

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 687th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 14.1.2022**

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 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

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

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
Ms Trevina C. W. Kung

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Secretary

Absent with apologies

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr C.H. Tse

In Attendance

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Alvin C. H. Kan

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 686th MPC Meeting held on 24.12.2021

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 686th MPC meeting held on 24.12.2021 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting]

S/K5/37A Proposed Amendments to the Approved Cheung Sha Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K5/37
(MPC Paper No. 1/22)

4. The Secretary reported that one of the proposed amendment items 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. Two other amendment items involved the incorporation of two completed developments of the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Development Scheme Plans (DSPs) into the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung - being a non-executive director of the URA Board
(the Chairman) and a member of its Committee;
*as the Director of
Planning*

Mr Wilson Y. W. Fung - being a former director of the Board of the Urban
(the Vice-chairman) Renewal Fund of URA;

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

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with HKHA,
AECOM and URA;

- Mr Franklin Yu - being a member of the Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with HKHA and URA;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of the Hong Kong Housing Society currently having discussion with HD and URA on housing development issues;
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being a former non-executive director of the URA Board and its Committees' former chairman/member, and a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund, and his spouse being an employee of the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of HKHA, but not involved in planning work; and
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA.

5. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting, and according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, the proposed amendments to the OZP in relation to the public housing development and the URA sites were proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of those Members in relation to HKHA and URA only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

6. The following representatives from PlanD, and the Housing Department (HD) 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)
- Ms Winsome W. S. Lee - Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon

HD

- Mr William S.K. Chan - Senior Architect/13, Housing Department
- Ms Glory Y. F. Kou - Architect 101, Housing Department
- Ms Belinda L. K. Lau - Senior Planning Officer/5, Housing Department
- Mr Alex Y. K. Tse - Planning Officer/19, Housing Department
- Mr David M. K. Lee - Senior Civil Engineer/3, Housing Department
- Mr Andy C. L. Ng - Civil Engineer/36, Housing Department

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica Y. C. Ho, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the OZP, the technical consideration, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments were as follows:

- (a) Amendment Item A – to rezone a piece of government land (about 1.05ha) currently occupied by Wang Cheong Factory Estate (WCFE) and a section of Tan Lai Street from “Open Space” to “Residential (Group A)11” for a

public housing development;

- (b) Amendment Items B1 to B4 – to rezone areas adjoining the draft Cheung Wah Street/Cheung Sha Wan Road Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/K5/URA3/A to rationalise the zoning boundaries and reflect the as-built conditions;
- (c) Amendment Items C and D – to incorporate two completed developments of two URA DSPs (i.e. URA Lai Chi Kok Road/Kweilin Street and Yee Kuk Street DSP No. S/K5/URA1/2 and URA Hai Tan Street/Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street DSP No. S/K5/URA2/2) into the OZP with suitable zonings; and
- (d) Amendment Items E1 and E2 – to rezone a site currently occupied by a residential development at Tai Po Road from “Comprehensive Development Area” and “Green Belt” to “Residential (Group C)7” and area shown as ‘Road’ to reflect the as-built condition.

[Mr Franklin Yu and Dr Roger C.K. Chan joined the meeting during the presentation session.]

8. As the presentation by PlanD’s representative had been completed, the Chairman invited questions and views from Members.

9. The Chairman and some Members raised the following questions on proposed public housing development at the WCFE site (Amendment Item A):

- (a) pedestrian connectivity between the proposed public housing development and the nearby MTR stations;
- (b) building height (BH) of the proposed public housing development in comparison with those of the surrounding developments;
- (c) noting the shortfall of elderly facilities especially Residential Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE) in both Cheung Sha Wan area and Sham Shui Po

District, whether such facilities would be provided in the proposed public housing development, and if further increase in proposed BH might provide scope to accommodate more government, institution and community (GIC) facilities;

- (d) the planning for the nearby government sites e.g. Wang Cheong Building and Cheung Sha Wan Temporary Wholesale Poultry Market; and
- (e) the rationale for providing information on the provision of open space within the Sham Shui Po District and Cheung Sha Wan Planning Area.

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

- (a) as shown on Plan 14 of the Paper, the proposed public housing development was about 400m to 500m away from the MTR Cheung Sha Wan and Lai Chi Kok Stations taking about 15 minutes to walk at a slower pace. It was well-connected to the nearby existing public housing estates where daily necessities could be found via the pedestrian network, and was also well-served by bus and mini-bus services. While 'Road' use including pedestrian facilities was always permitted on the OZP, relevant government departments would take opportunities to improve the pedestrian environment for enhancing walkability as appropriate and necessary;
- (b) as shown on Plan 13 of the Paper, the proposed public housing development with a maximum BH of 152mPD would be the same of the adjoining residential development, namely The Sparkle, and similar to the surrounding high-rise residential developments with BH of about 108mPD to 185mPD. Although the development would inevitably result in loss of visual openness, reduction in the width of existing view corridor and visual permeability, the proposed BH of the proposed public housing development was considered not incompatible with those of the surrounding area in general. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L), PlanD considered that the proposed

development was generally visually compatible with the surrounding urban built environment;

- (c) according to the planning standards for elderly and child care services/facilities recently incorporated into the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), there would be shortfalls in the Cheung Sha Wan Planning Area in the provision of RCHE (a shortfall of 515 beds), community care services facilities (a shortfall of 656 places) and child care centres (a shortfall of 685 places). In the Sham Shui Po District, there would be a shortfall of 1,265 beds for RCHE. As the HKPSG requirements for these facilities were a long-term goal, the actual provision would be subject to consideration and priority of the Social Welfare Department (SWD) in the planning and development process. Currently, there were already various GIC facilities in the nearby public housing developments. For example, RCHEs were found at Lai On Estate, Lai Kok Estate and Un Chau Estate, and had been proposed at the public housing development at the North West Kowloon Reclamation Site 1 (East) to the southeast and comprehensive development at the sites of the Kerry Hung Kai Warehouse and Yuen Fat Warehouse to the south. Opportunities had already been taken to provide appropriate social welfare facilities within the proposed public housing development with a gross floor area (GFA) of not less than 5% of the total attainable domestic GFA, i.e. about 2,963m² and the type of facilities would be determined in consultation with relevant government departments. A planning brief would subsequently be prepared to guide the detailed design of the public housing development;
- (d) to the northwest of the proposed public housing site was Wang Cheong Building and Cheung Sha Wan Temporary Wholesale Poultry Market, which were zoned partly "Government, Institution or Community" (reserved for a primary school) and partly "Open Space". Wang Cheong Building was allocated to the Government Property Agency as a government storage depot and currently there was no relocation programme for the building. A technical study to explore the feasibility of relocating Cheung Sha Wan Temporary Wholesale Poultry Market and

some other wholesale markets to North West Tsing Yi was being undertaken by the Civil Engineering and Development Department and was anticipated to be completed in 2022. Implementation of the proposed open space and primary school would be further reviewed subject to the relocation of the existing uses on the concerned sites; and

- (e) for the Cheung Sha Wan Planning Area, while there was a surplus of about 3.7 ha of planned local open space (LO), there was a deficit of about 11.2 ha of planned district open space (DO). Nevertheless, for the Sham Shui Po District, there was a surplus of about 20 ha and 12.5 ha of planned LO and DO respectively. While the proposed public housing development would provide a public open space (POS) of not less than 800m², the loss in open space provision could be met by the existing and planned provisions nearby. For instance, there would be new provision at the recently completed Hoi Ying Estate and Hoi Tat Estate, and the public waterfront promenade along the Cheung Sha Wan waterfront being implemented for completion by 2024.

11. In response to two Members' questions on how the site constraint of the proposed public housing site had affected the design and layout of building blocks and POS, Mr William K.S. Chan, Senior Architect/13, HD, said that in view of the 15m-wide air quality zone and traffic noise from the West Kowloon Corridor and Lai Chi Kok Road, some mitigation measures including building setback, podium design, building orientation and disposition, and acoustic windows etc. had been incorporated in the notional scheme. To alleviate the potential impact of the fixed noise from the surrounding buildings, the proposed building block 2 would be in a single aspect design. A noise barrier along the site boundary facing the West Kowloon Corridor would be built to provide noise mitigation for the children's play area on the podium level. Furthermore, an at-grade POS would be provided between the two building blocks so as to maximise the visual openness and permeability for the adjoining developments, including The Sparkle.

12. In response to a Member's question on the relocation arrangement for the existing tenants in WCFE, Ms Belinda L. K. Lau, Senior Planning Officer/5, HD, said that HKHA had announced the clearance arrangements on 24.5.2021 for the tenants in HKHA's factory estates affected by the redevelopment proposals, including restricted tenders for

priority bidding of vacant factory units in HKHA's two remaining factory estates. As of early January 2022, over 60% of the tenants in all four factory estates, namely Yip On Factory Estate, Sui Fai Factory Estate, WCFE and Kwai On Factory Estate had already moved out or applied for termination of their tenancies.

13. The Chairman remarked that the scheme as shown in the Paper was notional only, and a planning brief would be prepared to guide the proposed public housing development. On the provision of open space, the Chairman supplemented that, in general, opportunities would be taken to provide more open space within urban renewal or redevelopment projects. For the subject proposed public housing development, about 3,200m² of open space for the residents and about 800m² POS would be provided. The design and layout of POS would be further enhanced at the detailed design stage. As for the provision of social welfare facilities, a GFA equivalent to not less than 5% of the total attainable domestic GFA of the proposed public housing development would be reserved and the exact type of facilities would be subject to further discussion among departments concerned. Members generally had no objection to the proposed Amendment Item A on the OZP.

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

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

15. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Cheung Sha Wan OZP No. S/K5/37 as shown on the draft Cheung Sha Wan OZP No. S/K5/37A at **Attachment II** (to be renumbered as S/K5/38 upon exhibition) and its Notes at **Attachment III** are suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised ES at **Attachment IV** for the draft Cheung Sha Wan OZP No. S/K5/37A (to be renumbered as S/K5/38) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings on the OZP; and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.”

16. 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 representatives of PlanD and HD for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

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

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/KC/483 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, 10-16 Kwai Ting Road, Kwai Chung, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/483)

17. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) 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 ARUP;
Mr Franklin Yu		and
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	-	his former firm having current business dealings with ARUP.

18. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered an apology for

being unable to attend the meeting. As Messrs Franklin Yu and Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

19. 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.

20. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) pedestrian connectivity of the application site (the Site);
- (b) the scope of providing the canopy with wider width;
- (c) noting the proposed 7m setback along Kwai On Road, what the width of pedestrian pavement would be upon future widening of the road; and
- (d) whether recycled water would be used for irrigation of the greenery in the proposed development.

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

- (a) as shown on Plan A-5 of the Paper, the Site was located between MTR Kwai Hing Station (about 250m to the northwest) and MTR Kwai Fong Station (about 600m to the southwest). From MTR Kwai Hing Station, the Site was accessible via pedestrian footbridge across Kwai Chung Road and pedestrian footpath along Tai Lin Pai Road. From MTR Kwai Fong Station, the Site was accessible via pedestrian footbridge across Kwai Foo Road and Kwai Chung Road and pedestrian footpath along Kwai Ting Road;
- (b) all-weather canopies were proposed along the northern and southern boundaries of the Site fronting Kwai On Road and Kwai Ting Road;

- (c) a 7m setback along Kwai On Road, as shown on the Kwai Chung Outline Development Plan, was required to facilitate a long term road widening proposal. The ultimate width of the pedestrian pavement around the Site was subject to detailed design of the future road scheme; and
- (d) according to the applicant, recycling water system for irrigation of the vertical greening would be explored during the detailed design stage.

Deliberation Session

22. The Chairman remarked that comparing with the previous approved application with similar development parameters for proposed non-polluting industrial use, the current application was for proposed office, shop and services and eating place uses and the planning merits remained largely the same. Members generally had no objection to the minor relaxation of PR and BH restrictions for the proposed redevelopment.

23. 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 14.1.2026, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the design and provision of parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces and vehicular access for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and implementation of traffic measures as proposed by the applicants 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 an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;

- (d) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the updated SIA in (c) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (e) the submission of land contamination assessments in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to development of the site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB.”

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

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

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/484 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Information Technology and Telecommunications Industries (Data Centre) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 57-61 Ta Chuen Ping Street, Kwai Chung, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/484A)

25. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 5.1.2022 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 review of layout design of the proposed development to accommodate various technical requirements. 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 and sewerage impact assessment, updated floor plan and development schedules.

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

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/485 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Industrial Use in "Industrial" Zone, 13-17 Wah Sing Street, Kwai Chung, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/485A)

27. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 7.1.2022 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments, including revised traffic impact assessment and sewerage impact assessment, revised floor plans and illustration diagrams.

28. 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, it was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances and supported with strong justifications.

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/488 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Wholesale Conversion of Permitted Information Technology and Telecommunications Industries Use (Data Centre) in "Industrial" Zone, 11-19 Wing Yip Street, Kwai Chung, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/488)

29. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 30.12.2021 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.

30. 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.

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H15/286 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Flat, Social Welfare Facility, Eating Place and Shop and Services Uses in “Residential (Group A)” Zone, Aberdeen Inland Lot No. 260, Aberdeen, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/286)

31. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung - being an ex-officio member of the
(the Chairman) Supervisory Board of HKHS;
as the Director of Planning

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

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of HKHS.

32. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the interest of Mr Ivan M.K. Chung (the Chairman) was direct, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. As 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.

33. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 4.1.2022 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.

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

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H4/101 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Telecommunications Radio Base Station) in "Comprehensive Development Area (2)" Zone, Upper Deck Floor and Roof Floor of Central Pier 6, Central, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H4/101)

35. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by China Mobile Hong Kong Company Limited (CMHK) and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest on the item for his former firm having current business dealings with CMHK.

36. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

37. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 30.12.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address public comment received on the application. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

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

[Ms Floria Y. T. Tsang, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong District (STP/HK) was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

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

A/H6/91 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Flat Use in "Residential (Group B)" Zone, 4, 4A, 4B and 4C Tai Hang Road, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H6/91B)

39. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tai Hang. Dennis Lau & Ng Chun Man Architects Limited (DLN) and Savills Valuation and Professional Services Limited (Savills) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - self-occupying a flat in Tai Hang.

40. As the property occupied by Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that she should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily. As Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee

agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

41. 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.

42. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was any previous application involving the application site (the Site) and similar application in the area;
- (b) referring to paragraph 8.2 of the Paper, how the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) restriction had met the consideration of such kind of applications in respect of site constraint, innovation architectural design and planning merits; and
- (c) clarification on the zoning demarcation, PR or gross floor area (GFA) restriction of the Site, and whether private lots within “Green Belt” (“GB”) would generally be GFA accountable.

43. In response, Ms Floria Y. T. Tsang, STP/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) an area along the eastern fringe of the Site and at its northeast and southwest was the subject of a previously rejected application (No. A/H6/87) for an access road and pedestrian link connecting the upper and lower Tai Hang Road. There was a similar application (No. A/H6/61) for minor relaxation of PR from 5.04 to 5.06 which involved the improvement of communal facilities at the entrance lobbies without changing the building bulk of two existing residential buildings;

- (b) in terms of site constraint, the Site was partly occupied by the ground anchors of the adjacent residential development, namely Trafalgar Court. In terms of architectural design and planning merits, vertical greening was proposed on the northern (facing Tai Hang Road) and the western façade of the podium of the proposed development. Besides, the proposed building block would only occupy about two-thirds of the frontage of the Site, allowing better street-level air ventilation and visual relief to the pedestrians; and
- (c) as shown on Plan A-2 of the Paper, Inland Lot No. 7426 included 4, 4A, 4B and 4C Tai Hang Road which was partly zoned “GB” and partly “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) subject to a PR restriction of 5 under the OZP since 2001. The Site under application for proposed minor relaxation of PR from 5 to 5.687 comprised only the “R(B)” portion of the lot. Taking the area of the entire lot, the resultant PR would be 5 and the applicant claimed that there was no rationale in taking away the development potential of the lot. Besides, the lot was subject to GFA restriction of 2,928.656m² under the lease and lease modification would be required for the proposed PR of 5.687 (equivalent to GFA of about 9,730.12 m²).

Deliberation Session

44. The Chairman remarked that despite the planning history of the Site, the current application focused only on proposed minor relaxation of PR within the “R(B)” zone but not the “GB” zone. Consideration should only be given to the individual merits of the Site in respect of site constraints, innovative architectural design and planning merits that would enhance the amenity of the locality.

45. 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 14.1.2026, 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, car parking and loading/unloading facilities for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of a revised Environmental Assessment and implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission of a Natural Terrain Hazard Study and implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Civil Engineering and Development or of the TPB.”

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

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong rejoined and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon joined the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

[Ms Katy C. W. Fung, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K) and Ms Helen H. Y. Chan, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon District (STP/K) were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 11

[Open Meeting]

Draft Planning Briefs for the “Comprehensive Development Area(2)” and “Comprehensive Development Area(3)” Zones in Kai Tak Development

(MPC Paper No. 2/22)

47. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kai Tak and Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung had declared an interest on the item for owning a flat in Kai Tak.

48. As the property owned by Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung had no direct view of the concerned sites, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

49. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms Helen H. Y. Chan, STP/K, briefed Members on the background of the draft Planning Briefs (PBs), major development parameters and planning requirements, and consultations with the Housing and Development Planning Committee (HDPC) of the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) and the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (KTTF) of the Harbourfront Commission (HC) as detailed in the Paper.

50. The Chairman said that the PBs were introduced to provide guidance for future development at the “Comprehensive Development Area (2)” (“CDA(2)”), “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Arts and Performance Related Uses” (“OU(APRU)”) and “Open Space” (“O”) zones; and “CDA(3)” zone (the Sites) on the draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/7. Submission of Master Layout Plans (MLPs) would be required for the two “CDA” sites. He then invited Members’ questions or views on the draft PBs.

51. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) horizontal and vertical pedestrian connectivity at various levels among the Sites;
- (b) details of commercial uses for the retail belts and underground shopping

street (USS);

- (c) details of the retail belts including the width, design and interface with the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Preservation Corridor (LTSBPC);
- (d) whether there were plans in the draft PBs showing the intended massing of the proposed developments, and whether the proposed developments could achieve plot ratio(PR)/gross floor area (GFA) within the building height restrictions;
- (e) the design of the proposed Grand Steps at the “OU(APRU)” site and whether a venue for art performance would be provided;
- (f) whether there was design flexibility for a sunken plaza at the “CDA(3)” site to better articulate the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge (LTSB), USS and the Grand Steps; and
- (g) whether the need to take account of the historical and cultural significance of LTSB and the locality in the development of the Sites had been incorporated in the PBs.

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

- (a) the requirements for horizontal and vertical pedestrian connections at various levels of the “CDA(2)”, “CDA(3)”, “OU(APRU)” and “O” sites as well as the curvilinear landscaped elevated walkway had been incorporated in the two PBs. Barrier-free vertical pedestrian facilities connecting G/F, LG1/F and LG2/F of the LTSBPC would be available, and there would be link bridges connecting the two sides of the LTSBPC. Pedestrian openings at specific locations would be provided to connect the LTSBPC with the adjoining “CDA” sites and the USS, and there would be a subway connecting LG2/F of LTSBPC leading to Kowloon City area. Besides, viewing platforms at LTSBPC and covered resting areas would enhance the pedestrian environment;
- (b) the “CDA(2)” and “CDA(3)” zones were primarily for commercial use

which would include retail, eating place, place of entertainment, office and/or hotel. Retail belts with building height not exceeding two storeys and minimum GFA of 1,970m² and 3,960m² would be provided along the southeastern boundary of the “CDA(2)” site and the southwestern and southeastern boundaries of the “CDA(3)” site respectively to accommodate shop and services and eating place uses. Not less than 4,000m² retail GFA would be provided at the same floor level of USS in each of the “CDA(2)”, “CDA(3)” and “OU(APRU)” sites. The 20m-wide USS would include 12m for retail uses and 8m for public passageway;

- (c) the proposed retail belts would be 15m in width. About 3m to 3.6m-wide covered unobstructed public pedestrian passageway would be provided along the G/F frontage. A cantilever design would be adopted along the site boundary fronting LTSBPC while a colonnade design would be adopted fronting the Station Square;
- (d) while the underground retail GFA was a minimum requirement, the maximum PR/GFA restrictions stipulated for the two “CDA” sites were in line with the restrictions under the OZP. The full PR/GFA potential was achievable within the building height restrictions. The future project proponents would provide more detailed design in the MLP submission for approval by the Town Planning Board. With the aim to provide guidance for future development at the concerned sites, the intended massing of the proposed developments was not set out in the PBs;
- (e) the proposed Grand Steps would cascade down from the platform of the “OU(APRU)” site to the “O” zone leading to the southern entrance of the LTSBPC and the Kai Tak Sports Park. The “OU(APRU)” zone was intended primarily for arts and performance related uses with a platform for public viewing as well as outdoor performance. The integrated public space would be a potential venue for holding public events, which was subject to detailed design;
- (f) as shown on Plan 4b of the Paper, there were three pedestrian openings along the southwestern site boundary for connection with LG1/F of the

LTSBPC. Flexibility for the design of the pedestrian openings had been allowed for the future project proponent; and

- (g) a GFA of about 6,900 m² of floor space was designated for arts and culture uses at the “OU(APRU)” site. While the definition of arts and culture might be broadbrush, suitable revision to the PBs could be made to emphasise the historical and heritage elements of the locality, including the significance of LTSB.

53. As Members had no further question on the PBs, the Chairman concluded that Members generally considered that the PBs useful in providing guidance for the preparation of the MLP submissions for the “CDA(2)” and “CDA(3)” zones, and that the PBs could be suitably amended to set out that the design of the future developments should respect the historical and heritage significance of the locality including the LTSB.

54. After deliberation, the Committee decided to endorse the draft PBs at **Appendices Ia and Ib** of the Paper subject to suitable revision to the PBs as mentioned in paragraph 53 above.

[Post-meeting note:

The PB for the Site covering the “CDA(2)”, “OU(APRU)” and “O” zones in Kai Tak Development would be revised as follows:

paragraph 2.1 of the PB

“The Site, which is located in the Kai Tak City Centre area of Kai Tak Development (KTD) on the south-western side of Kai Tak River, is zoned “CDA(2)”, “OU(APRU)” and “O” on the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/7 (Plan 1). *To its further east and southeast across “CDA(3)” zone is the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge (LTSB) Preservation Corridor, and the development of the Site shall respect the historical and heritage significance of the locality including LTSB...*”

paragraph 2.4 and item 3 ‘Planning/Development Requirements’ of the PB

“...At least 60% of the total GFA in the “OU(APRU)” zone shall be used for arts and performance related uses *including the elements to showcase the historical*

and heritage of Kowloon City/Kai Tak including LTSB ...”

The PB for the Site covering the “CDA(3)” in Kai Tak Development would be revised as follows:

paragraph 2.1 of the PB

“The Site, which is located in the Kai Tak City Centre area of Kai Tak Development (KTD) abutting Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Preservation Corridor (LTSBPC) to its southwest, is zoned “CDA(3)” on the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/7 (Plan 1). ***The development of the Site shall respect the historical and heritage significance of the locality including LTSB...***”]

[The Chairman thanked Ms Katy C. W. Fung, DPO/K, and Ms Helen H. Y. Chan, STP/K, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

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

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

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

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

55. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kowloon Tong. AGC Design Limited (AGC), MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) and WSP (Asia) Limited (WSP) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with AGC and WSP;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with MVA; and
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company owning properties in Kowloon Tong.

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

57. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 17.12.2021 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 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 visual impact assessment, traffic impact assessment, revised environmental assessment and revised sewerage impact assessment.

58. 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 13

Section 16 Application

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

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)

59. The Secretary reported that the application site was located at 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. Wong - being an employee of HKBU;

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 court member of HKBU and a director of a company owning properties in Kowloon Tong.

60. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting and as the interests of Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong, Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong, Messrs Franklin Yu and Stanley T.S. Choi were direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong left the meeting, and Messrs Franklin Yu and Stanley T.S. Choi left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

61. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Mak Chung Hang, STP/K, 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.

62. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

63. Members noted that the application involved minor relaxation of building height restriction for the provision of additional academic supporting facilities within the existing Academic and Administration Building of HKBU and there was no information from the applicant that such facilities would be opened for public use.

64. 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 14.1.2026, 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 Chairman thanked Mr Mak Chung Hang, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Stanley T.S. Choi rejoined the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Jessie K. P. Kwan, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon District (STP/K) was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K14/806 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Office Use in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 11 Lai Yip Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon (MPC Paper No. A/K14/806)

65. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - his firm having current business dealings with ARUP;

Mr Franklin Yu - his firm having current business dealings with ARUP; and

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

66. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting, Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting, and Mr Franklin Yu had not yet rejoined the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

67. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessie K. P. Kwan, STP/K, 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.

68. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the planning and design merits of the application and the comparison of such merits with the two similar approved applications nearby;
- (b) how the width of 1.5m of the proposed canopy was determined;
- (c) the possibility of tree planting within the proposed setback areas along Hang Yip Street and Lai Yip Street; and
- (d) whether lease modification was required if the planning application was approved.

69. In response, Ms Jessie K. P. Kwan, STP/K, made the following main points:

- (a) there were two similar approved applications (No. A/K14/763 and A/K14/774) within the same street block. In addition to the setback requirements as required under the Outline Development Plan, additional merits had been proposed for both applications. For application No. A/K14/763, a 0.1m voluntary setback, trees, planters and vertical greening were proposed. For application No. A/K14/774, a 1.5m-wide canopy, featured paving, street-level plot planters and flat roof landscaping were proposed. For the subject application, a 1m voluntary setback, a 1.5m-wide canopy, planters and vertical greening were proposed. The greenery coverage of the development schemes under applications No. A/K14/763, A/K14/774 and the subject application was 20%, 21.7% and 25% respectively;
- (b) according to the Buildings Department's Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers, sunshades projecting not more than 1.5m from the external wall complying with other relevant criteria might be exempted from gross floor area (GFA) and site coverage calculation on application to the Building Authority. The applicant might have considered such factor in determining the width of the proposed canopy. Together with the additional voluntary 1m G/F setback along Lai Yip Street, there would be a total of 2.5m covered walkway for pedestrian;

- (c) the setback area would be surrendered back to the government if required. Subject to the future design and pedestrian flow of the walkways, tree planting at the proposed setbacks could be arranged. The proposed 3m setback area would generally integrate with the government's enhancement proposals for a better pedestrian network in the area; and
- (d) the wholesale conversion of the subject building was completed in 2012. As advised by the Secretary for Development, the existing wholesale-converted office building could not be taken as a pre-1987 industrial building (IB) and it was not the targeted aged IB under the government policy to incentivise the redevelopment. Hence, the policy was not applicable to the proposed redevelopment under the current application.

70. Ms Trevina C. W. Kung, Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department, supplemented that the arrangement of lease modification and premium estimation for the proposed redevelopment under the current application would follow the existing mechanism and reference would not be made to the policy to incentivise IB redevelopment.

[Ms Lilian S.K. Law left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

Deliberation Session

71. The Chairman remarked that the applicant had proposed planning and design merits in the development scheme under the current application. Members generally had no objection to the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio and building height restrictions.

72. 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 14.1.2026, 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 an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;

- (b) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the updated Sewerage Impact Assessment in condition (a) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the submission of Land Contamination Assessment 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 Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) the submission of a revised Traffic Impact Assessment, and the implementation of the mitigation measures, if any, identified therein, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (e) the 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 Town Planning Board; and
- (f) the design and provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Ms Jessie K. P. Kwan, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[Professor T.S. Liu left the meeting and Mr Franklin Yu rejoined the meeting at this point.]

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

Agenda Item 15

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K8/50 Proposed Service Reservoir in “Green Belt” and “Open Space” Zones, Government land to the south of Lion Rock Park and to the north of Ma Chai Hang Fresh Water Service Reservoir, Wong Tai Sin, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K8/50)

74. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Water Supplies Department (WSD) and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest on the item for his former firm having current business dealings with WSD. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting

Presentation and Question Sessions

75. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr William W. L. Chan, STP/K, 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.

76. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) land use of the area surrounding the application site (the Site); and
- (b) whether visitor centre/gallery would be provided in the proposed ancillary building of the service reservoir, and whether its landscaped roof and planting area of the Site would be opened up for public enjoyment.

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

- (a) the Site was currently a vegetated and unused slope to the south of Lion Rock Park. The site surroundings were mainly vegetated slopes. To the southeast and east of the proposed ancillary building was an access road connecting to Chuk Yuen Road, and to the further east was the

existing residential cluster including Tin Wang Court and Tin Ma Court;
and

- (b) there was no provision for visitor centre/gallery in the proposed ancillary building, which was mainly intended for accommodation of cavern ventilation equipment and related electrical/fire safety facilities on G/F and 1/F. There was potential to open up the landscaped roof to the public. Should there be any request for guided tour/visit to the facilities, the Water Supplies Department (WSD) would process such requests under the established practice.

Deliberation Session

78. A Member expressed support to the application and considered that there was scope to open up the landscaped roof and organise guided tours for the public with a view to introducing the new initiative of cavern development to accommodate public facilities. Two Members supported the application and considered the suggestion on providing public education worthy to be pursued. One of the Members further provided views on the potential environmental impact of the proposed development on the underground water and said that the released site of the Diamond Hill Fresh Water and Salt Water Service Reservoirs should be better utilised. The other Member remarked that special attention should be paid to the proposed 775m-long vehicular tunnel in the detailed design to cater for the safety of those using it.

79. The Chairman concluded that Members generally had no objection to the proposed service reservoir and welcomed the proposal of accommodating public facilities in rock cavern that could release land for other uses. On environmental issue, the Chairman remarked that an Environmental Permit had been granted for the proposed development and it was confirmed that there would be no insurmountable environmental impacts, including those on the underground water table, arising from the construction and operation of the proposed facilities with effective mitigation measures in place. Regarding the future use of the released sites, there was an on-going feasibility study on proposed housing development with community facilities at the site, and any rezoning proposal would be submitted to the Town Planning Board for consideration. As regards some Members' suggestion that WSD

could consider providing visitor centre/gallery within the ancillary building for public education purpose, the Chairman said that while there might not be space available within the building for such setup, WSD could be advised to consider providing guided tours/visits for public education purpose and an advisory clause to this effect could be included in the approval. Members agreed.

80. 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 14.1.2026, 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 and vehicular access for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (b) the submission and implementation of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board.”

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

“to consider providing guided tours/visits at the proposed service reservoir for public education purpose.”

Agenda Item 16

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K12/42 Proposed Flat, Shop and Services, Eating Place, School (Kindergarten), Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) and Public Vehicle Park (Light Goods Vehicle) in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone, 35 Clear Water Bay Road, Ngau Chi Wan, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K12/42C)

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

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

Mr Franklin Yu - his firm having current business dealings with ARUP; and

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with ARUP, AGC and MVA.

83. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

84. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 28.12.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address departmental comments and to conduct further liaison with the Transport Department (TD) to address the traffic concerns. It was the fourth time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the

applicant had reviewed the traffic forecast, assessment and the proposed traffic improvement schemes.

85. 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 fourth deferment and a total of eight months had been allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, it was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted.

Agenda Item 17

Any Other Business

86. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:35 p.m.