

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 680th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 24.9.2021**

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

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),
Transport Department

Mr Patrick K.H. Ho

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Gavin C.T. Tse

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department

Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department

Mr Albert K.L. Cheung

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

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 Denise M.S. Ho

Opening Remarks

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

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 679th MPC Meeting held on 10.9.2021

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 679th MPC meeting held on 10.9.2021 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

[Open Meeting]

Y/K9/14 Application for Amendment to the Approved Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/26, To rezone the application site from “Residential (Group A) 4” to “Government, Institution or Community (1)”, Hung Hom Inland Lots 238 S.F RP and 238 S.G, 37 Winslow Street, Hung Hom, Kowloon

4. The Committee noted that the application was withdrawn by the applicant on 21.9.2021 after issuance of the Paper.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

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

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K20/134 Proposed Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) and Permitted Open Space in “Open Space” and “Residential (Group A)” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’, Government Land at the Junction of Yen Chow Street West and Tung Chau Street, Sham Shui Po, Kowloon (MPC Paper No. A/K20/134)

5. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Transport Department (TD). Townland Consultants Limited (Townland) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| Mr Patrick K.H. Ho | - being the Assistant Commissioner/Urban of TD;
and |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - his former firm having business dealings with
Townland. |

6. As the interest of Mr Patrick K.H. Ho was direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

[Mr Patrick K.H. Ho left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Winsome W.S. Lee, TP/TWK,

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed public vehicle park (PVP) (excluding container vehicle) by automated parking system (APS) and permitted open space;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, a total of 14 public comments were received, including four supporting, one objecting and nine expressing concerns on the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Whilst the area shown as 'Road' within the application site (the Site) and in the vicinity was reserved for road widening of Tung Chau Street, according to TD, there was no development programme at that road portion. The small irregular pocket of land within the "Residential (Group A)" zone was outside the vesting order of any housing estate. The proposed development would not affect any road or housing development and would help address the parking demand in the Sham Shui Po (SSP) district and allow early implementation of the public open space (POS). The Secretary for Transport and Housing had given policy support as the proposed development would increase parking provision and provide a POS under the principle of "Single Site, Multiple Use". The proposed development with low-rise above ground structures was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong joined the meeting during the presentation session.]

Operation of Automated Parking System

8. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the reason for adopting circular shaft as the design of the APS on the Site;
 - (b) whether the car parking spaces were for monthly or hourly rental;
 - (c) what contingency plan there was in time of malfunctioning of the APS;
 - (d) operation of the APS;
 - (e) whether there was management plan for queuing of vehicles; and
 - (f) walkability from the car park to the surrounding areas.
9. In response, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, made the following main points:
- (a) since the Site was small in size and irregular in shape, the applicant considered that an underground circular shaft lifting system requiring smaller footprint at ground level was suitable to optimise the land use efficiency and maximise the area for open space;
 - (b) the party to undertake the management and maintenance of PVP would be identified by TD. The issue of outsourcing operation of the PVP and the parking fee determination mechanism would be decided near the time when the PVP was due for commissioning and there was no information available at such early planning stage on whether the parking spaces would be for hourly or monthly rental;
 - (c) in case of malfunctioning of the APS, the system would allow properly trained personnel to retrieve vehicles to minimise the impact on car park users. The traffic impact in case of mechanical failure of one of the circular shafts was also assessed in the traffic impact assessment (TIA)

report. The applicant indicated that if one circular shaft was malfunctioned, the other would still function as a reserve. The at-grade conventional parking spaces would also serve as contingency in case of system failure of APS;

- (d) the drivers would leave their vehicles at the drop off entrance of the circular shaft on the ground level. A computerised system with mechanical devices would convey and store the vehicles in a vacant parking space inside the underground car park. The car retrieval process was the reverse of the automated parking process and drivers and passengers could get into their vehicles at the car park pick-up exit area. An average of about 2 to 3 minutes was assumed for storing or retrieving each vehicle. The initial assumptions were subject to the actual operation of APS and the detailed design proposal after the design and build contract was awarded;
- (e) the potential queue length had been assessed in the TIA and sufficient queuing area together with buffer area would be provided within the proposed development. The vehicular access road within the Site also served as the queuing area for the APS. There would be digital panels at the ingress point and near the APS to show the vacancy of parking spaces. Similar APS had been operated in overseas densely populated cities and TD put forth the pilot projects on APS in Hong Kong to test the applicability in building, operating and managing different types of APS in Hong Kong; and
- (f) after parking their cars, people could leave the Site via the access points at Sai Chuen Road and Yen Chow Street West. There was footpath along Sai Chuen Road which led to Sham Mong Road and MTR Nam Cheong Station to the further south and also footpath along Yen Chow Street to the SSP old district to the northeast.

Traffic Impact

10. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was traffic flow data at Sai Chuen Road and the nearby junction with and without the proposed development for comparison; and
- (b) given that the applicant was TD, how the TIA could be assessed impartially.

11. In response, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) capacity assessment on key junctions without and with the proposed development was provided in the TIA. The 2020 observed junction capacity assessments revealed that all of the key junctions assessed would operate satisfactorily during the peak hours including the junction of Yen Chow Street West and Sai Chuen Road, which had sufficient reserve capacity. Based on the 2029 peak hour junction performance with the proposed development, the estimated reserve capacity of the junction of Yen Chow Street West and Sai Chuen Road would still have sufficient reserve capacity during the peak hours. The results of the TIA indicated that all assessed junctions would perform within capacity during the peak hours for both scenarios; and
- (b) while the application was submitted by the Strategic Studies Division of TD, the submitted TIA was prepared by a traffic consultant and assessed by a separate division of TD, the Traffic Engineering (Kowloon) Division of TD. During the processing of the application, the latter had provided comments on the TIA and the applicant had submitted further information to address the comments on traffic aspect.

Car Parking Demand

12. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the types of vehicles to be parked in the APS and whether coaches and heavy goods vehicles could be parked at the Site;

- (b) whether there was information on car parking demand in the area and information on utilisation of existing car parks under short term tenancies (STT) or in the housing estates nearby;
- (c) whether the at-grade car parking spaces were necessary given the purpose of the pilot scheme was to assist TD to gain experience in operating the APS; and
- (d) whether the at-grade parking provision in the pilot scheme could deviate from requirements under the concerned LandsD's Practice Notes.

13. In response, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) the APS was for parking of private cars only. The design vehicle dimension within the circular shafts could accommodate most types of private cars in Hong Kong. Other oversized private cars and light goods vehicles would be accommodated at the at-grade conventional parking spaces at the Site. Parking of coaches and heavy goods vehicles would not be allowed at the Site;
- (b) parking demand was a prime factor in selecting suitable sites for PVP and the application of APS. TD's parking demand assessment and roadside parking surveys revealed that there was a shortfall of about 200 public car parking spaces in the vicinity, and the utilisation rate of STT car parks and statistics of illegal parking also revealed that there was parking demand in the area. The proposed development would help address the parking demand in the surrounding areas. With regard to meeting the parking demand for commercial vehicles, TD would request the inclusion of additional conditions stipulating the minimum number of parking spaces for commercial vehicles when re-tendering the existing car parks covered by STTs and the provision of parking facilities for commercial vehicles in new developments as appropriate. There were STT car parks at Tung Chau Street/Yen Chow Street, Po Lun Street/Sham Mong Road, and Yuet Lun Street with provision of parking spaces for commercial vehicles. However,

the utilisation rate of specific STT car parks was not available;

- (c) the at-grade conventional parking spaces at the Site were designated for oversized private cars, barrier free parking and electric vehicles (EVs) with the charging facilities for which could not be provided within the APS; serving as contingency arrangement and meeting the requirements under the Practice Note No. 2/2000 of the Lands Department on the provision of mechanical car parking system in that not less than one-sixth of the total number of spaces provided should be accommodated in the conventional system; and
- (d) regarding the reduction of at-grade parking spaces for a better layout and larger POS at the Site, TD could further liaise with LandsD on the requirement for provision of conventional parking spaces in the mechanical car parking system.

Public Open Space

14. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the area of the POS and greenery coverage;
- (b) interface between the children play area and the APS;
- (c) accessibility of the POS;
- (d) having noted surplus provision of open space within SSP area, whether the provision of open space in the Site was suitable as there might be safety issue; and
- (e) whether the West Kowloon Corridor located to the north of the Site would pose environmental nuisance to the users of the POS.

15. In response, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) according to Drawing A-5 of the Paper, the POS with an area of not less than 1,135m² included the lawn area, children play area and fitness corner while greenery coverage would cover the lawn area, planting area and green roofs;
- (b) the children play area and fitness corner and the car entrance to the APS were all on ground level. Physical separation and/or measures, such as shrubs, fencing to ensure pedestrian safety would be further considered at the detailed design stage. The applicant would implement all necessary measures to ensure public safety;
- (c) the vehicular ingress and egress of the Site were at Yen Chow Street West and Sai Chuen Road respectively while pedestrian accesses were also provided at both locations. There were a number of public housing estates in the vicinity including Fu Cheong Estate and Wing Cheong Estate and the residents there could access the POS on foot;
- (d) based on the requirements in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), there was a surplus of local open space and district open space for the SSP district but most of it was provided in the new reclamation areas and along the Cheung Sha Wan waterfront promenade. The surrounding areas of the Site were more densely populated. Residents in the nearby public housing estates and residential developments in the old district area would likely welcome the proposed POS. While the Site had been zoned "O" for a long time, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) had no programme to implement open space development at the Site. LCSD had no objection to the proposed development with the provision of open space, the associated management and maintenance arrangement, and the adoption of 'universal play' concept of the POS; and
- (e) the POS was located outside the buffer distance of 20m from West Kowloon Corridor and tree planting was proposed along the northern

boundary of the Site which might serve for screening purpose to mitigate the potential environmental impacts.

Interface with Transitional Housing Development

16. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the long term use of the transitional housing site abutting the south of the Site;
 - (b) whether residents in the transitional housing could easily access the POS at the Site;
 - (c) whether there was any air quality impact from the proposed development on the residents of the transitional housing; and
 - (d) whether the operator of the transitional housing was aware of the APS pilot project and whether any acoustic window would be installed for the transitional housing to minimise the traffic noise impact.
17. In response, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, made the following main points:
- (a) the remaining “O” zone was intended for open space development in the long term and it would be used for transitional housing development on a temporary basis under STT with population in-take in Q1 2022. The Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) would review the operation of the transitional housing upon the expiry of the 5-year STT term subject to the availability of the site and planned use of the site at that time;
 - (b) the residents of the transitional housing could access the POS via the access point at Yen Chow Street West or Sai Chuen Road while accessing via the emergency vehicular access of the transitional housing to the POS could be explored at a later stage;

- (c) the transitional housing development would be completed with population in-take by Q1 2022 which would be before the construction of the proposed development in 2023. The transitional housing development had been included in the preliminary environmental review (PER) of the subject application for assessment. The applicant would adopt environmental control measures recommended in the PER to mitigate the impact of the proposed development on the residents of the transitional housing during construction phase, for example, hard paving on open area, regular watering and spraying on dusty areas and materials, vehicle washing facilities to reduce dust emission; and the use of quiet powered mechanical equipment, construction method, noise barriers and noise enclosure as far as practicable. DEP had no in-principle objection to the application from the environmental perspective and the proposed development would not cause insurmountable environmental impact on air quality, sewerage and noise aspects. To address DEP's concern on construction noise impact, an approval condition on the submission of a construction noise impact assessment prior to the development of the Site and the implementation of noise mitigation measures identified therein for the construction phase of the proposed development was suggested; and

- (d) the operator of the transitional housing was the Hong Kong Council of Social Service and there was no information on whether noise mitigation measures, such as acoustic window had been installed in the transitional housing development. The issues including safety and physical interface, potential visual impact, and construction noise etc. had been taken into account in the layout design and technical assessments of the proposed development. Both APS and the transitional housing projects were under the purview of THB and the project teams were expected to maintain close co-ordination to address potential interface issues throughout the construction and operation of the two projects.

18. Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment), EPD, supplemented that according to the information provided by the applicant, the APS would generate about 40 car trips/hour and it would neither entail significant

increase in road traffic emissions nor air quality impact. The access road to the APS was a local distributor and the provision of a 5m-buffer from the transitional housing site was considered sufficient. As the Site was located near the transitional housing development, quieter construction method for the proposed development would be required and the relevant approval condition would be imposed.

Others

19. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether it was the first application for APS submitted for the Town Planning Board (the Board)'s consideration; and
 - (b) the reason for demolishing the down ramp of the West Kowloon Corridor.
20. In response, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, made the following main points:
- (a) some APS projects were within "Government, Institution or Community" zone under which PVP was always permitted. Since the proposed development was partly within an area zoned "Open Space" and area shown as 'Road' which would require planning permission from the Board, it was the first planning application for PVP in the form of APS submitted for the Board's consideration; and
 - (b) the down ramp of the West Kowloon Corridor along the northern boundary of the Site was completed in 1988 and had been in use for about 10 years for providing connection to the former SSP ferry pier. Due to the change in development plans over the years, part of the down ramp was demolished to give way for the development of Fu Cheong Estate in 1990s. Demolition works of the remaining down ramp of the West Kowloon Corridor was being conducted by the Highways Department.

[Mr Franklin Yu and Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung joined the meeting, Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung left the meeting temporarily and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting during the question and

answer session.]

Deliberation Session

21. The Chairman recapitulated that the proposed development was one of the TD's pilot projects on APS in Hong Kong. The interface with the transitional housing nearby was well-noted by THB and mitigation measures were proposed to minimise potential impacts from the APS. The proposed development would also allow early implementation of the POS at the Site and LCSD had no objection to the application. He then invited Members to consider the application.

22. Members generally supported the pilot scheme for APS and the proposed PVP cum POS development to be implemented under the principle of "Single Site, Multiple Uses", which could better utilise the Site. A few Members opined that many densely populated cities had adopted similar APS and technical feasibility should not be a major concern. A Member considered that the Site was suitable for the pilot project since it was not a very busy district but there was parking demand. A Member said that TD could consider phased commencement to ensure smooth operation of the APS. A Member raised doubts on the parking demand in the area as the STT car park nearby was not fully utilised.

23. Some Members raised concern that traffic to the APS and the at-grade parking spaces would create interface issues including traffic noise and air pollution impacts on the adjoining transitional housing development. They were of the view that THB should better co-ordinate the two projects so that the interface issues could be addressed and mitigation measures for the transitional housing development could be provided timely and effectively, where appropriate. A few Members considered that the layout of the proposed development could be improved at the detailed design stage to provide a more pedestrian friendly, greener and safer environment especially for users of the proposed children play area and fitness corner. In that regard, two Members suggested that the proposed pedestrian path along the northern boundary of the Site might be swapped with the at-grade car parking spaces along the southern boundary to provide a wider and more welcoming access from Yen Chow Street West. A Member also considered that the one-sixth conventional car parking provision requirement of the LandsD not appropriate for the pilot project and suggested that TD should liaise with LandsD on whether the at-grade parking spaces could be reduced for better

utilisation of the above-ground space for a better designed POS.

24. The Chairman concluded that Members generally supported that proposed development. With regard to Members' concerns on better co-ordination between the subject proposal and the transitional housing and the need to address potential interface issues, the Chairman suggested that such concerns should be conveyed to THB for their consideration. In addition, an appropriate advisory clause for better layout and design of the open air car park and POS should be added. Members agreed.

25. 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 24.9.2025, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following condition:

“The submission of a construction noise impact assessment prior to development of the site and the implementation of noise mitigation measures identified therein for the construction phase of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board.”

26. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the following advisory clause as well as those as set out at Appendix IV of the Paper.

“the project proponent should try to provide a better layout and design for the open air carpark and the public open space during the detailed design stage.”

[Mr Patrick K.H. Ho rejoined the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

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/K5/834A)

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

28. 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

29. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Winsome W.S. Lee, TP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio restriction for permitted non-polluting industrial use (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of dangerous goods);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, three public comments were receiving with one indicating no comment and two expressing concerns on the application. 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 development was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone and the proposed building height of not more than 130mPD complied with the building height restriction under the Outline Zoning Plan. The Secretary for Development gave policy support to the application under the Government's policy on revitalising pre-1987 industrial buildings (the Policy). The proposed development would provide full-height building setback of 2m from Cheung Sha Wan Road, which was in line with the Outline Development Plan (ODP)'s requirements for the purpose of street widening and streetscape improvement. A voluntary setback of 1m at the building frontage on G/F and 1/F and a 2m-wide continuous canopy along the building façade and vertical green walls were also proposed. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

30. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed setback was a requirement under the outline zoning plan;
- (b) the details on proposed repavement of the public footpath in front of the application site (the Site); and
- (c) whether the canopy abutting Cheung Sha Wan Road was a continuous canopy or only covered the main entrance.

31. In response, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) the 2m-full height setback from Cheung Sha Wan Road was in accordance with the requirements under the ODP;
- (b) the applicant proposed to repave the public footpath outside the Site, so that it would match the featured paving pattern for the setback areas within the Site for a more pleasant streetscape. The public footpath portion would be handed back to the Government for management and maintenance upon repaving; and
- (c) the applicant proposed a 2m-wide continuous canopy along the building façade as shown in Drawing A-3 of the Paper. In the original submission, there was no continuous canopy. Having noted Members' views in other similar cases, the applicant had revised the scheme and proposed a continuous 2m-wide canopy for a better pedestrian environment.

Deliberation Session

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 24.9.2025, 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 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 Town Planning Board; and
- (b) 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 Town Planning Board.”

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

set out at Appendix IV of the Paper.

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/837 Proposed Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (2)” Zone, Portion of Workshop C3, G/F, Block C, Hong Kong Industrial Centre, 489-491 Castle Peak Road, Lai Chi Kok, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/837)

34. The Secretary reported that K & K Chartered Architect & Associates (K&K) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest on the item for his former firm having business dealings with K&K.

35. As Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

36. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Winsome W.S. Lee, TP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed shop and services;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, two public comments supporting the application but without stating any detailed comment were received; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the

application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed use at the premises was considered generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone and compatible with the changing land use character of the area. It was considered not incompatible with other uses in the same industrial building. The proposed use in general complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D in that it would not induce adverse fire safety, traffic, environmental or infrastructural impacts. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

37. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

38. 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 24.9.2025, 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 fire service installations before operation of the proposed use to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (b) if the above planning condition (a) is not complied with before operation of the proposed use, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

39. 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 Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, and Miss Winsome W.S. Lee, 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/K5/838 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, 646-648A Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/838)

40. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (ARUP) and Archiplus International Limited (AI) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interest on the item:

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

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

42. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 17.9.2021 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.

43. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the

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

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/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/526A)

44. The Secretary reported that the application site 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.

45. 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 not attending the meeting. As the property owned by Professor John C.Y. Ng's spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

46. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 8.9.2021 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 second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had

submitted further information to address departmental comments.

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 one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of further information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of three 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 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/527

Proposed Comprehensive Residential (Flat) and Social Welfare Facility (Child Care Centre) Development with Minor Relaxation of Maximum Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions (Amendments to an Approved Scheme) in "Comprehensive Development Area (3)" Zone, Tsuen Wan Town Lots 126, 137, 160 and 363 (New Grant Nos. 4697, 4728, 4817 and 6927) and adjoining Government Land, Tsuen Wan, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/527A)

48. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan and the application was submitted by Tippon Investment Enterprises Limited, which was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK). Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD), and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with SHK and AECOM and past business dealings with LD;
- Mr Franklin Yu - his spouse being an employee of SHK;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having business dealings with SHK and AECOM;
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan;
- Professor John C.Y. Ng - his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan; and
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a former Executive Director and Committee Member of The Boys' & Girls' Clubs Association of Hong Kong which had received sponsorship from SHK.

49. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had already left and Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for not attending the meeting. As the interest of Mr Franklin Yu was direct, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. As the interest of Ms Lilian S.K. Law was indirect, Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application 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.

50. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 10.9.2021 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.

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. 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 Stephen C.Y. Chan, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), and Ms Apple W.C. Lau, Town Planner/TWK (TP/TWK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/TY/145 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Concrete Batching Plant
for a Period of 5 Years in "Industrial" Zone, Tsing Yi Town Lot 98,
14-18 Tsing Tim Street, Tsing Yi, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/TY/145A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

52. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Apple W.C. Lau, TP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) renewal of planning approval for temporary concrete batching plant for a period of five years;

- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, a total of 33 public comments were received, including 32 supporting and 2 objecting to the application. 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. 34D in that there had been no material change in planning circumstances since the previous approval granted, no adverse planning implication arising from the renewal and the applicant had complied with all approval conditions of the latest planning approval, and the approval period sought which was the same as the last approval was not unreasonable. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended.

53. In response to a Member's questions on the traffic impact of the concrete batching plant as raised in a public comment, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, said that tankers and trucks would transport the raw materials to the concrete batching plant for further processing and the concrete would be transported away from the plant to construction sites by road based transport. While the Commissioner for Transport had no objection to the application, to ensure that vehicular movement associated with the concrete batching plant would be properly managed within the application site (the Site), approval conditions including no queuing on public roads at any time during the planning approval period and the submission of a traffic management plan including contingency plan and the associated mitigation measures and traffic facilities were suggested.

54. A Member enquired on the distribution of other concrete batching plants in the Territory. In response, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, said that while it was understood that there were a number of concrete batching plants located at scattered locations in the

territory, there were eight existing/approved concrete batching plants/asphalt plants located in the western and northern parts of Tsing Yi. Geographically, Tsing Yi was situated at a relatively central location in the territory which could facilitate timely and prompt delivery of concrete. Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment), Environmental Protection Department (EPD), supplemented that there were some concrete batching plants located in the Yau Tong Industrial Area and Sam Mun Tsai in Tai Po and some small scale ones scattered in various locations in the New Territories.

55. In response to a Member's question on lease control for concrete batching plant use, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, said that the lease for the Site was for industrial or godown or both uses excluding offensive trades. A temporary waiver was also required to permit the current parking and loading/unloading spaces for the plant. Approval of the concrete batching plant on a temporary basis for five years could allow monitoring of the operation and impacts of the use on the Site taking account of changes in planning circumstances and traffic conditions. Mr Albert K.L. Cheung, Assistant Director (Regional 1), LandsD, supplemented that there were some leases specified for concrete batching plant use and most of those were located along the coastal area with marine access such as Green Island Cement in Tuen Mun and Whampoa. With the changing market needs, some owners might have applied for lease modification for other uses. The Secretary added that the leases of some lots in the Yau Tong Industrial Area also allowed for concrete batching plant use and those sites had been rezoned to "Comprehensive Development Area" to provide incentives for gradual change to residential use. The Chairman further supplemented that under the licensing requirement, EPD would closely monitor the operation of the concrete batching plant.

Deliberation Session

56. In response to a Member's concern on possible traffic impact should there be non-compliance with the concerned approval conditions, the Chairman said that if the applicant failed to comply with any of the approval condition(s), the approval would be revoked. If the approval was revoked, relevant government departments would follow-up to terminate the licence granted for the concrete batching plant use.

57. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a

temporary basis for a period of five years from 15.10.2021 to 14.10.2026, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no queuing on public roads in the vicinity of the site resulting from the operation of the concrete batching plant shall be allowed at any time during the planning approval period to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission of a traffic management plan including contingency plan and associated mitigation measures and traffic facilities within six months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board by 15.4.2022;
- (c) in relation to (b) above, the implementation of the approved traffic management plan during the operation period of the concrete batching plant to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) the existing fire service installations implemented at the site shall be properly maintained in efficient working order at all times during the planning approval period to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (e) if the above planning condition (a), (c) or (d) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (f) if the above planning condition (b) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

set out at Appendix VI of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, and Ms Apple W.C. Lau, TP/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H5/413 Proposed Flat with Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction in “Residential (Group A)”, and “Residential (Group C)” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’, 31 - 36 Sau Wa Fong, Wan Chai, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H5/413C)

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

60. 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.

61. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 16.9.2021 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 third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

62. 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 third deferment of the application at the request of the applicant 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 Ng Kwok Tim, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong District (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/HK/14 Temporary Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) for Letting of Surplus Monthly Parking Spaces to Non-residents for a Period of 5 Years in "Residential (Group A)" Zone,

- (a) Car Park in Model Housing Estate, North Point
- (b) Car Park in Hong Tung Estate, Lei King Wan, Quarry Bay
- (c) Car Park in Hing Wah (II) Estate, Chai Wan
- (d) Car Park in Tsui Lok Estate, Chai Wan
- (e) Car Park in Yue Wan Estate, Chai Wan
- (f) Car Park in Shan Tsui Court, Chai Wan

(MPC Paper No. A/HK/14)

63. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

64. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Gavin C.T. Tse and Franklin Yu were direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As the interest of Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon was indirect and Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

[Messrs Gavin C.T. Tse and Franklin Yu left the meeting temporarily and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

65. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Kwok Tim, STP/HK,

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) for letting of surplus monthly parking spaces to non-residents for a period of five years in the six housing estates;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, one public comment objecting to the application was received. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The application for letting of the surplus parking spaces to non-residents as proposed would help utilize resources more efficiently. With ongoing monitoring, the proposed temporary period of five years was considered acceptable as only the surplus parking spaces would be let to the non-residents and the parking need of the residents would not be compromised. The proposal would not attract additional traffic flow to the surrounding areas. The Transport Department (TD) had no comment on the application from traffic engineering perspective. Moreover, to address TD's concern that residents of the subject housing estates should be accorded priority in renting the monthly parking spaces, and that the demand from the estate residents for renting monthly parking spaces and the number of parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be monitored from time to time, appropriate approval condition was recommended. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions on the previous and similar applications.

66. Some Members noted that the Incorporated Owners (IO) of Shan Tsui Court had raised an objection to the application on grounds that their residents had not been allocated

adequate number of parking spaces whilst on the contrary, HKHA indicated that there were 86 surplus parking spaces (i.e. vacancy rate of 34%) available for letting to non-residents (in the period from May 2020 to April 2021). In that regard, Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the mechanism for letting monthly parking spaces for residents and non-residents;
- (b) whether the monthly car parking rental charges were the same for residents and non-residents; and
- (c) whether the application was only for letting the surplus parking spaces on a monthly basis.

67. In response, Mr Ng Kwok Tim, STP/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) the HKHA indicated that they would continue to uphold their policy that residents should have priority in renting parking spaces. It was understood that residents could apply for car parking spaces on a yearly basis and the HKHA would allocate the car parking spaces to residents when available. Residents could also inform HKHA about their car parking needs in-between application cycles. For the subject application, the HKHA had conducted local consultation with the respective estate management advisory committees/mutual aid committees, and the IO of Shan Tsui Court raised an objection. To address the concern, an approval condition was suggested which required that priority be accorded to residents in letting the car parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport;
- (b) the HKHA advised that the monthly car parking rental charges for both residents and non-residents were the same; and
- (c) the application was for letting of surplus parking spaces on a monthly basis.

68. A Member asked whether the car parking spaces were originally provided to serve the residents, and if so, the HKHA should not only accord priority but must satisfy the residents' parking needs first before letting the spaces to non-residents. The Chairman said that those car parking spaces under application were provided as ancillary car park for resident's use in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. Hence, HKHA should only let the car parking spaces not needed by residents to non-residents. As the surplus car parking spaces would be let to the public, it would be regarded as public vehicle park (PVP) which required planning permission.

69. Another Member asked whether the HKHA was required to reserve some parking spaces for public use within the housing estates. The Secretary said that the car parking spaces under the subject and similar applications by HKHA were originally provided as ancillary car parking for residents' use. In some housing estates, the demand for parking spaces might decline over time due to factors such as aging residents. If HKHA wished to let the surplus parking spaces to members of the public, they would require planning permission as PVP was normally a Column 2 use under "Residential (Group A)" ("R(A)") zone. In some newly gazetted OZPs, PVP, which was a requirement by relevant government departments and supported by technical assessments, had been included as a Column 1 use.

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

Deliberation Session

70. Some Members were of the views that the HKHA had not provided sufficient information (such as the application mechanism, the number of outstanding applications waiting for car parking spaces, the average waiting time of residents etc.) for the Committee to consider whether the objection raised by the IO of Shan Tsui Court would be satisfactorily addressed. More information should be requested from the HKHA for the Committee to make a decision on the letting of surplus car parking spaces at Shan Tsui Court.

71. Mr Patrick K.H. Ho, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), Transport Department, pointed out that according to Appendix Ic of the Paper, HKHA advised that the average number of monthly private car parking spaces let to non-residents in Shan Tsui Court

from May 2020 to April 2021 was 33, which was lower than the 86 surplus car parking spaces indicated by HKHA. A Member remarked that the residents' parking needs should be satisfied first before the vacant parking spaces be let to non-residents. In response, the Chairman said that the HKHA could let out less parking spaces depending on the residents' parking demand.

72. The majority of Members considered that the letting of surplus car parking spaces would allow better utilisation of resources and should be supported. The mechanism for allocation of the car parking spaces to residents was operational details which the HKHA should be given flexibility to handle. While Members generally considered that the HKHA should better communicate and liaise with residents of Shan Tsui Court on their specific concerns, HKHA should also be advised to timely allocate adequate car parking spaces to meet the needs of the residents for the subject and other similar cases. The Chairman said that Members' views could be included as an advisory clause for the applicant's consideration. Members agreed.

73. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years up to 24.9.2026, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition:

“Priority should be accorded to the residents of Model Housing Estate, Hong Tung Estate, Hing Wah (II) Estate, Tsui Lok Estate, Yue Wan Estate and Shan Tsui Court in the letting of the surplus vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.”

74. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the following advisory clause as well as those as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

“there should be better communication and liaison with the residents of Shan Tsui Court to address their concerns. The applicant should also be advised to timely allocate adequate car parking spaces to meet the needs of the residents for the subject and other similar cases.”

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

[Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau and Roger C.K. Chan left the meeting and Messrs Gavin C.T. Tse, Franklin Yu and Wilson Y.W. Fung rejoined the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

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

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K11/240 Shop and Services in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone, Factory Space No. F7, G/F, Wah Hing Industrial Mansions, 36 Tai Yau Street and 21-25 Tseuk Luk Street, San Po Kong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K11/240)

75. The Secretary reported that K & K Chartered Architect & Associates (K&K) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest on the item for his former firm having business dealings with K&K.

76. Members noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

77. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Helen H.Y. Chan, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) the applied shop and services;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment was received; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The 'Shop and Services' use under application was considered generally in line with the planning intention of the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" ("OU(B)") zone and was compatible with the changing land use character of the area, which was being transformed into commercial/business use with similar applications for 'Shop and Services' use approved on G/F units of other industrial and industrial-office buildings in the vicinity. The applied use in general complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D. To address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended.

78. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

79. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission and implementation of a proposal on the fire safety measures within six months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 24.3.2022; and
- (b) if the above planning condition (a) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the

same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

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

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K14/804 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restriction for Permitted Office, Shop and Services and Eating Place Uses in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 334-336 and 338 Kwun Tong Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/804)

81. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 8.9.2021 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.

82. 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 15

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K14/805 Proposed Shop and Services (Bank) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Workshop Units 6C and 6D, G/F, Hoi Luen Industrial Centre, 55 Hoi Yuen Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/805)

83. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 14.9.2021 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.

84. 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 16

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K18/340 Proposed Religious Institution in “Residential (Group C) 1” Zone, 109 Boundary Street, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/340)

85. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 8.9.2021 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.

86. 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 17

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K22/31 Proposed Residential Development with Public Waterfront Promenade
in "Commercial (2)" Zone, New Kowloon Inland Lot Nos. 5805, 5806
and 5982, 1-5 Kai Hing Road, Kowloon Bay, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K22/31)

87. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 9.9.2021 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.

88. 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 18

Any Other Business

89. Since it was the last Metro Planning Committee attended by Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung, the Secretary, before her retirement, the Chairman on behalf of Members extended a vote of thanks to Miss Lung for her contributions to the Committee and wished her a happy and healthy retirement. Miss Lung thanked Members for their support over the past years and expressed gratitude for their dedication to the Committee's work.

90. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:15 p.m.