

**TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**Minutes of 676<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 23.7.2021**

**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 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

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong), Transport Department  
Mr Horace W. Hong

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department  
Mr Gavin C.T. Tse

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department  
Mr Albert K.L. Cheung

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

**Absent with apologies**

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

**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 Carman C.Y. Cheung

## **Opening Remarks**

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

## **Agenda Item 1**

### **Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 675<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 9.7.2021**

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 675<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 9.7.2021 were confirmed without amendments.

## **Agenda Item 2**

### **Matter Arising**

[Open Meeting]

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

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

## **Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Shek Kip Mei Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K4/29  
(MPC Paper No. 6/21)

---

4. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendment item involved two public housing developments to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) which was supported by an Engineering Feasibility Study (EFS) conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) with WSP (Asia) Limited (WSP) as the consultant of the EFS. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

5. The Committee noted that according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the proposed amendment for public housing development was the subject of amendment to the outline zoning plan (OZP) proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of Members in relation to HKHA on the item only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting. As Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in relation to the amendment item, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

6. The following government representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

- Mr Derek P.K. Tse - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK)
- Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho - Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK)
- Mr Chi Keong Fung - Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK)

CEDD

- Mr Fung Sing Sit - Chief Engineer/Housing Projects 3 (CE/HP3)
- Mr Patrick C.Y. Yeung - Senior Engineer/Housing Project 3 (SE/HP3)

HD

- Ms Belinda L.K. Lau - Senior Planning Officer/5 (SPO/5)
- Mr Alex Y.K. Tse - Planning Officer/19 (PO/19)

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

Background

- (a) to meet and expedite housing land supply, the Government had been carrying out various land use reviews, including those on Government land (GL) with temporary uses. A piece of GL abutting the upper end of Nam Cheong Street (the Site) was identified as suitable for public housing

development. It would be developed as two sites, namely Chak On Road South (CORS) Development and Pak Tin Extension (PTE) Development separated by a public road, Chak On Road South;

Proposed Amendment

- (b) Amendment Item A: rezoning of the Site (about 1 ha) currently occupied by an existing public road namely Chak On Road South, the temporary Chak On Road Driving Test Centre (DTC), Geotechnical Engineering Office's temporary site office and depot area, a temporary transit nursery and a small strip of man-made cut slope from "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") and "Residential (Group A)" ("R(A)") to "Residential (Group A)2" ("R(A)2") subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 9 with domestic PR not more than 7.5 and a maximum building height (BH) of 200mPD;

Technical Assessments

- (c) the EFS conducted by CEDD covered various technical aspects, which confirmed that the proposed public housing development was technically feasible with no insurmountable technical problem subject to implementation of appropriate mitigation measures;

Provision of Government, Institution and Community Facilities and Open Space

- (d) the existing and planned provision of Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities and open space were generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population in accordance with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG);
- (e) according to the HKPSG, there would be shortfalls in the provision of residential care homes for the elderly, community care services facilities and child care centres. As for hospitals, the assessment of the overall

provision was based on a hospital cluster, and a number of hospital redevelopment projects were planned in the Kowloon West Cluster. Social welfare facilities would be provided in the proposed development. The actual provision of social welfare facilities would be subject to the consideration of the Social Welfare Department (SWD) in the planning and development process;

Departmental Comments

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

Consultation

- (g) the Sham Shui Po District Council (SSPDC) was consulted on 29.6.2021 regarding the proposed amendments to the OZP. While SSPDC members had no in-principle objection to the proposed public housing development, they expressed concerns mainly on the potential traffic impacts of the reprovisioned DTC at the PTE site, the potential traffic and safety issues posed by the temporary DTC at Pak Wan Street and the supply of parking spaces in the vicinity as well as the amount and types of social welfare facilities to be provided.

8. As the presentation by PlanD's representative had been completed, the Chairman remarked that if Members agreed to the proposed OZP amendments, the draft OZP would be exhibited for public inspection and the public could submit representations and comments on the OZP to the Board during the statutory publication period. The representations and comments received would then be considered by the Board. The Chairman then invited questions from Members.

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

Site Division

- (a) the rationale of retaining Chak On Road South which divided the Site into

two housing projects;

- (b) HD's view on separating the Site into the CORS and PTE Developments;
- (c) whether Chak On Road South could be changed from a public road to an estate road under the management of HD;
- (d) the rationale of inclusion of Chak On Road South into the "R(A)2" zone instead of an area shown as 'Road';
- (e) noting that the PTE Development abutted the boundary of the existing Pak Tin Estate site, why the PTE site was not integrated into the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment;

*Building Height*

- (f) the rationale of stipulating the BH restriction of 200mPD;
- (g) compatibility of the proposed BH restriction of 200mPD with surrounding developments and whether the BH of the proposed housing development could be further increased to allow more design flexibility;

*Accessibility/Pedestrian Network*

- (h) details on the traffic and pedestrian accessibility (including barrier-free access) of the proposed development to the surrounding areas;
- (i) details on the proposed new footbridge with lift tower;
- (j) the connectivity between the CORS and PTE Developments;

*GIC Facilities*

- (k) the types of GIC facilities in the neighbourhood to serve the needs of future residents;



- (l) details on the provision of GIC facilities for the elderly in the area;
- (m) estimated number of the elderly in the Shek Kip Mei planning area;
- (n) the types of elderly facilities which would be in need at the time of completion of the developments;
- (o) whether other GIC facilities, such as community hall and wet market, would be provided in the area;

Others

- (p) the type of flats to be provided and the type of families and age groups to be accommodated in the proposed housing development;
- (q) whether there were environmental impacts, especially from surrounding roads, on the future residents;
- (r) the maintenance responsibility of the slope at the southern portion of the PTE site;
- (s) the relocation and rehousing arrangement of residents at Pak Tin Estate during its redevelopment;

Driving Test Centre

- (t) reasons for re-provisioning the DTC at the PTE site;
- (u) whether the driving test routes would include the use of Chak On Road South and create traffic or noise impacts on the surroundings; and
- (v) whether there were examples of DTC re-provisioned within other public housing developments.

10. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, Mr Fung Sing Sit, CE/HP3, CEDD, and Ms Belinda L.K. Lau, SPO/5, HD, made the following main points:

Site Division

- (a) the existing public road, Chak On Road South, provided vehicular access to the CORS and PTE sites as well as the Shek Kip Mei Fresh Water Service Reservoir and drainage facilities located at the western end of the road. During the EFS, relevant government departments were consulted and it was considered that Chak On Road South should be retained with possible minor modifications to be further determined at the detailed design stage. Considering the sloping topography of the Site, with a higher site formation level at the CORS site to the north of Chak On Road South and a lower site formation level at the PTE site, retaining Chak On Road South could reduce excavation and achieve better site optimization. Chak On Road South also served as air ventilation corridor to the area. Furthermore, if Chak On Road South was relocated to the northern part of the Site, it would be too close to the Nam Cheong Street/Lung Yuet Road junction and it would require a steep gradient to connect to Nam Cheong Street;
- (b) in view of the site constraints and technical considerations as well as the estimated construction time and costs, the EFS found that the current division of the Site into two developments would be desirable for site formation and the public housing development. It would also provide opportunities for different types of public housing at two sites. Flexibility would be allowed for the housing type to cater for possible demand change between Public Rental Housing/Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) and other Subsidised Sale Flats. HD would look into the housing type for CORS and PTE Developments at the detailed design stage;
- (c) a 24-hour access to Chak On Road South for regular or emergency maintenance of the water and drainage facilities located at the western end of the road should be provided. Maintaining Chak On Road South as a public road would allow free access as required;

- (d) inclusion of Chak On Road South into the proposed “R(A)2” zone would allow design flexibility, and any road re-alignment which might be required at the detailed design stage would be permissible under the OZP. Members’ comments about better integration of the CORS and PTE sites would be taken into consideration at the detailed design stage;
- (e) the planning controls for Pak Tin Estate zoned as “R(A)” were different from those for the proposed development zoned as “R(A)2”. As assessed in the EFS, the inclusion of social welfare facilities with a GFA equivalent to about 5% of the domestic GFA was technically feasible and was proposed to be exempted from the overall PR calculation. In addition, there was a requirement for a DTC to be re-provisioned and integrated within the PTE Development. As such, a “R(A)2” zone for the Site was proposed to accommodate those special requirements which were exempted from GFA calculation while “R(A)” zone had no such exemption clause;

*Building Height*

- (f) a number of factors would be taken into account to determine the BH restriction in general, and they included site constraint, technical feasibility, topography, the spatial relationship and compatibility with the surrounding environment, and the planning parameters of the proposed scheme. For the proposed amendment item, taking into account the surrounding residential developments, particularly the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment with a maximum BH of 157mPD, the Site was planned with similar intensity of domestic PR of 7.5 and overall PR of 9.0, and the site level being at least 42m higher compared with the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment, the proposed scheme with BH of 199mPD was adequate to accommodate both re-provisioning of the DTC and the equivalent of 5% of domestic GFA for social welfare facilities in the podium. The maximum BH restriction of 200mPD was hence proposed for the “R(A)2” zone;
- (g) the Site was located in the vicinity of various residential developments including Chak On Estate with existing BH of about 119mPD and private residential developments above Lung Cheung Road with existing BHs up to

about 191mPD to the further north, and the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment with a maximum BH at 157mPD to the south. The proposed development with a BH restriction of 200mPD would be amongst the highest BHs in the surrounding area. The BH restriction of 200mPD was adequate to accommodate the proposed development intensity and GIC facilities. The minor relaxation clause stipulated under the Notes of the “R(A)2” zone could cater for any future increase in building height, if needed, with justifications;

Accessibility/Pedestrian Network

- (h) as shown on Plan 2 of the Paper, there were existing facilities at the northern tip of the Site allowing pedestrian crossing at Nam Cheong Street and Lung Yuet Road. The Site was also accessible from Chak On Estate via an existing footbridge across Lung Yuet Road to the western side. In addition, a new footbridge with lift tower was proposed to connect the Site with the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment to the south. The new footbridge would facilitate the future residents of the proposed public housing development to gain easy access to the retail facilities and Public Transport Interchange (PTI) at the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment. Moreover, as compared with the existing distance of about 1km to reach MTR station from the Site via Nam Cheong Street, walking distance would be shortened to about 800m with the proposed footbridge and lift tower. The feasibility to provide more at-grade crossing at Nam Cheong Street would be explored at the detailed design stage. There were also existing public transport services including franchised bus and green minibus services along Nam Cheong Street and in the vicinity of the Site to different locations as well as MTR stations. The PTI in the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment would be in proximity to the Site;
  
- (i) the proposed new footbridge with lift tower would be designed and managed by HD. The intention of the new footbridge was to link the Site with the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment so that future residents at the Site could have easy access to facilities thereat. The design of the new footbridge and lift tower would be further investigated at the next stage and

their carrying capacities would meet the requirements in accordance with the prevailing relevant regulations;

- (j) HD would explore and investigate how best to provide appropriate pedestrian facilities to enhance accessibility between the CORS and PTE developments at the detailed design stage;

GIC Facilities

- (k) in the Shek Kip Mei area, there were a number of public housing estates near the Site including Chak On Estate, Pak Tin Estate, Shek Kip Mei Estate and Nam Shan Estate, which provided various elderly, child care services and other GIC facilities. The existing and planned provisions of GIC facilities were generally adequate to meet the demand of the planned population in accordance with the HKPSG, except the residential care homes for the elderly (RCHE), community care services facilities and child care centres, the requirements of which were recently incorporated in the HKPSG as a long-term goal. As the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment was scheduled to be completed in year 2027/2028 with provision of GIC facilities including day care centre for the elderly, RCHE, neighbourhood elderly centre, centre for children and youth development and participation programme, welfare clinic (dental), community hall, and other special needs care facilities, the future residents of the proposed development scheduled for completion in 2030 or beyond at the Site could also use these GIC facilities. The type of GIC facilities to be provided at the Site would be determined at the detailed design stage in consultation with relevant government departments including SWD;

- (l) there were several existing GIC facilities for elderly in the area such as day care centres for the elderly in Chak On Estate and Nam Shan Estate; neighbourhood centres for senior citizens in Chak On Estate and Shek Kip Mei Estate; centre for senior citizens and residence for senior citizens in Nam Shan Estate, care and attention home for the elderly on Nam Cheong Street; health clinics in Shek Kip Mei Estate and Nam Shan Estate;

- (m) according to the population data in 2019, there were about 73,600 persons aged 65 or over in the Sham Shui Po area and the elderly population was projected to increase to 114,000 in 2029. There was no information on the elderly population projection for the Shek Kip Mei planning area, which might be broadly estimated taking into account that the population in the Shek Kip Mei planning area was some 20% of the population in Sham Shui Po;
- (n) the proposed development at the Site would provide GIC facilities (GFA equivalent to about 5% of the domestic GFA) and SWD initially indicated that elderly facilities should be provided at the Site to meet the future population in the area. It had been assumed a RCHE would be provided on the Site for EFS assessment purpose, though the type and actual provision of the facilities would be determined in consultation with SWD at the detailed design stage;
- (o) in terms of other GIC facilities, there were currently two community halls in the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment and Shek Kip Mei Estate and a public library in Shek Kip Mei. The community hall and the wet market in the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment were located within walking distance from the Site. The retail facilities, shops and wet market in the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment would be managed by the HD;

Others

- (p) as the proposed development was still in an early planning stage, HD had not yet determined the type of public housing to be provided nor the target family/age group distribution of future residents. Flexibility would be allowed for the housing type to cater for possible demand change between Public Rental Housing/Green Form Subsidised HOS and other Subsidised Sale Flats and HD would look into the housing type at the detailed design stage;
- (q) the EFS had confirmed that the proposed public housing development was technically feasible with no insurmountable technical problems including

traffic and transport, urban design and visual, air ventilation, landscape, environment, risk, infrastructure and other aspects. For traffic noise aspect, proposed mitigation measures including provision of acoustic window might be considered for residential units facing Nam Cheong Street and Lung Yuet Road to alleviate any potential impacts;

- (r) the slope within the PTE site was currently within the vesting order boundary of Pak Tin Estate which was managed by HD. HD would update the vesting order as appropriate;
- (s) Pak Tin Estate was redeveloped by phases. Residents at Phase 7 & 8 were first relocated to Shek Kip Mei Estate while the blocks were redeveloped. The newly re-developed blocks would then become the reception for residents of the remaining Pak Tin Estate. The scheduled completion date of the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment was 2027/2028;

Driving Test Centre

- (t) the DTC had been operating at the Site since 1995 and it involved three driving test routes. It was considered that re-provisioning of the DTC, with the same size as the existing centre, within the Site was necessary to continue providing driving test facilities for people in the wider area. The proposal to incorporate the DTC into the PTE development was in line with the “single site, multiple use” policy;
- (u) the ingress/egress point of the DTC would be at Nam Cheong Street rather than Chak On Road South. Normally, the candidates would drive into and wait within the DTC. The Preliminary Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment demonstrated that the traffic impact caused by the re-provisioned DTC was acceptable from traffic point of view and no insurmountable traffic problem was anticipated; and
- (v) there was no example of DTC re-provisioned within other public housing developments.

11. A Member further asked about the operation of a DTC. As invited by the Chairman, Mr Horace W. Hong, Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport Department, said that the driving tests were scheduled with a controlled number of candidates taking the tests each day. The relocated DTC would conduct driving tests during the non-peak hours to minimize traffic impacts on the surroundings. Another Member considered that there would be traffic impacts induced by people practising driving on the test routes at other times. Mr Hong advised that there was other similar DTC in Ho Man Tin, that was close to but not within a public housing estate, which also received driving test applications.

12. Members generally had no objection to the proposed amendments to the OZP, but some Members raised concern on retaining the existing Chak On Road South which would separate the Site into two housing developments and would pose constraints on the design and generate undesirable noise or traffic impacts on future residents. However, noting the topography of the Site and the need to keep the existing Chak On Road South as a 24 hour-vehicular access to the water services and drainage facilities located at the western end of the road, Members agreed to the proposed amendment to rezone the Site including Chak On Road South to “R(A)2” to allow flexibility so that HD and CEDD could further investigate and explore the possibility to better integrate the access road into the housing development at the detailed design stage. Members also suggested the project proponents to explore further enhancement of pedestrian connections between the two housing developments at the Site and more convenient pedestrian linkages to the surrounding areas including the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment and Kowloon Tong area through Cornwall Street. Both HD and CEDD noted Members’ suggestions which would be considered during the detailed design stage.

13. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Shek Kip Mei Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K4/29 and that the draft Shek Kip Mei OZP No. S/K4/29A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/K4/30 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper were suitable for public exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and



- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Shek Kip Mei OZP No. S/K4/29A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP.

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

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

[The Chairman thanked the government representatives for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, stayed at the meeting for the next item while others left the meeting at this point.]

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr Franklin Yu joined the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 4**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K5/829            Further Consideration of Section 16 Application  
Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted  
Non-polluting Industrial Use (Excluding Industrial Undertakings  
Involving the Use/Storage of Dangerous Goods) in "Other Specified  
Uses" annotated "Business (1)" Zone, Nos. 550-556 Castle Peak Road,  
Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/829B)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application – during the consideration of the application on 30.4.2021, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application pending the applicant’s submission of further information (FI) on how the original scheme could be enhanced including more details on greening and landscaping proposals, improvement to streetscape/pedestrian environment, and elaboration on other planning and design merits to support the minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) being sought;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction for permitted non-polluting industrial use (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of dangerous goods);
- (c) departmental comments on the FI and the application were set out in paragraph 4 of the Paper and paragraph 9 of Appendix F-1 of the Paper respectively; and
- (d) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD maintained its previous view of having no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 5 of the Paper. The application was for minor relaxation of PR restriction from 12 to 14.4 (i.e. +20%) for the redevelopment of an existing pre-1987 industrial building (IB) at the application site into a proposed 27-storey IB for permitted non-polluting industrial use with building height (BH) complying with the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) restriction. In response to Members’ concerns, the applicants had submitted a revised scheme with a voluntary full-height setback of 3m at the western portion of the façade facing Castle Peak Road and a recessed area of 1.5m-wide with a clear headroom up to 2/F at the western portion of the façade facing Wing Hong Street for improving pedestrian environment and streetscape, and a continuous passageway covered by overhang and canopies on the three sides of the building facades. The landscape proposal was further refined with tree planting along Castle Peak Road and

Wing Hong Street, more vertical greening along the Wing Hong Street façade and larger planting areas on 1/F, 3/F and R/F. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of PlanD considered that the revised scheme would further promote visual interest and comfort for pedestrians, and contribute to a pleasing public realm. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

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

### Tree Planting

16. In response to a Member's question about the tree planting proposal, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, explained that trees would be planted along Castle Peak Road in the area with full-height setback and also along Wing Hong Street at the recessed area underneath the overhang of the building with a clear headroom up to 2/F. The applicants would consult a registered landscape architect to ensure suitable tree species would be selected.

### Recycled Water and Irrigation

17. In response to a Member's questions on details on how recycled water was to be used for irrigation, Ms Ho said that in general recycled water might involve collection and reuse of water from air conditioning system and rainwater but the applicants had not provided the details. According to the applicants, the proposed vertical greening would be irrigated with an automatic irrigation system using recycled water as shown on Plan FA-18 of the Paper. Usually, details on how water might be collected and recycled for use would only be considered at the detailed building design stage and such information might not be available during the planning application stage. The Sustainable Building Design Guidelines did not mandate the use of recycled water for irrigation.

### Building Height

18. Noting the revised scheme with additional voluntary full-height setback, recessed area, and continuous passage covered by overhang and canopies, a few Members asked

whether the BH restriction needed to be relaxed. Ms Ho replied that the applicants did not apply for minor relaxation of BH restriction and the proposed BH of the revised scheme still complied with the OZP restriction of 130mPD. The BH restriction of 130mPD in the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (1)” zone under the OZP generally provided sufficient flexibility to accommodate redevelopments in the area with a higher PR unless exceptionally high floor-to-floor height was required.

### Deliberation Session

19. Compared with the previous scheme, Members considered that the revised scheme was greatly improved in terms of landscape design and planning merits. Members generally appreciated the revised scheme with vertical greening (despite a lack of detail on the irrigation system) and more setbacks as well as a full-length canopy/overhangs along the building façade for improving the pedestrian environment without the need for relaxation of the BH restriction. Rather than simply creating canopy all long the building, the applicants had adopted a creative design of having recessed area with a clear headroom up to 2/F, which would serve as overhang for pedestrians.

20. As the revised scheme was greatly improved taking note of Members’ view in the previous MPC meeting, a few Members expressed that it would be useful if applicants could receive earlier advice on the Board’s main concerns, such as pedestrian comfort, streetscape and greening to refine their schemes so that the planning applications could be considered in one go rather than being deferred and further considered. The Chairman said that the relevant District Planning Office of PlanD would convey Members’ general concerns of considering similar IB applications to the applicants during the processing of the planning applications and the applicants would decide whether to revise the schemes before submission to MPC meeting. The applicants and their consultants would also be aware of Members’ concerns as recorded in the minutes of meeting for considering similar planning applications.

21. 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 23.7.2025, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the

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

- “(a) the submission of a revised traffic impact assessment and implementation of traffic mitigation measures identified therein for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and provision of vehicular access, vehicle parking spaces, and loading/unloading facilities and maneuvering spaces for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (d) in relation to (c) above, the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works as identified in the updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (e) the submission of land contamination assessments in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to development of the site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB.”

22. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix F-VIII of the Paper.

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

## **Agenda Item 5**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/834            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 (2)” Zone, 750 Cheung Sha Wan Road, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/834)

---

23.            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 had 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.

24.            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, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

25.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 7.7.2021 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.

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



Mr 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.

28. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting, and Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting. As the interest of Mr Daniel K.S. Lau was indirect, the property owned by Mr Horace W. Hong and Professor John C.Y. Ng's spouse had no direct view of the Site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

29. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Rosa P.L. Tse, TP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) and building height (BH) restrictions for permitted information technology and telecommunications industries (data centre development);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 22 public comments were received, with 3 supporting comments from the same member of Tsuen Wan West Area Committee, 12 opposing comments from individuals including residents of Summit Terrace, and seven comments providing views from individuals. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper.



The proposed use was in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone. The Development Bureau gave policy support to the application as the proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction from 9.5 to 11.4 (+20%) was in line with the policy on revitalising pre-1987 industrial buildings (IBs). The Innovation and Technology Bureau considered that the proposed development would help address the growing demand for data centres and the proposed floor-to-floor height of 5.8m was reasonable and genuinely required for high-tier data centres. The proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction from 100mPD to 116.2mPD (i.e.+16.2%) was to meet operational requirement for the data centre and was considered to be generally proportionate to the applied minor relaxation of PR restriction and might not be unreasonable. The proposed development would also provide various planning and design merits including the Outline Development Plan (ODP) requirement of 0.2m full-height setback from Pun Shan Street, landscape treatment to be provided along the full-height voluntary setbacks facing Castle Peak Road – Tsuen Wan and the service lane on the northwest boundary. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L) of PlanD considered that the proposed BH was unlikely to induce significant adverse effects on the visual character of the area nor adverse air ventilation impact. Besides, the proposed design measures, including landscape treatment, might promote visual interest and improve pedestrian environment. The Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department also considered that the proposed development was not incompatible with the surroundings. The current scheme offered more design merits as compared with the previous application (No. A/TW/508) submitted by the same applicant for minor relaxation of PR for permitted non-polluting industrial use (excluding industrial undertakings involving use/storage of dangerous goods). 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.

30. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) comparison between the previously approved scheme for industrial use and the current scheme for data centre development in terms of design and planning merits;
  - (b) details on the proposed canopy and the pedestrian circulation in the area;
  - (c) compatibility of the proposed BH with the surrounding developments;
  - (d) how to ensure the BH relaxation sought would only be allowed for a data centre development;
  - (e) details on the vertical greening and its irrigation system and how the proper maintenance of the greening features could be ensured;
  - (f) the typical layout of each floor within the proposed data centre development;
  - (g) how the potential noise nuisances induced by the data centre development to the surrounding residential developments could be tackled; and
  - (h) the difference in workers employment for general industry use and data centre use.

31. In response, Mr Ng Kar Shu, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) the previous application (No. A/TW/508) for minor relaxation of PR restriction from 9.5 to 11.4 for permitted non-polluting industrial use was approved by the Committee in 2020 and the applicant now applied for the same extent of minor relaxation of PR but also a minor relaxation of BH restriction from 100mPD to 116.2mPD for data centre use. Compared with the previously approved scheme, the current scheme had more planning and design merits including additional full-height and wider

setback from Castle Peak Road—Tsuen Wan (3-4.5m), full-height setback from the north-western lot boundary facing the service lane (3.5m), additional canopy at the entrance, additional tree planting and a vast area of vertical greening between G/F and 15/F facing Castle Peak Road—Tsuen Wan. The previously approved scheme only provided a clear headroom of 15m from G/F as recessed areas along Castle Peak Road—Tsuen Wan and the north-western lot boundary facing service lane without a canopy at the entrance;

- (b) the canopy provided a covered area of about 17m<sup>2</sup> at the pedestrian entrance facing Castle Peak Road—Tsuen Wan. People from the MTR station and Discovery Park would walk along Castle Peak Road—Tsuen Wan to reach the building and then enter the building from that pedestrian entrance;
- (c) the Site was situated at the fringe of a large cluster of industrial buildings/sites zoned “OU(B)” in the Chai Wan Kok Industrial/Business Area which was subject to a maximum BH of 100mPD under the OZP. However, as seen on Plan A-7, the BHs of some existing buildings were up to 181mPD (Cable TV Tower). The existing building namely Octagon on Pun Shan Street which was near the Site had a BH of 147mPD. Given the Site context, the CTP/UD&L of PlanD considered that the proposed BH was unlikely to induce significant adverse impacts on the visual character of the area and the proposed development would not be incompatible with the surrounding area;
- (d) ‘data centre’ was always permitted under Column 1 for the “OU(B)” zone under the Notes of the OZP, and the current application was for PR and BH relaxations for the permitted data centre use. The applicant needed to apply for lease modification with the Lands Department should the application be approved by the Committee. The BH relaxation sought under the application was scheme-based and specifically for data centre use. If the proposed data centre was no longer pursued, the applicant could use the Site for any permitted uses under Column 1 complying with the PR and

BH restrictions of OZP;

- (e) the applicant had provided some details on what species to be planted for the vertical greening system and the vertical greening modules were proposed to be equipped with drainage and irrigation system connected to the main building's water supply as shown in Drawing A-17 of the Paper. The applicant would explore the possibility of using greywater for irrigating landscaping features during the detailed design stage. Gondola would be used for maintenance of the vertical greening at upper levels of the building. Regarding the implementation of vertical greening, a standard landscape clause could be included at the lease modification stage to ensure the landowner would maintain the vertical greening properly. The Lands Department would issue warning letter to the landowners to rectify if there were complaints against non-compliance with the landscape clause;
- (f) referring to the typical floor section in Drawing A-16, higher headroom of 5.8m was required for accommodating the 2.5m tall data racks as data centre equipment with mechanical room. Cooling towers were on the top levels of the building;
- (g) to its further north/northwest across Castle Peak Road—Tsuen Wan about 50m from the Site was a residential cluster including Summit Terrace, and residents of Summit Terrace had raised concerns on the potential noise impacts generated by data centre use in the public comments. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) had no objection to the application based on the Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) submitted by the applicant. Approval condition on the submission of an updated NIA to the satisfaction of DEP had been recommended to address the concerns on the possible noise nuisances; and
- (h) compared with other general industrial uses, the employment population of data centre business should be relatively smaller.

32. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 23.7.2025, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the design and provision of parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces and vehicular access for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (c) in relation to (b) above, the implementation of the recommended works as identified in the updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of land contamination assessments in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to development of the site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (e) the submission of an updated Noise Impact Assessment and the implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (f) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

33. 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 Ng Kar Shu, (STP/TWK) and Ms Rosa P.L. Tse, (TP/TWK) for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 7**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/526                      Proposed Social Welfare Facility (Day Care Centre and Residential Care Home for the Elderly) in "Residential (Group B) 4" Zone, Portion of Level 3, Greenview Court Shopping Centre, 644-654 Castle Peak Road - Tsuen Wan, Tsuen Wan, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/526)

---

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

Mr Horace W. Hong            -    owning a flat in Tsuen Wan;

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.

35.            The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the property owned by Mr Horace W. Hong and Professor John C.Y. Ng's spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

36.            The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 5.7.2021 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.

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

[Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District (STP/TWK) was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 8**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

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

---

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

38. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) restriction for permitted industrial use;

- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of seven public comments from individuals were received, with one supporting comment, one opposing comment and five comments providing views. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed use was in line with the planning intention of the “Industrial” zone. The Development Bureau gave policy support to the application as the proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction from 9.5 to 11.4 (+20%) was in line with the policy on revitalisation of pre-1987 industrial buildings (IB). The proposed development had incorporated full-height building setbacks of 3.5m along Tai Lin Pai Road and 0.5m to 1.7m along Wah Sing Street to realise the planning intention set out in the Outline Development Plan (ODP) for road widening as well as a passage for the public as a ‘short cut’ connecting Tai Lin Pai Road at LG/F and Wah Sing Street at UG/F; and provision of a landscaped courtyard at the LG/F entrance at Tai Lin Pai Road, a sky garden with peripheral greening on 6/F, and landscape treatments in the forms of trees, planters, vertical green and seating at various levels of the building. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of PlanD considered that the proposed design measures might promote visual interest and pedestrian comfort with improvement on the connectivity between Tai Lin Pai Road and Wah Sing Street. 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.

39. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) details on the irrigation system for the landscaping features;



- (b) details on the proposed setback, the landscaped courtyard and the public passage as a 'short-cut' for improving the pedestrian environment and the pedestrian flow;
- (c) the public benefits of the proposed landscaped courtyard, the public passage and setback at Wah Sing Street; and
- (d) the greening proposal on upper floors and the sky garden on the refuge floor and the public benefits.

40. In response, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the applicant, a proprietary cellular system with built-in irrigation system, similar to that used in the K11 Musea, would be adopted for vertical greening. The feasibility of using recycled water for irrigation would be explored at the detailed design stage;
- (b) the proposed development had incorporated full-height setbacks of 3.5m along Tai Lin Pai Road and 0.5 to 1.7m along Wah Sing Street as per the ODP requirements. The proposed landscaped entrance courtyard at the south-western corner of LG/F near Tai Lin Pai Road to be opened for public use was a voluntary proposal. Although the applicant did not provide the actual site area of the landscaped entrance courtyard, the courtyard was created by full-height setback from the south-western building line and the area was sizable as shown in Drawing A-10 of the Paper. As there were many workers in the neighbourhood and there was quite a high volume of pedestrian flow on both Tai Lin Pai Road and Wah Sing Street, the proposed 'short-cut' connecting Tai Lin Pai Road at LG/F and Wah Sing Street at UG/F would provide convenience for pedestrians. As shown in Drawing A-2 of the Paper, pedestrians could enter the building from the landscaped courtyard to access the escalator and the public passage (of not less than 3.5m-wide) inside the building and exit at Wah Sing Street. There was no indication of doors at the other entrance at Wah Sing Street in the submission. The public passage and entrance courtyard would be open to the public from 8am to 8pm under the management of the

building;

- (c) the landscaped courtyard was inviting for pedestrians to enter the building to use the public passage under a weather-protected environment between Tai Lin Pai Road and Wah Sing Street. The pedestrian environment was also improved with tree plantings in the setback area along Tai Lin Pai Road. The applicant proposed a setback of 0.5m to 1.7m from Wah Sing Street and there would be greenery and shrub proposed on the 1/F for visual amenities. According to the ODP, Wah Sing Street would be widened to 20.5m in future but the actual width would be subject to detailed design by the concerned departments; and
- (d) the sky garden on the refuge floor was only accessible for occupants and visitors in the building, and the greenery on the upper floors were mainly for visual amenity purpose.

#### Deliberation Session

41. Members generally supported the application and considered that the landscaped courtyard and provision of public passage were good design merits. Some Members considered that the façade/access arrangement at Wah Sing Street could be improved with provision of canopy or recessed area as a rain-shelter for improving the pedestrian environment. A few Members also considered that the use of recycled water for irrigating the landscaping features should be encouraged. A Member remarked that the future design should not rely on fresh water for irrigating the landscape features and there should be guidelines requiring the use of recycled/grey water. Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)/Environmental Protection Department (EPD), supplemented that there was currently no such guidelines on the use of recycled water under EPD and the Water Supplies Department might have more information in that regard. The Government in general encouraged the use of recycled water for irrigation in buildings. To address Members' concerns, the Chairman suggested and Members agreed that advisory clauses to encourage the provision of a canopy/weather protected design along Wah Sing Street and the use of recycled water for irrigation would be included for the applicant's consideration.

42. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 23.7.2025, 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 landscape proposal for LG/F level of the development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and provision of parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces and vehicular access for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the design and implementation of traffic measures as proposed by the applicant at his own cost prior to occupation of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB; and
- (d) the submission of land contamination assessments in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to development of the Site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB.”

43. 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 explore the possibility of using recycled water for irrigating the landscaping features in the proposed development; and
- (b) to explore the possibility of providing a canopy/weather protected design along the façade facing Wah Sing Street.”



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

### **Agenda Item 10**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H8/432                      Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development with Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions (Amendments to an Approved Master Layout Plan) and Land Filing in "Comprehensive Development Area (2)" Zone and area shown as 'Road', Kai Yuen Street, North Point, Hong Kong (MPC Paper No. A/H8/432)

---

48. The Secretary reported that the application was located in North Point. KTA Planning Limited (KTA) and K & W Architects Limited (K&W) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Alex T.H. Lai                      - his former firm had business dealings with K&W;

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 Horace W. Hong - his spouse owning a flat in North Point; and

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - owning a flat in North Point.

49. The Committee noted that the applicant 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 the interest of Mr Daniel K.S. Lau was indirect and the property owned by Mr Horace W. Hong's spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

50. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 6.7.2021 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.

51. 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**

[Mr Mak Chung Hang, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon District (STP/K) was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 11**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

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

---

52.            The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Kowloon Tong. Kenneth To & Associates Limited (renamed to KTA Planning Limited) (KTA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members 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 which owned properties in Kowloon Tong.

53.            The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interest of Mr Daniel K.S. Lau was indirect, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

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

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed school (primary school);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 104 public comments from a member of Kowloon City District Council, owners/residents in the Kowloon Tong Garden Estate (KTGE) and Kowloon Tong area, existing kindergartens in the KTGE and individuals including parents of students of schools in the Kowloon Tong were received objecting to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed development was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The Site was previously used as a kindergarten with planning permission under application No. A/K18/266 for 'School (Kindergarten cum Child Care Centre)' approved by the Committee in 2009 and had ceased operation since the 2020/2021 school year. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had reservation on the current application as the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) could not address their comments regarding the implementation and enforceability of the proposed 'school bus only' arrangement, the accuracy of the conducted traffic survey and assessments on the nearby junctions and adequacy of pedestrian facilities. The Commissioner of Police also did not support the application owing to public safety reasons and saturation of the traffic situation at the concerned area. He had serious reservation on the proposed 'school bus only' policy as many schools failed to fully implement the arrangement and there was no statutory means to enforce the arrangement. A relatively high number of traffic complaints had been received in adjoining streets, which might cause traffic congestion to one of the busiest intersections in Kowloon at Boundary Street and Waterloo Road. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the



application. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

55. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the Site could still be used for a kindergarten if the current application for proposed primary school was rejected and whether a new TIA would be required;
- (b) details on the unauthorised structures at the Site;
- (c) what other facilities would be provided in the proposed primary school, other than classrooms, and any shortfalls in primary school provision in the area; and
- (d) why the TIA was considered unacceptable by the C for T.

56. In response, Mr Mak Chung Hang, STP/K, made the following main points:

- (a) given that the kindergarten had only ceased operation for a short period of time at the current juncture, the Site could be re-used for a kindergarten if the planning parameters (i.e. number of classrooms and students) remained the same as that under the approved planning application No. A/K18/266. The applicant would need to apply for school registration with the Secretary for Education (SED) as well as comply with other prevailing regulations. SED would seek relevant departments, including PlanD, for comments on the school registration application as appropriate. The applicant would need to provide reasons/justifications on why the applied use had ceased for a period of time. If the planning parameters of the kindergarten were different from the approved application, a separate planning permission would then be required to reflect the new planning parameters and an updated TIA would be needed to ascertain the acceptability of the proposal from the traffic aspect;

- (b) the Site did not involve any unauthorised building works. Some similar applications were previously rejected by the Committee with having unauthorised building works on the sites as one of the rejection reasons;
- (c) the proposed primary school would have a school hall and six classrooms. The applicant did not specify that other facilities would be provided. The existing provision of primary school places was generally adequate to meet the demand of the population in the Kowloon Tong Planning Area; and
- (d) C for T considered that the TIA submitted by the applicant was not acceptable because the TIA only compared the trip generation rates of the 2009 approved kindergarten scheme and the survey data collected in October 2020. The TIA should be updated to investigate the impact caused by the proposed primary school. The applicant had failed to address the comments raised by C for T.

57. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Horace W. Hong, Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport Department, further elaborated why C for T had reservation on the application. Mr Hong advised that the TIA was considered unacceptable as it did not reflect the actual vehicle flows. For instance, the traffic survey was carried out at 3pm which did not tie in with the school finishing hours during COVID-19 pandemic. TD had advised the applicant to rectify and update the TIA, but the applicant had not submitted any further information nor revised the TIA to address the comments.

#### Deliberation Session

58. A Member remarked that the comments of SED, which only provided information on the school registration procedure, did not offer sufficient information to assist the Board in considering the application, for example, there was no information on shortfall/surplus of primary school places in the area nor advice on the suitability of the premises for the proposed school. The Chairman explained that SED would normally provide information on school places if the proposal involved public school while SED would not provide policy support for private school applications such as the current application, which were market led. Notwithstanding that, the applicant needed to fulfil

requirements for school registration and other prevailing regulations.

59. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application for the following reason:

“the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not create adverse traffic impact in the area.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr Mak Chung Hang, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 12**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K18/339 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Religious Institution (Church) and School (Kindergarten and Primary School) Uses in “Government, Institution or Community (4)” Zone, 2 Lancashire Road and 134 Waterloo Road, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/339)

---

60. The Secretary reported that the application was located in Kowloon Tong. AGC Design Limited (AGC), MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) and WSP (Asia) Limited (WSP) were three 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 AGC and WSP;

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

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which

owned properties in Kowloon Tong.

61. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting, and Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting.

62. 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 comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

63. 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 13**

#### **Any Other Business**

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