

**TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**Minutes of 669<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 16.4.2021**

**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  
Ms L.C. Cheung

**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 668<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 26.3.2021

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 668<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 26.3.2021 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 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/832                      Proposed Industrial Use (Dangerous Goods Store) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (2)” Zone, Portion of Workshop A6, 1/F, Block A, Hong Kong Industrial Centre, 489-491 Castle Peak Road, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/832)

---

4.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 29.3.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

5.            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 4**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/473 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Information Technology and Telecommunications Industries (Proposed Data Centre Development) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 2-10 Tai Yuen Street, Kwai Chung, New Territories (MPC Paper No. A/KC/473A)

---

6. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members have declared interests on the item:

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

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

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

7. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had not yet arrived to join the meeting. As Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

8. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 29.3.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more 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 applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

9. 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 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.

### **Agenda Item 5**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/474                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Industrial Use in "Industrial" Zone, 45-51 Tai Lin Pai Road, Kwai Chung, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/474)

---

10.            The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 30.3.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

11.            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**

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

**Agenda Item 6**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/H4/97                      Public Utility Installation (Telecommunications Radio Base Station) in  
   “Comprehensive Development Area (2)” Zone, 3/F and R/F, Central  
   Pier No. 6, Hong Kong  
   (MPC Paper No. A/H4/97)

---

12.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Hutchison Telephone Company Limited which was a subsidiary of CK Hutchison Holdings Limited (CKHH). Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest on the item for his former firm having business dealings with CKHH. Members noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application and Mr Lai had not yet arrived to join the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

13.            With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, 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 public utility installation (telecommunications radio base station);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 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 10 of the Paper. The application was to enhance the coverage of mobile network at the subject pier. The applied use was considered not incompatible with the existing pier use. Given the small scale of the installation, it would unlikely affect the operation of the ferry services nor generate significant visual impact on the surrounding areas. Relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To monitor the site condition and allow flexibility to review the development progress of the “Comprehensive Development Area (2)” (“CDA(2)”) zone, a temporary approval of five years, instead of permanent permission sought, was recommended.

14. The Chairman and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether all such installations required planning permissions, and the tenancy arrangement if the application was approved;
- (b) noting that the outdoor antennae were attached to the external wall of the roof floor of the concerned pier and separated from other existing similar installations on the roof top, whether the possible visual impact of such installations in the area in general and the subject case had been assessed;
- (c) any control on the scale and location of such installations;
- (d) any public health concerns in relation to such installations in general;
- (e) any similar planning application in the area; and
- (f) in view of the wider application of 5G technology, whether there was an authority to co-ordinate the telecommunications related installations.



15. In response, Ms Karmin Tong, STP/HK, made the following main points:
- (a) the application premises fell within an area zoned “CDA(2)” on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and the applied telecommunications radio base station subsumed under ‘Public Utility Installation’ required planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). It should, however, be noted that for various zones of the OZP such as “Government, Institution or Community”, such installations were always permitted and planning permission from the Board was not required. Since the application premises was located within the pier under the management of Transport Department (TD), should the current application be approved, the applicant should submit an application for commercial concession to the Government Property Administrator (GPA) who acted as the leasing facilitator of TD to prepare and execute the agreement for leasing out spaces at the pier for commercial concession;
  - (b) site selection for such installations was mainly decided by the service providers. As far as the visual impact of the subject case was concerned, given the small scale of the installation, both the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD and the relevant Task Force of the Harbourfront Commission had no adverse comment on the application. Also, in processing similar commercial concession applications for such installations, GPA would circulate the applications to relevant government departments, including PlanD, for comment. PlanD would provide comments, including those on the visual aspect, if any, on the proposals;
  - (c) according to the Definition of Terms used in statutory plans, ‘telecommunications radio base station’ meant any installation including an equipment cabinet not bigger than 5 metres x 4.5 metres x 3.5 metres (LxWxH) and antenna(e) not bigger than 0.6 metre x 0.6 metre x 2.5 metres (LxWxH), excluding pole, for planar shape or 0.8 metre in diameter for circular shape, within, attached to or on the roof top of a building or structure for the provision of public telecommunications services to serve the local district. Apart from that, there were no other requirements on the

design of the telecommunications radio base station from the planning perspective;

- (d) according to the information from the Department of Health, with compliance with the relevant international guidelines, exposure to radiofrequency fields generated by such installation would normally not pose significant adverse health effects;
- (e) seven similar planning applications at various piers in the Central harbourfront had been processed, which were all approved by the Committee; and
- (f) the Office of the Communications Authority (OFCA) was the licensing authority for the installation of telecommunications radio base stations.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai arrived to join the meeting during the question and answer session.]

#### Deliberation Session

16. Whilst acknowledging the functional need for the installation of the telecommunications radio base stations, two Members were concerned about the possible visual impact in relation to the installations of the outdoor antennae which were proposed by different service operators and without coordination, particularly at the waterfront area where the application premises was located. They considered it was necessary for the relevant authority to co-ordinate the installation of such facilities especially in some prominent locations, e.g. the waterfront area, so as to minimise the possible visual impact.

17. The Chairman remarked that the Government had adopted a new approach in consolidating the utility pipelines in common utility tunnels in planning new development areas. Similar approach could be adopted for other public utility installations, such as telecommunications related facilities, in a co-ordinated manner among different service providers, which could not only minimise the possible visual impact on the surroundings but also enable efficient management of such facilities in the long run. The application of such approach in the developed urban area, however, might be subject to constraints.

18. The Chairman concluded that Members in general had no objection to the application and that a temporary approval of five years, instead of permanent permission sought, could be granted to the application to monitor the site condition and the development programme of the “CDA(2)” zone. To address the concern of possible visual impact of the outdoor antennae on the waterfront area, an advisory clause should be added to remind the applicant to minimise such impact as far as practicable. The Chairman also proposed and the meeting agreed that Members’ view on better co-ordination of telecommunications installations so as to minimise the possible visual impact on the surroundings should be conveyed to OFCA for consideration.

19. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years, instead of permanent permission sought, until 16.4.2026 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board.

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

“to minimise the visual impact of the outdoor antennae on the waterfront area as far as practicable.”

### **Agenda Item 7**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/H4/98	Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Public Utility Installation (Telecommunications Radio Base Station) for a Period of 5 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pier” Zone, Portions of Roof Floor, Western Berth of 1/F and G/F of Central Pier No. 2, Central, Hong Kong (MPC Paper No. A/H4/98)
---------	---

---

21. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Park Island Transport Company Limited which was a subsidiary of 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 Franklin Yu - his spouse being an employee of SHK;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having business dealings with 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.

22. As the interests of Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Franklin Yu were direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As the interest of Ms Lilian S.K. Law was indirect and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

[Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting and Mr Franklin Yu left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

23. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, 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 renewal of planning approval for temporary public utility installation (telecommunications radio base station) for a period of five years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;

- (d) during the statutory publication period, two public comments from individuals, including one supporting and one raising concerns on the application, 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 two previous applications for the same use at the application premises on a temporary basis for five years each were approved by the Committee in 2011 and 2016 respectively. The current application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C and 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.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

24. In response to a Member's enquiry on the installation of a relatively large number of antennae at the application premises, Ms Karmin Tong, STP/HK, said that according to the applicant, the concerned installation was aimed to resolve the reception problem for mobile phones not only at the subject pier and Central harbourfront but also in the surrounding areas.

#### Deliberation Session

25. Members generally had no objection to the application. The Chairman remarked that as agreed by Members when considering a similar application under Agenda Item 6, Members' view regarding fostering better co-ordination of telecommunications installations by different service providers would be conveyed to the Office of the Communications Authority for consideration.

26. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years and be renewed from 21.5.2021 to 20.5.2026 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board.

27. 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.]

[Mr Franklin Yu returned to join the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 8**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/H7/178                      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Private Club (Recreation Facilities) Use for a Period of 3 Years in "Residential (Group C) 1" Zone, 48 Shan Kwong Road, Happy Valley, Hong Kong  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/H7/178)

---

28. The Secretary reported that the application was located in Wong Nai Chung and the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Jockey Club (HKJC). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung        -        co-owning with spouse a flat in Wong Nai Chung;

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung    -        being a horse owner and an ordinary member of the HKJC and the Hong Kong Racehorse Owners Association Limited;

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung      -        being an ordinary member of the HKJC;

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - being an ordinary member of the HKJC;
- Dr Roger C.K. Chan - being an ordinary member of the HKJC;
- Professor T.S. Liu - being an ordinary member of the HKJC and Principal Investigator of a community project funded by the HKJC Charities Trust;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - being an ordinary member of the HKJC and the Hong Kong Racehorse Owners Association Limited and a former horse owner; his former firm having business dealings with HKJC; and his parents co-owning a flat in Wong Nai Chung;
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being an ordinary member of the HKJC and co-owning with spouse a flat in Wong Nai Chung; and
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his organisation having obtained sponsorship from HKJC.

29. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung had not yet arrived to join the meeting. As the interests of Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung, Dr Roger C.K. Chan, Professor T.S. Liu, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Mr Stanley T.S. Choi and Ms Lilian S.K. Law in relation to HKJC were indirect, and the properties co-owned by the Chairman and his spouse and by Ms Lilian S.K. Law and her spouse had no direct view of the application site (the Site), the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. Mr Alex T.H. Lai said that he had frequent visits to the private club at the Site and would not join the meeting.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

30. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, STP/HK,

presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary private club (recreation facilities) use for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, four public comments from individuals, including two objecting to and two expressing views on the application, 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. The last previous application for the same use at the application site (the Site) on a temporary basis for three years was approved by the Committee in 2018. The current application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C and 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.

31. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) any requirement for opening up the concerned private club for public use;
- (b) whether the applied use was in existence before the publication of the first OZP covering the Site;
- (c) details of HKJC's redevelopment proposal, including the number of residential units to be provided, and whether the recreational facilities would be opened up for public use upon redevelopment;



- (d) whether the Site was granted to HKJC at a premium or at a nominal rent; and
- (e) any limit on the maximum number of applications for renewal of planning approval.

32. In response, Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, STP/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) the Site was under private ownership of HKJC and there was no requirement for opening up the club to the public under the lease. Whether the private club would be opened for public use was at HKJC's sole discretion;
- (b) the Site was previously occupied by two stable blocks and zoned "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Royal HKJC Stables" ("OU(RHKJC Stables)") on the first statutory plan for the Wong Nai Chung area (i.e. the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. LH7/6). In view of the race course development at Shatin in 1980s, those stables were no longer required by HKJC. Upon the request of HKJC, the Town Planning Board (the Board) agreed to rezone the Site from "OU (RHKJC Stables)" to "Residential (Group C)" ("R(C)") in 1981;
- (c) the Site was subject to a maximum plot ratio of 5 and a maximum building height of 130mPD under "R(C)1" zone on the OZP. According to the applicant, the redevelopment proposal would be a mixed residential and sport complex development. The residential flat-mix and facilities to be provided were still subject to further investigation by the applicant. Since the proposal was still at an early stage and was still being examined, there was no information on whether the recreational facilities would be opened for public use;
- (d) the Site was owned by HKJC under a restricted lease dated 1933. There was no information on the land premium of the private lot in hand; and

- (e) there was no limit on the number of applications for renewal of planning approval under the Town Planning Ordinance. However, each renewal application, including the approval period, would be considered by the Committee on its individual merits.

### Deliberation Session

33. Members noted that HKJC had repeatedly applied for temporary planning permission to use the Site for recreational purpose since 1988. In considering the last application (No. A/H7/176), a shorter approval period of 3 years, instead of 5 years sought, had been granted for closer monitoring of the redevelopment progress of the Site. Under the current application, it was the first time that the applicant had provided an update of the latest redevelopment proposal, i.e. the mixed development, with a preliminary timeframe indicating that a s.16 planning application would be submitted in Q2 2023 for the redevelopment proposal.

34. Whilst noting that the Site was located in an area predominantly for low to medium-density residential developments and the housing need of the Wong Nai Chung area was less acute as compared to other districts in Hong Kong, Members generally considered that HKJC should actively pursue the redevelopment proposal and expedite the implementation of the zoned use of the Site. Regarding the possible types of residential use that could be pursued at the Site, say 'Flat' or 'Residential Institution', it would be up to the applicant to decide when submitting a s.16 application.

35. A Member enquired whether a shorter approval period of say two years, instead of three years sought, should be granted. The Chairman said that having regard to the preliminary timeframe for the proposed redevelopment at the Site as submitted by the applicant, an approval period of three years was considered appropriate. Members agreed.

36. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years and be renewed from 1.5.2021 to 30.4.2024, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the

following conditions:

- “(a) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting within 6 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 1.11.2021; and
- (b) if the above planning condition 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.”

### **Agenda Item 9**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H8/431                      Proposed Eating Place in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pier” Zone, Shop B, Ground Floor, North Point (East) Ferry Pier, North Point, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H8/431)

---

37.            The Secretary reported that the application site was located in North Point. Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had declared an interest on the item for owning a flat in North Point.

38.            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.

39.            The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 26.3.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

40.            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.

[The Chairman thanked Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 10**

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

[Open Meeting]

A/K10/268                      Proposed School (Kindergarten) in "Residential (Group B)" Zone, G/F,  
28A Grampian Road, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K10/268)

---

41.            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.

42.            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.

43.            The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 24.3.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more 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.

[Mr William W.L. 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/K14/794                      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, 119-121 How Ming Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/794A)

---

45. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) and Dennis Lau & Ng Chun Man Architects & Engineers (HK) Limited (DLN) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members have declared interests on the item:

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

- Mr Franklin Yu - his firm having current business dealings with ARUP; and
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having business dealings with ARUP and DLN.

46. The Committee noted that 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.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

47. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr William W.L. 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 29 public comments were received, with 7 supporting comments from a member of the Kwun Tong Centre Area Committee (KTCAC) of the Kwun Tong District Council, Incorporated Owners of the subject building and the Yip Fat Factory Building Phases 1 and 2 and an individual, and 22 objecting comments from one of the owners of the subject building, a member of KTCAC and individuals. 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 of 200mPD complied with the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) restriction. While the Development Bureau (DEVB) advised that the Policy on Revitalisation of Industrial Buildings (the IB Revitalisation Policy) was not applicable to the subject building as it was a “special factory”, it acknowledged that there were certain merits in the proposal. The Director-General of Trade and Industry (DG of TI) considered that it would put the application site (the Site) into optimal use to provide more industrial space. The applicant had also proposed various planning and design measures, including provision of building setback as required under the Outline Development Plan, a canopy along the street frontage and landscape treatments such as vertical greenings, podium garden (open to the public), planting areas and refuge floor/sky garden. Two openings for possible footbridge connections to the adjoining buildings would also be reserved. The Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) considered that the proposed pedestrian connections could help alleviate the congested pedestrian environment. 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.

48. The Chairman and Members raised the following questions:

*Ownership and Legal Disputes*

- (a) whether the applicant was the current landowner of the subject lot and whether the applicant had failed to comply with the ‘Owner’s Consent/Notification’ requirements as alleged in a public comment;
- (b) whether the applicant and other current land owners should resolve the land disputes on their own should the application be approved;
- (c) should the application be approved, whether the applicant had to obtain full consent from other landowners before taking forward the redevelopment proposal;

*The Proposed Scheme*

- (d) whether the car parking provision complied with the planning requirement, and whether any public car parking spaces were proposed;
- (e) the average floor area of the proposed IB;
- (f) details of the proposed pedestrian connections, and whether there was a minimum requirement for the width of the openings reserved for footbridge connection;
- (g) details of the proposed vertical greening system;
- (h) any tree planting in the proposed setback area along How Ming Street;
- (i) whether the podium garden was gross floor area (GFA) accountable, and how the opening hours of the podium garden were determined;
- (j) whether any approval condition regarding the opening hours of the podium garden and footbridge connections was recommended;
- (k) should the application be approved, whether the applicant could apply for further relaxation of PR;

*The IB Revitalisation Policy*

- (l) the reason why the current application was not covered by the IB Revitalisation Policy;
- (m) information/statistics of the nature of uses of the industrial buildings in the area; and
- (n) whether approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for application not covered by the IB Revitalisation Policy.



49. In response, Mr William W.L. Chan, STP/K, made the following main points:

*Ownership and Legal Disputes*

- (a) the applicant was one of the “current land owners” of the subject lot. The applicant had complied with the “Owner’s Consent/Notification” requirements as set out in the Town Planning Guidelines No. 31A by taking reasonable steps with notices published in local newspapers and notices posted in prominent positions on or near the Site;
- (b) land disputes between the applicant and other landowners of the subject lot were not relevant for the consideration of the application. The concerned parties could resolve the disputes under the established land administration regime;
- (c) should the application be approved, the applicant would need to obtain full consents from other landowners before submitting lease modification application and the general building plans of the proposed redevelopment would have to comply with the approved scheme;

*The Proposed Scheme*

- (d) the car parking provision complied with the high-end requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. No public car parking spaces were proposed at the Site;
- (e) the average floor area of the proposed IB was about 300m<sup>2</sup>;
- (f) under the proposed scheme, two openings were reserved at the podium garden on 1/F of the IB for future footbridge connections to the adjoining Yip Fat Factory Building Block 2 and Entrepot Centre, which aimed to connect with the existing major pedestrian network to the APM Millennium City 5. The minimum requirement for the width of the two openings would be confirmed at the detailed design stage;

- (g) panel type vertical greening system was proposed by the applicant. The use of recycled water for irrigating the landscaping features could be further explored at the detailed design stage;
- (h) the proposed setback area along How Ming Street would be handed over to the Government upon redevelopment. The landscape treatment within the setback area would be subject to agreement with the relevant government departments;
- (i) the proposed podium garden was GFA accountable. According to the applicant, the opening hours of the podium garden would be from 7am to 8pm daily, which could be further examined at the detailed implementation stage. The Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines promulgated by DEVB would serve as a reference for the applicant at the detailed design stage;
- (j) noting that the implementation of the proposed footbridge connections would be subject to further discussion with the owners of the Yip Fat Factory Building Block 2 and Entrepot Centre and their redevelopment programme, no approval condition was therefore recommended in that respect. As the applicant needed to comply with the approved scheme, such requirement could be scrutinised during the building plan submission stage. Regarding the proposed podium garden, there was also no approval condition proposed;
- (k) according to the IB Revitalisation Policy, the minor relaxation of PR was up to 20% of the maximum permissible PR as specified on the OZP. In any case, applications for minor relaxation of PR would be considered by the Board on a case-by-case basis;

*The IB Revitalisation Policy*

- (l) the user of the subject lot was restricted to a factory for the manufacture of wearing apparel hats and gloves embroidery excluding offensive trades, as specified on the lease. DEVB was of the view that the subject IB was

regarded as a “special factory” and thus not covered by the IB Revitalisation Policy;

- (m) information was available on IBs that were wholly or partly constructed on or before 1.3.1987 (i.e. the Pre-1987 IBs) in the Kwun Tong area, which was the prerequisite for the IB Revitalisation Policy. However, information related to the “special factories” or the specific use of each IB was not available; and
- (n) there were similar applications for minor relaxation of PR in Kwai Chung and Chai Wan approved by the Committee, which were not covered by the IB Revitalisation Policy.

50. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the main considerations for the subject application, the Chairman said that the application was for proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction for permitted non-polluting industrial use. Given that the subject building was a “special factory”, DEVB advised that the IB Revitalisation Policy was not applicable to the current application. However, DG of TI had no objection to the application given that it would put the Site into optimal use to provide more industrial space. In assessing such application, the main considerations should be based on the merits of the development proposal, technical feasibility, site context, other requirements/restrictions, etc. In other words, the planning assessments would be similar to other applications for minor relaxation of PR restriction in accordance with the provisions of the OZP.

51. A Member enquired about the traffic congestion problem at How Ming Street. Upon the Chairman’s invitation, Mr Patrick K.H. Ho, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), Transport Department (TD) said that the Police had taken enforcement actions against illegal parking in the Kwun Tong area in the past few months, including How Ming Street and Hoi Yuen Road, and the traffic condition had been improved. TD planned to implement long-term measures, including conversion of a section of How Ming Street to two-way traffic, to further alleviate the traffic congestion in the area.

52. With regard to some Member’s enquiries on the implementation of the footbridge connection, Mr Albert K.L. Cheung, Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department said

that should the application be approved by the Board, the relevant terms and conditions for the provision of openings for the footbridge connections as agreed by relevant government departments could be imposed on the Site at the lease modification stage, as appropriate.

### Deliberation Session

53. The Chairman recapitulated that given the nature of “special factory” of the existing building, the IB Revitalisation Policy was not applicable to the current application. In considering the application, Members could consider whether there were sufficient justifications and planning merits to support the proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction.

54. Whilst the application was outside the scope of the IB Revitalisation Policy, Members noted that the proposal was generally in line with the direction of the said policy. The proposed scheme comprised various planning gains and design merits including the proposed setback, landscape treatments, podium garden, sky gardens and pedestrian connections. In particular, the podium garden was proposed to be opened to the public and the proposed footbridge connections could help enhance the overall pedestrian network in the area. Besides, the relevant technical assessments conducted had confirmed that no significant adverse impact was envisaged. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. In view of the above, Members generally considered that the application could be supported.

55. Some Members were concerned about the opening hours of the proposed podium garden and the implementation of the proposed footbridge connections. A Member suggested that the opening hours of the podium garden should tally with the MTR operation time. As regards the implementation of the proposed footbridge connections, it was noted that such provision was subject to the applicant’s further discussion with the owners of the adjoining buildings and resolution of some technical issues.

56. A Member observed that details of the vertical greening system were not included in the submission. Another Member suggested that the applicant should be encouraged to use recycled water for irrigating the landscaping features within the development. Members noted that an advisory clause in that respect had been included.

57. Regarding Members' general concern on traffic congestion in Kwun Tong, Mr Patrick K.H. Ho, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), TD said that enforcement action played a very crucial role in tackling illegal parking. Besides, the short to long-term traffic improvement measures would continue to be implemented in the Kwun Tong area with a view to alleviating the traffic congestion situation.

58. The Chairman concluded that Members generally indicated support for the application. To address Members' concerns on the opening hours of the podium garden and the reserved openings for possible footbridge connections, the Chairman proposed and the Members agreed that two additional approval conditions should be imposed. Besides, to address Members' concern on how the implementation of the proposed pedestrian connectivity under the current application could be facilitated, the Secretary suggested and Members agreed that the EKEO would be requested to consider incorporating the proposed pedestrian connections into their overall planned pedestrian network.

59. 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 16.4.2025, 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 an updated sewerage impact assessment 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 updated sewerage impact assessment in condition (a) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of a land contamination assessment 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 Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;

- (d) the submission of a revised traffic impact assessment and the implementation of the mitigation measures, if any, identified therein to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (e) 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;
- (f) the design and provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (g) the submission of a proposal on the opening hours of the podium garden to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (h) the design and provision of the reserved openings for future footbridge connections at the level of the podium garden to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB.”

60. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Pape:

[The Chairman thanked Mr William W.L. Chan, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung joined the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, Senior Town Planner/Kolwoon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Items 12 and 13**

**Section 16 Applications**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

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 Residential 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/K14/797A)

---

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 Restriction for Permitted Residential Development in “Residential (Group B) 2” Zone, Government Land in Site R2-4 of Anderson Road Quarry Development, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/798A)

---

61.                      The Committee agreed that as the two applications were similar in nature (minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) and building height (BH) restrictions for permitted residential developments) and the application sites were located in close proximity to each other in the Anderson Road Quarry Development (ARQD), they could be considered together.

62.                      The Secretary reported that application No. A/K14/797 was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) while application No. A/K14/798 was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) and 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 HKHS. The following Members had declared interests on the items:

- Mr Ivan M.K. Chung - being an ex-officio member of the Supervisory  
(Chairman) Board of the HKHS;  
(as Director of Planning)
- Mr Gavin C.T. Tse - being a representative of the Director of Home  
(as Chief Engineer Affairs who was a member of the Strategic  
(Works), Home Affairs Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing  
Department) Committee of the HKHA;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with HKHA and  
MVA;
- Mr Franklin Yu - being a member of the Building Committee of  
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 Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm had business dealings with  
HKHA, HKHS, Townland, WTP, WSP, MVA and  
SYW; and
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member and an ex-employee of the HKHS  
which was involved in housing development  
issues in discussion with HD (the executive arm of  
HKHA).

63. The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the interests of the Chairman, Messrs Gavin C.T. Tse and Franklin Yu were direct, they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the items. As Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon's spouse and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. The Vice-chairman took over the chairmanship of the meeting at this point.



[The Chairman, Messrs Gavin C.T. Tse and Franklin Yu left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

64. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Papers:

- (a) background to the applications;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction 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 BH restrictions (BHRs) for permitted residential developments under application No. A/K14/797; and the proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction for proposed social welfare facility, school (not elsewhere specified), shop and services, market and eating place uses and minor relaxation of BHRs for permitted residential development under application No. A/K14/798;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Papers;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, a public comment from an individual raising concern on application No. A/K14/797, and a public comment from an individual indicating support and expressing views on application No. A/K14/798, were received. The major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Papers; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 on the Papers. The proposed provision of non-domestic facilities was considered generally in line with the planning intention of the concerned zones. The proposed minor relaxation of PR restrictions was in line with the government's overall policy to optimise scarce land resources and relevant technical

assessments confirmed that the proposed uses were acceptable with no insurmountable impacts. The proposed minor relaxation of BHRs was considered not unacceptable having regard to the site constraints and the planning and design merits of the proposals. The Director of Social Welfare (DSW) supported the applications for timely provision of social welfare facilities to serve the future residents. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the applications. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

65. Some Members raised the following questions:

*The Low-rise Non-domestic Block at Site R2-4 (Application No. A/K14/798)*

- (a) BH of the proposed block;
- (b) whether elderly facilities could be provided at the green roof of the building;
- (c) whether the green roof would be opened for public use;
- (d) whether the disposition of building block had taken into account the air ventilation requirement;

*Provision of Social Welfare Facilities*

- (e) whether the proposed day care facilities for the elderly could serve the actual needs of community;
- (f) the demand and provision of residential care homes for the elderly (RCHE) in the ARQD;
- (g) in view of the relatively remote location of ARQD and demographic profile of the planned population, whether there was scope to provide a wider range of social welfare facilities in the ARQD;

*Building Height and Plot Ratio Restrictions*

- (h) the background of imposing a maximum BHR of 280mPD for Site R2-4 on the OZP, and to what extent the BHR could be relaxed;
- (i) how the vantage points were selected under the applications;
- (j) the rationale for imposing the current PR restriction on the OZP; and

*Details of ARQD*

- (k) the PR restriction of the remaining “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) zones, the planned population of ARQD and their distribution and whether air ventilation impact had been considered for ARQD.

66. In response, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, made the following main points:

*The Low-rise Non-domestic Block at Site R2-4 (Application No. A/K14/798)*

- (a) the proposed block would be 10m in height;
- (b) whether elderly facilities could be located at the green roof of the building would be subject to further liaison between the applicant and the Social Welfare Department (SWD);
- (c) the green roof was mainly intended for landscaping purpose and there was no information or commitment to open the area for public use;
- (d) having considered that Site R2-4 was not situated at the major ventilation corridor and wind enhancement features including building separation were proposed and that it abutted a public open space of about 19m-wide, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD had no adverse comment on the proposed layout from air ventilation perspective. SWD also had no adverse comment on the building deposition;

*Provision of Social Welfare Facilities*

- (e) in formulating the details of provision of social welfare facilities, SWD had been consulted at the early planning stage of the development projects. DSW advised that the provisions would address the demand at a district level (i.e. the whole ARQD) rather than on each individual housing site. The provisions had taken into account various factors including the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines for a planned population of 30,000 in ARQD, the existing and planned provision of social welfare facilities in ARQD and the adjoining areas, the site context and the demand for special social services. The proposals aimed to echo the Government's ageing in place policy;
- (f) there were 100 RCHE beds in the ARQD. As for the OZP planning scheme area, there was a shortfall of about 300 RCHE beds;
- (g) the ARQD was located at the northern edge of Kwun Tong and quite far away from the Kwun Town Town Centre area. Apart from the proposed GIC Complex under planning, another site was reserved at ARQD for social welfare block to accommodate additional social welfare facilities. SWD would further review the provisions and optimise the land resources to cater for the needs of ARQD;

*Building Height and Plot Ratio Restrictions*

- (h) the BHR for Site R2-4 was imposed based on the recommendations of the 'Planning Study on Future Land Use at Anderson Road Quarry - Feasibility Study' (the ARQ Study) with consideration given to the key urban design concepts including stepped BH profile to respect the Tai Sheung Tok ridgeline and the planned adjacent open space, '20% building free zone' of Tai Sheung Tok ridgeline, human-scale environment with the adjacent public open space, and BH variations of the building clusters. Further relaxation of BHR should respect the urban design concepts above;

- (i) the two vantage points at Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (i.e. strategic viewing point) and Jordan Valley (i.e. district viewing point) selected under the current applications were the same adopted in the ARQ Study. The use of the same vantage points aimed to demonstrate the possible visual impact arising from the proposed minor relaxation of PR and BHR;
- (j) the PR restrictions imposed on the OZP were based on the recommendations of the ARQ Study which identified ARQD for medium-density residential development with PR ranging from 3 to 5.5. The development scale had balanced the housing needs with the capacity of the existing and planned traffic networks and had taken into account the need for protection of the Tai Sheung Tok ridgeline; and

*Details of ARQD*

- (k) the residential developments at ARQD were mainly zoned “R(B)” on the OZP and their distribution was shown on Plan A-4 of the Papers. The PR restrictions of the remaining “R(B)” zone fell within the range from 3.5 to 5.5. The planned population of ARQD was 30,000. Air ventilation assessment had been conducted under the ARQ Study prior to formulation of the land use zonings on the OZP.

67. In response to Members’ concerns for timely provision of social welfare services in the ARQD, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, said that the housing developments to be implemented by HKHA and HKHS and the social welfare facilities were expected to be completed concurrently. However, given that there would be some delays and ‘out of sync’ condition for actual service provisions, it would be difficult if not totally impossible to achieve a seamless transition for various development projects. Nevertheless, Members’ concerns would be conveyed to relevant government departments, as appropriate.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

### Deliberation Session

68. Members generally considered that as the magnitude of minor relaxation of PR and BH restrictions sought was not significant and the applications were mainly to facilitate the provision of non-domestic facilities including social welfare facilities and other supporting facilities to serve the future residents, the applications could be supported.

69. Members noted that the air ventilation assessments under the applications had been conducted to compare two scenarios (i.e. the current scheme and the recommended scheme under the ARQ Study), which concluded that with the proposed mitigation measures, the wind environment in the area could be enhanced.

70. Two Members expressed concerns on the possible mismatch of population intake and provision of supporting facilities, especially at the early phase of development. Members noted the tentative implementation programmes of open space and GIC facilities, including public open space, transportation and pedestrian connections, schools and kindergarten, community hall and library, etc. in the ARQD, which reflected the efforts made by relevant government departments to minimise the time gap of population intake and service provision as far as practicable. To meet the daily needs and create a liveable environment for the future residents, Members generally considered that the relevant government departments should closely monitor the development programme so as to ensure the timely provision of the supporting facilities.

71. The Vice-chairman concluded that Members generally indicated support for the applications but were concerned about the timely provision of GIC and supporting facilities in the ARQD to tie in with the population intake. The Secretary suggested and Members agreed that their views be conveyed to the relevant government departments in taking forward the development projects.

72. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications, on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). Each of the permissions should be valid until 16.4.2025, 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(s):

Application No. A/K14/797

“the design and provision of the social welfare facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Social Welfare or of the TPB.”

Application No. A/K14/798

“(a) the design and provision of the social welfare facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Social Welfare or of the TPB; and

(b) 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.”

73. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV of the respective Paper.

[The Vice-chairman thanked Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

**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/K18/338A)

---

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

- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member and 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.

75. 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.

76. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 9.4.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address comments from the Transport Department. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

77. 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 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.



**Agenda Item 15**

**Any Other Business**

78.           There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:35 p.m.