

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 688<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 28.1.2022**

#### **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

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  
Mr T.S. So

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department  
Ms Trevina C. W. Kung

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Mr C. K. Yip

Secretary

**Absent with apologies**

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr C.H. Tse

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

**In Attendance**

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Johanna W. Y. Cheng

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Carman C. Y. Cheung

## **Opening Remarks**

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

## **Agenda Item 1**

### Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 687<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 14.1.2022

[Open Meeting]

2. The Secretary reported that subsequent to the circulation of the draft minutes of the 687<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting to Members, the following proposed amendments to paragraphs 60 and 63 were received:

“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.”

“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.”

3. The Committee agreed that the draft minutes of the 687<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 14.1.2022 were confirmed with the above amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

**Matter Arising**

[Open Meeting]

Y/H10/15            Application for Amendment to the Approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/19, to rezone the application site from “Residential (Group C)1” to “Residential (Group B)” or “Government, Institution or Community”, No. 1, 3, 5, 7, 9-11 and 13-15 Northcote Close, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong

---

4.            The Secretary reported that a letter dated 20.1.2022 from Masterplan Limited, representative of the applicant of the application (No. Y/H10/15), raising concerns on some public comments was received and circulated to Members before the meeting on 27.1.2022. The application was scheduled for consideration by MPC on 18.2.2022.

5.            The letter raised that the (i) authenticity of some public comments was in doubt and requested the Board to investigate, and (ii) that two comments appeared to be submitted by the same person and hence should be counted as a duplicate submission.

6.            Regarding (i), according to the general practice by the Board set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 30B (TPB-PG No.30B), the provision of the particulars of commenters for planning applications was to facilitate communication with the Secretary of the Board and relevant government departments, and was advisory in nature. Hence, the identity of the commenters for planning applications would not be subject to verification. Nevertheless, the Board would consider the substance and concerns raised rather than the quantity of public comments received.

7.            Regarding (ii), the Secretariat had further reviewed the two concerned comments (No. 121 and 122). As they were submitted by the same person within the same publication period, they would be combined and treated as one comment received. The comments available for public inspection had been updated accordingly.

8.            The Committee noted and agreed that the Secretariat would act on behalf of the Committee to reply to the letter with the aforementioned points.

**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Item 3**

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/H1/2                    Application for Amendment to the Draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H1/21, To rezone the application site from “Government, Institution or Community”, “Green Belt” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “Government, Institution or Community (2)”, Inland Lot 7704 RP (Part) and Government Land  
(MPC Paper No. Y/H1/2A)

---

9.                    The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the University of Hong Kong (HKU). MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) and WSP Hong Kong Limited (WSP) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung<br><i>(the vice-chairman)</i> | - | being the Chairman of the Accounting Advisory Board of School of Business, HKU;  |
| Professor Roger C.K. Chan                         | - | being an Honorary Associate Professor of HKU;  |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law                                | - | being an Adjunct Associate Professor of HKU;   |
| Professor John C.Y. Ng                            | - | being an Adjunct Professor of HKU;   |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho                                 | - | being an advisor of a construction firm having business dealings with HKU and having current business dealings with MVA; and |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai                                  | - | his former firm having current business dealings with HKU and WSP.   |

10.                    The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferral of consideration of the application. Professor Roger C.K. Chan and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung had not yet joined the meeting. As the interests of Ms Lilian S.K. Law and Professor John C.Y. Ng were indirect, and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

11. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 12.1.2022 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.

12. 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 three 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.

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

#### **Agenda Item 4**

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

[Open Meeting]

A/K1/263 Proposed Hotel and Related Tourism Development (Amendments to an Approved Master Layout Plan) in "Comprehensive Development Area" Zone, The Former Marine Police Headquarters Site, Junction of Canton Road and Salisbury Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K1/263)

---

13. The Secretary reported that the application was located in Tsim Sha Tsui. The application was submitted by Flying Snow Limited, which was a subsidiary of CK Hutchison Holdings Limited (CKHH). KTA Planning Limited (KTA) was one of consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Ms Trevina C.W. Kung - her spouse being an employee of CK Asset Holdings Limited, which was related to CKHH;  
(as Assistant Director  
(Regional 1), Lands  
Department)
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with CKHH;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA; and
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsim Sha Tsui.

14. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferral of consideration of the application. As the interest of Ms Trevina C.W. Kung was direct, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. As the interest of Mr Daniel K.S. Lau was indirect, and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the application and 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 they could stay in the meeting.

15. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 17.1.2022 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.

16. 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, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 5**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting] (Presentation and Question Sessions only)

A/K5/842                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Office, Shop and Services and Eating Place Uses in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (2)” Zone, 868-888 Cheung Sha Wan Road, Kowloon (MPC Paper No. A/K5/842A)

---

17.                      The Secretary reported that Wong & Ouyang (Hong Kong) Limited (WOHK) was one of the consultants of the applicant.    The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                  |   |   |
|------------------|---|---|
| Mr Franklin Yu   | - | having current business dealings with WOHK; and             |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his former firm having current business dealings with WOHK. |

18.                      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, 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 (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung joined the meeting during the presentation session.]

20.                      Some Members raised the following questions:



- (a) whether the at-grade open space was for public use;
- (b) whether the landscaped podium gardens were for public use;
- (c) whether the proposed setback from Cheung Sha Wan Road was a mandatory requirement;
- (d) whether the proposed parking spaces met the upper or lower end of the parking standard under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG);
- (e) details on pedestrian accessibility in terms of public transport and width of the pavement;
- (f) details on the District Council (DC) Members' comment in paragraph 9.1.8 of the Paper and the building height (BH) restrictions for areas in the vicinity of the application site (the Site);
- (g) details on Buildings Department (BD)'s comment that the proposed site coverage (SC) exceeded the permissible limits under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R); and
- (h) whether the proposed development met the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) requirements.

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

- (a) the applicant indicated that the at-grade open space in the eastern end of the Site would be provided with planters and trees for public enjoyment and an approval condition on the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal was recommended. The Urban Design & Landscape Section (UD&L Section) of PlanD would ensure compliance with the approved scheme in the discharge of the said approval condition;

- (b) the podium garden on 1/F was accessible to workers, customers of the commercial portion and visitors while the sky garden on 13/F would only be accessible to workers in the proposed development;
- (c) the 2m-wide building setback proposed along Cheung Sha Wan Road was in accordance with such requirement under the draft Cheung Sha Wan and Sham Shui Po Outline Development Plan (Northern Section) No. D/K5A/1B (the ODP), which was an administrative plan and not a statutory requirement under the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). PlanD would encourage the authorized persons to respect the setback requirement under the ODP and would reflect PlanD's district planning comments in this regard, during building plan submission stage;
- (d) the proposed number of parking spaces was slightly over the lower-end requirement of HKPSG and Transport Department had no adverse comment on the application;
- (e) with reference to Plan A-2 of the Paper, the MTR Cheung Sha Wan Station Exits were located at the east and west end of the pavement near the Site and pedestrians could easily access the MTR from the proposed development. There were also road crossings on Cheung Sha Wan Road in front of the Site and bus stops along Cheung Sha Wan Road. Many public transport options including mini-buses were available in the area. The existing pavement was 2.8m wide and the applicant proposed to setback 2m from the lot boundary and provide full length canopy along the frontage of the proposed development. The continuous 2m-wide canopy of about 88m long would provide weather protection for pedestrians and further enhance pedestrian comfort. Under the canopy, the applicant would select suitable tree species with narrow tree crowns to balance the need for enhancing pedestrian flow and provision of tree shading. As the applicant would be required to submit a landscape proposal under the suggested approval condition, UD&L Section would provide comments on landscape design and tree planting when vetting the landscape proposal;
- (f) at a meeting of the Planning Development and Transport Affairs Committee

under the Sham Shui Po (SSP) DC, a DC member had raised a general concern that redevelopment of the existing 12-storey tall industrial building to a new building of 130m would induce visual and air ventilation impacts to the surroundings. It was explained at the DC meeting that despite the proposed relaxation of plot ratio (PR) restriction for the proposed development, the proposed BH of 130mPD complied with the BH restriction under the OZP. With reference to Plan A-1, the area to the north of Cheung Sha Wan Road would be subject to a BH restriction of 130mPD while the area to the south would be subject to a BH restriction of 120mPD;

- (g) according to BD's comments, with reference to the First Schedule of the B(P)R for Class A sites, the proposed SC would exceed the permissible limit. However, application for flexibility in determining SC under the B(P)R20 might be considered by BD subject to compliance with relevant criteria under PNAP-132; and
- (h) the applicant had included calculations on façade length and building separation to demonstrate preliminary compliance with the building permeability requirement under the SBDG in the submission. BD had no in-principle objection to the application and indicated that detailed comments on compliance with SBDG, inter alia, would be formulated at building plan submission stage.

### Deliberation Session

22. Members generally appreciated the proposed design scheme which provided ample greenery, public spaces, full length canopy, building recess and gaps at the eastern and western ends of the Site to improve air ventilation and permeability. The proposed scheme was considered to be a good reference for other applications. Two Members had some concerns that the proposed tree plantings within the setback area might hinder pedestrian flow and suggested that trees might be planted outside the setback area and opined that it might be good to provide street furniture (i.e. benches or chairs) under the canopy. However, other Members noted that areas outside the canopy fell within Government land and any tree planting proposals would be subject to agreement of the Transport Department or Highways Department. Since a

landscape clause was recommended as an approval condition, the details of tree plantings and any seating if proposed, would be further considered by UD&L Section when the applicant submitted the landscape proposal.

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 28.1.2026, 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 traffic impact assessment report and implementation of traffic mitigation measures identified therein for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and provision of vehicular access, vehicle parking spaces, loading/unloading facilities and maneuvering spaces for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) 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;
- (d) the submission of land contamination assessments in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to development of the site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (e) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

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

set out at Appendix IV of the Paper.

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

## **Agenda Item 6**

### Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/845                      Shop and Services in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business (3)"  
Zone, Portion of Factory No. 6, G/F, Elite Industrial Centre, No. 883  
Cheung Sha Wan Road, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/845)

---

25.            The Committee noted that the applicants' representative requested on 14.1.2022 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address comments from the Fire Services Department. It was the first time that the applicants requested deferment of the application.

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

**Agenda Item 7**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/846                      Shop and Services (Fast Food Counter & Local Provisions store) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (3)” Zone, Portion of Factory No. 6, G/F, Elite Industrial Centre, No. 883 Cheung Sha Wan Road, Kowloon (MPC Paper No. A/K5/846)

---

27.                      The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 14.1.2022 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address comments from the Fire Services Department. It was the first time that the applicants requested deferment of the application.

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

[Mr K.S. Ng, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 8**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/TW/529                      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, 46-48 Pak Tin Par Street, Tsuen Wan, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/529A)

---

29.                      The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Tsuen Wan. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi                      -    his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and
- Professor John C.Y. Ng                      -    his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.

30.                      As the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi’s spouse and the property owned by Professor John C.Y. Ng’s spouse had no direct view of the Site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

31.                      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 had no objection to the application.

32.                      Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a)    any comparison with similar approved applications in terms of floor-to-floor height;
  - (b)    details on the additional design merits and planning gains as compared with the previously approved scheme under application No. A/TW/517;

- (c) whether the height of the transfer plate was a valid justification for relaxation of the building height (BH);
- (d) details on the street improvement design and dimensions of the canopy;
- (e) how the opening of the garden and seating areas in the upper floors for public use could be ensured and what the operating hours were;
- (f) whether there was any information on the structural engineering aspect (i.e. columns layout) for the proposed development;
- (g) why the full-height setback was reduced from 2m-wide in the approved scheme to 1m-wide in the current scheme; and
- (h) whether the applicant would use recycled water for irrigation.

33. In response, Mr K.S. Ng, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) as shown in Appendix V of the Paper, there were 8 similar applications approved for minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) restriction under the Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). For those similar applications for workshop use, the typical proposed floor heights were from 4.08m to 4.95m which were comparable to the proposed floor-to-floor height of 4.1m under the subject application. There was one additional approved application for proposed minor relaxation of both PR and BH restrictions for data centre with typical floor height of 5.8m to accommodate extra high headroom for data centre use. A planning application for proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction in Kowloon Bay, which was considered in July 2020, had included an assessment which mentioned that the typical floor height of newly completed commercial buildings in Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong ranged from 4.2 to 4.8m. These figures would be a reference given no similar application for proposed minor relaxation of BH for commercial buildings in Tsuen Wan;



- (b) compared with the previously approved application (No. A/TW/517) for non-polluting industrial use, the current scheme would have additional greenery (about 26.76% of the total site area) even though the minimum requirement on greenery coverage under Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) was not applicable to the Site (being less than 1,000m<sup>2</sup> in site area). Different from the previous scheme, the applicant also proposed podium gardens/seating area on 1/F to 4/F which could be accessible to the public, and these could be regarded as additional planning gain/design merit of the current scheme;
- (c) a transfer plate was commonly designed for transition between the shop and services podium and office tower and the relevant government departments had no adverse comments on the proposed 2m high transfer plate;
- (d) as compared with the existing industrial building on the Site, the proposed office development would help promote visual interest and pedestrian comfort with adoption of terraced podium and articulated building edges/facades and landscape treatments including vertical greening, podium and sky gardens, outdoor seating areas and landscaped balconies. The applicant proposed a 1m-full-height setback on G/F along Pak Tin Par Street with provision of full length canopy for weather protection;
- (e) the outdoor seating areas on 2/F and 3/F abutted the shop and services and eating place floors and public could access those floors via lifts and stairs. The sky garden on 4/F could also be accessible through lifts and stairs. Those podium and sky gardens were not public open space but were open space within a private development and the applicant proposed that public access could be allowed. At the General Building Plan (GBP) submission stage, PlanD would ensure that the GBP was in accordance with the proposed scheme under the application, if approved. The Buildings Department would be the authority to enforce any non-compliance with the approved GBP. The applicant had not provided information on the opening hours of the podium and sky gardens and outdoor seating areas;

- (f) the applicant did not provide floor plans showing details of the column structures in the planning application. However, it was common to have wider columns for the commercial podium as compared with the office tower and a transfer plate was needed between the two portions of the building;
- (g) since the proposed development had changed from industrial to commercial, the means of escape, car parking and loading/unloading (L/UL) requirements had also changed accordingly. As shown in Drawing A-10b, there were additional carlifts, escalators for pedestrian, and more Light Goods Vehicles (LGV) to be provided on G/F to meet the standard. As the Site was relatively small and needed to accommodate additional transport facilities and means of escape on the G/F, the applicant had proposed a setback of 1m-wide in the current scheme; and
- (h) the applicant had not considered using recycled water for irrigation at the proposed development at the current stage.

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

### Deliberation Session

34. Noting that the Site was relatively small with technical constraints of meeting the standard requirements for parking facilities and means of escapes, Members generally considered that the applicant had endeavoured to propose a development with creative design of semi-public podium gardens on the upper floors of the building with voluntary setback, full length canopy along the façade and enhanced greening ratio. All Members appreciated the provision of podium and sky gardens on upper levels that were accessible to the public. However, the applicant had not provided the opening hours in the submission and some Members had concern on whether those gardens/outdoor seating areas would be accessible to the public at reasonable hours. A Member also considered that the use of recycled water for irrigating the landscaping features should be encouraged. To address Members' concerns, the Chairman suggested and Members agreed to include (i) an approval condition to specify that the sky and podium gardens and outdoor seating areas on 1/F to 4/F to be opened and accessible

to the public at reasonable hours and (ii) an advisory clause to encourage the use of recycled water for irrigation.

35. 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 28.1.2026, 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 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;
- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works as identified in the updated SIA for the proposed development in condition (b) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of land contamination assessments in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to development of the Site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (e) the sky and podium gardens and seating areas on 1/F to 4/F of the proposed development to be opened and accessible to the public at reasonable hours to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

36. 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 explore the possibility of using recycled water for irrigating the landscaping features in the proposed development.”

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

### **Agenda Item 9**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/530 Columbarium in “Government, Institution or Community (4)” Zone, Level 2 and Extension, Hoi Wui Tap, Western Monastery, Lo Wai, Tsuen Wan (Lot No. 1461 (part) and 1499 (part) in D.D. 453)  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/530)

---

37. The Secretary reported that the application was for a columbarium in Tsuen Wan. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                        |   |   |
|------------------------|---|---|
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai       | - | his former firm being the legal advisor of the Private Columbaria Licensing Board (PCLB); |
| Mr Stanley T.S. Choi   | - | his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and         |
| Professor John C.Y. Ng | - | his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.  |

38. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferral of consideration of the application. As the interest of Mr Alex T.H. Lai in relation to PCLB was indirect, and the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi's spouse and the property owned by Professor John C.Y. Ng's spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

39. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 21.1.2022 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address comments from the Transport Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

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

[Mr Daniel K.S. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 10**

### **Section 16 Application**

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

A/KC/476

Further Consideration of Section 16 Application

Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Non-Polluting Industrial Use (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of Dangerous Goods) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone, 94-100 Ta Chuen Ping Street, Kwai Chung, New Territories

(MPC Paper No. A/KC/476B)

---

41. The Secretary reported that KTA Planning Limited (KTA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had declared an interest on the item for being a member of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA. The Committee noted that Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had already left the meeting.

## Presentation and Question Sessions

42. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the reconsideration of the application, deferral decision of the Committee on 27.8.2021, further information on the greening and landscape design of the proposed development, departmental comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department maintained its previous view of having no objection to the application.

43. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) details on the greenery calculation;
- (b) location of the non-building area (NBA);
- (c) information on tree planting and planters in the NBA and the width of the pedestrian passageway thereat;
- (d) whether the podium garden on 2/F would be accessible for public and would that be a factor for considering the application; and
- (e) details of the proposed canopy.

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

- (a) the applicant had proposed planters, edge planters, vertical greening and roof greenery, and the total greenery area was increased to 27% as compared with 20.3% of the scheme considered by the Committee on 27.8.2021, notwithstanding that not all the greenery provisions were counted towards the greening ratio under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG);
- (b) as shown on Plan FA-2, the NBA (i.e. setback of 3.5m from the Ta Chuen Ping Street) was a statutory requirement stipulated under the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and was for the long-term road widening and improvement of air

ventilation for the area;

- (c) to address Members' concern in the previous MPC meeting, the tree plantings were relocated from the NBA on G/F to the 2/F podium. A series of 1m-wide planters and shrub plantings were provided within the NBA (3.5m-wide) at grade and there were diagonal paths between the planters to enhance pedestrian flow to the pavement. It was generally considered that the revised landscaping proposal could strike a balance between enhancing pedestrian circulation and comfort of pedestrian. The detailed long-term road widening proposal was yet to be worked out but yet with the 3.5m-wide NBA and the existing 2.5m-wide footpath, there would be a pedestrian passageway with an overall width of about 6m in the interim stage. It was understood that the Transport Department (TD) would be responsible for the design of the road widening proposal while the Highways Department (HyD) would be responsible for implementation and maintenance of road works. Both TD and HyD had no adverse comment on the current proposal within the NBA;
- (d) the podium garden on 2/F would only be opened to users of the proposed development. While each application was assessed on its individual merits, provision of podium garden for public use might not be considered as a mandatory requirement for approving similar applications. The setback area for some applications was not proposed to be opened to public due to technical constraints and safety concerns; and
- (e) a 1.5m-wide canopy (over 30m in length) was proposed along almost the entire building façade at Ta Chuen Ping Street. The canopy would overhang above portion of the NBA. Due to site level difference, the vertical clearance of the canopy from ground level ranged from about 3.5m at the eastern portion to about 6m at the western portion.

#### Deliberation Session

45. Members generally considered that the revised scheme had been improved to

address the previous comments of the Committee made at its meeting on 27.8.2021. However, a few Members, whilst not objecting to the application, commented that the proposed planters within the NBA might segregate the NBA from the existing road pavement and might not be effective in improving pedestrian circulation. A Member also considered that the canopy was not wide enough for weather protection in the area particularly for the portion with a clearance of 6m-tall. For the areas with 6m-clearance, tree planting could be a better option to provide shading and greenery effects to pedestrians. Another Member asked whether TD and HyD could possibly co-operate with the applicant in integrating the NBA and the footpath in the future road widening scheme. The Chairman remarked that TD and HyD would need to plan and implement the road widening plan in a comprehensive and consistent manner for the whole area and the road improvement plan would be rather long-term.

46. A Member asked whether there were concerns on the consistency of the Committee's decision for similar applications as there were different views on whether tree plantings within the NBA was considered acceptable for the subject application and that considered under agenda item 5. The Chairman said that each application should be assessed on its individual merits based on its site constraint and context. For example, for the planning application considered under agenda item 5, that site had a much longer frontage compared to the subject site and only a few widely spaced out trees were proposed within the NBA. The Chairman further said that for the current application, Members previously had no objection to the application but considered that the applicant should be requested to provide further information on greening proposal within the NBA, and the applicant had endeavoured to address Members' concern based on the circumstances of the site.

47. Members generally considered that there was still room for improving the canopy design and the greening proposal in the NBA. The Chairman suggested and Members agreed to include advisory clauses to encourage the applicant to improve the design of the canopy to ensure better weather protection for pedestrians and explore ways to improve the greening proposal (including location of the planters to facilitate pedestrian flow) within the NBA during the detailed design stage.

48. 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 28.1.2026, 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 submission of an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the updated Sewerage Impact Assessment in (b) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (d) the submission of a 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 the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB.”

49. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix F-VIII of the Paper with the following additional advisory clauses:

- “(a) to improve the design of the canopy for better weather protection for pedestrians; and
- (b) to explore ways to improve the greening proposal (including location of the planters) to facilitate pedestrian flow within the non-building area during the detailed design stage.”

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting during the deliberation session.]

[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 11**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/KC/486                      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, 66-72 Lei Muk Road, Kwai Chung, New Territories (MPC Paper No. A/KC/486A)

---

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

51.                      The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferral of consideration of the application and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had already left the meeting.

52.                      The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 21.1.2022 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address further departmental comments. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including revised Traffic Impact Assessment and Sewerage Impact Assessment, updated floor plans/artist impressions/landscape plans and technical clarifications to address departmental comments.

53.                      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.

**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Item 12**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H3/442 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Office, Shop and Services and Eating Place Uses in “Commercial” Zone, 92-103A Connaught Road West and 91, 99 & 101 Des Voeux Road West, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/442C)

---

54. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Sai Ying Pun/Sheung Wan. Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) and Ronald Lu & Partners (RLP) 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 RLP;                                   |
| Mr Franklin Yu            | - | having current business dealings with ARUP;   |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai          | - | his former firm having current business dealings with ARUP and RLP;                   |
| Mr C.H. Tse               | - | being the voluntary company secretary of the Hong Kong News-Expo in Sai Ying Pun; and |
| Professor Roger C.K. Chan | - | his spouse owning a flat in Sai Ying Pun.   |

55. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferral of consideration of the application. Messrs. Thomas O.S. Ho and C.H. Tse and Professor Roger C.K. Chan had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting while 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.

56. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 13.1.2022 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to refine the proposed design and to address departmental comments. It was the fourth time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments and public comments.

57. 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.

[Ms Floria Y. T. Tsang, Senior Town Planner/ Hong Kong District (STP/HK), Ms Chillie T.L. So, Town Planner/Hong Kong District (TP/HK), and Ms Candy C. Y. Ho, Senior Engineer/ Transport Department (Sr Engr/ TD), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 13**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/H5/417            Proposed Residential cum Commercial Development with Minor Relaxation of Domestic Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions in "Residential (Group E)" Zone, 269 Queen's Road East, Wan Chai, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H5/417)

---

58. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Wan Chai. The application was submitted by the Land Supply Section of Lands Department (LandsD). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Ms Trevina C.W. Kung - being the Assistant Director (Regional 1) of  
(as Assistant Director LandsD;  
(Regional 1), Lands  
Department)
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings  
with LandsD; and
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - his spouse serving an honorary post at Ruttonjee  
Hospital in Wan Chai.

59. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the interest of Ms Trevina C.W. Kung was direct, the Committee agreed that she should leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As the interest of Ms Lilian S.K. Law was indirect, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

[Ms Trevina C.W. Kung left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

60. 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.

61. Some Members raised the following questions:

#### *Building Height and Plot Ratio*

- (a) the rationale for imposing the building height (BH) restriction of 100mPD on the “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) zoning of the Site on Outline Zoning Plan (OZP);
- (b) the permissible plot ratio (PR) for the Site under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) and the PRs of nearby developments;
- (c) whether there were other private land zoned “R(E)” on the OZP and the reasons for imposing PR restriction on the Site;

- (d) whether the future developer could seek planning permission for further relaxation of the PR and/or BH restrictions after the land was sold;
- (e) whether there would be potential to provide some floor space (say 5% of domestic gross floor area (GFA)) for Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities;

Traffic and Parking

- (f) whether the proposed car parking spaces were for public use and the proposed number of spaces;
- (g) whether approval conditions were suggested regarding provision of car parking spaces, ways to alleviate the congested traffic conditions near the Site especially at Queen's Road East, and whether the proposed development would affect the existing on-street metered parking near the Site;

Others

- (h) details on the planning merits; and
- (i) information on how photographic recording of the existing Lui Kee Education Service Centre as advised by Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) would be conducted.

62. In response, Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, STP/HK, and Ms Candy C.Y. Ho, Sr Engr/TD, made the following main points:

Building Height and Plot Ratio

- (a) the BH restriction of 100mPD had taken into account the BH restrictions/profile of the existing developments in the surrounding areas. The adjacent "Residential (Group A)" ("R(A)") sites along the Queen's Road East were first stipulated with BH restriction of 100mPD on the draft Wan

Chai OZP No. S/H5/26 in 2010. In 2018, according to the Court's rulings on two judicial review applications and the related appeals, the BH restrictions were further reviewed and the BH restriction of the "R(A)" sites along the Queen's Road East had been relaxed to 110mPD taking account of the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG). During the BH review in 2018, the "R(E)" site was also reviewed and it was considered that the BH restriction of 100mPD needed not be amended as it could allow accommodation of the maximum PR under the OZP meeting the SBDG requirements;

- (b) if there was no PR restriction on the Site, the Site, being a Class B site, might be allowed to be developed with a maximum domestic PR of 9 under B(P)R. There was no PR restriction stipulated on the OZP for the "R(A)" sites along Queen's Road East and their development intensities would be controlled under the B(P)R;
- (c) there were only two "R(E)" sites including the Site and the Wan Chai Polyclinic site located further south on the Wan Chai OZP. Both sites were on Government land and identified as potential private housing sites. The "R(E)" zoning with maximum PR would facilitate appropriate planning control over the development scale, design and layout of the development, taking into account various environmental, traffic, visual, air ventilation and other infrastructural constraints;
- (d) the key development parameters of the scheme, if approved, would be incorporated in the land sale document and the Government would not normally allow modification to the key development parameters shortly after land sale. However, the developer could seek planning permission from the Town Planning Board for any amendments to the scheme;
- (e) based on the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines requirements, the planned provision for GIC facilities within Wan Chai OZP area was generally adequate to meet the demand of the planned population, except for the shortfall in Residential Care Homes for the Elderly. Also, the Site was

relatively small and there was already a “G/IC” cluster in the Morrison Hill nearby, hence no GIC facilities were proposed at the Site. Under the “R(E)” zone, social welfare facilities were always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building but there was no provision to exempt them from GFA calculation. The feasibility of adding GIC facilities and the related amendment to the scheme might require new technical assessments;

Traffic and Parking

- (f) the proposed car parking spaces were ancillary facilities for the building development and not for public use. Based on the scheme, there would be 26 car parking spaces, 3 motorcycle parking spaces and 3 loading/unloading (L/UL) bays. It was considered necessary for the proposed development to be self-sufficient in the provision of parking and L/UL facilities so that it would not put pressure on usage of car parking spaces in the surroundings. The ingress/egress was proposed at Kennedy Street instead of the busy Queen’s Road East;
- (g) in terms of traffic aspect, approval conditions on the submission of a Traffic Review Report and a Construction Traffic Impact Assessment and that relating to provision of car parking spaces, L/UL facilities and access arrangement were recommended to be imposed if the planning application was approved. The future developer was required to discharge the planning conditions to the satisfaction of TD. Besides, when the future developer submitted General Building Plan (GBP) for the proposed development, TD would also review the ingress/egress and the parking layout to ensure traffic safety in the vicinity and the design of adequate waiting space for any car lift to avoid queuing back onto public roads. There was no on-street metered parking in the vicinity of the Site;
- (h) the road improvement measures related to the Hopewell Phase II development targeted for completion in 2023 would improve the capacity at the junction of Kennedy Road and Queen’s Road East;

Others



- (i) a number of design merits were proposed such as about 10m and about 5m setbacks from Queen's Road East and Kennedy Street respectively, and the provision of covered landscape area on 3/F for residents' use and to improve air ventilation and visual impact; and
- (j) AMO's comment on conducting photographic recording would be included as advisory clause for the applicant (LandsD) to note. Further details on how to conduct photographic recording and its responsibility would be discussed among relevant departments when formulating the land sale document.

### Deliberation Session

63. Members generally supported the application for relaxation of PR as it would allow better utilization of land to increase housing land supply, and the relaxation of BH restriction as it was generally compatible with that of the surrounding developments and would not have adverse visual impacts. One Member considered that there might be room to reduce the number of L/UL facilities and one Member opined that the land disposal should be expedited. The Committee noted that the proposed PR and BH were considered optimal by the applicant taking account of capacities of existing infrastructures and the technical assessments, and that the Site had been included in the 2021-22 Land Sale Programme for disposal.

64. Two Members noted and generally agreed with the AMO's comment that as the Lui Kee Education Service Centre at the Site was built in 1960, it might have potential heritage value, and agreed that there should be proper photographic record of the building as suggested by AMO. One of the Members further suggested to open up the Site for public visit before its demolition. The Chairman said that Members' comments would be conveyed to LandsD for their consideration.

65. 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 28.1.2026, 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 inclusion of the requirements of submission of a traffic review report and implementation of mitigation measures identified therein in the lease conditions of the Site to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and provision of car parking spaces, loading/unloading facilities and access arrangement for the proposed development to the satisfaction of Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of Construction Traffic Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of an updated Traffic Noise Impact Assessment and implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (e) the implementation of the sewer connection and upgrading works identified in the Sewage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, STP/HK, Ms Chillie T.L. So, TP/HK, and Ms Candy C.Y. Ho, Sr Engr/TD, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

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

[Ms Trevina C.W. Kung rejoined the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 14**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/H8/433                      Proposed Office in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pier” Zone, Shop B, Ground Floor, North Point (East) Ferry Pier, North Point, Hong Kong (MPC Paper No. A/H8/433)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

67.                      With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr K.T. Ng, 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 on a temporary basis for a period of five years.

68.                      Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a)    noting the comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) that there was existing constraint on electricity supply at the pier, whether the proposed office use could be supported in terms of electricity loading;
- (b)    whether the proposed office use would have sewerage impacts;
- (c)    whether it was viable for potential tenants if the approval was only granted on a temporary basis of five years; and
- (d)    the reason why businesses did not continue to operate at the pier despite having obtained planning permissions.

69.                      In response, Mr K.T. Ng, STP/HK, made the following main points:

- (a)    as advised by C for T (Ferry and Paratransit Division), the proposed office (as compared to eating place) was considered as a low electricity consumption use. Having assessed the application and the estimated electricity consumption provided by the applicant, C for T considered that the application would not affect the ferry operation and supported the application

from ferry operations point of view;

- (b) as the proposed premises could be connected to the existing public sewers, both the Environmental Protection Department and Drainage Services Department had no adverse comment on the application;
- (c) although the premises was currently vacant and not used for pier operation, it was considered not appropriate to allow for a permanent office use as there was a possibility that the premises could be for other uses which were more related to supporting the ferry services. In order not to jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the zone and to allow flexibility in the use of the pier to meet future requirements, a temporary approval of five years was recommended to encourage better utilisation of the premises; and
- (d) some approved applications for retail shop and office at the pier had commenced and operated for a period of time, and subsequent closures were business decision of the operators. A few planning permissions had not commenced due to failure to comply with approval conditions relating to fire fighting and fire service installations.

### Deliberation Session

70. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of five years until 28.1.2027, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition:

“ the provision of fire service installations and equipment to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr K.T. Ng, STP/HK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong District (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 15**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/H17/141            Proposed Minor Relaxation of Site Coverage Restriction for Permitted Flat Use in “Residential (Group C) 5” Zone, 92 Repulse Bay Road, Repulse Bay, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H17/141A)

---

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

72.            With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Rico W.K. 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.

73.            In response to a Member’s enquiry on the building height (BH) of the proposed development, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, STP/HK, said that the BH of the proposed development was 53.3mPD (4 storeys above 1 storey of carports) and the absolute BH was 10.5m that would not exceed the BH control of 35ft under the lease. Under the Outline Zoning Plan, the application site was subject to a maximum BH of 4 storeys above 1 storey of carports.

#### **Deliberation Session**

74.            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 28.1.2026, 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 condition:

“            the submission and implementation of a diversion proposal to the sewer main

at the site to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB”

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

### **Agenda Item 16**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/H18/88 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Site Coverage for Permitted Flat Use in  
“Residential (Group C) 5” Zone, 19 Tai Tam Road, Stanley, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H18/88)

---

76. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was in Stanley. Dr Lawrence Poon had declared an interest on the item as his close relative’s residence had direct view of the Site, and the Committee agreed that he should leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting at this point.]

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

77. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Rico W.K. 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.

78. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the building bulk, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, STP/HK, explained that the building height (BH) had decreased from the existing level of 74.5mPD to the proposed level of 71.15mPD as the proposed scheme had a lower site formation level as compared with that of the existing building. The proposed scheme would provide a setback of the residential building (above the 2/F) from the site boundary facing Tai Tam Road. The proposed minor relaxation of site coverage restriction was to allow more design flexibility for the proposed development while the maximum plot ratio and BH would not be exceeded.

Deliberation Session

79. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 28.1.2026, 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 a Noise Impact Assessment and the implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (b) the submission of a Natural Terrain Hazard Study and the implementation of any necessary hazard mitigation measures to the satisfaction of the Director of Civil Engineering and Development or of the TPB.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr Rico W. K. Tsang, STP/HK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]





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

### **Agenda Item 18**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K14/811            Proposed Public Utility Installation (Underground Stormwater Storage Tank with Ancillary Aboveground Structures) in "Open Space" Zone, Lower Sau Nga Road Playground, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/811)

---

85.            The Secretary reported that AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) 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 AECOM; and
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	-	his former firm having current business dealings with AECOM.

86.            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.

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

87.            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 (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

88. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed development could be developed in phases;
- (b) function of the screen at the blower room;
- (c) whether the applicant would use recycled water for irrigation; and
- (d) which department would be responsible for the design of open space in the proposed development and whether there would be any other covered areas.

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

- (a) as the underground storage tank would occupy almost the entire site, there would be constraint for phased development and it could not shorten the construction time. When conducting site selection for the underground stormwater storage tank, the applicant had taken into account that the only existing facility on the Site to be affected would be one 7-a-side- soccer pitch while the other site options would involve more facilities to be affected. During construction at the application site (the Site), the public could still use similar recreation facilities located at the Upper Sau Nga Road Playground and the Hiu Kwong Street Children's Playground to its north and south respectively;
- (b) although the exact detail was not yet certain, the applicant, i.e. Drainage Services Department (DSD) noted from the MPC's previous deliberation on a similar application in Tsim Sha Tsui in that Members had suggested to incorporate public education exhibits in the development so as to enhance public knowledge of the importance of water resources and water conservation. Hence, information display at the proposed blower room would be provided to introduce the stormwater storage scheme for

educational purpose (subject to review in the detailed design stage);

- (c) the proposed public utility facility could effectively protect low-lying areas from flooding, it would intercept and store stormwater in the storage tank during extreme rainstorm event and stormwater as collected would serve as water supplement for the Tsui Ping River to maintain its streamflow for the enhancement of the appearance of the river during dry seasons. DSD would consider the technical feasibility to use recycled water for irrigation during the detailed design stage; and
- (d) DSD would be the project proponent for the proposed development and they had consulted the Leisure and Cultural Services Department on the layout and design of the open space facilities, which might be further refined if there were comments from the relevant stakeholders. There were seating amenities with cover (installed with solar panel) at the western side of the Site and some covered seatings on the ground level of the multi-purpose building at the south of the Site.

### Deliberation Session

90. Members generally supported the proposed development as it could provide essential drainage service while the recreational use/open space could be re-provisioned. Members also appreciated the applicant's initiative to include some information within the proposed development to educate the public on the importance of water resource and the drainage facilities. Two Members considered that the design could be further enhanced and improved in terms of layout arrangement for better sun shading for the soccer pitch, more creative open space facilities and design, etc. A Member suggested the applicant to consider providing urban farming on top of the facility to enhance the neighbourhood relationship. Members generally considered that the application was a good reference for other project proponents of similar projects.

91. 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 28.1.2026, 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 implementation of the layout plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of landscape proposal and tree preservation and removal proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

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

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

### **Agenda Item 19**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

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

---

93. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kowloon Tong. Aurecon Hong Kong Ltd. (Aurecon) was one 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 Aurecon; and
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Kowloon Tong.

94. The Committee noted that 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.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

95. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr C.H. Mak, 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.

96. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

97. A Member showed support to the application as the proposal was improved compared to the previous scheme. Members noted that the licensing for Residential Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE) would be under Social Welfare Department (SWD)'s purview and SWD would monitor operations of RCHEs and quality of services provided for the elderly.

98. 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 28.1.2026, 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 spaces and loading/unloading space for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;

- (b) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment in approval condition (b) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (d) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

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

**Agenda Item 20**

Any Other Business

100. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:35 p.m.