

**TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**Minutes of 675<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 9.7.2021**

**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  
Miss Kirstie Y.L. Law

## **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 674<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 25.6.2021**

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 674<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 25.6.2021 were confirmed without amendments.

## **Agenda Item 2**

### **Matter Arising**

[Open Meeting]

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

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/K10/4                      Application for Amendment to the Draft Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K10/27, To amend the building height restriction on a “Government, Institution or Community” Application Site from 3 storeys to 45 metres above Principal Datum, 40 Lung Kong Road, Kowloon City, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. Y/K10/4B)

---

4.                      The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Ma Tau Kok and Mr C.H. Tse had declared an interest on the item for his close relative owning a property in Ma Tau Kok. As the property owned by Mr C.H. Tse’s close relative had no direct view of the Site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

**PlanD**

Ms Katy C.W. Fung                      -    District Planning Officer/Kowloon  
(DPO/K)

Mr C.H. Mak                                      -    Senior Town Planner (STP/K)

**Applicant’s Representatives**

*The Kowloon City Christians’ Church (KCCC)*

Mr Siu Chun Keung

Mr Lam Wing Leung

Mr Mak Chi Kong

Mr Yu Wing Fai, Chris

Mr Fong Kwai Sang

Mr Kam Kin Ho

Ms Lo Pui Man, Eliza

Mr Leung Sik Kwong

Ms Wong Fan Yi, Helen

Ms Lee Fung Yee, Leona

Ms Ho Cho Yi

Mr Chan Yan Leung

*DeSPACE (International) Limited*

Mr Lam Kwok Chun, Greg

Ms Lau Fung Yee, Rebecca

Mr Ng Kai Yu, Aigo

Mr Li Ka Ho, Mario

Mr Yeung Ho Pak, Matthew

*CTA Consultants Limited*

Mr Kelvin Leung

*THEO Texture*

Mr Ben Wong

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

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr C.H. Mak, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) the proposed amendment to the building height (BH) restriction from three storeys to 45 metres above principal datum (mPD) for the Site on the Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 45 public comments were received, with 43 supporting comments from the Hong Kong Institute of Family Education, shop operators in Kowloon City, students/parents/teachers/working partner of the Cornerstone Education Centre (CEC) and individuals, one opposing comment from the Owners' Corporation of 61 South Wall Road, and one comment providing views from an individual. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed uses were in line with the planning intention of the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone. The Secretary of Home Affairs (SHA) might consider giving policy support to the application along the prevailing policy and the Secretary for Education (SED) had no specific comment on the proposed educational facilities. The proposed redevelopment with a BH of 45mPD was considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD considered that the increase in BH would unlikely cause any significant impact on the landscape character of the area. The proposed design measures, including a 5m setback from Lung Kong Road, terraced roof gardens and rooftop with vegetated edges and façade treatment at the lower part of the building, might also promote visual interest and pedestrian comfort. The Social Welfare Department (SWD) advised that the applicant should consider incorporating subvented welfare facilities at the Site for the benefit of the community. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government

departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

8. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Messrs Greg Lam, Siu Chun Keung and Ben Wong, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

*Background of KCCC*

- (a) KCCC was a non-profit making organisation under section 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance. The church was established at the Site in 1967, with its registered members increased from about 100 to more than 1,000 over the years. The education centre started operation in 1992 and had been growing steadily with about 70 classes at present. The financial support to the church was mainly through fund-raising while the education centre was generally self-sustained;
- (b) KCCC provided a wide range of learning programmes and activities for different groups of people including children, the elderly, housewives, ethnic minorities and new immigrants, e.g. tutorial and interest classes, senior academy, capacity building mileage programme, youth learning and activities, and community services and visits. Their services were well recognised by the community and working partners;

*Need for Redevelopment/Expansion*

- (c) there was an immediate need to redevelop the existing building of CEC due to its old building age and high maintenance cost. Its building design, e.g. nil provision of lift and barrier-free access, was also unable to meet the current standards;
- (d) currently, there were insufficient space/facilities in CEC, including classrooms, teaching facilities and staff office space, to support the daily operation. Sharing of facilities among different groups of users was common. An expansion was required to enhance its services. Given the small site area, relaxing the BH restriction for the Site was the only possible option for the expansion purpose;

*The Redevelopment Proposal*

- (e) according to the current proposal, the BH restriction for the Site was proposed to be relaxed from three storeys (i.e. 18.69mPD) to 45mPD (nine storeys on top of two storeys of basement car park). The gross floor area (GFA) would be increased from 1,800m<sup>2</sup> to 4,208m<sup>2</sup>. Upon redevelopment, there would be more space for religious and educational services. The new space/facilities to be provided would include car parking and loading/unloading facilities, gathering place for visitors, separate floors for tutorial classes for primary and secondary school students, a multi-purpose hall for assembly and sports activities, and office space and conference rooms;

*Planning Justifications*

- (f) the proposal was in line with the government policy of “single site, multiple uses” for consolidating and providing government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in a multi-storey development;
- (g) in formulating the current proposal, reference had been made to the relaxed BH restriction for the Lok Sin Tong (LST) site in the proximity. The proposed redevelopment at the Site would be similar to and create a harmonious synergy with the LST welfare complex;
- (h) concerned government bureaux/departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

*Design Merits*

- (i) the proposed scheme had incorporated various design measures to enhance the pedestrian environment and visual interest, including the provision of a 5m setback from Lung Kong Road, a series of terraced roof gardens on 3/F, 5/F, 7/F on the southern side of the building and the rooftop with vegetated edges, a landscaped area of about 76m<sup>2</sup> (12% of the site area), and façade treatment at the lower part of the building with special design elements



illustrating the concept of bringing more energy, vitality and hope to the community; and

*Conclusion*

- (j) upon redevelopment, KCCC could provide more comprehensive and high-quality services to serve the community.

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

*Background of KCCC*

10. In response to a Member's enquiry on the history of KCCC, Mr Siu Chun Keung, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) KCCC was first established in 1942 as a family church. In 1949, the Government allowed the church to set up a school, namely Christ College, at the Site. The building was developed with three storeys in 1970s;
- (b) given the limited space, the organiser applied to the then Education and Development Bureau in 1990 to relocate Christ College to a site in Pok Hong Estate, Shatin. In 1992, CEC was set up at the Site to provide educational and community care services to serve the Kowloon City community; and
- (c) KCCC endeavoured to improve its services by providing quality and diversified education not only to youngsters, but also adults and the elderly so as to equip them in face of the ever-changing society.

*The Application*

11. Some Members raised the following questions to PlanD's representatives:

- (a) why a s.12A application was required for the redevelopment of CEC;

- (b) whether policy support was given by SHA and SED;
- (c) BH of the surrounding developments, and whether any new proposal for redevelopment of the nearby LST site with a higher BH was received recently;
- (d) whether there was any deficit in the provision of social welfare facilities in Kowloon City district; and
- (e) should the application be approved, whether the applicant could consider further relaxing the BH of the Site for the provision of more GIC facilities.

12. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, made the following main points:

- (a) the subject s.12A application was submitted to amend the BH restriction of the Site for religious institution and school uses to facilitate the redevelopment of CEC. While 'religious institution' and 'school' were Column 1 uses which were always permitted, the proposed redevelopment with a BH of 45mPD exceeded the BH restriction of three storeys as stipulated on the OZP and hence a s.12A application to amend the BH restriction was required;
- (b) policy support from SHA might be considered based on the prevailing policy, upon receiving more details on the religious facilities and comments from relevant bureaux/departments. In view of the scope of services to be provided by CEC, there was no need to obtain SED's policy support;
- (c) the BH restriction for the surrounding residential developments was mainly 80mPD (or 100mPD for sites with an area of 400m<sup>2</sup> or above) and the LST site in the proximity was subject to a BH restriction of 60mPD. Since the OZP amendment made in 2018 to relax the BH restriction for the LST site, no new planning application for a revised BH was received;
- (d) there were currently deficits in the provision of 340 places for child care

services and 538 places for community care services for the elderly in Kowloon City district; and

- (e) should the current application be approved and the OZP be amended, the applicant could still submit a s.16 application to the Committee for consideration for minor relaxation of the BH restriction for the Site to accommodate more GIC facilities in future.

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

- (a) the reasons for not adopting the scheme with a maximum BH of 60mPD previously submitted by the applicant in the representation to the draft OZP in 2018;
- (b) the proposed floor-to-floor (FTF) height in the current scheme; and
- (c) whether the applicant had considered reshuffling the proposed uses across different levels to accommodate the welfare facilities requested by SWD.

14. In response, Messrs Greg Lam, Siu Chun Keung and Ben Wong, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposal with a maximum BH of 60mPD for the Site submitted for the Board's consideration in the representation to the draft OZP in 2018 was formulated on the assumption that height restriction for community/school facilities (i.e. not more than 24m above ground level) could be relaxed. At present, the applicant decided to proceed with the current proposal which followed the prevailing height restriction for prudence, taking into account the licensing requirement for the day and evening schools;
- (b) the proposed FTF height in the current scheme had taken into account the operational requirements for different uses, while allowing some design flexibility. With reference to the section plan shown in Drawing Z-7 of the Paper, high headroom with FTF height of 4.55m for G/F lobby and

5.95m for 1/F assembly hall for gathering and church services was proposed. An average FTF height of about 3.3m was proposed for 2/F to 5/F with classrooms. To accommodate space for assembly and sports activities, a FTF height of 4.9m was proposed for the assembly hall on 6/F. As use of projector and visual illustration was required for offices and conference rooms, a FTF height of 4.2m was proposed for 7/F and 8/F where the uses were located. That said, the exact FTF height would be subject to detailed design; and

- (c) the lower floors would be fully utilised for educational uses to meet the 24m height restriction, and hence there was no room for accommodating other facilities including those requested by SWD. The applicant would continue to liaise with concerned departments with a view to reviewing the 24m height restriction for school/welfare facilities. Should the relevant restriction be relaxed, the applicant might apply to the Board for minor relaxation of the BH restriction to facilitate provision of more welfare facilities, if financially viable.

*The Current and Proposed Development*

15. The Vice-chairman and some Members raised the following questions to the applicant's representatives:

- (a) the major church activities and educational services that were currently provided;
- (b) the current demand for services and charges of tutorial classes offered by CEC;
- (c) the need for expansion, the estimated growth in demand for services upon redevelopment, and whether there would be changes in charges and direction of service provision offered by CEC after redevelopment;
- (d) whether there were any assessment criteria/mechanisms in identifying the service targets;

- (e) whether the services provided by CEC would also serve ethnic minorities in the community;
- (f) the reasons for not agreeing to SWD's request to provide subvented welfare facilities at the Site;
- (g) whether the facilities to be provided in the new building would be available for use by the community; and
- (h) the interim arrangement during construction.

16. In response, Messrs Greg Lam, Siu Chun Keung and Ben Wong, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) currently, religious gatherings with about 300 attendees were held in the hall of the Site on Sunday morning, followed by other church activities like fellowship in the afternoon and evening. Fellowship and other forms of gatherings among KCCC church members, students of tutorial and interest classes at CEC were also held during weekends. Being the operator of CEC, KCCC provided support to its operation in terms of venue provision, networking and financial subsidies. CEC provided a wide variety of classes for different people. For children, in addition to the tutorial classes, interest classes and special training were also provided. For adults, classes with diverse topics and skills training were introduced to provide comprehensive learning experience. For the elderly, apart from offering diverse learning opportunities at CEC's Senior Academy, social inclusion programmes among the elderly and youngsters were also introduced to promote harmony across generations and encourage life-long learning;
- (b) the current demand for services provided by CEC was high and had been ever-growing. The education centre offered about 70 classes and about 180 students attended the classes daily. All 14 classrooms were often fully occupied, and sharing of classrooms among different classes were

common. Classes offered by CEC were popular and had good reputation. Taking the summer course for STEM education to be held this year as an example, the quotas were filled with a long waiting list soon after the launch of the course. Being a non-profit making organisation, CEC offered affordable tutorial and interest classes to students. The current charges for a tutorial class conducted five days a week (1.5 hour each day) was only about \$1,700 per month (i.e. about \$50 per hour);

- (c) expansion of the centre was considered necessary to alleviate the problems of deficiencies in facilities and overcrowding, and to ensure that good quality educational services would be provided. Upon redevelopment, the GFA would be about two times that of the existing building. It was estimated that the number of students would be increased by about 25% who were mostly living or studying in the same district while the demand for adult and elderly services would be increased by about 75% including those coming from other districts due to enhanced accessibility after commissioning of the Shatin-Central Link (SCL). CEC endeavoured to uphold the objective of providing affordable and quality educational services to the community notwithstanding the expenditure on the redevelopment project;
- (d) whilst there were no specific assessment criteria for identifying the service targets, staff at CEC were experienced and well-trained to identify the needs of the targets through daily communication. Home visits as appropriate were also conducted to better understand their needs;
- (e) services and supports were also offered to ethnic minorities including Thai, Pakistanis and new immigrants from other countries. Adaptation programmes and Cantonese language courses were offered to help them familiarise with the local culture and adapt to the community. Counselling and emotional support services were also provided;
- (f) SWD's requests to incorporate subvented welfare facilities at the Site had been thoroughly considered. Given the restrictions under the Education

Regulation that no part of any school premises should be situated at a height of more than 24m above ground level, it was difficult for the applicant to incorporate additional welfare facilities as there was already great demand for space to serve the original service targets. Nonetheless, the applicant would further liaise with SED to explore the possibility of relaxing such height restriction and making adjustment to the proposed scheme wherever possible;

- (g) the applicant was willing to provide suitable facilities including conference rooms, assembly hall and classrooms for the use of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and District Council (DC) when needed. Further details would be worked out at the implementation stage; and
- (h) according to their earlier discussion with relevant government departments, it was noted that several unleased government sites were available within the district and could serve as potential temporary decanting sites. Subject to approval of the subject application, the applicant would apply to the Government under the established mechanism for a suitable site to continue its operation temporarily during construction.

### *Transport and Traffic*

17. A Member asked about the accessibility of the Site and the major mode of transport used by people accessing the Site. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, with reference to Figure 3.13 of the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) submitted by the applicant (Appendix 1a of the Paper), said that the Site was located in a convenient location in close proximity to public transport facilities along Nga Tsin Wai Road and Prince Edward Road East. It could be accessed from the newly opened MTR Sung Wong Toi (SWT) Station via Nam Kok Road, Nga Tsin Wai Road and Lung Kong Road. Besides, there would be a proposed sunken plaza in the Urban Renewal Authority (URA)'s scheme at Sa Po Road/Kai Tak Road to connect the area to the Kai Tak Development Area. Mr Kelvin Leung, the applicant's representative, supplemented that the Site was located within a walking distance of 500m from the SWT Station. According to the survey conducted in the TIA, about 95% of the school-related users and 65% of the church-related users travelled to the Site by public transport and/or on foot.

18. Some Members raised the following questions to the applicant's representatives:
- (a) given the convenient location of the Site and the provision of a public car park in the nearby URA's scheme at Sa Po Road/Kai Tak Road redevelopment project, whether the proposed 2-storey basement carpark at the Site was necessary;
  - (b) whether the parking spaces at the Site would be open for public use; and
  - (c) whether adverse traffic impact would be generated from the proposed development.
19. In response, Messrs Kelvin Leung, Greg Lam and Siu Chun Keung, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:
- (a) the high-end parking provision under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) was proposed for the Site, which was agreed by the Transport Department (TD). As a result, a 2-storey basement carpark with a total of 31 car parking spaces were proposed. A traffic review would be conducted at the lease modification stage upon commissioning of the SCL and the car parking provision could be reviewed accordingly, taking into account the full in-take of passengers after the pandemic and re-opening of schools;
  - (b) there was an acute demand for car parking spaces at the Site especially on Sundays when church services were held. Reducing the proposed car parking provision was considered not desirable as it would worsen the parking problem in the district. The proposed car parking spaces were intended to serve the users of the Site only but not the public; and
  - (c) according to the TIA conducted by the applicant, adverse traffic impact from the proposed development with a 2-storey basement carpark was not anticipated. Besides, the use of car lift would not lead to the tail back



problem on the public road.

20. Mr Patrick K.H. Ho, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), TD, supplemented that the prevailing policy was to encourage provision of sufficient car parking spaces within the development to cater for the parking demand generated so as to minimise the impact on the surrounding area. The proposed car parking provision had met the requirements set out in the HKPSG and TD had no further comment on the revised TIA submitted by the applicant.

21. As regards the 2-storey basement carpark, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, clarified that whether or not to provide two basement storeys would not affect compliance with the BH restriction on the OZP as the proposed BH restriction for the subject "G/IC" zone was imposed in terms of mPD instead of number of storeys.

22. In response to a Member's enquiry on the nearby metered parking spaces, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, said that three metered parking spaces outside the Site were proposed to be relocated to 20-26 Lung Kong Road.

#### *Design Merits*

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

- (a) the greenery proposed in the development;
- (b) whether the applicant had considered introducing urban farming in the development;
- (c) whether the potential impact from the nearby Lung Kong Road Public Toilet (PT) and Refuse Collection Point (RCP) had been taken into account in the proposed disposition of the terraced roof gardens;
- (d) whether barrier-free access design was incorporated in the proposed scheme;
- (e) how the proposed scheme would be able to encourage social inclusion;

- (f) whether the applicant had considered providing canopy and planting trees on the pavement to enhance pedestrian comfort and visual interest;
- (g) whether the back lane of the Site would be affected by the proposed redevelopment; and
- (h) the design merits and public benefits in relation to the proposed redevelopment.

24. In response, Messrs Ben Wong, Greg Lam and Siu Chun Keung, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) while details of the landscape treatment were to be formulated at the detailed design stage, about 76m<sup>2</sup> of greenery (about 12% of the site area) would be proposed in different forms of landscape treatment at various levels of the development, including shrub planting on G/F, landscape area with peripheral planting at terraced roof gardens on 3/F, 5/F, 7/F and the roof garden to enhance visual comfort. Full-height glass doors at terraces would provide visual connection between the indoor and outdoor spaces, bringing more vibrancy to the development. The flexibility in the proposed BH had allowed sufficient headroom for exploring the feasibility of installing planters;
- (b) the applicant welcomed the idea of promoting urban farming in the development. As there was no such expertise in the institution, they would explore the feasibility of incorporating it into the development in collaboration with the relevant organisation;
- (c) while the Site was located in the vicinity of the PT and RCP, the podium on 3/F was located at about 14mPD. Odour nuisance was not envisaged given the sufficient buffer distance. Appropriate mitigation measures would be incorporated at the detailed design stage;

- (d) the design and layout were proposed with careful consideration of the needs of different users and would comply with the latest Design Manual for Barrier Free Access to ensure easy access to various facilities, particularly by the elderly and physically disabled. By doing so, it would encourage interaction and social inclusion among different users. In the proposed layout, ample communal space was provided at the G/F lobby for people to use and gather. Facilities like the assembly halls and activity rooms were located at various floors equipped with washrooms and elevators suitable for use by the physically disabled. The applicant would also consider incorporating other suitable facilities such as sick room into the development as suggested by a Member;
- (e) there was no level difference between the entrance of the building and the G/F lobby. The planned communal space would allow different users to gather and take rest, which would encourage social inclusion;
- (f) despite the west-facing orientation of the Site, the proposed development at the LST site with a proposed BH of 60mPD could provide necessary shading to the Site. Suitable building materials would be considered to alleviate the impact of intense direct sunlight, if any. The applicant would continue to refine the design to create a more user-friendly environment. The possibility of providing a canopy at the building frontage would be explored. Other design measures such as provision of vertical greening and other green features, selection of suitable building materials and adoption of more environmentally friendly construction methods would also be considered. The applicant would work towards obtaining the BEAM Plus accreditation where possible. On tree planting, given the narrow pedestrian footpath even after the incorporation of a 5m setback from Lung Kong Road, a design concept of trunks and branches on the building façade were adopted at the entrance instead of planting trees on the pavement so as to ensure a safe and comfortable walking environment;
- (g) according to the proposal, the back lane of the Site would not be affected by the redevelopment; and

- (h) a number of design merits brought by the redevelopment were set out in the Paper, which included the 5m building setback from Lung Kong Road allowing more spacious pedestrian walking environment; innovative building design with a series of terraced roof gardens at different levels such as 3/F, 5/F, 7/F on the southern side of the building; provision of flexible layout to cater for needs of different users; space for landscaping and planting opportunities at edges of G/F, roof gardens on terraced balconies and rooftop, as well as the provision of available facilities including conference rooms and activity rooms to the local community for holding district activities and events.

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

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

[Mr Daniel K.S. Lau and Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung left the meeting at this point.]

#### Deliberation Session

26. The Chairman recapitulated that the subject s.12A application was to amend the the BH restriction from three storeys to 45mPD to facilitate the redevelopment of CEC at the Site. The 'religious institution' and 'school' uses were always permitted within the "G/IC" zone. As an established practice, subject to the submission of a specific development proposal with the support of relevant technical assessments, favourable consideration could be given to amending the BH restriction for "G/IC" sites where appropriate.

27. Members generally considered that the application for amending the BH

restriction from three storeys to 45mPD for the Site could be supported as it would facilitate the redevelopment of CEC for provision of more facilities and services to meet the needs of the community, no adverse impact would be generated from the proposed redevelopment and concerned government bureaux/departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

28. Some Members had the following observations and suggestions on the design of the proposed redevelopment:

*Provision of More GIC Facilities*

- (a) taking such a good opportunity of redevelopment, the applicant should consider providing more welfare facilities in the development, including those requested by SWD. In that connection, the applicant could consider further increasing the BH so as to optimise the development potential of the Site;

*Transport and Traffic*

- (b) in view of the convenient location of the Site, the use of public transport by the users of the Site should be encouraged. The provision of the 2-storey basement carpark might not be desirable as it would attract more traffic to the area;
- (c) as the proposed run-in/out had already occupied about one-third of the site frontage, the provision of the basement carpark and related facilities might pose traffic and safety concerns and might generate adverse impact on the pedestrian environment;
- (d) the applicant should be invited to review the need for providing the 2-storey basement carpark. In any event, the provision of car parking spaces should be minimised if practicable, say by adopting the low-end of the HKPSG requirements;

*Building Design and Greening*

- (e) it would be more desirable to plant trees on G/F instead of illustrating the concept of bringing more energy, vitality and hope to the community via façade treatment;
- (f) the project could help instill energy into the old district, and there was scope to incorporate more greening and quality design to enhance the comfort for both the users of the Site and pedestrians; and
- (g) the applicant had not yet committed to adopt a green building design at the Site. To this end, the applicant was strongly advised to enhance the design of the proposed scheme.

29. Noting a Member's observation that the applicant might not be very keen to attain a BEAM Plus grading, another Member remarked that whilst GFA exemption through BEAM Plus could serve as incentives for improving building design in private projects, it might not be applicable to the present case as the redevelopment scheme was not proposed up to the maximum permissible GFA under the Building (Planning) Regulations. Notwithstanding that, it might be appropriate to convey Members' views to the applicant for its consideration in the enhancement of the building design.

30. A Member opined that should a high development intensity be approved for the Site, more land premium would likely be incurred, which might exert a financial burden to KCCC, adversely affecting the redevelopment progress of the Site.

31. The Chairman said that should the application be approved and the OZP be amended, a s.16 planning application could be submitted by the applicant for minor relaxation of the BH restriction if considered appropriate. Such mechanism should be sufficient to cater for the necessary increase in BH and development intensity in future for accommodating more GIC facilities including those requested by SWD at the Site. As regards some Members' concerns on the car parking provision, the Chairman said that a traffic review would be undertaken by the applicant for TD's consideration at the lease modification stage prior to finalisation of the parking requirements. If the Committee agreed to the rezoning application, the statutory plan-making process would follow and the applicant was advised to take note of Members' views in the detailed design stage, in

particular the car parking provision, greenery provision and building design.

32. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree to the application by amending the building height restriction of the application site from 3 storeys to 45mPD. Amendments to the Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan would be submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong left the meeting during the deliberation session.]

[Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

### **Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 4**

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

[Open Meeting]

A/K4/74 Proposed Residential Institution (Student Hostels) with Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction in “Government, Institution or Community (7)” Zone, Tat Hong Avenue, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K4/74)

---

33. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the City University of Hong Kong (CityU). KTA Planning Limited (KTA), Leigh & Orange Limited (L&O), MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA), Urbis Limited (Urbis), WSP (Asia) Limited (WSP) and Beria Consultant Limited (Beria) were six of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being a senior lecturer of CityU;

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being a part-time lecturer of CityU;

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with MVA and

Urbis;

- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm had business dealings with CityU, L&O, MVA, WSP and Beria; and
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member and an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA.

34. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application, and Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau, Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the interests of Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong were direct, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion.

35. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 24.6.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address departmental and public comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

36. 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 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/833                      Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (2)”  
Zone, Portion of Workshop C4, G/F, Block C, Hong Kong Industrial  
Centre, 489-491 Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/833)

---

37.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 21.6.2021 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.

38.            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 6**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/523                      Proposed School (including the uses of Kindergarten, Primary School, Secondary School and Tutorial School) in “Residential (Group B) 4” Zone, Level 2, Greenview Court Shopping Centre, 644-654 Castle Peak Road, Tsuen Wan  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/523A)

---

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

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi        -    his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and

Professor John C.Y. Ng     -    his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.

40.            The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As 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.

41.            The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 21.6.2021 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.

42.            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.

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

### **Agenda Item 7**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/TW/525                      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Information Technology and Telecommunications Industries (Data Centre) for a Period of 3 Years in "Comprehensive Development Area (3)" Zone, 1/F (Portion) and 3/F, Asia Tone i-Centre, 1 Wang Wo Tsai Street, Tsuen Wan  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/525)

---

43.            The Secretary reported that the application was located in Tsuen Wan and the application was submitted by Mapletreelog PF (HKSAR) Limited (Mapletreelog). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi        -    his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and

Professor John C.Y. Ng     -    his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.

44.            As 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. The Committee also noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary information technology and telecommunications industries (data centre) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, one comment from an individual expressing concerns on the application was 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 application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

46. In response to a Member's enquiry on the roof-top machines as mentioned in the public comment, Mr K.S. Ng, STP/TWK, said that the machines installed at the roof-top of the subject building were mainly for ventilation and cooling purposes to support the operation of the data centre. Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment), Environmental Protection Department, supplemented that it was not uncommon that chillers or cooling machines were installed on the roof-top of data centres for refrigerating and air conditioning purposes.

## Deliberation Session

47. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years and be renewed from 18.7.2021 to 17.7.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board.

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

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

## **Agenda Item 8**

### Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/475                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Industrial Use in "Industrial" Zone, 14-15 Yip Shing Street, Kwai Chung  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/475)

---

49. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 29.6.2021 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.

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

applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Agenda Item 9**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/476                      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, 94-100 Ta Chuen Ping Street, Kwai Chung  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/476)

---

51.            The Secretary reported that KTA Planning Limited (KTA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The Committee noted that Mr Daniel K.S. Lau has declared an interest on the item for being a member and an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA.

52.            The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had already left the meeting.

53.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 24.6.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for one month 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.

54.            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.

### **Hong Kong District**

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

#### **Agenda Item 10**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/H3/443                      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Eating Place for a Period of 5 Years in "Government, Institution or Community" Zone, G/F, 4 David Lane, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/443)

---

55.            The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Sai Ying Pun. Dr Roger C.K. Chan had declared an interest for his spouse owning a property in Sai Ying Pun.

56.            As the property owned by Dr Roger C.K. Chan's spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

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

57.            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 eating place for a period of five years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period; 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 application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

58. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

59. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years and be renewed from 13.8.2021 to 12.8.2026 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the existing fire service installations implemented at the premises should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period; and
- (b) if the above planning condition (a) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should be revoked immediately without further notice.”

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



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

**Agenda Item 11**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H5/416                      Proposed Public Utility Installation (Fresh Water Pumping Station) and Government Use in "Open Space" Zone, Lockhart Road Playground, Lockhart Road, Wan Chai  
(MPC Paper No. A/H5/416)

---

61.            The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Wan Chai. The application was submitted by the Water Supplies Department (WSD) and KTA Planning Limited (KTA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Alex T.H. Lai            - his former firm had business dealings with WSD; and
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau        - being a member and an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA.

62.            The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Daniel K.S. Lau had already left the meeting.

63.            The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 30.6.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address departmental and public comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

64.            After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the

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

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 12**

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

[Open Meeting]

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

---

65. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP), AGC Design Limited (AGC) and MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) were three of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

66. The Committee noted that the applicants had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Thomas O.S. Ho 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.

67. The Committee noted that the applicants' representative requested on 23.6.2021 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 applicants requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicants had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

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

### **Agenda Item 13**

#### **Any Other Business**

69. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:10 p.m.