport on foot via Po Fung Road;
- (h) the YKT Village was an indigenous village relocated from elsewhere, of which the boundary of “Village Expansion Area” was similar to the boundary of the current “Village Type Development” zone. No Small House application had been received in recent years;
- (i) the ancestral hall of YKT Village would not be affected by the construction work of the proposed development under Item A;
- (j) similar to some other social welfare facilities, the hostel for severely mentally handicapped persons cum day activity centre and the supported

hostel for mentally handicapped persons should not be located more than 24 metres above ground according to the requirements in the HKPSG. Both facilities had been included in the TIA for assessment purpose. Further requirements would be subject to advice from SWD, which would be incorporated into the land sale conditions, as appropriate. There were precedents in other districts, e.g. Kai Tak, where relevant requirements to provide social welfare facilities, including hostel for moderately mentally handicapped persons, in private housing development had been included in the land sale conditions. Details of the management arrangements, including those relating to the private residential portion and social welfare facilities within the proposed development, would be suitably incorporated into the land sale conditions according to the established practice of the Lands Department;

- (k) the hostel for severely mentally handicapped persons provided home living for persons with severe mental handicap who lacked basic self-care skill and required assistance in personal and nursing care, while the supported hostel for mentally handicapped persons provided group home living for persons who could live semi-independently with a fair amount of assistance in daily activities, and their residents could work or receive training at other locations during daytime;
- (l) the position of the TWDC on both Items A and B remained as summarised in paragraphs 15.2(a) to 15.2(d) and 15.3 of the Paper; and
- (m) there were existing noise barriers along the relevant section of Tuen Mun Road to mitigate the noise impact on the proposed developments.

Item C (Proposed Public Housing Site near Cheung Shan Estate)

14. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the Tsuen Wan No. 2 Fresh Water Service Reservoir (TW2-FWSR) had any heritage significance;

- (b) noting the ageing population, the number of existing schools nearby and a school in Cheung Shan Estate had ceased operation ten years ago due to low demand, the reason for proposing a primary school with 30 classrooms at the site, and the associated traffic impacts;
- (c) pedestrian accessibility to the surrounding areas and public transport arrangement of the proposed development; and
- (d) noting the constraints on building disposition due to the alignment of the XRL, any possibility to increase the BH of the proposed GIC blocks and provide more GIC facilities.

15. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/TWK, PlanD, Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SDW, CEDD, and Ms Helen S.M. Szeto, SE4/SD(W), CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) the TW2-FWSR was constructed in 1980s with concrete structures and thus it should not have major heritage significance;
- (b) the primary school was proposed as a result of liaison with the Education Bureau (EDB). EDB considered that a primary school should be provided within the site based on the increased population brought by the proposed public housing developments in both Items C and D. The traffic flow induced by the primary school was insignificant as compared to the proposed public housing development and no significant adverse traffic impact was anticipated according to the TIA conducted. PlanD would further liaise with EDB to update the supply and demand of primary schools in the area;
- (c) the proposed public housing development would be connected to the nearby existing developments via Cheung Shan Estate Road West and Lei Shu Road. Apart from the existing public transport facilities in the nearby Lei Muk Shue Estate and Cheung Shan Estate, a new public transport interchange would be introduced within the proposed development to cater

for the additional demand in future; and

- (d) the technical constraints imposed by the XRL alignment running beneath the site had been duly considered. CEDD had consulted the Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL) on relevant railway protection requirements which had been taken into account in proposing the site formation works for the future public housing development. The non-domestic block and primary school which had lower BH would be located within or adjacent to the railway protection zone. Further increase in BH of these building blocks might not be able to satisfy the railway protection requirements.

Item D (*Proposed Public Housing Site at the former Kwai Chung Public School Site*)

16. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) given that the Kwai Chung Public School had a long history serving the local area, whether there were measures to preserve its historical and cultural elements;
- (b) whether assessment on the historical and cultural values of the site had been conducted;
- (c) details of the site formation work to be implemented; and
- (d) how the potential air ventilation impact of the podium of the indicative scheme of Item D on the pedestrian environment could be mitigated.

17. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/TWK, PlanD, Mr Ng Kar Shu, STP/TWK, PlanD, Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SDW, CEDD, and Mr. K.W. Lee, SE5/SD(W), CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) the Kwai Chung Public School had been operating at the site since the 1960s and was expanded in the 1970s, but had ceased operation in 2009.

TWRC had been consulted on the proposed scheme. It was noted that TWRC members shared similar views on preserving certain elements of the public school with high cultural value, e.g. memorial photos, in the future development. Upon liaison with HD, it was agreed that those elements would be preserved and incorporated into the future development as far as practicable and TWRC would be further consulted in that regard. CEDD would pay extra care when dismantling the building structures;

- (b) site visits and survey for the public school had been conducted, and relevant survey materials had been passed to the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) for preliminary assessment in July 2019. AMO advised that the public school might not need to be preserved. Having said that, CEDD would conduct a detailed survey and recording on the abandoned building structures and elements before dismantling works;
- (c) site formation work would be carried out for the proposed public housing development and the future site level would align with the existing Kwok Shui Road at about +16mPD; and
- (d) an Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) (Expert Evaluation) had been conducted for the proposed development and demonstrated that it would not have significant adverse air ventilation impact on the pedestrian environment. Mitigation measures, including 15m-wide building gaps between building blocks and building setbacks from Castle Peak Road – Kwai Chung, were proposed to mitigate the air ventilation impacts. Also, quantitative AVA would be conducted by HD in the detailed design stage to further assess the impact of the proposed development. The building design of the proposed public housing development would also follow the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines.

Other General Issues

18. The Vice-chairman and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the traffic impact of the proposed public housing developments had been assessed;
- (b) whether environmentally friendly design would be incorporated in the landscape area of the proposed public housing developments;
- (c) how the locations of the proposed social welfare facilities were determined, and whether the technical assessments conducted had taken into account the impacts of the facilities; and
- (d) whether all social welfare facilities currently proposed would be implemented in the two public housing developments.

19. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/TWK, PlanD, and Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SDW, CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) the traffic impacts of the proposed public housing sites with the associated GIC facilities had been assessed. It was anticipated that the overall traffic impact would be acceptable and TD had no objection to the rezoning proposals;
- (b) environmentally friendly design measures would be incorporated into the detailed design of the proposed public housing developments as far as practicable;
- (c) in general, SWD would be consulted when there were potential sites to provide social welfare facilities. The types of social welfare facilities proposed under this OZP amendment exercise were recommended by SWD based on the demographic situation and demand in the area, and the impacts of social welfare facilities had been included in the technical assessments for assessing the technical feasibility; and
- (d) the social welfare facilities to be provided within the public housing developments would be reviewed and updated during the implementation

stage so as to meet the prevailing needs of the local community.

20. Some Members raised concerns on the potential ecological and environmental impacts of the proposed private housing developments under Items A and B, the potential noise impact from the Tuen Mun Road on the proposed developments and also their pedestrian accessibility. A Member provided some background information of the provision of public schools in the territory, their relationship with local communities and potential cultural values, and was concerned that AMO might not be able to fully assess the intangible heritage and cultural values as well as the social significance of the former Kwai Chung Public School under Item D as they would probably focus more on the built heritage feature of individual buildings/structures.

21. Apart from those amendment items mentioned above, Members had no comments or questions regarding the other proposed amendments to the OZP.

22. Noting that PlanD and the relevant government departments had put in much effort in putting forward proposed amendments to the OZP which were supported by various technical assessments, a few Members considered that relevant government departments should cultivate more effective communication with the locals and the general public on OZP amendments in the future. A Member also raised question on the details of the consultation process with TWDC. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/TWK, PlanD said that relevant information, including development parameters, proposed facilities and results of technical assessments, was already included in the relevant TWDC Paper and presented in the TWDC meeting on 9.10.2020. In response to the concerns raised by the TWDC members in the TWDC meeting, including concerns on adverse traffic impacts and tree removal, the government team had explained in detail the site constraints of the proposed developments and that relevant technical assessments conducted had assessed the potential impacts and recommended relevant mitigation measures. Whilst the technical assessment reports were at the finalisation stage, the assessment results presented in the TWDC meeting were still valid. Noting TWDC's concerns, DEVB issued a letter to TWDC on 1.2.2021, which had also included a link for the TWDC members to download the Paper submitted to the Committee, including the technical assessment reports attached to the Paper.

23. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Chairman explained that if the proposed

amendments to the approved OZP were agreed by the Committee, the draft OZP and its Notes together with the revised ES would be exhibited under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) for public inspection and members of the public could submit representations. Members also noted that the schemes for the proposed housing developments as shown in the Paper were indicative only and would be subject to further assessment and detailed design, and all relevant information, including the technical assessment reports attached to the Paper, was already made available for public information. A Member remarked that the public should be made aware of the above information during the public consultation process.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung joined and Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

24. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/33 and that the draft Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/33A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/TW/34 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/33A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.

25. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revisions would be submitted for the Board's consideration.

[The Chairman thanked the government representatives and the consultants for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Ng Kar Shu, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TW/511 Proposed Wholesale Conversion of an Existing Industrial Building for Eating Place, Shop and Services, Office, Art Studio (excluding those involving direct provision of services or goods), Information Technology and Telecommunications Industries and Research, Design & Development Centre in “Industrial” Zone, Nos. 12-16 Fui Yiu Kok Street, Tsuen Wan, New Territories

(MPC Paper No. A/TW/511E)

26. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|
| Mr Stanley T.S. Choi | - | his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and |
| Professor John C.Y. Ng | - | his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan. |

27. As the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi’s spouse and Professor John C.Y. Ng’s spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

28. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Kar Shu, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) the proposed wholesale conversion of an existing building for eating place, shop and services, office, art studio (excluding those involving direct provision of services or goods), information technology and telecommunications industries and research, design and development centre;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 13 public comments, including two supporting comments from individuals, eight objecting comments from individuals and three containing both supporting and opposing comments from a resident and representatives of the Incorporated Owners of Chelsea Court, were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. While the commercial and office nature of the proposed wholesale conversion was not in line with the planning intention of the “Industrial” (“I”) zone, three out of six proposed uses, including ‘Art Studio’, ‘Information Technology and Telecommunications Industries’ and ‘Research, Design and Development Centre’, were always permitted while the remaining three uses, i.e. ‘Eating Place’, ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Office’, might be permitted on application to the Town Planning Board. The proposed uses were considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The application generally complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 25D. The proposed scheme with an increase in building height to not more than 50.52mPD did not exceed the relevant restriction for the “I” zone under the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The proposal with 10% of the converted floor space designated for specified uses prescribed by the Government was in line with the new policy initiatives of revitalisation of industrial buildings (IBs) and the Secretary for Development indicated policy support to the application. Although there would be under-provision of parking facilities, the Commissioner for

Transport had no objection to the application in view of the site constraints. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

29. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the percentage of applied uses which required planning permission;
 - (b) whether 5/F to 10/F could be used for 'Office' exclusively;
 - (c) any requirement for compliance with sustainable building design;
 - (d) any plan to extend the existing pedestrian access network to this industrial area;
 - (e) the nature of the current application and information on similar applications;
 - (f) the measures under the two rounds of revitalisation of IBs; and
 - (g) limitations on wholesale conversion of IBs for commercial use in the "I" zone and the differences when compared with the commercial developments in the "Commercial" ("C") zone.
30. In response, Mr Ng Kar Shu, STP/TWK, made the following main points:
- (a) the uses which required planning permission accounted for about 40% of the total gross floor area (GFA) of the building after conversion. However, such percentage was only a rough estimation given that some floors i.e. 5/F to 12/F comprised both uses requiring and not requiring planning permission, and there was no breakdown on the uses;

- (b) 5/F to 10/F could be allocated for 'Office' use should the application be approved;
- (c) the applicant had not proposed additional greening area or vertical greening due to technical constraints, but the proposal would need to comply with the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) if GFA concessions were claimed for any green/amenity features and/or non-mandatory/non-essential plant rooms;
- (d) as the subject industrial area comprised mainly private lots, there was no plan for the Government to further extend the existing pedestrian access network to this area;
- (e) the current application involved wholesale conversion of an existing IB within the "I" zone, on which three out of six proposed uses required planning permission. Since the promulgation of the first round of revitalisation of IBs in 2010, there were a total of four similar applications for wholesale conversion of IBs within the "I" zone on the OZP and all of them were rejected. One of the applications was rejected as the IB was purposely built and should be utilised for the specific purpose, while the remaining three were rejected mainly on the ground that sufficient car parking and loading/unloading facilities could not be provided;
- (f) under the first round of revitalisation of IBs, the major measure was exempting wavier fees to incentivise private owners to convert IBs aged 15 years or above in "C", "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" ("OU(B)") and "I" zones. The second round of revitalisation of IBs was announced in 2018. An additional requirement of designating 10% of the converted floor space for specified uses prescribed by the Government was included for cases involving wholesale conversion of IBs. In addition, there was a new measure by relaxing the maximum permissible non-domestic plot ratio by up to 20% to incentivise private owners to redevelop IBs constructed before 1987 on sites located outside "Residential" zones in main urban areas and new towns; and

- (g) according to the Notes of the OZP of the “I” zone, only “Office (Audio-visual Recording Studio, Design and Media Production and Office Related to Industrial Use only)” was always permitted, and thus the office use under “I” was generally more restrictive. Three of the six proposed uses in the current application, including ‘Art Studio (excluding those involving direct provision of services or goods)’, ‘Information Technology and Telecommunications Industries’ and ‘Research, Design and Development Centre’ uses, which were related to clean industries, were always permitted. To avoid jeopardising the long-term planning intention of the site, should the Committee decide to approve the application, it was recommended that the approval would be for the lifetime of the building. Upon redevelopment, the site would need to conform to the zoning and development restrictions on the OZP in force at the time of redevelopment.

Deliberation Session

31. Members generally supported the proposed wholesale conversion as the existing IB could be revitalised with the new proposed uses and the building facilities could be upgraded and renovated. A few Members considered that the subject IB might have room to incorporate sustainable building design elements and enhance the overall built environment. Members noted that an advisory clause was recommended for the applicant to observe the sustainable building design requirements and pre-requisites under SBDG would be applicable if GFA concessions were claimed for any green/amenity features and/or non-mandatory/non-essential plant rooms. While noting that implementation of substantial sustainable building design elements at the existing IB might not be feasible due to technical constraints, e.g. loading requirement, Members agreed that an advisory clause should be added to encourage the applicant to explore the possibility to incorporate suitable sustainable building design elements in the development, as appropriate.

32. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 5.2.2025, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the

permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the submission and implementation of fire services installations and water supply for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works as identified in the updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development in condition (b) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

33. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper and the following additional advisory clause:

“to explore the possibility to incorporate suitable sustainable building design elements in the development, as appropriate.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr Ng Kar Shu, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/820

Further Consideration of Section 16 Application

Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Non-polluting Industrial Use (Excluding Industrial Undertakings Involving the Use/Storage of Dangerous Goods) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, Nos. 1016-1018 Tai Nan West Street, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/820A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

34. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application – during the consideration of the application on 18.9.2020, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application pending the applicant’s submission of further information and clarification on building design and landscaping treatment especially within the setback area at pedestrian level under the proposed scheme;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) restriction for permitted non-polluting industrial use (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of dangerous goods);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 5 of the Paper; and
- (d) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 6 of the Paper. The application was for minor relaxation of PR restriction from 12 to 14.3998 (i.e. +2.3998 or +20%) for the redevelopment of an existing industrial building (IB) at the application site into a 29-storey IB for permitted non-polluting industrial use with building height complying with

the Outline Zoning Plan restriction. To address the Committee's concerns, the applicant had submitted further information to refine the proposed scheme and provided clarifications, including provision of tree planting instead of planter boxes within the setback areas, planting trees within the lot boundary without encroaching onto the public footpath to facilitate pedestrian flows, taking up the future management of the tree planting within the setback areas which would be dedicated as 'Common Area', increasing the overall greenery from 20% to 22.827% and using recycled rainwater for irrigation. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of PlanD considered that the revised scheme would further enhance the pedestrian environment and visual amenity along the building frontages. The Commissioner for Transport considered the level of services of the public footpaths acceptable, taking into account the proposed tree planting in the setback areas. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

35. Some Members enquired on the details regarding the additional planning and design merits under the revised scheme. In response, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) although no information was provided by the applicant on the exact species of trees to be planted within the setback areas, in similar applications in the same district also submitted by the same applicant, the applicant had proposed to adopt slow-growing species which required no hard pruning to maintain the suitable height of the trees. Also, the applicant would consult a Registered Landscape Architect on tree species at the detailed design stage;
- (b) regarding the choice of location of vertical greening, the applicant might consider the corner of Tai Nan West Street and Wing Hong Street a prominent location and thus proposed to provide vertical greening at the corner splay; and
- (c) a 1.5m-wide continuous canopy along all three building edges was

proposed by the applicant which might be gross floor area (GFA) accountable. If some GFA arising from the canopy could not be exempted in the building plan submission stage, the applicant would absorb those GFA in the proposed development.

Deliberation Session

36. Members generally considered that the further information submitted by the applicant had demonstrated significant improvements and could address the Committee's previous concerns. A Member opined that it would be more beneficial if vertical greening could also be provided along the façade facing Tai Nam West Street.

37. Some Members considered that the revised scheme could serve as a good example for similar applications to follow suit and had some discussions on the successful implementation examples of vertical greening in Hong Kong. Members noted that approved applications under the second round of revitalisation of industrial buildings in the Cheung Sha Wan area were still in the building plan submission stage and thus no example of implemented vertical greening could be provided for Members' reference at the moment. Members agreed that an advisory clause should be added to remind the applicant to give due consideration to the long-term management and maintenance of the greening features in the detailed design.

38. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 5.2.2025, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the design and provision of parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces and vehicular access for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental

Protection or of the TPB; and

- (c) in relation to (b) above, the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

39. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix F-IX of the Paper and the following additional advisory clause:

“to give due consideration to the long-term management and maintenance of the greening features in the detailed design.”

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/828 Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (2)”
Zone, Portion of Workshop C2, G/F, Block C, Hong Kong Industrial
Centre, 489-491 Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K5/828A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

40. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the shop and services;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, no public comment was received;

and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (2)” zone and was considered compatible with the changing land use character of the area and other uses in the same industrial building (IB). The applied use in general complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D in that it would not induce adverse fire safety, traffic and infrastructural impacts on the uses within the subject building and the adjacent areas. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The aggregate commercial floor area approved by the Committee on the ground floor of the subject IB would be 460m² which was equal to the maximum permissible limit for an IB with sprinkler system. A total of 24 similar applications on the ground floor of the subject IB were approved since 2001 and approval of the application was consistent with the previous decisions of the Committee.

41. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

42. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the submission and implementation of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting, within six months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 5.8.2021; and
- (b) if the above planning condition (a) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the

same date be revoked without further notice.”

43. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K16/43 Eating Place, Office, Shop and Services, and Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone, 5/F and 6/F, 9 Po Lun Street, Lai Chi Kok, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K16/43)

44. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by LCK Real Estate Limited, which was a subsidiary of Transport International Holdings Limited partly owned by Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with SHK; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his former firm had business dealings with SHK; |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | his spouse being an employee of SHK; and |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law | - | being an ex-Executive Director and committee member of The Boys’ & Girls’ Clubs Association of Hong Kong which received sponsorship from SHK. |

45. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the interests of

Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Franklin Yu were direct, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. As the interest of Ms Lilian S.K. Law was indirect, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

46. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 27.1.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

47. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K3/591 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Non-Polluting Industrial Development (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of Dangerous Goods) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone, Nos. 71-75 Bedford Road, Tai Kok Tsui, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K3/591)

48. The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had declared an interest on the item for being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with

KTA. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

49. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 20.1.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

50. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H5/415	Proposed Office, Shop and Services and Eating Place in "Residential (Group A)" Zone, 72-76 Queen's Road East, Wan Chai, Hong Kong (MPC Paper No. A/H5/415)
----------	---

51. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 21.1.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

52. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K10/265 Proposed Comprehensive Residential and Commercial (Shop and Services) Development in "Comprehensive Development Area (3)" Zone, Kowloon Inland Lots 6342, 6344, 7427, 7629, 7630, 7631 and 7632, Mok Cheong Street and Sung Wong Toi Road, Ma Tau Kok, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K10/265B)

53. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Ma Tau Kok. Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) and Archiplus International Limited (AI) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his former firm had business dealings with AI; |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | - | being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong |

Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA; and

Mr C.H. Tse - his close relative owning a flat in Ma Tau Kok.

54. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, and the property owned by Mr C.H. Tse's close relative had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

55. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 20.1.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address further departmental comments. It was the third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information, including responses to departmental comments, supplementary information on Traffic Impact Assessment, revised Master Layout Plan and Landscape Master Plan, and revised technical assessments on sewerage and drainage, air ventilation, air quality and noise aspects.

56. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information. Since it was the third deferment and a total of six months had been allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K14/797 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restrictions for Proposed ‘Social Welfare Facilities’, ‘School (Kindergarten)’, ‘School (not elsewhere specified)’, ‘Shop and Services’, ‘Market’, ‘Eating Place’, ‘Institutional Use (not elsewhere specified)’ and ‘Place of Entertainment’, and Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Public Housing Developments in “Residential (Group B) 3” Zone, Government Land in Sites R2-5 and R2-8 of Anderson Road Quarry Development, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/797)

57. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| Mr Gavin C.T. Tse
<i>(as Chief Engineer
(Works), Home Affairs
Department)</i> | - | being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of the HKHA; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his former firm had business dealings with HKHA; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with HKHA; |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - | his spouse being an employee of the Housing Department (HD) (the executive arm of HKHA), but not involved in planning work; |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | being a member of the Building Committee of HKHA; and |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | - | being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which was involved in housing development issues in discussion with HD (the executive arm of HKHA). |

58. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Gavin C.T. Tse, Thomas O.S. Ho and Franklin Yu were direct, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. As the interest of Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon was indirect and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

59. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 28.1.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

60. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K14/798 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Proposed ‘Social Welfare Facility’, ‘School (not elsewhere specified)’, ‘Shop and Services’, ‘Market’ and ‘Eating Place’ Uses and Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Public Housing Development in “Residential (Group B) 2” Zone, Government Land in Site R2-4 of Anderson Road Quarry Development, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/798)

61. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS). Townland Consultants Limited (Townland), Wong Tung & Partners Limited (WTP), WSP (Asia) Limited (WSP), MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) and SYW & Associates Limited (SYW) were five of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| Mr Ivan M.K. Chung
(<i>Chairman</i>)
(<i>as Director of Planning</i>) | - | being an ex-officio member of the Supervisory Board of the HKHS; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his former firm had business dealings with HKHS, Townland, WTP, WSP, MVA and SYW; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with MVA;
and |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | - | being an ex-employee of the HKHS. |

62. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the interest of Mr Ivan M.K. Chung was direct, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. As Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

63. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 28.1.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

64. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K18/338 Proposed School (Primary) in "Residential (Group C) 1" Zone, 5
Lincoln Road, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/338)

65. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kowloon Tong. Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | - | being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA; and |
| Mr Stanley T.S. Choi | - | his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Kowloon Tong. |

66. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, and the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi's spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

67. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 25.1.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of responses to comments of the Transport Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

68. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 15

Any Other Business

69. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:20 p.m.