

**TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**Minutes of 667<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 12.3.2021**

**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

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

**Absent with Apologies**

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

**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 Ryan C.K. Ho

## **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 666<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 26.2.2021

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 666<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 26.2.2021 were confirmed without amendments.

## **Agenda Item 2**

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/TWW/5                      Application for Amendment to the Approved Tsuen Wan West Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TWW/19, To Rezone the Application Site from “Government, Institution or Community” to “Residential (Group A)5”, Lots 99, 100, 101 RP, 110 RP, 171C and 183 in D.D. 390 and Adjoining Government Land, Sham Tseng, Tsuen Wan West, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. Y/TWW/5A)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

PlanD

- Mr Derek P.K. Tse            -    District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK)
  
- Mr K.S. Ng                    -    Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK)

Applicant’s Representatives

*Sham Tseng Chan Kee Roasted*

*Goose Company Limited*

Mr W.M. Chan

*Toco Planning Consultants  
Limited*

Mr Ted Chan

Mr Daniel Wei

*Barrie Ho Architecture  
Interiors Limited*

Ms Maggie Mak

Mr Brio Lam

Mr Julian Ng

*CKM Asia Limited*

Mr K.M. Chin

*Ramboll (HK) Limited*

Mr C.M. Cheng

5. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. He then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the background of the application.

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

- (a) background of the application;
- (b) the proposed rezoning of the application site (the Site) from "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") to "Residential (Group A)5" ("R(A)5") on the approved Tsuen Wan West Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TWW/19 to facilitate a proposed residential development with retail and social welfare facilities (SWF);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;

- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 5,687 public comments, including 2,201 supporting comments, 3,264 objecting comments and 222 comments with reservation/providing views on the application, were received. The supporting comments were submitted by the former Chairmen, Vice-chairman and members of Tsuen Wan District Council (TWDC) and Tsuen Wan Rural Committee, current members of TWDC, Chairman of Ma Wan Rural Committee, Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen, members and/or representatives of Sham Tseng Villages, Sham Tseng Village Office, Sham Tseng Commercial New Village, Tsuen Wan West Area Committee, 深井潮州同鄉會, Sham Tseng Trade Association Limited, 香港工商總會荃灣分會, 荃灣各界協會, 荃灣區體育康樂聯會, 靈光小學校友會, Yuen Yuen Institute Neighbourhood Elderly Centre, residents of nearby residential developments and individuals; while the objecting comments and those with reservation/providing views were submitted by the current members of TWDC including Chairman of the TWDC District Planning, Development and Facilities Management Committee, Hong Kong Telecom, members of 靈光小學校董會, 青深房屋關注組, residents of nearby residential developments and individuals. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed residential development with retail and SWFs was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The proposed development intensity was also not incompatible with the surrounding residential developments. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape considered that the proposed development would unlikely induce adverse impacts on visual quality, landscape character and surrounding pedestrian wind environment. As the proposed development would not generate adverse traffic impact on the surrounding area, the Commissioner for Transport had no adverse comment on the application. The Site was originally reserved for the development of an ambulance depot but such facility was subsequently built in another “G/IC” site. Since then, the Site had not been designated for any specific government, institution and

community (GIC) use. Apart from the Social Welfare Department (SWD), other government bureaux and departments consulted had no plan to utilise the Site for GIC uses. The Site was mainly private land and relatively small in size. The premises-based SWFs proposed at the development were considered acceptable by SWD. Relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

7. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr W.M. Chan and Mr Ted Chan, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) the Site was located in Sham Tseng which was a well-established residential area with GIC uses and basic infrastructures. There were some high-rise residential developments including Rhine Garden, Bellagio and Lido Garden to its east and south, and some low-rise clusters such as Sham Tseng Village to its further north. Being located in the midst of the development, the Site was considered appropriate for a medium-rise residential development. The lawn on 3/F of the proposed development could also provide visual pleasure and greenery to the neighbours;
- (b) the rear part of the Site was a restaurant in 1990. For the front part of the Site, an application for a proposed temporary single-storey commercial development for a period of six years was approved by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) in 2005. Subsequently, renewal of the said planning approval had been approved by the Committee four times, each of three years, and the commercial development continued to operate till now;
- (c) the Site was originally zoned "G/IC" for an ambulance depot. However, such facility was subsequently developed at another site at the junction of Tuen Mun Road and Castle Peak Road – Sham Tseng in 1997. Since then,

the Site had not been designated for any GIC use;

- (d) the proposed development would bring about social benefits by providing the SWFs, while making efficient use of land resources to increase the housing supply and provide more retail facilities to the locals; and
- (e) the development scheme had been enhanced with the support of technical assessments, taking into account the departmental comments and local concerns. The proposed development would not generate adverse impact on the surroundings. Furthermore, strong local support to the application had been obtained.

8. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicant's representatives were completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

9. In response to a Member's enquiry on the subsequent procedure should the Committee agree to the application, the Chairman said that PlanD would proceed to the OZP amendment procedure. The proposed OZP amendment(s) would be submitted to the Committee for consideration, and if agreed, the amendments would be published for public inspection. The public could submit representations and comments to the Town Planning Board (the Board) in accordance with the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO). The representations and comments received would then be submitted to the Board for consideration. The Chairman remarked that the proposed scheme under application was only a notional scheme. Should the application be agreed by the Committee, appropriate development restrictions would be imposed on the proposed "R(A)5" zone for the Site and the project proponent should implement the scheme in accordance with the restriction on the Notes of the zone under the OZP.

10. The Chairman and some Members raised the following questions to PlanD's representatives:

*The Site*

- (a) the planning history of the subject "G/IC" zone;



- (b) the building height (BH) restriction of the subject “G/IC” zone;

*The Proposed Development*

- (c) noting that the width of the existing footpath in front of the Site was relatively narrow, whether the proposed site boundary could be rationalised with a view to improving the streetscape and pedestrian circulation along Castle Peak Road;
- (d) whether the proposed development would induce adverse visual impact on Emmanuel Primary School, which was located to the north of the Site;
- (e) whether there was any mechanism to ensure that the approved scheme would be implemented, say if the Site was sold to another owner;

*The Proposed Social Welfare Facilities*

- (f) the funding arrangement for the SWFs, and whether the gross floor area (GFA) for the SWFs would be included in the GFA calculation of the proposed development;
- (g) whether there was any restriction on height above the ground floor level imposed on residential care homes for the elderly (RCHE);

*Provision of GIC facilities in Sham Tseng and the Tsuen Wan District*

- (h) the population in Tsuen Wan West, and the existing and planned provision of GIC facilities as well as their general distribution in the area;
- (i) noting that some GIC facilities (including market, library and post office) were provided on a temporary basis in Sham Tseng, whether the Government had any plan to provide such facilities on a permanent basis in the long run;

- (j) even though there was no major shortfall in GIC facilities in the area, whether the Site could provide more community facilities to serve the wider district; and

*Others*

- (k) whether the operation and maintenance of the telephone exchange to the west of the Site would be affected by the proposed development during construction and after completion of the proposed development as raised in a public comment.

11. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, made the following main points:

*The Site*

- (a) the Site had been zoned “G/IC” for an ambulance depot since the first Tsuen Wan West OZP gazetted in 1989. On 22.9.1989, the Board decided not to uphold the objection against the “G/IC” zoning lodged by the previous land owner as the Site had been reserved for an ambulance depot, which was considered the only available site that could meet the development programme of the ambulance depot at that time. However, as the Sham Tseng Fire Station cum Ambulance Depot was subsequently built at another “G/IC” site in 1997, the Site had not been designated for any GIC use since then;
- (b) the Site was currently subject to a BH restriction of two storeys on the OZP. Any development at the Site exceeding the BH restriction would require planning permission from the Board;

*The Proposed Development*

- (c) there was no requirement for building setback from Castle Peak Road by the Government. That said, to rationalise the boundary of the “R(A)5” zone, the applicant proposed to include a small piece of government land

(about 58m<sup>2</sup>) at the southeastern corner of the Site within the same “G/IC” zone into the “R(A)5” zone as non-building area (NBA) which would be open 24 hours to the public for pedestrian circulation. Regarding the rationalisation of the zoning boundary along Castle Peak Road for improving the streetscape and pedestrian circulation, it could be examined when the proposed amendments to the OZP were submitted to the Committee for agreement prior to gazetting under the TPO, should the application be agreed to;

- (d) the proposed development and Emmanuel Primary School were located at two platforms with level difference and separated by a vegetated slope. The proposed development at a lower level would be visible from the concerned school, and might create some visual obstructions to the school;
- (e) the proposed scheme under the current application was only a notional scheme for illustration purpose. Should the application be agreed by the Committee, the Site would be rezoned to “R(A)5” with stipulation of appropriate development restrictions and requirements. Relevant development restrictions/requirements would also be incorporated into the lease conditions as appropriate at the land exchange stage. There was no control on land transaction. The future development at the Site should comply with the development restrictions/requirements under the “R(A)5” zone and the lease, not the notional scheme under the current application;

#### *The Proposed Social Welfare Facilities*

- (f) according to the established funding arrangements, SWD would, through the Lotteries Fund, provide the construction cost of the proposed SWFs to the developer. Upon completion, the facilities would be handed over to the Government and appropriate service providers would be selected by the Government. The floor area of GIC facilities, including SWFs, as required by the Government would be exempted from the GFA calculation of the proposed development;

- (g) the RCHE should be situated at a height of not more than 24 metres above the ground level in accordance with the relevant regulation. Since a standard RCHE (with 100 places) required a sizable site area, the Site was considered not suitable for such provision;

*Provision of GIC Facilities in Sham Tseng and the Tsuen Wan District*

- (h) the planned population in Tsuen Wan West was about 34,400 persons. The existing GIC facilities in area covered by the Tsuen Wan West OZP mainly concentrated in Sham Tseng, which comprised an elderly centre, a pre-school (including child care centre) and a nursery school, two primary schools, a children and youth integrated services centre, a fire station cum ambulance depot, a mobile post office, a mobile library and a temporary market;
- (i) the planned provision of GIC facilities was based on the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and the planned population. There was generally no shortfall in major community facilities in the Tsuen Wan West area except for child care centres, community care services facilities and RCHE which were long-term targets to be achieved in the planning and development process. Furthermore, the slight shortfall in primary and secondary school classrooms could be addressed by the provision in the Tsuen Wan district. As the planning standard for library was one district library for 200,000 persons, the population of some 20,000 persons in Sham Tseng was far below the minimum population requirement. The existing provision of library (with one surplus) in the Tsuen Wan district was sufficient to serve the residents there. That said, the mobile library in Sham Tseng could provide additional services to the local community. As for post office and market, their provisions were not population-based. In addition, the temporary market in Sham Tseng had been operating for more than 20 years to serve the local community;
- (j) as the Site was relatively small, it might not be suitable to accommodate stand-alone GIC facilities. Apart from SWD, relevant government

bureaux and departments had no plan to use the Site for providing GIC facilities under their respective purview. The proposed provision of premises-based SWFs with a GFA of not less than 918m<sup>2</sup> (equivalent to about 20% of the domestic GFA at the Site) on 2/F of the development was considered acceptable to SWD; and

*Others*

- (k) regarding the public comments raised by Hong Kong Telecom concerning that the telecommunication services would be affected by the proposed development during construction/after completion of the proposed development, the Office of the Communications Authority had no adverse comment on the application and advised the applicant to liaise and work closely with the relevant stakeholders with a view to minimising possible disruption to the normal operation of the telephone exchange and provision of public telecommunication services arising from the proposed development.

12. With regard to the potential visual impact on Emmanuel Primary School, Mr Ted Chan, the applicant's representative, added that as the façade of the school building facing the proposed development had no window, no adverse visual impact on the school was envisaged. Regarding the provision of GIC facilities in the area, Mr W.M. Chan, the applicant's representative, supplemented that the population in Tsuen Wan West was insufficient to justify a district library while the Sham Tseng Children and Youth Integrated Services Centre operated by the Boys' and Girls' Club Association of Hong Kong had been providing library services to the local community. For the post office services, the request for a permanent post office made by the local residents was turned down by the Government in the past due to financial viability consideration.

13. Some Members raised the following questions to the applicant's representatives:

- (a) history of the Site, and whether there was any change in land ownership since 1989;

- (b) whether a designated lift would be assigned for the proposed retail and GIC uses and whether a universal accessible lift would be provided to serve the elderly and disabled people in the development scheme; and
- (c) management of the common facilities of the proposed development.

14. In response, Mr W.M. Chan, Mr Ted Chan and Ms Maggie Mak, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) the Site was originally occupied by the factory of the San Miguel Brewery Hong Kong Limited. The Site was sold to the applicant in 1989 and there was no change in the land ownership since then;
- (b) a designated lift would be provided at the development to serve the retail and GIC facilities at the low zone. Priority would be given to the SWFs' users and a detailed operation and management plan would be prepared in consultation with SWD. Barrier free access would also be provided to serve the SWFs' users in accordance with the relevant regulations and requirements; and
- (c) the detailed management arrangement of the common facilities would be subject to further discussion with the relevant government departments at the detailed design stage, which would be incorporated in the land lease and deed of mutual covenant of the development, as appropriate. In general practice, the common areas, including lifts and circulation area, would be managed by a property management company on the payment of fee to be shared by relevant parties. The lawn on 3/F could be open for public use if considered appropriate.

15. In response to a Member's enquires related to the procedure on land resumption of private lots for public purpose, Mr Albert K.L. Cheung, Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department (LandsD) explained that land resumption would normally be initiated by LandsD at the request of the relevant government departments for implementation of government projects. For land resumption under the Lands Resumption Ordinance (Cap.

124), project proponent of the government project should satisfy the Chief Executive in Council that the use of the site was for a “public purpose” before statutory power under Cap. 124 could be invoked to resume private land. Regarding the Member’s further question on the land administration for change of use at a site, Mr Cheung said that if the proposed change of use was not permitted under the lease, an application for land exchange/lease modification would be required. Such application, if approved, would be subject to the payment of premium and administrative fee.

16. As the applicant’s representatives had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairman informed the applicant’s representatives that the hearing procedure for the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Committee’s decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representatives from PlanD and the applicant for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon joined the meeting during the question and answer session.]

#### Deliberation Session

17. The Chairman recapitulated the statutory procedure in processing a section 12A application and the subsequent OZP amendment procedure. He also said that the application was supported by PlanD as there was no designated GIC use for the Site, the Site comprised mainly private land and was relatively small in site area to accommodate any stand-alone GIC use, the proposed development was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses in terms of its uses and development intensity, and the SWFs would be provided within the future development as a planning gain which were accepted by SWD.

18. Noting that the proposed development submitted under the application was only a notional scheme and the land ownership might change over time, a Member asked whether the future land owner was required to implement the scheme upon the completion of the OZP amendment. In response, the Chairman said that the future land owner could decide whether or not to proceed with the development scheme submitted under the current application.

19. Two Members had reservation on the application. A Member said that there was change in planning circumstances in the area since 1989 as a few large residential developments had been completed in the area. With the significant growth of population in the area, the demand for GIC facilities was keen. Furthermore, there was no other site available in the town centre area of Sham Tseng for the provision of GIC facilities. Given the relatively isolated location of Sham Tseng in the whole of Tsuen Wan West, opportunities should be taken to provide more GIC facilities at the Site to serve the local community. Additional GIC facilities should also be provided to serve the wider district. Another Member was of the view that as the Site was zoned “G/IC”, the Site could be used for elderly facilities and institutional use, instead of a private residential development. There were insufficient planning gains to support the rezoning application.

20. Some Members considered that each application for rezoning of “G/IC” site should be considered on its individual merits. Majority of Members generally supported the application as the subject “G/IC” zone comprised mainly private land under a single ownership, the originally planned GIC use was no longer required, the relevant government bureaux and departments had no plan to use the Site for GIC uses, the proposal could help increase the housing supply whilst providing GIC facilities as per SWD’s requirements, the proposed development was generally compatible with the surrounding developments, the various technical assessments conducted had confirmed no adverse impact on the surrounding area, and relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. It would be appropriate to rezone the Site for other gainful use to achieve better site utilisation.

21. Given that the Site was zoned “G/IC”, a few Members considered that the applicant and the relevant government departments should further explore the possibility to accommodate more GIC facilities, such as RCHE, and the provision of more open space in the future development, in order to meet the community needs and public aspiration. A few Members, whilst noting the proposed scheme was only a notional one, opined that consideration should be given to enhancing the provision of SWFs, such as separate access to such facilities in the detailed design stage. Two Members also considered that the proposed site boundary could be rationalised with a view to improving the pedestrian environment and the streetscape. A Member pointed out that as the implementation of the proposed development would involve land exchange application, it was anticipated that the



development parameters as well as the planning merits under the proposed scheme could be incorporated in the lease, as appropriate.

22. A Member, who expressed reservation on the application during the earlier discussion, opined that should the application be approved, the Committee should send a clear message that one main consideration was on the unique background of the subject “G/IC” site in that the originally designated GIC use was no longer required and the Site was largely owned by a single owner.

23. The Chairman remarked that should the application be approved, the details on the proposed amendments to the OZP such as the site boundary would be further examined by PlanD. The proposed amendments to the OZP would be submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting of the draft OZP for public inspection. In response to a Member’s enquiry, the Chairman said that the requirement on the provision of SWFs could be reflected in the Notes and/or Explanatory Statement of the OZP, as appropriate.

24. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree to the application by rezoning the application site from “Government, Institution or Community” to “Residential (Group A)5”. The relevant proposed amendments to the approved Tsuen Wan West Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TWW/19 would be submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance upon reference back of the OZP.

[Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting during deliberation.]

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

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung joined the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 4**

##### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K16/44                      Correctional Institution in “Government, Institution or Community”  
Zone, 3/5 Butterfly Valley Road, Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre,  
Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K16/44)

---

25.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Correctional Services Department (CSD). Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had declared an interest on the item as his close relative was an employee of the CSD who had no involvement in the application.

26.            As the interest of Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon was indirect, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

##### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

27.            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 correctional institution;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 25 public comments were received, with 20 supporting comments from the Chairman of the Sham Shui Po West Area Committee, Lions Club of Sham Shui Po Hong Kong, chaplains and individuals; three objecting comments from a member of the Sham Shui Po District Council and individuals; and two public comments expressing concerns/views on the application from the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited (Towngas) and a concern group on rights of prisoners. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed redevelopment was mainly located within the existing Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre (LCKRC) with an expansion into the northern man-made slope and natural hillside within the same “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone. It was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses, developments and landscape setting. The proposed redevelopment with a maximum building height (BH) of about 70.6mPD and as a continuation and expansion of the existing reception centre would unlikely induce significant adverse impact on the visual character of the surrounding townscape. The Secretary for Security had given policy support to the proposed redevelopment. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD and the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department had no adverse comment on the application from the visual perspective and the former also from the landscape planning perspective. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

28. In response to a Member's enquiry on the visual impact on the Jao Tsung-I Academy arising from the proposed redevelopment, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK referred to photomontages (VP5) submitted by the applicant which were viewed from the sitting-out area outside the Jao Tsung-I Academy towards the proposed redevelopment and pointed out the difference between the existing condition and that with the proposed development. In response to the same Member's further question on the existing BH profile of the surrounding area, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, with reference to Plan A-2, elaborated the BH of the government, institution and community facilities within the subject “G/IC” zone including the Jao Tsung-I Academy with a BH ranging from 24.1mPD to 62.4mPD, CSD's staff quarters and staff club of about 22.7mPD to 57.4mPD, and the existing LCKRC with a BH of about 18.1mPD to 40.2mPD. An international school with a BH of about 29.9mPD and the Cheung Sha Wan Industrial/Business Area generally zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” with a maximum BH ranging from 120mPD to 130mPD were located to the

further east of the Site across Butterfly Valley Road/the elevated Tsing Sha Highway. The proposed redevelopment had various heights ranging from about 65mPD in the south to 70.6mPD in the north.

### Deliberation Session

29. 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 12.3.2025, 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 of a revised traffic impact assessment and implementation of traffic mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and provision of vehicular access, vehicle parking spaces, and loading/unloading facilities and manoeuvring spaces to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of a revised drainage impact assessment and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of an updated sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (e) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the updated sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (f) the submission of the detailed work proposal(s) with necessary protective measures to safeguard Lai Chi Kok Hospital at No. 800 Castle Peak Road prior to commencement of any works to the satisfaction of the Antiquities

and Monuments Office or of the TPB; and

- (g) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

### **Agenda Item 5**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K5/831 Proposed Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Portion of Unit A, G/F, Wing Hong Factory Building, 777-783 Yu Chau West Street, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/831)

---

31. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Ivan M.K. Chung - being a non-executive director of the URA Board  
(the Chairman) and a member of its committee;  
(as Director of Planning)
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with URA;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm had business dealings with URA;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues;

- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being a former non-executive director of the URA Board, a former chairman/member of its committees and a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund;
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung (Vice-chairman) - being a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund; and
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund.

32. The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the interest of the Chairman was direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As the interests of Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung and Ms Lilian S.K. Law were indirect, and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

[The Chairman left the meeting temporarily and the Vice-chairman took over the chairmanship at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

33. 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 proposed 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 proposed use was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone and was considered compatible with the changing land use character of the area. The proposed use generally complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D in that it would not induce adverse fire safety, traffic and infrastructural impacts on other uses within the subject building and the adjacent developments. Should the application be approved, the aggregate commercial floor area approved by the Committee on the G/F of the subject building would be 12m<sup>2</sup>, which was within the maximum permissible limit of 230m<sup>2</sup>. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The application site was the subject of a previous application (No. A/K5/800) for ‘Shop and Services (Neighbourhood Resources Centre)’ use involving the entire Unit A (230m<sup>2</sup>), which would be relocated to another location. Approval of the application was consistent with the previous decision of the Committee.

34. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

35. 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 12.3.2023, 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 service installations before the operation of the proposed use to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (b) if the above planning condition is not complied with before operation of the proposed use, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

[The Chairman returned to join the meeting and resumed chairmanship of the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 6**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/471 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Non-Polluting Industrial Use (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of Dangerous Goods) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 10-16 Kwai Ting Road, Kwai Chung, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/471A)

---

37. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) was one of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with ARUP;

Mr Franklin Yu - having current business dealings with ARUP; and

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm had business dealings with ARUP.

38. The Committee noted that the applicants had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Kau had already left the meeting. As Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

39. The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 26.2.2021 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 second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicants had submitted further information in response to departmental comments.

40. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicants pending the submission of further information from the applicants. 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 applicants. If the further information submitted by the applicants 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 applicants that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[The Chairman thanked Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, and Ms Winsome W.S. Lee, TP/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

### **Hong Kong District**

#### **Agenda Item 7**

##### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H15/285                      Proposed School (Kindergarten and Nursery) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business (1)" Zone, 2/F of an Office Building at Aberdeen Inland Lot No. 360, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/285)

---

41. The Secretary reported that Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD) and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) were two of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had declared interest on the item for having current business dealings

with AECOM and past business dealings with LD.

42. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting.

43. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 24.2.2021 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.

44. 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 8**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H21/153                      Proposed Religious Institution (Redevelopment of Temple) in "Green Belt" Zone, Government Land to the Northwest of 986 King's Road, Quarry Bay, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H21/153)

---

45. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 22.2.2021 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.

46. 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.

[Ms Karmin Tong, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 9**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H24/27                      Proposed Shop and Services (Retail Shop) in "Other Specified Uses"  
annotated "Pier and Associated Facilities" Zone, Shop A, Lower Deck,  
Central Pier No. 8, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H24/27)

---

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

47. Ms Karmin Tong, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed shop and services (retail shop);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;

- (d) during the statutory publication period, two public comments from the Working Group on Town Planning of Central and Western District under the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) and a C&WDC member, expressing concerns on the application were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 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 10 of the Paper. The proposed retail shop was considered generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pier and Associated Facilities” (“OU(PAF)”) zone. The proposed use was considered not incompatible with the pier use as it would provide convenient services to ferry passengers as well as visitors using the subject pier and waterfront promenade. Considering the small size of the proposed retail shop, it would unlikely cause disruption to the pier operation and passenger circulation. The Commissioner of Police objected to the application due to the possible nuisance and crowd gathering arising from the intended sale of bottled alcoholic liquor at the proposed retail shop. As such concern was a law enforcement issue rather than a land-use related matter, it should be dealt with separately. There were two previous applications at the application site and four similar applications within the same “OU(PAF)” zone approved by the Committee. Approval of the application was consistent with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessment above were relevant.

48. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the complaints statistics in the pier area and details of the complaints received;
  
- (b) the operation hours of the proposed retail shop;
  
- (c) the distribution of shop and services uses at the piers in the area and the

premises which had liquor licences; and

- (d) whether there was any noise sensitive receiver in the surrounding area.

49. In response, Ms Karmin Tong, STP/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) 22 complaints related to noise and five complaints related to nuisance in the pier area were received by the Police last year. There was no information available in hand regarding the details of the complaints received;
- (b) the operation hours of the proposed retail shop would be from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 midnight daily;
- (c) there were shop and services use including retail and fast food shops, and eating place use approved by the Committee in Piers No. 3 to 8 as well as the Central Terminal Building, and restaurants in Piers No. 3, 7 and 8 had obtained liquor licences to provide alcoholic beverages; and
- (d) the subject premises was located at Central Pier No. 8. There was no residential development in the vicinity and hence no sensitive receiver could be identified.

#### Deliberation Session

50. 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 12.3.2025, 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 condition:

“the provision of fire service installations and equipment to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

51. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as

set out at Appendix IV of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked Ms Karmin Tong, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 10**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H3/442                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Office, Shop and Services and Eating Place Uses in "Commercial" Zone, 92-103A Connaught Road West and 91, 99 & 101 Des Voeux Road West, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/442)

---

52.            The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) and Ronald Lu & Partners (RLP) were the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho        -    having current business dealings with ARUP and RLP;
- Mr Franklin Yu            -    having current business dealings with ARUP; and
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai         -    his former firm had business dealings with ARUP and RLP.

53.            The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

54.            The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 25.2.2021 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.

55. 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**

[Miss Helen H.Y. Chan, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 11**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K11/236                      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, 20-24 Tai Yau Street, San Po Kong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K11/236C)

---

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

56. Miss Helen H.Y. Chan, STP/K, presented the application and covered the

following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (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 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of ten public comments from individuals including four supporting and six objecting comments were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 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 11 of the Paper. The proposed redevelopment was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone and the proposed building height (BH) of 88.75mPD complied with the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) restriction. The Secretary for Development gave policy support to the application. The applicants had proposed various planning and design measures, including incorporation of a 3m-wide full height building setback from Tai Yau Street in compliance with the requirement to provide a 3m-wide non-building area (NBA) under the OZP, provision of a voluntary 2m-wide full height setback at the rear service lane, a glass canopy along the full length of the building frontage and site coverage of greenery of about 36.7%. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD considered that the proposed measures might promote visual interest and pedestrian comfort along Tai Yau Street. The Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office advised that the proposed setback would enhance the walkability in the area. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessment above were



relevant.

57. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the existing and proposed use of the rear service lane, and the future management and maintenance responsibilities of the rear service lane;
- (b) details of the ingress/egress of the proposed development. Noting that the proposed vehicular access was located near the main entrance of the proposed development, whether there would be concern on pedestrian safety;
- (c) whether recycled water would be used for irrigation of greenery in the proposed development;
- (d) whether the adjoining existing industrial building (IB) to the immediate southwest encroached onto the application site;
- (e) details and future management responsibility of the proposed glass canopy along Tai Yau Street;
- (f) whether the proposed setback abutting Tai Yau Street was considered acceptable by the relevant government departments, and the possibility of tree planting at the setback area; and
- (g) whether the setback requirement was also applicable to the adjoining lot, and whether the proposed planter boxes within the setback area would affect the future road works.

58. In response, Miss Helen H.Y. Chan, STP/K, made the following main points:

- (a) the rear service lane was currently used for driveway as well as parking and loading/unloading purpose. Such uses would remain unchanged under the proposed scheme. The applicants would undertake the future management

and maintenance responsibilities of the rear service lane;

- (b) the ingress/egress of the proposed development was proposed at Tai Yau Street and there was no provision of run-in/out at the rear service lane. The Transport Department (TD) had no comment on the proposed vehicular arrangement;
- (c) the applicants would use recycled water for irrigation of all the greenery features within the proposed development;
- (d) a common staircase currently served both the existing IB at the application site and the adjoining IB which fell outside the site. Upon redevelopment, the staircase was proposed to be retained which had been included in the gross floor area calculation under the proposed scheme;
- (e) a glass canopy with a clear headroom of 6m and a width of 2.5m at the setback area along Tai Yau Street was proposed to provide weather protection for pedestrians. CTP/UD&L, PlanD considered that such provision might promote pedestrian comfort. The applicants would undertake the future management and maintenance responsibilities of the glass canopy;
- (f) the proposed 3m-wide setback from the lot boundary abutting Tai Yau Street was in line with the requirements stipulated on the OZP. TD and Highways Department (HyD) had no adverse comment on the proposal provided that the surrendered area would meet the government requirements and they would take up the maintenance and management responsibilities upon the area was surrendered to the government. Tree planting at the setback area might not be appropriate as the concerned setback area was for future road widening purpose; and
- (g) according to the Notes of the "OU(B)" zone, a minimum of 3m-wide NBA was designated from the lot boundary abutting Tai Yau Street, including the application site as well as the adjoining lots. According to the applicants,

the planter boxes on G/F were not fixed feature and moveable.

### Deliberation Session

59. Members generally considered that the application for proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction to facilitate the redevelopment of the two existing IBs at the Site could be supported. Regarding a Member's concern on the pedestrian safety in relation to the design of vehicular access, Mr Patrick K.H. Ho, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), TD pointed out that such run-in access arrangement as a form of connection with local roads by which the development was served was not uncommon. As the driving speed of vehicles manoeuvring to and from the building via the vehicular access would not be high, it would unlikely pose a danger to the pedestrians.

60. A Member considered that tree planting along Tai Yau Street should be explored. Another Member said that TD and HyD could consider providing tree planting along the existing public pavement upon completion of the proposed redevelopment as the road widening works along Tai Yau Street might not be implemented in the near future. The Chairman said that the applicants could be advised to explore the possibility of tree planting at the setback area along Tai Yau Street with the relevant government departments at the detailed design stage, as appropriate. Members agreed that an advisory clause should be added in that regard.

61. 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 12.3.2025, 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 of a revised sewerage impact assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (b) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the revised sewerage impact assessment for the

proposed development in condition (a) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;

- (c) the submission of land contamination assessments in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to development of the site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (d) the design and provision of vehicular access, vehicle parking and loading/unloading facilities and manoeuvring spaces for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB.”

62. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper with the following additional advisory clause:

“to explore the possibility of tree planting within the setback area along Tai Yau Street.”

[The Chairman thanked Miss Helen H.Y. Chan, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 12**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K12/42                      Proposed Flat, Shop and Services, Eating Place, School (Kindergarten), Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) and Public Vehicle Park (Light Goods Vehicle) in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone, 35 Clear Water Bay Road, Ngau Chi Wan  
(MPC Paper No. A/K12/42)

---

63. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP), AGC Design Limited (AGC) and MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) were three of the

consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with ARUP and MVA;
- Mr Franklin Yu - having current business dealings with ARUP; and
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm had business dealings with ARUP, AGC and MVA.

64. The Committee noted that the applicants had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

65. The Committee noted that the applicants' representative requested on 25.2.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicants requested deferment of the application.

66. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicants pending the submission of further information from the applicants. 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 applicants. If the further information submitted by the applicants 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 applicants 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 13**

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K15/127                      Proposed Residential cum Commercial Development in “Residential (Group E)” Zone, 8 Sze Shan Street, Yau Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/127A)

---

67.            The Secretary reported that CYS Associates (HK) Limited (CYS) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest on the item as his former firm had business dealings with CYS.

68.            The Committee noted that the deferment of consideration of the application was made by the Planning Department (PlanD) and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

69.            The Secretary reported that PlanD had requested deferment of consideration of the application for two months as more time was required for relevant government departments to provide comments on the further information submitted by the applicant, especially the revised technical assessments that were only submitted on 25.2.2021, and it was pre-mature for PlanD to make recommendations and for the Committee to consider the application.

70.            After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by PlanD. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from today’s meeting.

**Agenda Item 14**

Any Other Business

71.           There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:30 p.m.