

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 701st Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 12.8.2022

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M. K. Chung

Chairman

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Assistant Commissioner/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 Wilson Y.W. Fung

Vice-chairman

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

In Attendance

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Cherry C.H. Yuen

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 700th MPC Meeting held on 29.7.2022

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 700th MPC meeting held on 29.7.2022 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/K9/19 Application for Amendment to the Approved Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/28, To rezone the application site from “Residential (Group A) 4” to “Government, Institution or Community (1)”, Hung Hom Inland Lots 238 S.F RP and 238 S.G, 37 Winslow Street, Hung Hom, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. Y/K9/19)

3. The Secretary reported that the application was for a columbarium use in Hung Hom. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Timothy K.W Ma - being a member of the Private Columbaria Appeal Board (PCAB); and

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - owning a flat in Hung Hom.

4. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferral of consideration of the application. Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interest of Mr Timothy K.W Ma in relation to PCAB was indirect, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

5. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 25.7.2022 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.

6. 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, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Messrs Franklin Yu and Paul Y.K. Au joined the meeting at this point.]

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

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

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/TWW/122 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Residential Development (Flat) in "Residential (Group B)" Zone, Lot 94 in D.D. 388 and adjoining Government Land, Castle Peak Road – Tsing Lung Tau, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/TWW/122)

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Cheryl H.L. Yeung, TP/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.

8. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the equivalent GFA increase in respect of the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) from 2.1 to 2.52;
- (b) whether the proposed modification of the footbridge ramp would affect the pedestrian connectivity and the barrier-free access of the footbridge;
- (c) details of the development programme and the temporary arrangement during the proposed modification works of the footbridge ramp;
- (d) the building height (BH) compatibility with the neighbouring residential development (i.e. Hong Kong Garden) as raised in the public comment;
- (e) regarding the similar application to the west of the application site (the Site), what minor relaxation had been approved; and
- (f) whether the proposed setback at the southern boundary of the Site fell within Government Land (GL).

9. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Ng Kar Shu, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed minor relaxation of PR by 20% would result in an increase of GFA of about 1,390m², and according to the applicant, that would allow additional 26 flats as compared to the OZP compliant scheme with PR of 2.1;
- (b) the footbridge abutting the Site provided access across Castle Peak Road and to the waterfront. The applicant proposed to modify the gradient and shorten a portion of the footbridge ramp to make room for the proposed vehicular ingress/egress to the residential development. A double deck design would be adopted and the gradient of the footbridge would not be too steep. The modified footbridge ramp would be designed and constructed to meet the requirements of the Highways Department (HyD), and an approval condition on design and provision of the modified footbridge ramp to the satisfaction of Director of Highways was

recommended. The modified footbridge ramp would be handed back to relevant departments for future management and maintenance. Pedestrian connectivity and barrier-free access facilities of the footbridge would not be affected upon completion of the proposed modification works. HyD also had plans to provide a lift at the footbridge;

- (c) according to the applicant, the proposed modification works of the footbridge ramp would be completed in 2026 tentatively before the estimated completion of the residential development in 2028. Although no detailed temporary arrangement during the footbridge modification works had been submitted by the applicant, an advisory clause was recommended to request the applicant to provide appropriate temporary traffic arrangement to demonstrate that the barrier-free access of the footbridge could be maintained during the proposed modification works of the footbridge ramp;
- (d) as shown on Plan A-1 of the Paper, the Site fell within “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) zone on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) subject to a BH restriction of 60mPD. The abutting Hong Kong Garden site fell within “R(B)1” zone that was subject to BH restrictions of 60mPD to 120mPD stepping up from the waterfront to the hillside. Although the existing low-rise residential portion of Hong Kong Garden to the north of the Site was 3 to 4 storeys in height, it was subject to a BH restriction of 60mPD on the OZP (i.e. same as that of the Site). The current application was in compliance with the BH restriction;
- (e) the similar application (No. A/TWW/107) was approved for minor relaxation of PR from 2.1 to 2.52 (+20%) and site coverage (SC) from 17.5% to 20.2% (+15%); and
- (f) as shown on Plan A-2 of the Paper, the proposed setback at the southern boundary currently fell within GL which the applicant proposed to form part of the Site. Subject to future land exchange application, the applicant proposed to provide setback area for widening the pavement.

[Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui joined the meeting during the question and answer session.]

Deliberation Session

10. The Chairman remarked that the subject application was for minor relaxation of PR for permitted residential development at the Site and the Committee had previously approved a similar application (with minor relaxation of both PR and SC) on a site further west. Members generally had no objection to the application. Members noted that the applicant had not applied for minor relaxation of BH restriction and the proposed floor-to-floor height for domestic floors was about 3.15m.

11. 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 12.8.2026, 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 provision of the modified footbridge ramp fronting the application site, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways 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; and
- (d) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the updated SIA in condition (c) to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

12. 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 Ng Kar Shu, STP/TWK, and Ms Cheryl H.L. Yeung, TP/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H7/183 Proposed Office, Shop and Services and Eating Place in “Residential
(Group A)” Zone, 8 Leighton Road, Causeway Bay, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H7/183)

13. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Wong Nai Chung. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung - co-owning with spouse a flat in Wong Nai
(Chairman) Chung; and

Ms Lilian S.K. Law - co-owning with spouse a flat in Wong Nai
Chung.

14. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferral of consideration of the application. As the properties co-owned by Mr Ivan M.K. Chung and his spouse, and Ms Lilian S.K. Law and her 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 5.8.2022 deferment of consideration of the application for one month so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address comments of the Transport Department. 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 one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 6

Any Other Business

17. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 9:30 a.m..