

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 686th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 24.12.2021**

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 Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Mr C.H. Tse

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),
Transport Department
Mr Patrick K.H. Ho

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Paul Y. K. 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

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 L.C. Cheung

Opening Remarks

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

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 685th MPC Meeting held on 10.12.2021

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 685th MPC meeting held on 10.12.2021 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[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. Matters Arising (i))

3. The Secretary reported that the matter arising was related to the proposed amendments to the approved Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) which were supported by the Planning and Engineering Study for the Development at Kowloon Bay Action Area (KBAA) – 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. The following Members had declared interests 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 current business dealings with Arup.

4. As Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Franklin Yu and Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the Study, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

5. The Secretary reported that a Paper on the item was circulated to Members before the meeting. The proposed amendments to the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) of the approved Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay OZP No. S/K13/30 were agreed by the Committee on 10.12.2021. In response to the request of Kwun Tong District Council for the provision of social welfare facilities in the proposed developments at KBAA, it was further proposed to incorporate the gross floor area exemption clause for Government, institution and community facilities as required by the Government under the proposed “Commercial(1)” (“C(1)”) and “C(2)” zones at KBAA as detailed in the Paper.

6. Members noted and agreed to the revised proposed amendments to the Notes and ES of the draft OZP No. S/K13/30A in Appendices I and II of the Paper.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

[Mr Clement C. M. Miu, 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/K1/262 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Stormwater Pumping Station) in
 “Open Space” Zone, Urban Council Centenary Garden Adjacent to
 Chatham Road South, Kowloon
 (MPC Paper No. A/K1/262)

7. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Tsim Sha Tsui and Mr Stanley T. S. Choi had declared an interest on the item for his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsim Sha Tsui.

8. As the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi’s spouse had no direct view of the Site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Clement C. M. Miu, 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. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong, Mr Franklin Yu and Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung joined the meeting during the presentation session.]

10. Some Members raised the following questions:

Site Selection

- (a) noting a public comment that the open area outside the Hong Kong Science Museum (HKSM) would be a more suitable location for the proposed stormwater pumping station (SPS), whether the applicant (i.e. Drainage Services Department (DSD)) had considered any alternative site for the SPS;

Technical Issues

- (b) construction timeframe of the SPS and the interim measures during the construction period;
- (c) whether the stormwater collected in the SPS would be recycled for irrigation of the landscape area of the Urban Council Centenary Garden (UCCG) and/or the nearby facilities (such as HKSM);
- (d) maintenance frequency of the SPS and whether maintenance works would affect the public usage of the adjoining UCCG;

Landscape and Architectural Design

- (e) details of the proposed landscape and architectural design and whether the proposal could be further enhanced to benefit users of the adjoining public open space and the pedestrians;

Reprovisioning of Public Toilet

- (f) whether the public toilet to be re-provisioned off-site would be upgraded; and
- (g) the reason why the existing public toilet, which was conveniently located and frequently used by general public, could not be reprovisioned in-situ.

11. In response, Mr Clement C. M. Miu, STP/TWK, made the following points:

Site Selection

- (a) according to the applicant, the SPS was originally proposed at the open area outside HKSM. However, it was subsequently revealed that the site had to be reserved for expansion of HKSM. After exploring other

possible sites in the vicinity, the Site was considered the most suitable location for the SPS as it was located near the existing downstream box culvert and flooding black spot at Chatham Road South with the least impact on the availability of public open space;

Technical Issues

- (b) the applicant indicated that the construction works was targeted for commencement in Q3 2022 and completion in 2027. The total development timeframe of about 5 years included preparation works for tree transplanting and implementation of mitigation measures to minimise the potential impacts of the SPS during the construction stage. DSD would continue to undertake the existing short and medium-term measures to ensure that the drainage situation in the area would not deteriorate during the construction period;
- (c) there was a small scale stormwater treatment plant at B1 floor to provide recycled water for irrigation. Given the limited scale of the SPS, the treated stormwater would only be sufficient for irrigation of the greenery features within the Site. Member's views to explore the feasibility of increasing the amount of recycled water for irrigation of the adjoining public open space would be conveyed to the applicant;
- (d) the proposed SPS would mainly operate during the rainy season. Frequent maintenance of the SPS was not anticipated and hence, public usage of UCCG would not be significantly affected during the operation stage of the SPS;

Landscape and Architectural Design

- (e) various landscape mitigation measures and architectural design features including screening trees and vegetation along Chatham Road South, vertical greening and façade articulation to break down the massing of the above-ground structures, and the stepped building design from 9.5mPD to

14.5mPD, had been incorporated to reduce the visual impact of the proposed SPS and to better blend in with the surrounding environment. An approval condition for the provision of a landscape plan, amongst others, to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services, was recommended;

Reprovisioning of Public Toilet

- (f) the existing public toilet (with an area of about 51.9m²) would be demolished and reprovisioned at about 130m south of the Site. The new public toilet would be upgraded with improved facilities to meet the current standards. The detailed design would be subject to further discussion between the applicant and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD); and
- (g) since a large portion of the Site would be occupied by the above and underground structures of the proposed SPS, the existing public toilet could not be reprovisioned in-situ.

12. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Clement C. M. Miu, STP/TWK, said that DSD had consulted the Yau Tsim Mong District Council, and the Chairman, Vice-chairman and two members showed support to the proposal. DSD had also consulted the relevant stakeholders (including residents and commercial operators in the area) who welcomed the project as it would address the flooding problem in the area. In response to two Members' suggestion to incorporate public education exhibits in the development so as to enhance public knowledge of the importance of water resources and water conservation. Mr Miu said that Members' views/suggestions would be conveyed to DSD for their consideration as appropriate.

Deliberation Session

13. The Chairman remarked that the application was for a proposed SPS to address the flooding problem in the area. The existing public toilet would be demolished and reprovisioned. The Committee noted that public toilet was regarded as 'public convenience'

which was an always permitted use in the “Open Space” zone of the subject Outline Zoning Plan.

14. While indicating support to the application, a Member opined that the Site was situated at a prime location and formed part of the public open space network in the Tsim Sha Tsui area. The proposed development should adopt an integrated design with the whole UCGG, maximise public facilities within the development (for example, to integrate a public toilet into the pump room building), and enhance the continuity and cohesiveness with other public open spaces in the area. DSD could consider to work with the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) and LCSD to enhance the design of the development.

15. Another Member shared similar view and suggested that the site layout and the landscape design (for example, providing a larger lawn area rather than a narrow pathway along Chatham Road South) could be improved to create a more welcoming environment for visitors. Another Member remarked that the new public toilet should be equipped with changing room and shower facilities for the public to use after exercises or during special events such as the dragon boat race.

16. The Chairman concluded that Members were generally in support of the application. Members' views on providing better landscape design could be addressed by the applicant when complying with the recommended approval condition on landscape plan and tree preservation proposals. The Chairman further proposed and the Committee agreed that an advisory clause be added to invite the applicant to consider ways to better integrate the proposed development with the surrounding areas in consultation with ArchSD and LCSD. Regarding the views on possible in-situ re-provisioning of the toilet, as there might be considerations on technical feasibility and impact on the development programme, it was considered that more flexibility should be allowed and the view would be recorded in the minutes for the applicant's consideration.

17. 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 24.12.2025, 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 provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire-fighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (b) the provision of a landscape plan, a tree transplant proposal and a revised tree preservation and removal proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the Town Planning Board.”

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

“to consult the Architectural Services Department and Leisure and Cultural Services Department on the layout and design of the development for better integration with the surrounding areas.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr Clement C.M. Miu, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K2/220 Proposed Composite Development with Flat and Shop and Services/Eating Place Uses in “Commercial” Zone, Nos. 15-15A, 17, 19 and 23 Saigon Street, Yau Ma Tei, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K2/220)

19. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Yau Ma Tei and Mr Stanley T. S. Choi had declared an interest on the item for his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Yau Ma Tei.

20. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi’s spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in

the meeting.

21. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 9.12.2021 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.

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

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/843 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Non-Polluting Industrial Use (Excluding Industrial Undertakings Involving the Use/Storage of Dangerous Goods) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone, No. 109 King Lam Street, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/843)

23. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 8.12.2021 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.

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.

[Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

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/K5/838B)

25. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and Archiplus International Limited (AI) 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 Arup ; and
Mr Franklin Yu		

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with Arup and AI.

26. As Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Franklin Yu and Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

27. 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. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

28. Some Members raised the following questions:

Proposed Scheme

- (a) details of the building setbacks under the proposed scheme and whether they were mandatory requirements or voluntary;
- (b) any information available regarding the extent of building setback provided in similar applications;
- (c) whether providing landscaping or trees in the building setback areas required under the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) was acceptable;
- (d) details on the proposed canopy and the reason for not providing a wider canopy (of 2m rather than 1.5m as proposed) so as to fully cover the building setback area;
- (e) details of the greenery features on ground floor;
- (f) whether the proposed landscaped podium garden would be limited for use by tenants of the proposed development;

- (g) details on the window design on 1/F and 2/F as shown in Drawing A-11 of the Paper;

Building Height

- (h) whether the proposed building height (BH) of the development would lead to negative impacts on the townscape and air ventilation as raised in the public comment from members of the Planning Development and Transport Affairs Committee (PTAC) of the Sham Shui Po District Council (SSPDC); and

Vehicular Arrangement

- (i) noting that there was no vehicle waiting area near the ingress/egress point, whether the proposed vehicular access and parking arrangement would create conflict between vehicles and pedestrians.

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

Proposed Scheme

- (a) as shown on Plan A-2 of the Paper, a minimum setback of 2m from the lot boundary abutting Castle Peak Road was a requirement under the OZP while the 2m setback from Tai Nan West Street and the 3m wide corner splay at the intersection of Castle Peak Road/Tai Nan West Street were requirements under the draft Cheung Sha Wan and Sham Shui Po Outline Development Plan (ODP). The setback requirement under the OZP was statutory and mandatory whereas those required under the ODP were administrative in nature;
- (b) the provision of building setback would depend on various factors including the site area, operational needs of the development, and other building and parking requirements, etc. The application site (the Site)

was relatively small, and there was less scope to provide more voluntary setback compared to larger sites. Some previous applications with larger site area had proposed more setback than those required under the OZP/ODP;

- (c) the setback requirement along Castle Peak Road under the OZP was aimed to maintain Castle Peak Road as the major breezeway of the area. Provision of landscaping or trees in the setback areas was not expected to affect airflow and was considered acceptable;
- (d) as illustrated in Drawings A-3 and A-4 of the Paper, a continuous canopy of 1.5m wide would be provided along Castle Peak Road and Tai Nan West Street. The applicant had not explained why the canopy was proposed to be 1.5m wide. The canopy would be provided of about 4.9m above the ground level. Instead of full coverage of the setback area, the 1.5m wide canopy might allow more sunlight penetration to the proposed greenery features on ground level. The applicant had not provided information on the detailed design of the canopy, but the canopy design would need to comply with requirements under the Buildings Ordinance regarding materials, structural safety, etc.;
- (e) the proposed greenery features on ground floor would be provided in the form of planters and trees. Locations of the planters would be close to the building façade while the trees would be close to the edge of the site boundary. The areas beneath the canopy would remain largely unobstructed for pedestrian movements;
- (f) the proposed landscaped podium garden would be for the use of tenants of the proposed development only so as to minimise visitors to the industrial building and to address the fire safety concerns of the Fire Services Department;
- (g) there was no information provided in the application on details of the window design. The applicant had indicated that energy saving

measures and anti-glaring materials would be adopted for the proposed development. The applicant also indicated that they would apply for BEAM Plus certification in the detailed design stage;

Building Height

- (h) the proposed BH for the development was 130mPD, which conformed to the BH restriction on the OZP. Members of PTAC of SSPDC raised a general concern on the BH of new developments in Cheung Sha Wan area, which might lead to negative impacts on the townscape and air ventilation; and

Vehicular Arrangement

- (i) the ingress/egress point of the proposed development was at Tai Nan West Street. There was a turntable area for the car lift to/from the basement carpark. The design and provision of vehicular access and maneuvering spaces, amongst others, were recommended as an approval condition which the applicant had to comply with to the satisfaction of the Transport Department.

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

Deliberation Session

30. Members generally were in support of the application and expressed appreciation that the applicant had tried to provide some planning gains and design merits, taking account of Members' concerns in considering similar cases. A Member indicated that the applicant should try to enhance the window design for better solar shading to reduce overall energy consumption of the proposed development. Another Member expressed some concerns on the possible conflict between vehicles and pedestrians near the ingress/egress point at Tai Nan West Street and suggested to provide adequate vehicular access and waiting space thereat and to avoid vehicle waiting at the setback area, which might obstruct pedestrian movement. The Chairman said that an approval condition was recommended in the Paper

regarding the design and provision of vehicular access and maneuvering spaces.

31. A Member considered that there was scope to extend the proposed canopy to 2m wide for better weather protection for pedestrians. In that regard, the Chairman proposed and the Committee agreed that an advisory clause regarding the design of the canopy should be included for consideration of the applicant.

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 24.12.2025, 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 vehicular access, vehicle parking spaces, and loading/unloading facilities and maneuvering spaces for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works as identified in the accepted Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission of land contamination assessments in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to development of the site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB.”

33. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV of the Paper and the following additional advisory clause:

“to improve the canopy design for the proposed development for better weather protection for pedestrians.”

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

[Mr Derek P.K. Tse, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK), and Mr K.S. Ng, STP/TWK, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

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 Approved Master Layout Plan) in “Comprehensive Development Area (3)” Zone, Tsuen Wan Town Lots 126, 137, 160 and 363, and adjoining Government Land, Tsuen Wan, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/527C)

34. The Secretary reported that the application site (the 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). AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one 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;

Mr Franklin Yu - his spouse being an employee of SHK;

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current 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.

35. As the interests of Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Franklin Yu were direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As the interests of Ms Lilian S.K. Law was indirect, and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application and the properties related to the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi's spouse and Professor John C.Y. Ng's spouse had no direct view of the Site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

[Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr Franklin Yu left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

36. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr K.S. Ng, 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. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

37. Some Members raised the following questions:

Development Proposal

- (a) the total gross floor area (GFA) and plot ratio (PR) of the proposed residential use and child care centre (CCC);
- (b) justifications for the proposed relaxation of domestic PR by 20%;

- (c) the difference between the previously approved scheme (Application No. A/TW/452) and the current proposal regarding the total number of flats and average flat size;
- (d) domestic PR and building height (BH) of the surrounding developments;
- (e) whether the proposed BH of 120mPD would obstruct the ridgeline of Tai Mo Shan as stated in the public comment;
- (f) the setback arrangements under the current proposal;
- (g) whether the setback arrangement along Wang Wo Tsai Street was considered acceptable;
- (h) noting that the north-western corner of Site A was designated as an open-air area in the previously approved scheme, whether the alteration under the current scheme was considered acceptable;

Provision of Government, Institution and Community (GIC) Facilities and Open Space

- (i) the current provision and shortfall of GIC facilities in the Tsuen Wan area and whether more GIC facilities could be provided at the Site;
- (j) whether there was scope to increase public open space provision at Site A;

Phased Development

- (k) noting that the proposed development was targeted for completion in 2023/24, whether construction works were already in progress at the Site; and
- (l) if the subject application was approved, whether the land owners of the remaining Sites B to D could pursue different schemes.

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

Development Proposal

- (a) the proposed relaxation of PR by 20% for residential use at Site A was equivalent to an increase of domestic GFA from 15,570.5 m² to 18,684.6 m². The proposed CCC with a non-domestic GFA of 1,007 m² was equivalent to a PR of 0.32 of Site A and PR of 0.1 of the Site;
- (b) the applicant had provided assessments to demonstrate the technical feasibility of the proposed development, and planning gains including mainly the provision of the CCC and additional housing supply to support the minor relaxation of PR restriction. The current scheme was considered in line with the prevailing Government's policy on allowing 20% increase in maximum domestic PR in private housing site where technical feasibility was demonstrated;
- (c) compared to the previously approved scheme (Application No. A/TW/452), the total flat number of the whole Site was increased from 1,047 to 1,330 with a reduction in average flat size from 50.33 m² to 47.42 m². Among the 465 flats proposed in Site A, the size of 155 flats was equal to or smaller than 40 m² while that for 310 flats was from 40 m² to 70 m²;
- (d) to the north of the Site was the New Haven with a BH of 150mPD and domestic PR of 7.679, to the west was Bo Shek Mansion (built in earlier year) with a BH of 95mPD and domestic PR of 4.76, to the east was Sheung Chui Court with maximum BH of 118mPD and domestic PR of 5.39, and to the south was a group of industrial buildings generally with BH not exceeding 100mPD;

- (e) given the site context and the proposed development as shown in the photomontages submitted by the applicant, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD was of the view that the proposed BH of 120mPD would unlikely induce any significant adverse visual impact to the surrounding built environment and the Tai Mo Shan ridgeline was not visible from the viewing points selected by the applicant for visual assessment;

- (f) the same width of setbacks (i.e. 1.5m along the section of the public lane to the north and 3m along Wang Wo Tsai Street to the south) would be provided as in the approved scheme. The applicant had proposed to reduce the width of a portion of the setback area along the public lane at the north-western corner of Site A from 4.6m to 3.1m to allow for the entrance of the CCC with overhang for weather protection and creation of a public gathering space that would be integrated with the adjoining public lane. The setback area along the eastern boundary facing Wang Wo Tsai Street Garden was revised from 3m to ranging from 1.2m to 3m wide. The applicant would also provide street furnitures abutting the existing public lanes for public use;

- (g) there was no specific requirement or adverse comment received from the relevant government departments on the proposed 3m wide setback along Wang Wo Tsai Street. The Transport Department had not indicated any need for widening of road/pavement;

- (h) under the approved scheme, the open-air area at the north-western corner was a fenced-off area serving as internal driveway for Site A. While the area was currently proposed as a part of the podium for mainly the new CCC with a small portion for clubhouse, a gathering area was proposed on the ground floor of that corner with provision of a 3.1m setback from the public lane. The residential tower would also be set back from that corner. Such alteration would be beneficial to the users of the CCC;

Provision of GIC Facilities and Open Space

- (i) there was no major shortfall of GIC facilities in the Tsuen Wan area, except CCC and elderly-related facilities. The Social Welfare Department (SWD) welcomed the provision of CCC under the current scheme and had no requirement for other GIC facilities at the Site. The GFA of the proposed CCC was about 5.4% of the total domestic GFA of Site A, which was similar to GIC provision in new public housing projects. In addition, there were various GIC facilities in the town centre, for example the nearby integrated social welfare building at Yan Chai Hospital providing a range of child and elderly-related facilities;
- (j) while there was surplus provision of public open space in the Tsuen Wan area, the gathering area outside the CCC entrance under the current scheme would provide extra public space;

Phased Development

- (k) the industrial building at Site A had been demolished and foundation works had commenced at the Site; and
- (l) under the current scheme, Site A would be developed first and would be self-contained. Approval of the subject application would serve as a catalyst for development in the remaining sites. Owners of those sites could either implement the subject scheme if approved, or submit alternative development proposal through fresh s.16 planning application.

39. In response to Members' enquiries, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that the fixed noise impact assessment submitted by the applicant was based on the survey data collected in 2019 to 2021, which were the latest data set by the time of assessment. The major fixed noise source was from the large-scale chillers and air conditioners of a data centre at the immediate north-west of Site A. As the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) raised objection during the general building plan submission of Site A, the applicant therefore proposed to revise the layout design and building deposition to reduce the exposure

to the noise source under the current planning application.

40. At the invitation of the Chairman, Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment), EPD, supplemented that after the development at Site A was completed, the fixed noise source from surrounding developments would be controlled under the Noise Control Ordinance (Cap. 400). If the noise level was excessive, EPD might serve noise abatement notices requiring mitigation measures to abate the noise.

Deliberation Session

41. Members generally were in support of the proposed relaxation of PR as it was in line with the prevailing government policy to increase domestic PR for housing supply, and the applicant had demonstrated that the increase in PR and BH were technically feasible and acceptable in the local context, and there were planning merits in the current proposal. The Committee noted that the increased PR would be subject to payment of land premium.

42. A Member said that the applicant should enhance the design of the public lane and setback areas while another Member suggested that the applicant should provide convenient and easily access for the future CCC users. Another Member considered that the applicant should further explore the possibility of providing more GIC facilities at the Site.

43. The Chairman concluded that Members in general supported the application. Regarding the views on the location of the CCC, an approval condition on the provision of social welfare facility was recommended by PlanD. Regarding the suggestion for the applicant to provide more GIC facilities, as the Board had to consider the application as submitted, it would not be appropriate to include an additional approval condition to require the provision of more GIC facilities. The comment would be recorded in the minutes for the applicant's consideration in any future submissions. The design of the setback areas could be further vetted by PlanD at the general building plan stage.

44. 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 24.12.2025, 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 incorporate the approval conditions as stipulated in conditions (b) to (h) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a revised phasing plan and implementation programme to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission and implementation of a Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of a revised Traffic Impact Assessment, and design and provision of parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces and vehicular access for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (e) the provision of fire service installations, water supplies for firefighting and emergency vehicular access to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (f) the implementation of the proposed noise mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (g) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (h) the provision of social welfare facility, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Social Welfare or of the TPB.”

45. 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 Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, and Mr K.S. Ng, STP/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr Franklin Yu rejoined the meeting and Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting ((Presentation and Question Sessions only))]

A/KC/480 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Information Technology and Telecommunications Industries (Data Centre) in "Industrial" Zone, 45-51 Tai Lin Pai Road, Kwai Chung, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/480)

46. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests 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 current business dealings with Arup.

47. The Committed noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting and as Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

48. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, 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. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

49. Some Members raised the following questions:

Site Coverage

- (a) the maximum permitted site coverage (SC) for the proposed development on the application site (the Site) under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R);

Underground Fuel Tanks and Voluntary Setback Area at Southern Site Boundary

- (b) whether fuel tank installation was specifically designed for Tier-III data centre and any similar application for Tier III data centre was processed by the Committee before;
- (c) whether the fuel storage should be classified as dangerous goods storage and would such installation constitute potential risk to the public;
- (d) noting that the voluntary setback area along the southern site boundary would be restricted for public access for safety reason, whether such arrangement was reasonable and there were alternative locations to house the fuel tanks;

Planning and Design Merits

- (e) detailed design of the canopies and why continuous canopies could not be provided;
- (f) the intention for an unequal width of building setback along Wah Sing Street;
- (g) the type of BEAM Plus Certification (i.e. BEAM Plus Data Centres or BEAM Plus New Buildings) the applicant targeted to achieve;
- (h) whether recycling water from cooling towers for irrigation of greenery on the Site had been proposed;

Provision of Car Parking and Loading/Unloading Facilities

- (i) as compared to the previously approved scheme for an industrial use at the same site (Application No. A/KC/474), there was a large reduction in the provision of loading/unloading bays for light goods/heavy goods vehicles. Whether such arrangement was considered acceptable;
- (j) whether the vehicle parking spaces would be opened up for public use; and

Departmental Views

- (k) departmental views on the proposed data centre development.

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

Site Coverage

- (a) the Site was a Class A site and the maximum SC under B(P)R for non-domestic building development with a building height over 61m was 60%. The current proposal had a SC of 59.95%;

Underground Fuel Tanks and Voluntary Setback Area at Southern Site Boundary

- (b) fuel tank installation was not uncommon for data centre development. According to the 4-tier classification system established by Uptime Institute as quoted by the applicant, the proposed Tier-III data centre was required to achieve concurrent maintainability with N+1 redundancy for 72-hour outage protection and higher uptime rate. To fulfil the redundancy requirement for Tier-III data centre, back-up fuel provision at times of power shortage was required. There were applications for Tier-III data centre previously considered by the Committee;
- (c) fuel tanks in support of data centre development were generally considered as an ancillary use to the data centre. The subject application had been circulated to relevant government departments for comment and no objection nor adverse comment on safety issue was received. Should the application be approved, relevant government departments would scrutinise the development proposal in the detailed design stage to ensure that the proposed data centre would conform to relevant safety standards;
- (d) according to the applicant, access control to the voluntary setback area was mainly for operational safety concerns. While the public would be prohibited from access to the setback area, building users would be allowed access with certain restrictions. Nonetheless, the voluntary setback area would be paved with landscape treatments to provide visual amenity and pedestrian comfort to the passers-by. Having regard to the setback requirements on the eastern and western site boundaries, the security and safety concerns and operational needs, the proposed siting of fuel tanks and access restriction were considered not unreasonable;

Planning and Design Merits

- (e) it was the applicant's intention to provide canopies along Tai Lin Pai Road and Wah Sing Street for shading and weather protection purpose. The two canopies were not in a continuous design and some sections abutting plant rooms were not provided with canopy cover. The canopy at Tai Lin Pai Road was about 9m in length and the canopy at Wah Sing Street was about 15m in length. The two canopies were about 2m in width;
- (f) the proposed building setback along Wah Sing Street with an unequal width of 0.5m to 1.7m had complied with the requirement under the Kwai Chung Outline Development Plan (ODP) No. D/KC/D. The setback thereat was to facilitate future widening of pavement and carriageway of Wah Sing Street. The road widening works would be subject to detailed design when there was a programme for implementation;
- (g) the applicant had not indicated the target type of BEAM Plus certification to be achieved;
- (h) the applicant had proposed to use greywater for greenery irrigation within the development. No information regarding recycling water from cooling towers was provided by the applicant;

Provision of Car Parking and Loading/Unloading Facilities

- (i) parking demand generated from a data centre use was different from that from an industrial use under the previously approved scheme. The applicant had demonstrated that the current proposal would accommodate the high-end provision of parking and loading/unloading facilities in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had no in-principle objection and proposed an approval condition on the design and provision of

parking and loading/unloading facilities, amongst others, to the satisfaction of C for T;

- (j) according to the applicant, the vehicle parking spaces in the development would not be opened for public use; and

Departmental Views

- (k) the current scheme for data centre development was welcomed by the relevant government bureau/departments, including the Office of the Government Chief Information Officer of Innovation and Technology Bureau as it was in line with the prevailing government policy to encourage high-tier data centre development to address the growing demand. Regarding the environmental protection aspect, the applicant had proposed to provide noise reduction measures according to the requirement of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) and the equipment and installation for the data centre would be provided in full compliance with international guidelines and relevant code of practice. EPD and the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) had no objection to nor adverse comment on the application.

51. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Stephen C. Y. Chan, STP/TWK, clarified that Drawings A-18 and A-19 of the Paper were the most updated illustration drawings to show the proposed setback and the open-sided mechanical floors in the building design would facilitate wind penetration.

52. In response to Members' enquiries on whether the applicant was bounded to implement the proposed data centre if the relaxation of BH was approved, Mr Stephen C. Y. Chan, STP/TWK, said that if the subject application was approved, the implementation of the proposal should conform to the approved scheme (i.e. data centre use with the relaxed BH) and the approval conditions imposed. Any amendment made to the approved scheme should comply with the established Town Planning Board (TPB) Guidelines No. 36B. If the subject application was approved, the Site would be subject to two planning permissions (including the previous permission for industrial use). The landowner/developer could

choose to implement any one of the permissions to meet changing market needs.

53. The Chairman supplemented that once a development with planning permission was completed, the planning permission(s) relevant to the site would lapse. For any future change of use or redevelopment, the proposed use or development would need to conform to the extant statutory plan.

54. Mr Albert K.L. Cheung, Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department (LandsD), supplemented that, to take forward the proposed scheme, the applicant needed to apply to LandsD for lease modification for data centre use. Subsequent change to other uses would not be permitted unless the lease was further modified.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Dr Roger C.K. Chan left the meeting at this point]

Deliberation Session

55. While supporting the application to facilitate data centre use, a Member was of the view the applicant should strengthen the proposed planning and design merits in support of the current proposal, including the provision of full length canopies along Tai Lin Pai Road and Wah Sing Street and provision of an equal width setback fronting Wah Sing Street, so as to further enhance pedestrian accessibility and comfort. Besides, the applicant should be suggested to adopt BEAM Plus Data Center Certification as a design reference for the proposed development.

56. The same Member opined that the applicant had not provided strong justifications for restricting public access to the proposed voluntary setback area at the southern site boundary. Two other Members echoed the same view.

57. Another Member said that there was still room for the applicant to improve the scheme, in particular the façade design and provision of the canopy.

58. The Chairman concluded that Members generally had no objection to the application. To address Members' concern on the canopy design, the Chairman proposed and the Committee agreed to include an additional approval condition on the design of the canopy. The Committee also agreed to include three advisory clauses for the applicant's

consideration, namely to improve the design of the setback area along Wah Sing Street, to review the design and management of the voluntary setback area at the southern site boundary to allow public access where feasible, and to adopt BEAM Plus Data Center Certification as a design reference for the proposed development.

59. 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 24.12.2025, 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 parking facilities, loading and unloading spaces and vehicular access for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and implementation of traffic measures, as proposed by the applicant at his own cost, prior to occupation of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of land contamination assessments in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to the development of the site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (e) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the updated Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (f) the design and provision of canopies at Tai Lin Pai Road and Wah Sing Street to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

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

- “(a) to improve the design of the setback area along Wah Sing Street;
- (b) to enhance the design and management of the voluntary setback area at the southern site boundary and for public access where feasible; and
- (c) to adopt BEAM Plus Data Center Certification as a design reference for the proposed development.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

[Ms Erica S. M. Wong, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting ((Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/H10/96 Proposed Eating Place in “Residential (Group C)” Zone, Shop 2, Lower
Ground Floor of Block I-J (A3), Scenic Villas, 2-28 Scenic Villa Drive,
Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H10/96)

61. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Pok Fu Lam. Professor T.S. Liu declared an interest on the item as he was having current education programme with the Caritas Pokfulam Community Development Project Centre at Pok Fu Lam Village.

62. As the interest of Professor T.S. Liu was indirect, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

63. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Erica S. M. Wong, STP/HK, 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.

64. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) if the application was approved, whether the subject eating place would be restricted to the catering business regulated under the light refreshment restaurant licence as proposed by the applicant;
- (b) whether there would be traffic impact as indicated in the public comments; and
- (c) what the applicant's responses to concerns raised by the locals were.

65. In response, Ms Erica S. M. Wong, STP/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) operation of different types of eating place was controlled under different food business licences regulated by the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH). There were different requirements on the type of food, the minimum size of kitchen, layout, etc. For light refreshment restaurant licence, the minimum size of the eating place was 20m². The specific type of eating place was not controlled under the planning regime;
- (b) the application premises (the Premises) was situated within a residential estate with adequate parking spaces for residents and some visitors' car parking spaces at the nearby cul-de-sac. The traffic impact generated would be limited as the Premises was only accessible via a private road (i.e.

Scenic Villa Drive) to Victoria Road. Traffic control would be handled by the property management office of the estate; and

- (c) a site notice had been posted to inform the locals of the application. Regarding the local concerns, the applicant had responded that the proposed eating place was mainly to serve the local neighbourhood, it would comply with the licencing requirements, there would not be unpleasant smell nor noise nuisance and minimal waste and traffic impacts were anticipated.

Deliberation Session

66. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Chairman said that the current application was for a permanent eating place use. If the permission was granted by the Town Planning Board, it would be subject to a validity period of four years, unless prior to that date, the permitted development had commenced or the planning permission was renewed.

67. A Member noted that there were both supporting and objecting public comments received. To address some public comments raising concern that the applicant might use the Premises for a catering business with more impacts than that of providing light refreshment after the planning permission was granted, the Member said that consideration might be given to stipulating an approval condition to restrict the type of catering business as proposed by the applicant. Another Member considered that there was no need to stipulate such approval condition as the Premises was small and in an obscured location and would not create major nuisance. The food licence issue should be controlled by the DFEH.

68. Noting that planning permission would be granted based on the submitted scheme, the Committee agreed that the incorporation of an additional approval condition to restrict the catering business for light refreshment was not necessary.

69. 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 24.12.2025, 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.”

70. 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 Ms Erica S.M. Wong, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting ((Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/H19/82 Proposed Residential Development with Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Residential Development with Historic Building Preserved” Zone, Maryknoll House, 44 Stanley Village Road, Stanley, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H19/82)

71. The Secretary reported that LWK & Partners (HK) Limited (LWK) and Siu Yin Wai & Associates Limited 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 LWK and SYW. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

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

Mr Rico W.K. Tsang - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr Edwin C.H. Lee - Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK), PlanD

- Mr Ivanhoe C.H. Chang - Commissioner for Heritage (C for H),
Development Bureau (DEVB)
- Miss Clarissa Y.T. Wan - Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation)³,
Commissioner for Heritage's Office (CHO),
DEVB
- Mr Mike K.O. Tang - Engineer (Heritage Conservation)³, CHO, DEVB
- Ms Susanna L.K. Siu - Executive Secretary (ES) (Antiquities &
Monuments), DEVB
- Ms Fiona Y.C. Tsang - Curator (Historical Buildings)¹, Antiquities and
Monuments Office (AMO), DEVB

Presentation and Question Sessions

73. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, STP/HK, PlanD, 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. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

74. The Chairman invited questions from Members.

New Additions and Alteration to the Maryknoll House

75. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) what the major concerns/issues were during the consideration of the previous s.12A rezoning application No. Y/H19/12;
- (b) details and rationale of the proposed additions and alterations under the current proposal;

- (c) whether the new western extension with a building height of 67.7mPD would affect public's appreciation of the Maryknoll House; and
- (d) whether the development would involve excessive tree removal and excavation works.

76. In response, Mr Rico W. K. Tsang, STP/HK, PlanD, made the following main points:

- (a) during the consideration of the s.12A application on 4.1.2019, the major concerns/issues of the Committee were related to the architectural design especially the negative impacts of the triple volume glass entrance lobby on the main façade, that public access should be increased to allow public's appreciation of the Maryknoll House, and that any proposed relaxation of building height (BH) restriction should not block the views of the Maryknoll House;
- (b) the main proposed additions and alterations included erection of two new extensions to the Maryknoll House (i.e. a 3-storey extension including a trellis at the top floor at its east and a 1-storey extension at its west) for residential use; new circulation cores between the main building and the chapel and library wings to meet the current building and fire safety requirements; installation of lifts in the new circulation cores for barrier-free access; alteration to the southern façade with construction of two new loggias; and relocation of the two existing staircases to facilitate public visit in future. Besides, the verandah at the west wing which was previously blocked-off would also be reverted to the original design. According to the applicant, the current scheme with addition of new extensions on both the eastern and western sides of the building would better respect the symmetrical built form of the Maryknoll House. In addition, the triple volume glass entrance in the indicative scheme of the s.12A application, which the Committee raised much concern on, was no longer pursued under the current proposal;

- (c) the Maryknoll House was situated on a hilltop platform and surrounded by dense vegetation. With reference to the photomontages submitted by the applicant from the public viewpoints at Murray House, Ma Hang Park and Kwun Yum Temple, the visual impact from the proposed relaxation of the BH of the new western extension by 3.7m (i.e. from 64mPD to 67.7mPD) was considered insignificant; and
- (d) a total of 141 out of 167 of existing trees would be felled with the same number of new trees to be compensated at the Site. The remaining trees would be retained or transplanted. Geotechnical works would be mainly conducted for construction of the two new residential blocks at the southern platform of the Site.

Preservation of Heritage Features

77. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the CHO's assessment of the current proposal, in particular the proposed two new extensions to the Maryknoll House;
- (b) the reason for relocating the existing staircases;
- (c) whether there was any appraisal on the social significance of the Maryknoll House submitted by the applicant; and
- (d) any similar case for revitalizing historic building for residential use and whether the government would offer assistance to the future flat owners for maintenance work of the preserved Maryknoll House.

78. In response, Mr Ivanhoe C.H. Chang, C for H, DEVB, made the following main points:

- (a) under the prevailing heritage conservation policy, the Government sought to protect, conserve and revitalise as appropriate historical and heritage sites

and buildings through relevant and sustainable approaches for the benefit and enjoyment of the present and future generations. CHO acknowledged the applicant's need to modify/alter the Maryknoll House, a Grade 1 building, for the new residential use and at the same time to fulfill the relevant statutory requirements, such as building and fire safety requirements. The current proposal which enabled in-situ preservation of the historic building had demonstrated the applicant's efforts to strike a balance between heritage conservation and development needs, and thus it was considered acceptable from the heritage conservation perspective. The current proposal with the two new extensions was considered an improved scheme as the existing building mass, symmetry and proportions of the Grade 1 building would be better maintained when compared with the triple volume glass entrance lobby design in the indicative scheme for the s.12A application. The addition of the new extension at the east wing generally followed the indicative scheme of the s.12A application, whilst the new extension at the west wing projected a more or less similar condition to the existing site condition where part of the west façade of the main building had already been blocked by the existing one-storey staff quarters;

- (b) the locations of the existing main staircases were within the private residential area in the new development. The proposed relocation of the staircases to the common areas of the new development would facilitate the opening of the staircases to the public during the guided tours;
- (c) the applicant had undertaken to submit a full Conservation Management Plan (CMP) with proposed mitigation measures to AMO for agreement, if the subject s.16 application was approved, and details including the social significance of the Maryknoll House, would be further assessed/evaluated in the full CMP; and
- (d) there were precedent cases for revitalizing historic buildings for residential use. Jessville, a Grade 3 historic building, at No. 128 Pokfulam Road, was one of the examples. Under the Government's "Financial Assistance for

Maintenance Scheme on Built Heritage”, subsidies would be provided to private owners of graded historic buildings to carry out maintenance works.

79. In response to a Member’s question on how the main staircases would be relocated, Ms. Susanna L.K. Siu, ES (Antiquities & Monuments), DEVB, responded that the existing timber flooring, metal balustrades and the timber handrails of the staircases would be dismantled by hand and re-assembled at the new locations. Some strengthening works would be conducted to the staircases to meet the current building regulation standards.

Public Appreciation and Access to the Maryknoll House

80. In response to some Member’s enquiries and concerns on the proposed public access to the Maryknoll House, Mr Ivanhoe C.H. Chang, C for H, DEVB responded that the Site was under private ownership and intended for private residential development. It was necessary to balance the opportunity for public appreciation of a heritage asset and maintenance of privacy of the future residents. The proposed arrangement of guided tours to the Maryknoll House had been provided by the applicant in the application. In addition, an approval condition on the provision of free guided tours with detailed arrangement to the satisfaction of the AMO had been recommended.

81. Mr Ivanhoe C.H. Chang, C for H, DEVB, added that the Maryknoll House was not open for public access or visit before. Under the current proposal, the applicant committed to arrange public guided tours free-of-charge every 6 weeks (i.e. 8 times a year) with a maximum of 25 visitors for each tour. The frequency of which was more than that proposed under the s.12A rezoning application (i.e. half-yearly). The public would be able to enter the Maryknoll House and visit the common areas in the chapel and library. The public could also continue to appreciate the Maryknoll House from the more distant public viewpoints as it would be preserved in-situ.

82. A Member asked and Mr Rico W. K. Tsang, STP/HK, PlanD, replied that the applicant had entered into an agreement with the owners’ committee of the adjacent Stanley Knoll to allow public access to the Maryknoll House for the proposed guided tours.

83. During the question and answer session, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon declared an interest on the item as a close relative of his lived in Stanley but the residence had no direct view of the Site. The Committee agreed that Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon could stay in the meeting.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

Deliberation Session

84. A Member expressed concern on the proposed new extension at the west wing of the Maryknoll House and the proposed relaxation in BH as the new structure would cover a portion of the building façade and hence affect the building design and obstruct public's view of the historic building. A Member considered that the public access arrangement currently proposed by the applicant was far from satisfactory.

85. The majority of Members indicated support to the application and generally considered that the current proposal was an improvement to the indicative scheme under the s.12A application and that the proposed extension was not major in scale and the proposed relaxation of BH was minor. A Member pointed out that given the Site was under private ownership and intended for private residential development, despite that there was strong aspiration to open up the historic building for more public access, the privacy of future residents at the Site should also be respected. Some Members considered that the applicant should explore the possibility to further enhance the public access arrangement, such as to increase the frequency and number of visitors of the guided tours and/or to provide virtual tour.

86. The Chairman concluded that the majority of Members supported the application whilst the dissenting views of individual Members were noted. Members' views that the public access arrangement should be further improved could be conveyed to the applicant for compliance of the relevant approval condition in due course.

87. 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 24.12.2025, 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 of a revised Conservation Management Plan (CMP) prior to the commencement of any works and implementation of the works in accordance with the CMP to the satisfaction of the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) of Development Bureau (DEVB) or of the TPB; and
- (b) the provision of free guided tours with detailed arrangements to the satisfaction of the AMO of DEVB or of the TPB.”

88. 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 the representatives from PlanD and DEVB for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H3/444 Proposed Office and Shop and Services in “Residential (Group A) 6”
Zone, 380 Des Voeux Road West, Shek Tong Tsui, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/444)

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

90. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Dr Roger C.K. Chan had already left the meeting.

91. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 6.12.2021 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.

92. 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 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H4/100 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Telecommunications Radio Base Station) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Pier" Zone, Portion of Top Roof of Pier 3 Garden, No. 11 Man Kwong Street, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H4/100)

93. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by SmarTone Mobile Communications Limited, which was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK). The following Members had declared interests on this item:

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

Mr Franklin Yu - his spouse being an employee of SHK;

- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with SHK; 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.

94. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left 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 of the item. As the interest of Ms Lilian S.K. Law was indirect, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

95. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 21.12.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address comments from the ferry operator. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

[Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, STP/HK, was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting ((Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

97. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, STP/HK, 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. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

98. In response to a Member’s enquiries, Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, STP/HK, said that the application site was currently occupied by a vacant 8-storey building. The population of the proposed development was about 265 persons based on the applicant’s assumption of about 2.3 persons per unit for a total of 115 units.

Deliberation Session

99. 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 24.12.2025, 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 of a revised Sewage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or the TPB; and

- (b) in relation to (a) above, the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the revised SIA to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or the TPB.”

100. 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 Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K14/804 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions 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/K14/804A)

101. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 9.12.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address departmental comments including the preparation of revised assessment report. 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, including revised traffic impact assessment, revised sewerage impact assessment, revised drainage impact assessment, revised visual impact assessment, revised landscape master plan, replacement pages for Planning Statement and revised plans.

102. 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.

Agenda Item 15

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

Confirmed Minutes of the 684th MPC Meeting

103. The Secretary reported that a letter dated 13.12.2021 and an e-mail dated 17.12.2021 from Mr Paul Zimmerman, Vice-chairman of the Southern District Council and the Secretariat's reply dated 17.12.2021 regarding the confirmed minutes of the 684th MPC meeting held on 26.11.2021 to discuss a section 12A application No. Y/H10/13 were circulated to Members before the meeting.

104. In his letter dated 13.12.2021, Mr Zimmerman considered that the response made by the applicant's representative at the meeting to Members' enquiry on site selection, i.e. that the application site to the east of 3 Sassoon Road was suggested to the applicant by the government, was a key point that should not be omitted from the minutes. The Secretariat's reply dated 17.12.2021 explained that the minutes was not a verbatim record but only to reflect the key points of the presentation and discussion, and no amendment to the minutes would be necessary. The further email dated 17.12.2021 from Mr Zimmerman enquired on the reasons and authority in deciding not to amend the minutes.

105. The Secretary said that it had been the Board's practice to record the key points of the presentation and discussion and the minutes was not intended to be a verbatim record. There was no reason to make amendment to the minutes as suggested. Members agreed.

106. The Committee agreed that the Secretariat would act on behalf of the Committee to give a further reply to Mr Zimmerman along similar lines as in the Secretariat's reply dated 17.12.2021.

107. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 2:35 p.m.