

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 685th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 10.12.2021**

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

Professor John C.Y. Ng

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 Paul Au

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
Mr C. K. Yip

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Josephine Y. M. Lo

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Ryan C. K. 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 684th MPC Meeting held on 26.11.2021

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 684th MPC meeting held on 26.11.2021 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

Amendments to Confirmed Minutes of 682nd MPC Meeting held on 29.10.2021

3. The Secretary reported that the deferral request of application No. A/K5/836 was considered by the Committee on 29.10.2021. Subsequently, the representative of the applicant clarified on 26.11.2021 that the applicant, i.e. Glory View Properties Limited, was no longer a subsidiary of Hang Lung Group and requested that the relevant part of the confirmed minutes regarding Members' declaration of interest should be rectified accordingly. The Secretary further said that the relevant amendments to the confirmed minutes, which mainly involved deletion of a Member's interest declared in relation to Hang Lung Group in paragraph 12, had been circulated to Members before the meeting.
4. Members agreed to the amendments made and a copy of the revised minutes regarding the application would be sent to the applicant for retention.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

[Ms Jessica Y. C. Ho, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK) was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K4/75 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 Chak On Estate, Shek Kip Mei, (b) Car Park in Nam Shan Estate, Shek Kip Mei, and (c) Car Park in Shek Kip Mei Estate, Shek Kip Mei
(MPC Paper No. A/K4/75)

5. 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 Paul Au - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA;
(as the Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department)

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 current 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 of the Hong Kong Housing Society which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues.

6. The Committee noted that Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Paul Au and Thomas O.S. Ho 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.

[Mr Paul Au and Dr Lawrence W.C Poon left the meeting temporarily and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica Y. C. Ho, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

8. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

9. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years up to 10.12.2026, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the following condition:

“Priority should be accorded to the respective residents of Chak On Estate, Nam

Shan Estate and Shek Kip Mei Estate 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.”

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

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K4/76 Proposed Comprehensive Redevelopment of Tai Hang Sai Estate and Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio, Building Height and Non-Building Area Restrictions in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone, Tai Hang Sai Estate, Shek Kip Mei, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K4/76)

11. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) and Arthur Yung and Associates Co. Ltd (AYA) was one of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| Mr Ivan M.K. Chung
<i>(the Chairman)</i>
<i>as Director of Planning</i> | - | being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its committee; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with URA; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his former firm having current business dealings with URA and AYA; |

- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of the Hong Kong Housing Society which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues;
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being a former non-executive director of the URA Board, a former chairman/member of its committees and a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund;
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a former director of the Board of the Urban
(*Vice-chairman*) Renewal Fund; and
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund.

12. The Committee noted that Ms Lilian S.K. Law had tendered an apology for not attending the meeting and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting. As the interest of the Chairman was direct, the Committee agreed that he should leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As the interest of Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung was indirect and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, 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.

[The Chairman left the meeting temporarily and the Vice-chairman took up the chairmanship of the meeting at this point.]

13. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) 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 Fung Chi Keong - Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon
(TP/TWK)

14. The Secretary reported that a letter was received from Tai Hang Sai Residents Rights Concern Group and Mutual Aid Committees of the eight blocks of Tai Hang Sai Estate (THSE) before the meeting requesting the Board to defer consideration of the application until a consent on rehousing arrangement was reached between the residents and the Hong Kong Settlers Housing Corporation Limited (HKSHCL) and conveying views similar to those submitted during the statutory publication period of the application which were already covered in the Paper. As the letter was received after the statutory publication period of the application, the comments made therein should be treated as received out-of-time.

Presentation and Question Sessions

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica Y. C. Ho, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. PlanD had no objection to the application.

[Messrs Franklin Yu and Albert K.L. Cheung joined and Mr Paul Au rejoined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

16. The Vice-chairman and Members had the following questions:

The Proposal

- (a) noting that the applicants had proposed to relax the plot ratio (PR) restriction of about 50%, whether such increase in development scale could be regarded as minor in nature;
- (b) in view of the policy initiatives to reserve about 5% of the total gross floor area (GFA) in future public housing developments for welfare facilities, whether the proposed non-domestic PR could be increased to accommodate

additional facilities to serve the locals;

- (c) whether the proposed scheme would follow the requirements, such as building separation, under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG), and whether Sites 1 and 2 would be considered separately under the SBDG;
- (d) noting that the proposed flat size for Starter Homes (SHs) in Site 2 would range from about 36m² to 92m² in GFA, the upper end of which was considered relatively large, whether the flat size could be reviewed with a view to providing more housing units;
- (e) should the application be approved by the Committee, whether the applicants would be required to submit another Master Layout Plan (MLP) to the Board for consideration;

Urban Design and Air Ventilation

- (f) details of the building height (BH) profile in the area, and whether the proposed development was considered compatible with the surrounding built environment;
- (g) the function of the non-building area (NBA) within the application site (the Site) and details of the proposed open space within the NBA;
- (h) whether the proposed development would induce adverse impact on the local air ventilation;

Urban Ecology and Heritage Conservation

- (i) given the Site was located to the immediate north of a vegetated knoll known as Woh Chai Shan (also named Bishop Hill), which was an important urban ecological space in the urban environment, whether the applicants had considered the continuity of the urban ecological environment or even the urban forestry in the area;

- (j) whether there was any connection in terms of open space provision and heritage conservation between the proposed development and Bishop Hill to its south;
- (k) whether there was any proposal submitted by the applicants to improve the greening and living environment in the proposed development;

Traffic

- (l) taking into account the future redevelopment of Nam Shan Estate and other developments in the vicinity as well as the future change in demographic profile and travel patterns, whether adverse traffic impacts due to the redevelopment were anticipated;

Rehousing Arrangement

- (m) details of the rehousing arrangement, and whether interim rehousing for the affected residents could be provided in the vicinity, such as transitional housing or public rental housing;
- (n) noting that the existing residents of THSE had grave concern on the rehousing arrangement, whether the applicants had considered to adopt phased redevelopment to minimise the impact on the residents;
- (o) the percentage of public comments received from the affected residents opposing the rehousing arrangement during public consultation period, and whether Tai Hang Sai Residents Rights Concern Group was consulted on the rehousing arrangement;
- (p) the monitoring mechanism of the proposed rehousing arrangement in future;

Implementation

- (q) noting that the proposed development comprised two development sites, whether it would be managed by two different parties in future; and

- (r) should the application be approved, whether the applicants were still required to comply with the requirements and procedures of other relevant government departments.

17. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, made the following main points:

The Proposal

- (a) in general, an application for minor relaxation of development restrictions would be considered by the Committee based on the overall planning and design merits of the proposed scheme as well as the applicants' justifications, and there was no predetermined magnitude of increase allowed for such application in numerical terms. Each application should be considered on its own individual merits and circumstances. There was an application involving minor relaxation of development restriction for about 50% in Kai Tak area;
- (b) although the proposed development was not a public housing development, welfare facilities with a GFA of about 6,500m², equivalent to PR of 0.31 or about 4.1% of the total domestic GFA of the Site (about 5.4% of the domestic GFA of Site 2), was proposed at Site 2. The government, institution or community (GIC) uses as required by the Government would be disregarded in calculating the maximum PR permitted under the OZP. While the relevant government departments had been consulted on the proposed GIC provision, the exact provision would be determined at the detailed design stage subject to further consultation with the relevant government departments;
- (c) according to the proposed scheme, Sites 1 and 2 would be considered individually with regard to the compliance with SBDG;
- (d) while no information on the number of units with size up to 92m² had been provided in the submission, it was indicated that average flat size for the SHs at Site 2 had made reference to another project of URA (i.e. eResidence in Ma Tau Wai) and URA would further review it at the

detailed design stage. There was no specific requirement on the average flat size in accordance with the OZP;

- (e) the applicants had already submitted a MLP under the current application. Should the application be approved by the Committee, the applicants would need to follow up with the relevant government departments in relation to the approval conditions under the planning permission;

Urban Design and Air Ventilation

- (f) as illustrated in the submitted visual impact assessment, the proposed scheme was considered generally compatible with the built character of the surrounding areas, even without showing the possible redevelopment of some existing old residential developments, such as Nam Shan Estate with BH restriction of 80mPD. It should also be noted that the Committee had previously approved three applications for minor relaxation of BHs for public housing developments ranging from 121mPD to 157mPD within the “Residential (Group A)” zone in the Shek Kip Mei area, which were considered comparable to the proposed BHs ranging from 115mPD to 160mPD under the proposed scheme. In the recent amendments to the Shek Kip Mei OZP in 2021, a BH restriction of 200mPD was imposed on the public housing site at Chak On Road South;
- (g) the 25m-wide NBA along the western boundary of the Site was designated to preserve the north-south air ventilation corridor and, together with Nam Shan Chuen Road to its north-east and the public open space (POS) and low-rise GIC facilities within the NBA, would form an air corridor for the summer south and south-westerly wind. Whilst low-rise GIC building structures of one to three storeys were proposed at the NBA, the applicants had made use of the level difference between the NBA portion of the Site and Tai Hang Sai Street so that only the top floor of the 3-storey building at the NBA would exceed the street level of Tai Hang Sai Street. The submitted air ventilation assessment (AVA) demonstrated that the proposed low-rise structures within the NBA would not adversely affect the air ventilation performance along the NBA. The subject NBA would also

provide landscaped POS and direct pedestrian access connecting the surrounding areas, while serving as an emergency vehicular access. The potential for further connection between the proposed POS and the adjoining Shek Kip Mei Central Playground to the northwest of the Site would also be considered at the detailed design stage;

- (h) the AVA submitted by the applicants indicated that the proposed scheme with the design features of 15m-wide building separations, podium void and setbacks would not have adverse air ventilation impact on the surroundings. There was also general improvement in air ventilation performance as compared with the previously approved scheme;

Urban Ecology and Heritage Conservation

- (i) while tree and landscape proposals had been submitted, no information on urban ecological environment or urban forestry was provided by the applicants;
- (j) Woh Chai Shan Service Reservoir was accorded as a Grade 1 historic building by the Antiquities Advisory Board and the revitalisation works were yet to be finalised. Though the applicants had not provided any proposal related to Bishop Hill, the proposed NBA and building separation within the Site had already taken into account the wind environment and visual corridor associated with Bishop Hill. In view of the heritage value possessed by THSE, the Antiquities and Monuments Office had recommended the applicants to preserve the key features and history of the estate by records through photographic recording and 3D scanning. Traditional fluorescent light shop signages and some of the ventilation bricks were suggested to be salvaged and displayed with interpretations in the future housing site to tell the history of the area;
- (k) landscaped private open space was proposed at different podium levels of the proposed development, which could improve the greening and living environment for the future residents;

Traffic

- (l) the traffic impact assessment (TIA) submitted by the applicants had demonstrated that there was no insurmountable traffic impact caused by the redevelopment with the implementation of the proposed improvement measures such as the proposed bus lay-by at Woh Chai Street and road widening up to 7.3m at Woh Chai Street (eastbound) and Tai Hang Tung Road (northbound) together with footpath widening up to 5m. The area of influence under the TIA had also covered the relevant major carriageways and road junctions in the area;

Rehousing Arrangement

- (m) in comparison with the rehousing arrangement and compensation under the previously approved scheme (application No. A/K4/67), which offered choices of cash compensation and purchase of a subsidised unit after redevelopment, the proposed scheme under the current application would offer cash compensation, rehousing to the rental units at Site 1 for eligible residents, purchasing SH units at Site 2, and rental allowance for temporary accommodations and ex-gratia moving allowance for the residents as the interim measures. A social service team appointed by HKSHCL would also assist in finding temporary accommodations for eligible households;
- (n) under the previously approved development scheme, the redevelopment was proposed to be implemented in two phases with remaining residential blocks kept for interim rehousing of affected residents during the first phase of redevelopment. Upon review by the applicants, the redevelopment under the current application would be implemented in one single phase as it could speed up the redevelopment process as much as possible to improve the living environment of THSE and increase housing supply. The applicants also considered it not appropriate to temporarily rehouse senior residents to the higher floors of the existing old blocks without provision of lift and that there were technical difficulties to refurbish the dilapidated flats and add lifts in the residential blocks to facilitate such interim rehousing arrangement. It was expected that the redevelopment timeframe would be reduced from 10 years as indicated in the approved scheme to 5

years under the current proposed scheme;

- (o) the exact percentage of public comments received from the affected residents opposing the rehousing arrangement during public consultation period was not available as the commenters were not required to provide their corresponding address. However, judging from the content of the comments, it appeared that a very large amount of those opposing the rehousing arrangement were likely submitted by the THSE residents. It was noted that HKSHCL had been carrying out engagement activities for the existing THSE residents including dissemination of brochure with information on the overall redevelopment timeline and preliminary framework of rehousing arrangement options and conducting six group discussion sessions for the residents, etc. since October 2021;
- (p) the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) would request HKSHCL to submit a report setting out its final rehousing arrangement before executing the relevant land lease for the proposed development;

Implementation

- (q) the proposed redevelopment was a collaboration between HKSHCL and URA. Site 1 would be re-granted to HKSHCL for providing rehousing units, while Site 2 would be granted to URA for providing SH units. The two development sites upon completion would be managed by URA and HKSHCL respectively; and
- (r) as the proposed comprehensive redevelopment was not in compliance with the lease conditions, the applicants had to apply to the Lands Department (LandsD) for surrender and re-grant of Site 1 and grant of Site 2. LandsD would follow up with the applicants on the lease upon application and consult relevant government departments including THB as appropriate.

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

Deliberation Session

18. Members generally supported the application as it could improve the living environment of the THSE residents and provide more housing units to meet the pressing housing need of the society, but had the following views on the development proposal:

- (a) the NBA with a sizeable area in a convenient location of the urban area was valuable. Apart from serving the air ventilation purpose, the NBA could be developed as public space for public enjoyment and contribute to the Woh Chai Shan to the south, the Shek Kip Mei Park to the north and the Beacon Hill to the further north;
- (b) there was room to improve the blocking, orientation and massing of the residential towers as well as the design and quality of private open space under the scheme. Further building setback from Woh Chai Shan to the south could open up the vista to a vegetated knoll from the proposed development;
- (c) the applicants should conduct better consultation with the affected residents and improve the rehousing arrangement to address their concerns properly;
- (d) the proposed flat size for the SHs up to 92m² at Site 2 was considered relatively large, which might not be financially viable for the first-time home buyers. Consideration should be given to reviewing the flat size at the detailed design stage; and
- (e) the previous development scheme was approved about five years ago and had not been implemented. With the URA's involvement for the current scheme, it was expected that the redevelopment project could be timely implemented. The introduction of SHs units and provision of more GIC facilities under the proposed scheme were appreciated.

19. In response to a Member's enquiry about whether the validity period of the planning permission could be shortened to expedite the proposed redevelopment project, the

Secretary explained that the proposed validity period of four years was a standard time clause, and the proposal was for a comprehensive development for which the applicants might require a reasonable period of time to fulfil the approval conditions, particularly those where Members' concerns such as those on design and layout, landscaping and open space provision would need to be taken into account. There was also no special planning circumstance to justify a shorter validity period for the planning permission.

20. The Vice-chairman concluded that Members generally had no objection to the application. While some Members' concerns could be addressed in the compliance of approval conditions, other concerns with regard to better consultation on and improvement of rehousing arrangement and review of flat size of SHs units could be included as additional advisory clauses for consideration of the applicants.

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 10.12.2025, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan to take into account the approval conditions as stated in paragraphs (b) to (i) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of a revised Traffic Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) the design and provision of vehicular access, car parking and loading/unloading facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (e) the submission of a revised Noise Impact Assessment and the

implementation of noise mitigation measures identified for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;

- (f) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (g) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works as identified in the revised Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development in relation to (f) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (h) the submission of a revised Land Contamination Assessment in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified prior to development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (i) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

22. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VII of the Paper and the following additional advisory clauses:

- (a) to better communicate with the affected residents in conducting consultation on the rehousing arrangement and improve the rehousing arrangement, where appropriate, to address their concerns; and
- (b) to review the flat size of starter home units with a view to providing more housing units to help those in need.

[Messrs Alex T.H. Lau and Franklin Yu left the meeting during the deliberation session.]

[The Vice-chairman thanked the representatives from PlanD for their attendance to answer

Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[The Chairman rejoined the meeting and resumed chairmanship at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/479 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Information Technology and Telecommunications Industries (Data Centre) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone, 20-24 Kwai Wing Road, Kwai Chung, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/479)

23. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 24.11.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to address comments from relevant government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

24. 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 Ng Kar Shu, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK) and Ms Cheryl H. L. Yeung, Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK) were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

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/526B)

25. 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 owns properties in Tsuen Wan; and

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

26. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the flat owned by Prof. John. C.Y. Ng’s spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

27. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Cheryl H. L. Yeung, TP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

28. Members had no question on the application.

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon rejoined the meeting during the presentation session.]

Deliberation Session

29. 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 10.12.2025, 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 loading/unloading spaces 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; and
- (c) the implementation of any mitigation measure as recommended in the updated Sewerage Impact Assessment in relation to (b) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

30. 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 Cheryl H. L. Yeung, TP/TWK for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

[Mr Ng Kwok Tim, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK) was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/H21/155 Eating Place (Restaurant) in “Open Space” Zone, Portion of Sai Wan Ho
Ferry Pier, Tai Hong Street, Sai Wan Ho, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H21/155)

Presentation and Question Sessions

31. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Kwok Tim, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied use, departmental comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

32. A Member had the following questions:

- (a) noting that the application premises had been used as an eating place since 2005, whether any planning permission had been obtained before; and
- (b) why a similar application within the “Open Space” (“O”) zone was rejected.

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

- (a) temporary planning permission for ‘Eating Place’ use at the premises was first granted in 2005 and subsequently renewed four times, each of which was on a temporary basis for a period of three years. The applicant did not apply for renewal of the latest approval under application No. A/H21/145 and the planning permission lapsed upon expiry of the approval on 8.4.2020. To continue the current use on the premises, the applicant was required to submit a fresh application; and
- (b) the similar application for proposed restaurants/fast food shops at another

“O” zone adjoining the One Island East was rejected upon review by the Town Planning Board mainly on the ground of being not in line with the planning intention of the “O” zone and would reduce the open space area.

Deliberation Session

34. 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 10.12.2025, 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 provision of fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

35. 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 Kwok Tim, STP/HK, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr C.H. Tse left the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 8

[Open Meeting]

S/K13/30 Proposed Amendments to the Approved Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K13/30
(MPC Paper No. 10/21)

36. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments involved the rezoning of a

cluster of government land in Kowloon Bay for commercial and open space uses which were supported by the Planning and Engineering Study for the Development at Kowloon Bay Action Area – Feasibility Study commissioned by the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) of the Development Bureau (DEVB) with Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) as the consultant. It also involved a proposed public housing site to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants for conducting technical assessments in support of the development proposal. The following Members had declared interests on the item :

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| Mr Paul Au
<i>as the Chief Engineer
(Works), Home Affairs
Department</i> | - | being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with HKHA, AECOM and ARUP; |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | being a member of the Building Committee of HKHA and having current business dealings with ARUP; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his former firm having current 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 of the Hong Kong Housing Society which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues. |

37. The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Franklin Yu and Alex T.H.

Lai had already left the meeting. 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 one of the subject amendments to the outline zoning plan (OZP) proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of Members in relation to HKHA only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

38. The following representatives from PlanD, DEVB, HD and ARUP were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Ms Katy C. W. Fung | - | District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K) |
| Mr William W. L. Chan | - | Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K) |
| Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong | - | Town Planner/Kowloon (TP/K) |

EKEO, DEVB

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Ms Carol Y. M. Cheuk | - | Senior Place Making Manager (Planning)
(SPMM(P)) |
| Mr Kelvin K. C. Chan | - | Place Making Manager (Planning) |

HD

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Ms Emily W. M. Ip | - | Senior Planning Officer |
| Mr Peter W. T. Wong | - | Senior Architect |
| Mr David M. K. Lee | - | Senior Civil Engineer |

ARUP

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Mr David W.L. Lee | - | Associate Director (AD) |
|-------------------|---|-------------------------|

Mr Tommy K.C. Chan - Senior Engineer (SE)

39. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr William W. L. Chan, briefed Members on the background, the proposed rezoning for commercial developments with open spaces and public transport facilities at Kowloon Bay Action Area (KBAA) and a public housing development at Yip On Factory Estate (YOFE), the proposed amendments to the Notes of the OZP, technical considerations, provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in the area, consultations conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. Amendment Items A1 to A6 mainly included rezoning proposals for commercial developments, at-grade public open spaces within private development (POSPD) and pedestrianisation proposal at Cheung Yip Street, in order to take forward the Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP) of the KBAA Study. Amendment Item B involved rezoning proposal for a public housing development at YOFE site together with a section of Wang Hoi Road.

40. Members had the following questions:

Provision of Open Space and Air Ventilation

- (a) noting that open space and arts, cultural or creative (ACC) uses were proposed underneath Kai Fuk Road Flyover, whether there was any air quality concern for the users;
- (b) how design coherence of the at-graded POSPDs which would be implemented by different developers in future could be ensured;
- (c) purpose of the proposed non-building area (NBA) for Lot 2 under the proposed “Commercial (1)” (“C(1)”) zone and any uses that could be allowed within the NBA;

Pedestrian Accessibility and Connections

- (d) whether the covered elevated walkway connecting the Kowloon Bay MTR Station and KBAA could be extended to Telford Plaza instead of Siu Yip Street;

- (e) details of the pedestrian network linking the areas of Kwun Tong harbourfront promenade, Kai Tak Development (KTD) and Kowloon Bay MTR Station;
- (f) whether the accessibility of the proposed pedestrian connection located within the Kai Tak Hospital cluster would be affected if restricted access arrangement was undertaken by the hospital in case of epidemic situation;

Traffic and Transport Aspects

- (g) the future road network connecting KTD and other parts of Kowloon East area;
- (h) noting that traffic congestion was often observed at the junction of Wang Chiu Road and Sheung Yee Road due to the queue of vehicles waiting to get into the carpark of Megabox, whether any traffic improvement measures would be proposed; and

Environmental Aspect

- (i) whether the future developments in KBAA would be required to use recycled/grey water for irrigating the landscaping features.

41. In response, Ms Katy C. W. Fung, DPO/K, PlanD, Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPM(M(P)/ EKEO of DEVB, Messrs David W.L. Lee, AD of ARUP, and Tommy K.C. Chan, SE of ARUP, made the following main points:

Provision of Open Space and Air Ventilation

- (a) in accordance with the RODP of KBAA, an at-grade public open space of about 8,400m² including a maximum built-over area of 400m² for ACC uses were proposed underneath the Kai Fuk Road flyover. The subject open space was not entirely covered by the flyover and the proposed ACC uses were relatively small-scale. The proposed at-graded POSPD adjacent to the western portion of “C(2)” zone could also facilitate wind penetration from the southwest to the area underneath the flyover, which could facilitate air ventilation in the area. Hence, major air ventilation issue was

not envisaged;

- (b) the future developers would be required under lease conditions to design and construct the POSPDs in KBAA. To ensure design coherence, it was recommended to require the developers to submit the landscape master plans (LMPs) for the POSPDs under the lease. The LMPs would be vetted by a design review panel, which would be similar to the arrangement adopted for some other land sale sites in Kai Tak and other Kowloon East areas;
- (c) the proposed NBA was designated mainly to improve the air ventilation performance in the area, which could be used for provision of landscaping features while aboveground structures would not be allowed in general. In addition, outdoor commercial activities could also be allowed;

Pedestrian Accessibility and Connections

- (d) the proposal of extending the footbridge system to Telford Plaza would be pursued when such opportunity arose in future;
- (e) multi-level pedestrian connection networks were proposed to connect Kowloon Bay MTR Station and the harbourfront via KBAA. The elevated networks would comprise a proposed footbridge from Siu Yip Street across Wai Yip Street connecting to a proposed elevated walkway with travellers along Sheung Yee Road to the west leading to Lot 2 of KBAA. By way of the internal linkages at podium level of the future developments at Lot 2, the public could pass through the proposed footbridge across Wang Chiu Road to reach the amenity area adjacent to Lot 1 and access the landscape deck/link bridge of the New Acute Hospital (NAH) in Kai Tak via the elevated walkway across the slip road of Kwun Tong Bypass. From there, the public could reach the Kai Tak waterfront either via an external staircase or the internal elevators at the NAH. The public could also use the at-grade pedestrianised Cheung Yip Street and the pedestrian crossing at Hoi Bun Road to access the promenade next to the Hong Kong Children's Hospital;

- (f) as the proposed elevated walkway from the amenity area at KBAA would connect to the landscape deck/link bridge of the NAH and further connect to the ground level via an external staircase, the public would not have to enter the core areas of the NAH to access the waterfront. If needed, the public could also access the promenade via the at-grade pedestrian network;

Traffic and Transport Aspects

- (g) vehicles from KTD could reach Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong areas via Kai Tak Bridge, Shing Cheong Road, Cheung Yip Street and Hoi Bun Road;
- (h) to alleviate the existing traffic congestion and to meet the traffic demand generated by the KBAA development, a number of improvement schemes, including road widening and optimising the method of control of traffic signals were proposed at the critical junctions, including Wang Chiu Road/Sheung Yee Road, to enhance their performances. With implementation of the proposed improvement measures, adverse traffic impact on the existing road network/junctions was not envisaged; and

Environmental Aspect

- (i) KBAA was envisioned to be a green, smart and sustainable commercial hub for mixed-use developments. Developments in the KBAA would be required to achieve BEAM Plus Provisional Gold or above rating under the lease and the utilisation of recycled/grey water was one of measures to be adopted to achieve the purpose of water saving under the BEAM Plus accreditation mechanism.

42. Members had no question regarding other proposed amendments to the OZP and generally considered that they were acceptable.

Deliberation Session

43. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay OZP No. S/K13/30 and that the draft approved Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay OZP No. S/K13/30A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/K13/31 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay OZP No. S/K13/30A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.”

44. 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 Town Planning Ordinance. Any major revision would be submitted for the Board’s consideration.

[The Chairman thanked the government representatives and the consultants from ARUP for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr William W. L. Chan, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K) was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K12/44 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) Choi Hung Estate, (b) Choi Wan (II) Estate and (c) Fu Shan Estate, Wong Tai Sin, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K12/44)

45. 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 Paul Au
<i>(as the Chief Engineer
(Works), Home Affairs
Department)</i> | - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidized Housing 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 current 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 of the Hong Kong Housing Society which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues.

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

[Mr Paul Au left the meeting temporarily and Dr Lawrence W.C Poon left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

47. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr William W. L. Chan, STP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

48. Members had the following questions on the application:

- (a) for how long the surplus parking spaces in the concerned estates had been let to non-residents and whether HD had any long-term plan on better utilisation of the surplus parking spaces in view of the high and growing vacancy rate; and
- (b) whether there was information on the occupancy rate of the surplus parking spaces that were let to non-residents within the said housing estates as approved by the Committee over the years.

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

- (a) the first application for changing ancillary car park to public vehicle park

was approved by the Committee in 2004 on a temporary basis for a period of three years. Subsequently, five renewal applications were approved by the Committee for a period of three years each and the latest planning permission (application No. A/K/18) was valid until 5.3.2022. According to the applicant, the parking demand of the residents would be monitored regularly and the number of parking spaces to be let to the residents and non-residents would be adjusted as appropriate. In fact, the number of surplus parking spaces at Choi Hung Estate that could be let to non-residents were reduced from 220 to 187 under the current application. For the carparks with relatively lower occupancy rates, HKHA had been adopting measures to maximise their usage including conversion for welfare, educational and retails uses. An advisory clause was recommended to advise the applicant to consider releasing such spaces for the provision of community facilities; and

- (b) HKHA had been reviewing the occupancy rate and the demand for parking spaces in individual carparks from time to time. No relevant figure related to the occupancy rates of the surplus parking spaces was provided in the submission.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

Deliberation Session

50. The Chairman shared Members' view that public land resources should be better utilized but remarked that there might be technical constraints (such as fire safety) for conversion of surplus parking spaces to government, institution or community facilities. A Member pointed out that at-grade/open air parking spaces should be more suitable to be released for other better use. Another Member considered that information on the occupancy rates of the surplus parking spaces that were let to non-residents throughout the years, where available, should be provided in future applications. The Chairman said that for future applications, the applicants would be advised to provide information related to the feasibility of conversion of vacant parking spaces to other uses and the occupancy rates of the surplus parking spaces let to non-residents to facilitate Members' consideration.

51. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years up to 10.12.2026, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the following condition:

“Priority should be accorded to the respective residents of Choi Hung Estate, Choi Wan (II) Estate and Fu Shan Estate 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.”

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

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K18/341 Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) with
Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction in “Residential (Group C)1”
Zone, 63 Cumberland Road, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/341)

53. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by China Coast Community Ltd. (CCC), and Townland Consultants Ltd. (Townland) and Aurecon Hong Kong Ltd. (Aurecon) were two of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest on the item as his former firm had current business dealings with CCC, Townland and Aurecon.

54. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferral of consideration of the application and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

55. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 3.12.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time to address comments

from relevant government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K18/342 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction to Allow for One Storey of Basement for Permitted House Use in "Residential (Group C)1" Zone, 14 Kent Road, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/342)

57. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kowloon Tong. Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had declared an interest as his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Kowloon Tong.

58. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferral of consideration of the application and Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

59. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 2.12.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time to address comments from relevant government departments. It was the first time that the applicant

requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K18/343 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Education Institution (Academic and Administration Building) in "Government, Institution or Community (9)" Zone, 15 Baptist University Road, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/343)

61. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kowloon Tong and the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being a council and court member of HKBU;

Professor Jonathan W.C.- being an employee of HKBU;
Wong

- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with HKBU;
- Mr Franklin Yu - having current business dealings with HKBU; and
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Kowloon Tong.

62. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferral of consideration of the application, and Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong and Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong, Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Franklin Yu had already left the meeting.

63. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 2.12.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for one month in order to allow adequate time for preparing further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

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/K22/31A)

65. The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 26.11.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow adequate time for preparing further information to address departmental comments. It was the second time that the applicants requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicants had submitted further information in response to departmental comments.

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

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K22/33 Office in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, Workshop A, 1/F, Newport Centre Phase I; and Units 7 and 8, Upper Ground Floor, Units 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20, 1/F; and Units 4, 6, and 8, 3/F, Newport Centre Phase II, 116 - 188 Ma Tau Kok Road, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K22/33)

67. The Secretary reported that RHL Surveyors Limited (RHL) was the consultant of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung (Vice-chairman)	}	personally knowing the Managing Director of RHL
Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon		
Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong		

68. The Committee noted that the applicants had requested deferral of consideration of the application, and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had already left the meeting. As Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

69. The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 19.11.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicants requested deferment of the application.

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

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

[Mr Paul Au rejoined the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 15

Any Other Business

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H7/179 Proposed Composite Building Development in "Commercial" Zone, 1
Stubbs Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong (Open Meeting)
(MPC Paper No. A.O.B.(i))

71. The Secretary reported that on 12.10.2021, the captioned application for a residential flat on 19/F of a proposed 22-storey composite building, which consisted of mainly offices and a 4-storey carpark, was received. The application site (the Site) fell within an area zoned "Commercial" ("C") on the approved Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H7/21. According to the Notes of the OZP for the "C" zone, 'Office' use was always permitted while 'Flat' was a Column 2 use which required planning permission from the Town Planning Board. During the publication period of the application, four public comments, of which one objected to and three expressed concerns on the application, were received.

72. On 1.12.2021, the applicant submitted further information (FI) clarifying that:

(a) the total gross floor area (GFA) of the composite development was about

23,593.8m² with only one domestic unit of not more than 85.04m² (i.e. 0.36% of the total GFA), which was of small scale;

- (b) there was a residential flat of similar size on 22/F of the AIA Building before demolition; and
- (c) the flat was proposed to be used as part of the office use of the whole building, which was always permitted in the “C” zone.

73. Given the small scale of the proposed flat in comparison with the proposed main office use and the applicant’s clarifications, the proposed ‘Flat’ use could be considered as ancillary to the permitted ‘Office’ use. As such, planning permission was not required for the proposed composite development at the Site. The applicant and public who had submitted comments on the application would be informed accordingly.

74. The Committee noted that the planning application would not be further processed.

75. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:40 p.m.