

RESTRICTED

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 672nd Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 28.5.2021**

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 Johanna W.Y. Cheng

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Charlotte P. S. Ng

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 671st MPC Meeting held on 14.5.2021

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 671st MPC meeting held on 14.5.2021 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

[Mr Louis K.H. Kau, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), Ms Katy C.W. Fung, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), Mr Derek P. K. Tse, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK) and Ms Vivian W. M. Tsang, Senior Town Planner/New Territories District Planning Division Headquarters (STP/NTHQ) were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting]

Review of Sites Designated “Comprehensive Development Area” on Statutory Plans in the Metro Area for the Years 2019/2021
(MPC Paper No. 4/21)

Presentation and Question Sessions

4. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Vivian W.M. Tsang, STP/NTHQ, introduced the background to the review of “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) sites. According to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 17A, a review of the “CDA” sites designated for more than three years should be conducted on a biennial basis to assist the Committee to monitor the progress of “CDA” developments. The last “CDA” Review was conducted in 2019. Ms Vivian W.M. Tsang further presented the results of the latest review on “CDA” sites in the Metro Area as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points:

- (a) as at the end of March 2021, there were a total of 58 “CDA” sites in the Metro Area. The current review had examined all 58 sites which had been designated “CDA” for more than three years;

“CDA” Sites with No Approved Master Layout Plan (MLP)

- (b) a total of 19 “CDA” sites had no approved MLP, and 16 of which were proposed for retention. Three sites, namely (i) at the junction of Kowloon City Road and Ma Tau Kok Road which was commonly known as “13 Streets” (K31); (ii) at the junction of Ma Tau Kok Road and To Kwa Wan Road which was commonly known as “5 Streets” (K54); and (iii) at the

periphery of the Tsuen Wan East Industrial Area (TW23) were subject to review on the zoning, site boundary and/or development intensity. Justifications for retention of the 16 sites and details of the three sites under review were set out in Appendices I and II of the Paper respectively;

“CDA” Sites with Approved MLP

- (c) a total of 39 “CDA” sites were with approved MLP. Amongst them, 24 sites were proposed for retention to ensure proper implementation in accordance with the approved MLPs and approval conditions. Justifications for retention of the 24 sites were set out in Appendix III of the Paper;
- (d) there were 11 sites previously agreed by the Committee for rezoning to appropriate zonings to reflect their as-built conditions when opportunity arose. The current progress of implementation of these sites was set out in Appendix IV of the Paper; and
- (e) as the development in four sites had been completed, it was proposed to rezone them to appropriate zonings to reflect their as-built conditions and approved uses subject to full compliance with the approval conditions (if applicable) and when opportunity arose. They included: (i) the residential cum hotel development at Oil Street (ex-Government Supplies Department Depot), North Point (H23); (ii) the comprehensive residential development with supporting commercial uses at the Former Lingnan Campus Site, Stubbs Road (H29); (iii) the comprehensive residential and commercial uses with public transport terminus, public coach park, Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities and public open space (POS) at the Ex-North Point Estate, North Point (H58); and (iv) the comprehensive residential and commercial development at MTR Nam Cheong Station (namely Cullinan West) (K26). Justifications for rezoning these sites were set out in Appendix V of the Paper.

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

Rezoning of “CDA” Sites with Completed Developments

5. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the residential cum hotel development at Oil Street in North Point (H23) had been completed with full compliance of all approval conditions while the comprehensive residential development with supporting commercial uses at the Former Lingnan Campus Site on Stubbs Road (H29) had also been completed with certain approval conditions yet to be complied with. The occupancy permits of both “CDA” sites had been issued. These sites would be rezoned to appropriate zonings to reflect their as-built conditions and approved uses in the future round of amendments to the respective Outline Zoning Plans. To address the enquiry of the Vice-Chairman on whether there was time limit for compliance with approval conditions, Mr Louis K.H. Kau responded that all approval conditions would have to be complied with during the validity period of the planning permission.

“CDA” Sites Subject to Review

6. In response to a Member’s request for clarification, Ms Vivian W.M. Tsang, STP/NTHQ, reiterated details of the three “CDA” sites that were subject to review as outlined in Paragraph 4.1.3 of the Paper. For the “13 Streets” (K31) site, the Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum (KC DURF) had proposed to sub-divide the “CDA” into two or three “CDAs” to reduce the difficulty in land assembly which might facilitate its redevelopment. For the “5 Streets” (K54) site, KC DURF had proposed to sub-divide the “CDA” into two “CDAs” and relax the plot ratio. For the site at the periphery of the Tsuen Wan East Industrial Area (TW23), it was designated as “CDA” together with the adjacent sites to address the industrial/residential (I/R) interface problem of the area and with completion of the surrounding residential/commercial developments, it could be considered for rezoning.

7. A Member, whilst noting that the “CDA” sites at “13 Streets” (K31) and “5 Streets” (K54) involved a large number of land owners, tenants and business operators and implementation of the “CDA” zones might be uncertain, pointed out that the “CDA(1)” site at the periphery of Tsuen Wan East Industrial Area (TW23) was under single ownership and enquired what hurdles were encountered by the owner to redevelop the site. In response, Mr Derek P. K. Tse, DPO/TWK, explained that the site (TW23) was previously part of a larger “CDA” zone covering the adjoining lots (currently zoned “Commercial (2)” (“C(2)”), “C(3)”) and “C(4)”.

and “C(4)”) which was designated to act as a land use buffer in-between the industrial area to the south and the residential area to the north. Developments within the said “C” zones had been completed and rezoned accordingly. Noting that the site was under single ownership, it was considered that rezoning the “CDA(1)” site (TW23) to other appropriate zoning might facilitate its early redevelopment.

Site Area of “CDA” Zones

8. In response to the Vice-Chairman’s enquiry on whether a total site area of the 58 “CDA” sites was available, Ms Vivian W.M. Tsang, STP/NTHQ, said that the site area of each “CDA” site was provided in Appendices I to V.

9. A Member enquired on whether sites had to be of a certain area before they would be considered for designation as “CDA”. In response, Ms Vivian W.M. Tsang said that the site areas of the 58 “CDA” zones varied and in designating sites as “CDA”, other than site area, there were other considerations such as site constraints/circumstances and other community needs. The Chairman supplemented that the purpose for designation of a “CDA” zone was to achieve comprehensive development of an area, and there was no yardstick on the optimal site area for “CDA” sites. The Secretary said that “CDA” sites with larger area might allow more flexibility in the provision of GIC, public transport and other facilities. However, the prospect for implementation of “CDA” sites depended on land ownership and land assembly, and the Board had in the past agreed to sub-divide large “CDA” sites with no implementation for a prolonged period to enhance their prospect for redevelopment. There were relevant examples in Yau Tong Industrial area, To Kwa Wan and Tsuen Wan. There was no hard and fast rule to determine whether a site was sizable enough to warrant comprehensive development or was too big and required sub-division. Each site should be considered on its own site circumstances and the specific planning purpose which a “CDA” site was designated to achieve.

10. A Member sought clarification on the different considerations for designating the entire street block at “13 Streets” as one “CDA” (K31) and designating the street block to its north across Mok Cheong Street as three “CDAs” (K30, K39 and K40). The Chairman said that the K30, K39 and K40 “CDA” sites were occupied by industrial buildings while the “13 Streets” “CDA” site (K31) was mainly residential buildings. The designation of those sites to the north of Mok Cheong Street as “CDAs” was to address the I/R interface problem.

The boundaries of the K30, K39 and K40 “CDA” sites had taken account of the existing land uses and redevelopment potential. The designation of some other “CDA” sites might be for addressing other concerns, such as traffic and noise impacts and appropriate mitigation measures could be assessed through the Master Layout Plan (MLP) submission requirements. Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, supplemented that K30, K39 and K40 were originally covered by a single “CDA” zone and was sub-divided into several smaller “CDA” sites upon review in 1999 to enhance their prospects for redevelopment. Besides land ownership, other considerations like site characteristics and potential improvement to the living environment, were considered in determining the site boundaries of these “CDA” zones. After the sub-division in 1999, applications for redevelopment at two of the sub-divided “CDA” sites had been approved/received. Planning permissions had been granted for residential uses at K39 with two approved MLPs while a planning application at K40 was received and would soon be submitted for consideration by the Committee. No planning application was received for K30 and one reason might be that the industrial building thereat involved multiple ownership. It was suggested to retain the designation of the “CDA” zone at K30 mainly for addressing the I/R interface problem.

11. In response to the enquiry by a Member on the “5 Streets” “CDA” site (K54) , Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, said that the northern part of the “CDA” zone was occupied by industrial buildings while the southern part was occupied by residential buildings. The designation of the “5 Streets” “CDA” site (K54) could address the I/R interface problems and improve the environmental and traffic conditions in the area through comprehensive redevelopment.

Planning Benefits of Comprehensive Developments

12. In response to two Members’ questions on the planning benefits achieved through the “CDA” planning mechanism, Ms Vivian W.M. Tsang, STP/NTHQ, said that a range of different land uses, including residential and commercial, as well as some public facilities such as POS, GIC facilities and public transport facilities could be provided through “CDA” developments that were guided by the submission of MLP and relevant technical assessments. Taking the Ex-North Point Estate (Ex-NPE) (H58) which had been redeveloped into Victoria Harbour as an example, the site was developed into a comprehensive residential development with commercial uses, provision of POS, GIC facilities and a covered bus terminus.

13. In response to a Member's question on whether "CDA" zones would still be designated in future, the Chairman said that "CDA" zoning would continue to be one of the planning tools to facilitate comprehensive development, and designation of sites as "CDA" would require careful consideration of the characteristics and planning requirements of individual sites. A planning brief (PB) would normally be prepared to set out the key development parameters and other planning and design requirements, including say requirements for GIC facilities, POS, public transport facilities etc. so as to guide the MLP submission. The PB would be submitted for approval by the Committee. The applicants would formulate the development scheme taking account of the requirements of the approved PB and submit planning applications in the form of MLPs.

14. At the Chairman's invitation, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, took the Ex-NPE "CDA" site (H58) as an example to illustrate what planning benefits and overall living environment improvement of the concerned area had been brought by the implementation of "CDA" development. According to the PB of the Ex-NPE "CDA" site, GIC facilities including social welfare facilities and a community hall were required to be provided within the site. In order to address concerns on air ventilation, the PB included the requirements for designation of visual and wind corridors as non-building area which aligned with the roads in the vicinity to improve the local wind environment. In this regard, 15m-wide building gaps had been accordingly provided within the site. The previous open-air bus terminus was re-provisioned as a covered bus terminus which minimised its potential noise impacts on sensitive receivers nearby. Besides, a POS which complemented the public waterfront promenade for public enjoyment was provided and handed over to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department for management. In this connection, a Member indicated that information highlighting the key differences in land use/facilities provisions before and after the "CDA" redevelopments might be useful for the Committee's reference in considering future designation of "CDA" zone. Two Members opined that "CDA" redevelopments would inevitably lead to relocation of affected residents and disruption of local networks which should be carefully tackled.

15. In response to a Member's enquiry on the specific planning purpose for designation of "CDA" zone at the Former Lingnam Campus Site on Stubbs Road (H29), Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the site was sold by land sale to a private developer for a comprehensive residential development. The "CDA" zoning was adopted to ensure that

traffic impacts on Stubbs Road and urban design concerns would be carefully addressed and mitigated through the submission of a MLP.

Others

16. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Secretary said that the review was conducted on the basis of each "CDA" zone, which might include more than one land lot. For "CDA" sites under multiple ownership, phased development might be permitted. In those cases, the applicants would still be required to submit a MLP covering the entire "CDA" to demonstrate how different phases could be implemented without compromising the comprehensiveness of the development.

17. In relation to the 16 "CDA" sites without approved MLP and proposed for retention, a Member asked whether the landowners had expressed concerns on implementation and had made requests to rezone the concerned sites to other zonings or to divide the "CDA" into smaller subzones. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, and Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, replied that no such requests were received in the last two years for the sites within the Hong Kong and Kowloon Districts.

18. Noting that fragmented land ownership would affect the prospect of implementation of "CDAs", a Member enquired if the involvement of Urban Renewal Authority (URA) was critical in the implementation of "CDA" sites that involved multiple ownership. The Chairman said that URA had its own business plan and project priorities. For the "CDA" sites that would affect a large number of owners, tenants and business operators, for example "13 Streets" (K31), the Development Bureau would have to assess appropriate implementation mechanism, including the implementation agents, to facilitate redevelopment of those sites.

Deliberation Session

19. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) note the findings of the review of the sites designated "CDA" on statutory plans in the Metro Area;

- (b) agree to the proposed retention of the “CDA” designation for the sites mentioned in paragraphs 4.1.1 and 4.2.1 and detailed at Appendices I and III of the Paper;
- (c) note the sites which were subject to review mentioned in paragraph 4.1.3 and detailed at Appendix II of the Paper;
- (d) note the agreement of the Committee to rezone the sites mentioned in paragraph 4.2.2 and detailed at Appendix IV of the Paper; and
- (e) agree to the proposed rezoning of the sites mentioned in paragraph 4.2.3 and detailed at Appendix V of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, Mr Derek P. K. Tse, DPO/TWK, and Ms Vivian W. M. Tsang, STP/NTHQ, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 4

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/K18/10 Application for Amendment to the Approved Kowloon Tong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K18/21, To rezone the application site from “Residential (Group C) 1” to “Commercial (3)” and ‘Road’, 3, 5 and 7 Kent Road, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. Y/K18/10A)

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

- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being 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 owning properties in Kowloon Tong.

21. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the interest of Mr Daniel K.S. Lau was indirect, 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.

22. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 18.5.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time to revise the development proposal 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 respond to departmental comments.

23. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information and 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 Items 5 to 8

Section 12A Applications

[Open Meeting]

- Y/K9/15 Application for Amendment to the Approved Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/26, To rezone the application site from "Residential (Group A) 4" to "Residential (Group A) 7", Hung Hom Inland Lots 240 S.A RP, 241 S.C RP and 241 RP, 11A and 15 Winslow Street, Hung Hom, Kowloon
- Y/K9/16 Application for Amendment to the Approved Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/26, To rezone the application site from "Residential (Group A) 4" to "Residential (Group A) 7", Hung Hom Inland Lots 239 S.F and 239 RP, 21 and 23 Winslow Street, Hung Hom, Kowloon
- Y/K9/17 Application for Amendment to the Approved Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/26, To rezone the application site from "Residential (Group A) 4" to "Residential (Group A) 7", Hung Hom Inland Lot 494, 1 and 2 Wa Fung Street, Hung Hom, Kowloon

Y/K9/18 Application for Amendment to the Approved Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/26, To rezone the application site from “Residential (Group A) 4” to “Residential (Group A) 7”, Hung Hom Inland Lot 266 RP, 244-248 Chatham Road North and 2A-2B Cooke Street, Hung Hom, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. Y/K9/15 to 18)

24. The Committee noted that the four s.12A applications for rezoning were similar in nature, the application sites were located in close proximity to one another within the same “Residential (Group A)” zone, and represented by the same representative, one paper was prepared to cover the requests for deferral of consideration of the four applications and agreed that the four applications could be considered together.

25. The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 5.5.2021 deferment of consideration of the applications for two months in order to allow time for preparation of traffic impact assessment to address comments from the Transport Department. It was the first time that the applicants requested deferment of the applications.

26. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the applications as requested by the applicants pending the submission of further information from the applicants. The Committee agreed that the applications should be submitted for its consideration within three 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 applications 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.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/522 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Information Technology And Telecommunications Industries (Data Centre Development) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 18-20 Pun Shan Street, Tsuen Wan, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/522)

27. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan and Kenneth To & Associates Limited (renamed to KTA Planning Limited) (KTA) and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited (MMHK) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|------------------------|--|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - having current business dealings with MMHK; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - his former firm had business dealings with MMHK; |
| Mr. Daniel K.S. Lau | - being a member and an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA; |
| Mr Stanley T.S. Choi | - his spouse being a director of a company owning properties in Tsuen Wan; and |
| Professor John C.Y. Ng | - his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan. |

28. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the interest of Mr Daniel K.S. Lau was indirect, Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, and the properties owned by the

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

29. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 17.5.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time to prepare further information to address the comments from the Environmental Protection Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

31. 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 proposed office and shop and services;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, six public comments objecting to the application were received from four individuals and a Wan Chai District Council member. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The application site (the Site) was zoned “Residential (Group A)” and should be developed in accordance with the planning intention of the zoning unless strong justification had been provided. The Site was located in a predominantly residential area, and out of the 15 buildings located within the immediate neighbourhood of the Site, 13 buildings (including the Site) were for residential developments. Whilst the proposed office

development with 'shop and services' use on the lowest three floors was considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments and did not exceed the building height restriction as stipulated on the Outline Zoning Plan, it was not fully in line with criterion (e) of Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 5 (TPB PG-No. 5) in that the proposed office building should not be located in a predominantly residential area. The proposed communal open spaces on 3/F and roof floor (R/F) were not easily accessible for public use and the planning gain proposed was considered to be limited. All previously approved planning applications for similar uses were different from the subject application either in terms of their site contexts or planning backgrounds and were not relevant to the subject 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 the presentation session.]

32. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) uses of the existing building on the Site;
 - (b) the total domestic gross floor area (GFA) allowed at the Site if the upper floors were for residential use;
 - (c) whether the Board had previously approved planning applications with public open space on upper/roof floors as proposed in the subject application;
 - (d) what mechanism was available to ensure that the proposed communal gardens would be open for use by the public as proposed by the applicant;
 - (e) whether the proposed development would worsen the traffic condition of the surrounding road network noting that there was usually traffic congestion on Queen's Road East (QRE) and no car parking spaces or loading/unloading (L/U) facilities were proposed on the Site;

- (f) whether there was information on the demand/supply of commercial office space in Hong Kong in general and the Wanchai district in particular; and
- (g) noting in the Paper that the application was considered not fully in line with the TPB PG-No. 5 as the proposed office building should not be located in a predominantly residential area, whether the planning assessment had duly considered that there was a commercial building adjacent to the Site.

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

- (a) the Site was currently occupied by Shun Fat Building which was a ten-storey building with an eating place on the G/F, offices on 1/F to 3/F, and 12 flats on 4/F to 9/F. The existing building was an OZP compliant use;
- (b) the Site (a Class B site) was subject to a maximum permissible domestic plot ratio of 9 under the Building (Planning) Regulations. Should the Site be redeveloped for residential use, the maximum GFA would be about 1,767m². Assuming an average flat size of 50m², it might yield about 35 flats;
- (c) the Board had previously approved schemes with roof top gardens but there was no information available regarding their utilisation;
- (d) during the general building plan submission stage, it was possible to check whether the communal gardens were included in the development as per the approved scheme. However, as the lease of the Site did not have any user restriction and lease modification was not required to implement the proposed use, there was no effective means to subsequently enforce the opening of the communal gardens would be open for public use;
- (e) no parking space and L/UL space would be provided in the proposed development, and according to the applicant, all L/UL activities would be effectively carried out on QRE and Li Chit Street. Although the Transport Department had no adverse comment on the application from the traffic engineering perspective, the applicant was requested to submit a revised

Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) and implement any mitigation measures identified in the TIA should the application be approved;

- (f) according to the Hong Kong Property Review 2021 conducted by the Rating and Valuation Department, the vacancies of Class A, Class B and Class C offices in the Wan Chai district were 10%, 10.8% and 9.1% respectively, which were similar to the respective territorial vacancies of 11.8%, 11.9% and 9.4%; and
- (g) the Site was located in a predominantly residential area. 13 out of the 15 buildings located within the immediate neighbourhood of the Site bounded by Landale Street, Johnston Road, Gresson Street and QRE were residential developments. Therefore, the proposed office development did not comply with the planning criteria as stipulated under the TPB PG-No. 5 as proposed office use should not be located in a predominantly residential area. The commercial development abutting the Site was Keen Hung Commercial Building which was covered by a planning application approved by the Board in 1992.

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

Deliberation Session

34. A Member noted the conclusion of the 'Land Use Review of the Area to the southwest of the Junction of Hennessy Road and Johnston Road' conducted in 2008 that the study area was more suitable for commercial use, and considered there was no strong justification for granting planning permission for the subject application as the Site was located outside the study area and occupied by a OZP compliant residential building. Two Members opined that the communal gardens proposed as planning gain under the proposed scheme was limited as they were not easily accessible for use by the public and the application should not be approved as the Site was located within a predominantly residential area.

35. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reasons were:

- “(a) there is no strong planning justification for a departure from the planning intention of the “Residential (Group A)” zone which is intended primarily for high-density residential developments; and
- (b) the proposed development does not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 5 in that the proposed office should not be located in a predominantly residential area.”

[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 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K22/30 Proposed Comprehensive Development including Flat (Subsidized Sale Flats), Shop and Services and Eating Place in “Comprehensive Development Area (5)” Zone, Kai Tak Area 2B Site 1, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K22/30)

36. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) and Kenneth To & Associates Limited (renamed KTA Planning Limited) (KTA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had declared an interest on the item for being a member and an ex-employee of HKHS and HKHS had business dealings with KTA.

37. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and as Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the

Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

38. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 13.5.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address comments from the Transport Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

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

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K15/126 Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development (Amendments to an Approved Scheme) in "Comprehensive Development Area (3)" Zone and area shown as 'Road', Yau Tong Inland Lots 4 S.B and 9, Yau Tong Marine Lot 57 and adjoining Government Land, Tung Yuen Street, Yau Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/126A)

40. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Charm Smart Development Limited, Glory Mission Development Limited, Hoover (China) Limited and Lucken Limited, which were subsidiaries of Yuexiu Property Company Limited (Yuexiu). Aurecon Hong Kong Limited (Aurecon) and Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited (HPA) were two of the consultants of the applicants. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest on the item as his former firm had business dealings with Yuexiu, Aurecon and HPA and the Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

41. 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 Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed comprehensive residential development (amendments to an approved scheme);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 14 public comments, with six supporting comments from individuals, and eight opposing comments from the recycling industry operators within the Yau Tong Industrial Area (YTIA) and individuals, 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 assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The application was to seek planning permission for proposed amendments to the previously approved master layout plan (MLP) under application No. A/K15/119 (the Approved Scheme) for a proposed comprehensive residential development with a public waterfront promenade (PWP) at the application site (the Site). Compared with the Approved Scheme, major

changes included an increase in site area to include a strip of government land (GL) that was included in the lot boundary in the land grant process for the Approved Scheme, corresponding increase in gross floor area (GFA), reduction in average flat size, increase in the number of flats and extension of the opening hours of the PWP to 24 hours daily (the Proposed Scheme). The Proposed Scheme was considered in line with the planning intention of the “Comprehensive Development Area (3)” (“CDA(3)”) zone and compatible with the long term planned land use of the area. The Proposed Scheme generally complied with the main planning and design requirements under the planning brief (PB). Having regard to the site constraints, nil provision of commercial use along the PWP at the Site might not be unreasonable. While the Site would be subject to industrial/residential interface problems, the applicant had proposed various measures/design to mitigate the environmental impacts and nuisance from the industrial operations. The applicant had submitted technical assessments to demonstrate that the Proposed Scheme would not impose significant adverse impacts on traffic, sewerage/drainage, environmental, air ventilation, visual and urban design, landscaping aspects and concerned government departments had no adverse comment on the application and relevant approval conditions were recommended to address their technical concerns. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

42. Some Members enquired on the planning merits of including the GL into the Site, and the Government’s considerations for granting GL to private developers. In response, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, said that the strip of GL abutting Shung Yiu Street included in the Site was currently idle land with some vegetation. Given its elongated shape and small area of 513m², its potential for alternative uses was limited. There was a large level difference between Shung Yiu Street and Tung Yuen Street and the GL formed part of a retaining wall. Inclusion of the GL into the Site would better utilise its development potential, and more GFA and flats could be provided in the “CDA(3)” zone to address the housing needs. Besides, the strip of GL would be landscaped to enhance the streetscape. Mr Albert K.L. Cheung, Assistant Director (Regional 1) of the Lands Department (LandsD) supplemented that applications for grant of extra GL in a land exchange would be assessed

based on LandsD's established criteria including whether there were other alternative public uses; whether the land area was capable of separate development; and whether there would be implications on land revenue, etc. The granting of GL in a land exchange for private developers was therefore not guaranteed. For the subject case, GL to be granted would be subject to payment at full land premium;

43. Some Member raised the following questions:

Details of the Proposed Scheme

- (a) purpose of the proposed footbridge and whether it was accountable for GFA calculation;
- (b) the number of parking spaces provided under the Proposed Scheme and whether they would be open for public use;

Flat Sizes and Flat Mix

- (c) the proposed range of flat sizes under the Proposed Scheme, and whether the flat sizes were saleable area or gross floor area;
- (d) whether the Board could impose planning conditions on a minimum flat size;

Provision of Social Welfare Facilities

- (e) noting that some public comments opposed the application due to nil provision of social welfare facilities (SWFs), what the shortfalls in SWFs were in the area;
- (f) noting that the Approved Scheme did not include any SWFs, whether there was any request from government departments for SWFs to be incorporated in the Proposed Scheme;
- (g) given that there would be increase in population in the area and there would be deficit of SWFs, whether the applicant could be requested to reserve some floor space for SWFs within the development;

Commercial Uses along the PWP

- (h) what justifications were provided by the applicant for nil provision of commercial uses along the PWP;
- (i) whether commercial uses were provided at other “CDA” sub-zones; and whether provision of commercial uses was a mandatory requirement;

Design and Uses at the PWP

- (j) how a harmonious design and connectivity of the PWP in different “CDA” subzones along the waterfront would be ensured;
- (k) whether building structures were allowed above the PWP;
- (l) whether the design and supporting facilities at the PWP could facilitate temporary activities like farmer’s market/weekend market;
- (m) accessibility to the PWP in the YTIA;
- (n) whether a pedestrian passageway was proposed in the inland portion of the Site to provide more direct access from Shung Yiu Street and Tung Yuen Street;

Other Issues

- (o) whether the Chief Engineer/Port Works of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CE/PW, CEDD) had provided the same comments regarding adverse effect on stability of seawall and threat of storm surges under the Approved Scheme; and how the Proposed Scheme had addressed the said comments; and
- (p) whether the affected recycling industry operators who had submitted the public comments would be assisted for relocation.

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

Details of the Proposed Scheme

- (a) the ingress of the development was proposed at Shung Yiu Street and the footbridge provided a linkage for residents between the inland and waterfront portions of the Site. The footbridge would minimize the need for residents to walk along Tung Yuen Street where industrial operations were concentrated. It would provide a direct route for residents in the waterfront portion to access the car park at the inland portion. The footbridge was accountable for GFA of 172m² and it would not be exempted from GFA calculation as it was for the exclusive use of residents and would not be open for public use;
- (b) a total of 219 ancillary car parking spaces would be provided for residents under the Proposed Scheme. To cater for parking needs of visitors to the area, a public vehicle park with not less than 171 parking spaces would be provided at the development at the nearby “CDA(5)” zone;

Flat Sizes and Flat Mix

- (c) the average flat size was reduced from about 55m² in the Approved Scheme to about 44m² in the Proposed Scheme, and the latter was within the range of flat sizes in the approved planning applications for residential developments in “CDA” and “Residential (Group E)” sites in YTIA from 42m² to 97m² and 37m² to 77m² respectively. According to the information provided by the applicant, 1,393 flats ranging from 20m² to over 70m² in saleable area would be provided in the Proposed Scheme; and 58% of flats were under 40m², 28% of flats were between 40m² and 70m² and 14% of flats were over 70m². The applicant had not provided information on the distribution of flat sizes under 40m²;
- (d) there was no specific requirement on flat size for the “CDA(3)” zone in the PB nor on the OZP. As for whether the Committee could impose a particular flat size for the Proposed Scheme as a planning condition, the proposed flat sizes were based on a layout that was assessed in the

Environmental Assessment (EA). If another flat size was to be specified, the layout needed to be amended and new technical assessments were required;

Provision of Social Welfare Facilities

- (e) the provision of SWFs was generally sufficient to meet the demand in the planning scheme area with the exception of shortfalls in the provision of child care centre, community care services facilities and residential care home for the elderly. There were various types of existing and planned SWFs in the planning scheme area including the facilities that would be provided in the Yau Tong Bay comprehensive development, and a piece of land zoned “Government, Institution or Community” in Lei Yue Mun Path had been reserved for the development of a welfare block that would accommodate SWFs;
- (f) there was no specific requirement for SWFs in the PB nor on the OZP. The applicant followed the PB and did not propose any SWFs in the Proposed Scheme and no departments had adverse comments in this regard;
- (g) regarding the suggestion to reserve a portion of land or some floor space at the Site for provision of SWFs/GIC facilities in the future, no technical assessments had been conducted under the Proposed Scheme to evaluate its environmental or traffic impacts. The Government was determined to provide more SWFs under its prevailing mechanism with coordination among relevant government departments, including by reservation of 5% of domestic GFA for provision of SWFs in public housing developments and purchase of suitable premises;

Commercial Uses along the PWP

- (h) according to the PB, appropriate amount of commercial uses should be provided along the waterfront to enhance the vibrancy of the PWP. However, same as the Approved Scheme, the applicant did not intend to provide any commercial uses under the Proposed Scheme due to site constraints. According to the applicant, the area of the waterfront portion

was very limited (about 1,469m²) and about one-third of its area was for the provision of the PWP (about 454m²). The remaining area had to meet the design requirements of providing on-site loading/unloading space, a proposed 3m-wide landscape buffer from the PWP, and other essential electrical and mechanical facilities. There was no space left for provision of commercial uses. The Harbour Office of the DEVB had been consulted and had no adverse comment on this aspect;

- (i) with reference to the approved MLPs of the “CDA(1)”, “CDA(3)”, “CDA(4)” and “CDA(5)” zones, commercial uses would be provided at “CDA(4)” and “CDA(5)”. Despite that the PB had specified a minimum commercial GFA of 500m² for “CDA(5)”, a commercial GFA of about 900m² would be provided along the PWP at the ground level of the waterfront portion according to the respective approved MLP. Besides, commercial GFA of 100m² would be provided at phase 2 of the “CDA(4)” development facing Yan Yue Wai and that would create synergy effect with the adjoining “CDA(5)”. In general, there was more flexibility for provision of commercial uses along the PWP for sites with longer frontages at the waterfront, and in this regard, the site frontage at waterfront for “CDA(4)” and “CDA(5)” was about 88m and that for “CDA(1)” and “CDA(3)” was much shorter;

Design and Uses at the PWP

- (j) a PWP was required to be provided in the five “CDAs” in YTIA. A smooth transition among different sections of the PWP in different “CDA” sub-zones was necessary to ensure continuity and cohesiveness. According to the OZP and the PB, the design of the PWP (including street furniture and types of trees) could make reference to PWP in other “CDA” subzones with MLP already submitted and approved by the Board. Appropriate conditions on the design and provision of the PWP had been imposed on approved applications of the respective “CDAs” and relevant government departments would provide inputs to ensure there would be harmonious design and uses along the PWP. In particular, comments would be sought from relevant departments, including the Urban Design

and Landscape section of the Planning Department, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department as well as the Harbour Office of DEVB;

- (k) as the PWP would be surrendered to the Government in the long term, government departments would unlikely agree to having building structures above the PWP;
- (l) the suggestion to explore temporary activities such as farmer's market/weekend market at the PWP would be conveyed to the relevant departments and its feasibility and the facilities needed to support such uses would be evaluated and considered at the detailed design stage. It was likely that such activities might not be feasible within the PWP at the Site which had a small area;
- (m) on accessibility to the PWP, the section of PWP in "CDA(5)" zone (that would be completed around 2023) would be a prominent entrance to the entire PWP which would link up the Kai Tak waterfront further northwest and Lei Yue Mun Village in the southeast in the long run. It could be accessed near Sam Ka Tsuen Typhoon Shelter or Yan Yue Wai. The PWP at "CDA(3)" could be accessed from Shung Wo Path which was sandwiched by the sections of PWP at "CDA(2)" and "CDA(3)". "CDA(2)" was currently occupied by the Kwun Tong Fish Market which had no relocation timetable yet. For "CDA(1)", as it abutted an industrial building to its northwest, its respective approved scheme included a 3m-wide pedestrian walkway along the northern boundary of the waterfront portion to provide a 24-hour direct connection to the PWP at that end via Tung Yuen Street. The PWP provided in the "CDA" subzones were all required to provide a 24-hour public access;
- (n) the Proposed Scheme had not included any pedestrian passageway open for public use within the inland portion;

Other issues

- (o) the comment of CE/PW of CEDD highlighted in paragraph 9.1.12 of the Paper was provided to remind the applicants to review the potential impact of more extreme weather on developments near the waterfront based on the experience at the coastline of Hong Kong during the Super Typhoon Mangkhut in September 2018. Since the Approved Scheme under the previous planning application No. A/K15/119 was approved by the Committee on 15.6.2018 prior to the super typhoon, CE/PW of CEDD had no comment on the previous application at that time. To address CEDD's comments regarding potential impacts resulted from extreme weather, the waterfront portion of the Proposed Scheme was designed in such a manner that the electrical and mechanical facilities were located near Tung Yuen Street away from the waterfront, a 3m-high fence wall was proposed between the PWP and the Site, and no basement carpark was proposed thereat. The CE/PW of CEDD had not provided information on the magnitude of possible storm surge during extreme weather. The comments of CE/PW of CEDD had been included in the advisory clause for the applicant's consideration, should the application be approved; and
- (p) the current recycling businesses in YTIA were undertaken by private operators, and such use would eventually be phased out when redevelopments on the sites gradually took place. There was no information on where those businesses might be relocated to.

[Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

Deliberation Session

45. The Chairman recapitulated that the Site was the subject of a previously approved planning application and the current application was mainly to incorporate a strip of GL which LandsD considered appropriate to be included into the applicant's lot during the land exchange process, with corresponding increase in GFA at the same plot ratio. The applicant had also proposed a reduction in average flat size with corresponding increase in the number of flats. The major parameters in the overall plot ratio, building height and provision of

PWP generally met the requirements of the OZP and PB. Regarding Members' concern on the design and connectivity of the PWP, it could be dealt with through approval condition and the relevant departments would work together to enhance the design and facilitate implementation of the PWP. With regard to the concern on provision of SWFs, whilst there was a need for more SWFs in the area in general, there was no such requirement stipulated under the PB and there was still opportunity to include requirements for SWFs within the adjacent "CDA(2)" zone that currently had no redevelopment plan yet.

46. Noting that the proposed average flat size was reduced to 44m² and the smallest flats were studio flats of merely 20m², two Members considered that the application should not be supported as flats with very small size would affect the living quality associated with small living spaces and would increase the demand for more community supporting facilities. Other Members, though raising concern on the small flat size under the proposed scheme, noted from a layout plan in the EA report that the proposed flats were mostly one to three bedroom flats and there was only one studio flat on each floor of two blocks in the inland portion. Also, given that a minimum flat size was not stipulated in the PB, a rejection of the application on ground of small flat size would be subject to challenge. Further, as there was no stipulated standard on a minimum flat size, the imposition of an approval condition on a minimum flat size, if the application was approved, should not be considered either. Notwithstanding that, information on flat sizes proposed in approved planning applications would be useful reference for Members' consideration of future cases.

47. Members raised the following views and concerns on other aspects of the proposed development:

Provision of Social Welfare Facilities

- (a) while noting the provision of SWFs was not mandatory at the "CDA(3)" zone, the applicant should consider reviewing the possibility to provide such facilities, particularly when additional GFA was proposed in the current scheme. With the current shortfalls and more new population in the area in the future, the Government should also strive to provide more such facilities to serve the local community. Particularly, the Government should review whether SWFs could be provided within the future development at "CDA(2)" zone;

Public Waterfront Promenade

- (b) regarding the design of the PWP, relevant approval condition should be imposed to ensure a continuous PWP with harmonious design and vibrancy for public enjoyment with coordination among relevant government departments;
- (c) there should be improvement to the public's accessibility to the PWP and enhancement of the design of the PWP with supporting facilities to allow flexibility for a wider range of activities, including farmer's market/weekend market;
- (d) the provision of a public pedestrian passageway within the inland portion allowing direct access between Shung Yiu Street and Tung Yuen Street to the PWP might be desirable;

Commercial Uses along PWP

- (e) taking into account the site constraints and small area of the waterfront portion, some Members considered it acceptable not to provide commercial uses along the PWP while some considered that the applicant should review the possibility to provide some commercial GFA along the PWP; and

Planning Benefits

- (f) the provision of more parking spaces in the proposed development could be considered as a planning gain while other planning gains or public benefits were very limited.

48. In response to Members' concerns, the Chairman made the following main points:

- (a) the Government had not prescribed a general standard on flat sizes, and stipulating a minimum flat size as an approval condition without sound basis would be subject to challenge. If an alternative minimum flat size

was to be stipulated, there would be implications on the layout and other aspects which had not been subject to technical assessments. The total number of flats was a binding development parameter in a planning permission, but the Board would not impose approval conditions to control the flat size and flat mix. There was no precedent case of using small flat size as a reason for rejection;

- (b) regarding the concerns on the implementation of the PWP, the design of the PWP in all the “CDA” subzones in the YTIA would be reviewed, monitored and coordinated by relevant government departments through compliance with the relevant approval condition. Members’ views would be conveyed to the relevant departments for consideration; and
- (c) regarding the provision of GIC facilities/SWFs, it was not stipulated as a statutory requirement under the “CDA(3)” zone and there was no provision to exempt such floor space from GFA calculation. As such, if some GIC facilities/SWFs were to be provided, either the domestic GFA would be reduced or the applicant had to submit an application for minor relaxation of plot ratio to accommodate the additional GFA for GIC facilities/SWFs. Besides, without relevant assessments on the kind of SWFs appropriate for the Site and funding arrangement from SWD, it would create uncertainties and delay the implementation of the proposed development. In any case, the opportunities to provide some SWFs in “CDA(2)” would be further explored.

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

49. After further deliberation, the majority of Members considered that the application could be approved since the Proposed Scheme generally complied with the development parameters and planning requirements as stipulated on the OZP and in the PB, and there was no adverse comment from relevant departments on the technical assessments submitted by the applicant. Two Members did not support the application due to the small flat sizes proposed, which would have potential negative impacts on the living quality of future residents and increase the demand for community supporting facilities in the area.

50. Members also agreed that additional advisory clauses should be provided to the applicant to consider (i) providing flats with a larger minimum flat size and with suitable mix; (ii) providing SWFs within the proposed development; and (iii) improving the public's accessibility to the PWP and enhancement of the design of the PWP with supporting facilities. At Members' request, the Secretariat would collate information on flat sizes in approved planning applications for Members' general reference in considering future cases involving residential development.

51. 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 28.5.2025, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan to incorporate the approval conditions as stipulated in conditions (b) to (n) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a development programme indicating the timing and phasing of the comprehensive development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission and implementation of a revised Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of a revised Environmental Assessment to address the potential air quality and noise impacts and industrial/residential interface environmental problems, and the implementation of the environmental mitigation measures identified therein for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (e) the submission of a revised Land Contamination Assessment and the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed therein prior to the commencement of the construction works for the proposed development to

the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;

- (f) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (g) the submission of a revised Drainage Impact Assessment to the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (h) the implementation of the sewerage and drainage facilities identified in the revised Sewerage Impact Assessment under approval condition (f) and the revised Drainage Impact Assessment under approval condition (g) to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (i) the submission of a revised traffic impact assessment and implementation of traffic mitigation measures identified therein for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (j) the design and provision of vehicular access, vehicle parking spaces, loading/unloading facilities and maneuvering spaces for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (k) the design and provision of a full height setback to allow a minimum width of 3.5m for footpath along Tung Yuen Street and Yan Yue Wai, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (l) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (m) the design and provision of the public waterfront promenade, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB; and

- (n) the public waterfront promenade should be opened 24 hours every day, as proposed by the applicant, and maintained and managed by the applicant before surrendering to the Government, to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB.”

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

- “(a) to consider providing flats with a larger minimum flat size and with suitable flat mix;
- (b) to consider providing social welfare facilities within the proposed development; and
- (c) to improve the public’s accessibility to the public waterfront promenade and enhance its design with supporting facilities.”

Agenda Item 13

Any Other Business

53. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:05 p.m.