

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 711th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 13.1.2023**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M. K. Chung

Chairman

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong,
Transport Department
Mr Horace W. Hong

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory S) (Acting),
Environmental Protection Department
Miss Queenie Y.C. Ng

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 Wilson Y.W. Fung

Vice-chairman

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

In Attendance

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

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Alex M.K. Choi

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 710th MPC Meeting held on 23.12.2022

[Open Meeting]

1. The Secretary reported that subsequent to the circulation of the draft minutes of the 710th MPC meeting to Members, an amendment to paragraph 15(m) incorporating a Member's comment and as shown on the screen was proposed. The Committee agreed that the minutes were confirmed with incorporation of the said amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

[Mr Clement Miu and Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, Senior Town Planners/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STPs/TWK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K1/267 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height and Site Coverage Restrictions for the Expansion of Hong Kong Science Museum and Hong Kong Museum of History in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Museums” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, 2 Science Museum Road and 100 Chatham Road South, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K1/267A)

3. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Tsim Sha Tsui (TST). Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had declared an interest on the item for his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in TST. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

4. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Clement Miu, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

[Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui joined the meeting during the presentation session.]

5. Some Members raised the following questions:

(a) noting that the proposal involved doubling of gross floor area and increase in site coverage for the new annexes with provision of additional museum

facilities, whether the current capacity of the Hong Kong Science Museum (HKScM) and Hong Kong Museum of History (HKMH) (the two Museums) had reached their limit and hence, the need for expansion as proposed by the applicant;

- (b) any estimation on the number of visitors to the two Museums upon expansion and whether the reduced open area within the Site due to the proposed increase in site coverage would be able to accommodate the anticipated increase in visitors due to the expansion proposal, especially during the weekends;
- (c) whether the proposal would adversely affect the original design features of the two Museums, and what new design features would be incorporated in the expansion proposal and their design merits;
- (d) whether the proposal included any features to enhance the open space environment, especially the provision of all-weather facilities, within the Site upon expansion;
- (e) given the presence of many other museums and heritage buildings in TST area, whether there were any proposals to enhance the connectivity of the Site with the surroundings as well as the harbourfront area; and
- (f) noting a public comment suggesting the open area of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) as an alternative site for the proposed expansion, what was the background for such proposal.

6. In response, Mr Clement Miu, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the Financial Figures 2021/22 of the two Museums, there were more than 1 million visitors to the two Museums per year. The existing capacity of the two Museums was not adequate to cope with the increasing demand and due to spatial constraints of the existing building design, there was no scope to expand the exhibition and learning facilities within the existing two Museums;

- (b) even with the increase in site coverage, there would still be about 30% of at-grade open area within the Site which was not considered unreasonable given the scale of the two Museums. According to the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) (Table 4.5 of Appendix 1b of the Paper) submitted by the applicant, the number of visitors to the two Museums upon expansion would be about 4,700 and 6,200 on weekdays and weekends respectively, and the open area within the Site was considered adequate to cater for the additional visitors;
- (c) the existing buildings of the two Museums were designed in the 1980s to 1990s and their built forms were rather enclosed and bulky with blank façades. Design features were proposed for the new annexes, e.g. the iconic circular building form of Annex 2B would foster visual prominence and interest to the townscape. The Architectural Services Department and Leisure and Cultural Services Department jointly organized a competition in 2021 to invite the interested parties to contribute ideas on the design of the annex buildings and open space within the Site and the detailed design would make reference to the winning entry of the competition;
- (d) currently, the open space within the Site was not fully all-weather. The applicant would provide canopy on some parts of the open space on the ground floor and along the central courtyard. Furthermore, the visitors would be sheltered from rain underneath the future Annex 2B;
- (e) as shown on Plans A-4 and A-5 of the Paper, three new pedestrian crossings across Granville Road were proposed to better connect the Site with the TST East area, through where visitors could reach Hung Hom Station via the existing footpaths along Science Museum Path and the elevated walkway over Cross Harbour Tunnel Toll Plaza, and to the TST waterfront promenade via the Urban Council Centenary Garden and Mody Road Garden. For access to the central area of TST, visitors could make use of the existing footbridge across Chatham Road South which would be connected to the entrance on 1/F of the future Annex 2B and central courtyard of the museum complex. It was envisaged that the overall connectivity of the Site with the surrounding areas and the pedestrian environment within and around the Site

would be enhanced. Regarding the enhancement of pedestrian connections between the two Museums and other museums and heritage clusters in TST area, while this was not within the scope of the expansion proposal, the suggestion could be conveyed to the applicant and relevant departments for consideration when opportunity arose; and

- (f) the open area of PolyU was zoned “Government, Institution or Community” on the approved Tsim Sha Tsui Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K1/28 and was planned for long-term educational use. It was considered not suitable for the proposed expansion of the two Museums.

[Ms Trevina C.W. Kung, Ms Sandy HY Wong and Messrs Franklin Yu and Paul Y.K. Au joined the meeting during the question and answer session.]

Deliberation Session

7. The Chairman remarked that the proposed expansion of the two Museums was in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Museums” zone and the proposed relaxation of building height and site coverage restrictions were not considered incompatible with the townscape of the surrounding area. There was a genuine need to expand the two Museums for enhancement of exhibition facilities to meet the world-class museum standard. In addition, the proposed expansion echoed with the prevailing policy objective of supporting development of museums, expanding the audience base and further promoting science, technology, engineering and mathematics education, history, arts and culture.

8. Members generally had no objection to the application. A Member opined that the design of the open space and pedestrian links within and around the Site should be inclusive to enable visitors with special needs to access the Site. Two Members opined that the two Museums upon expansion might become a future focal point in the area and better integration with the surrounding heritage clusters should be promoted to create synergy effect for reinforcing the attractiveness of TST area. In that regard, the Chairman suggested and Members agreed to include an advisory clause to request the applicant to consider further enhancing the connectivity of the Site with the surrounding areas with a view to promoting

synergy effect.

9. 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 13.1.2027, 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 implementation of traffic management control measure(s) and/or restriction on access arrangement and/or tree transplantation to facilitate the local traffic improvement proposal as proposed by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the revised Sewerage Impact Assessment in planning condition (b) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

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

“to note the comments of the Town Planning Board that consideration should be given in the detailed design stage to further enhance the connectivity of the application site with the surrounding areas, especially the existing museums and heritage clusters, in order to create synergy effect for reinforcing the attractiveness of the Tsim Sha Tsui area.”

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/493 Proposed Flat in Area Shown as 'Road', Lots 1232 RP, 1234 RP, 1236 RP, 1237 RP and 1239 in Survey District 4 and Adjoining Government Land, Castle Peak Road - Kwai Chung, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/493A)

11. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 30.12.2022 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to address comments from relevant Government departments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

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 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 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/KC/500 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Public Housing Development in “Residential (Group A) 2” Zone, Tai Wo Hau Road and Kwai Shing Circuit, Kwai Chung, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/500)

13. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) and the Housing Department (HD) was the executive arm of HKHA. Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (ARUP) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item :

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

Mr Franklin Yu - being a member of the Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA, and
- his firm having current business dealings with ARUP;

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau } being members of the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) which currently had discussion with HD (the executive arm of HKHA) on housing development issues; and
Ms Lilian S.K. Law }

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS which currently had discussion with HD (the executive arm of HKHA) on housing development issues.

14. The Committee noted that Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Paul Y.K. Au and Franklin Yu were direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As Ms Lilian S.K. Law and Mr Timothy K.W. Ma had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

15. 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.

16. In response to a Member's question on the availability of open space for children and community-based welfare facilities for family in the vicinity of the application site (the Site), Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, with reference to Drawings A5 to A8 of the Paper, said that the applicant had proposed communal podium gardens with seating, children's play area and open landscape decks on different levels in both Phases 1 and 2 of the proposed public housing development. As Kwai Chung was a relatively well-established community, in general sufficient open space and various community-based social welfare facilities were available to meet the needs of the local residents.

Deliberation Session

17. The Chairman recapitulated that the application was to seek planning permission for proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio and building height restrictions for permitted public housing development at the Site which fell within the "Residential (Group A)2" zone. The current proposal, having taken into account the site context, site constraints and technical feasibilities, was in line with the policy objective of optimizing the development potential of housing sites. In implementing the public housing projects, relevant government departments would co-ordinate and consider providing suitable community and social welfare facilities, including those serving the need of families, for the district as a whole.

18. While Members generally had no objection to the application, one Member expressed concerns on the lack of open space and community facilities designated for children and teenagers in new public housing estates and opined that the design of open space and community facilities should be flexible and responsive to the changing needs of the population structure. Another Member opined that given the rather long span of the proposed footbridges, consideration could be given to providing automated facilities, particularly for those in need, such as the elderly. In response, the Chairman said that Members' concerns/suggestions on the design of the housing development and the associated footbridges would be conveyed to the applicant, i.e. the Housing Department for consideration.

19. 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 13.1.2027, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (b) 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;
- (c) the submission of an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment 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 Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TWW/125 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted ‘House’ Use and Proposed Improvements on the Existing Access Road in “Residential (Group C)” and “Green Belt” Zones and area Shown as ‘Road’, 400 Castle Peak Road - Ting Kau (Lot 403 in D.D. 399) and Adjoining Government Land, Ting Kau, Tsuen Wan West, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/TWW/125)

21. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 23.12.2022 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to address comments from relevant government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr Clement Miu and Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STPs/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

[Mr Ng Kwok Tim and Ms Karmin Tong, Senior Town Planners/Hong Kong (STPs/HK), and Mr. Billy W.M. Au Yeung, Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H20/198 Proposed Driving School with Permitted Government Use (Driving Test Centre & Government Offices) and Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle) in “Government, Institution or Community (2)” Zone, At the Junction of Shing Tai Road and Sheung Mau Street, Chai Wan, Hong Kong

(MPC Paper No. A/H20/198A)

23. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Transport Department (TD). Mr Horace Hong, CTE/HK, had declared an interest on the item for being a representative of the Assistant Commissioner for Transport. As the interest of Mr Horace Hong was direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Mr Horace Hong left the meeting temporarily and Mr Franklin Yu rejoined the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

24. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Kwok Tim, 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.

[Mr Paul Y.K. Au rejoined the meeting during the presentation session.]

25. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that the current Ap Lei Chau Driving School (ALCDS) was being operated on a temporary basis, whether the proposed driving school and parking facilities at the application site (the Site) were on a permanent basis;
- (b) noting one of the public comments expressing doubt on the need to relocate ALCDS to the Site, justifications for the relocation and reasons for choosing the Site for such purpose;
- (c) noting that there were three other designated driving schools in Kowloon and the New Territories, whether the driving test demand was so substantial that warranted the reprovision of the affected ALCDS;
- (d) whether the capacity of the surrounding road network was sufficient to cater for the additional traffic generated from the proposed driving school, especially the traffic due to driving tests;
- (e) whether the proposed driving school and public vehicle park (PVP) would induce any noise impact on the residents in the vicinity; and
- (f) whether automated parking system and charging facilities for electric vehicles would be provided at the proposed PVP.

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

- (a) the proposed driving school, which was a government designated driving school, and the parking facilities would be operated on a permanent basis;
- (b) the site currently occupied by ALCDS was rezoned from “Other Specified Use” annotated “Cargo Handling Area” (“OU(Cargo Handling Area)”) to “Open Space” (“O”) on the approved Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan (the OZP) No. S/H15/33 in 2015. It was intended for open

space development in the long term and the current use of ALCDS thereat was not in line with the planning intention and hence, there was a need to relocate the driving school to a permanent site. The Site falling within an area zoned as “Government, Institution or Community(2)” on the Chai Wan OZP was identified and considered suitable for the reprovisioning of the ALCDS as the traffic flow in the Chai Wan area was relatively low;

- (c) while there was no detailed breakdown on the statistics for each designated driving school, according to the applicant, there had been a steady growth in the number of driving tests over the past decade. Besides, ALCDS was the only designated driving school located on the Hong Kong Island and it was essential to have it reprovisioned in this area in order to continue serving the needs there;
- (d) the traffic impact assessment submitted by the applicant revealed that the key junctions of the road network in the vicinity would operate within its capacity limit even with the proposed development in place. The driving training/test routes were planned with a view to avoiding the need to pass through roads and junctions with heavy traffic and the existing residential area in Heng Fa Chuen, and the driving training would also be arranged to avoid traffic peak hours. Notwithstanding that, the applicant had proposed measures to improve the junction of Shing Tai Road and Chong Fu Road with signalized pedestrian crossing and to widen the footpath at Shing Tai Road to cater for the future pedestrian demand;
- (e) as shown on Plan A-1 of the Paper, the Site was surrounded mainly by government, institution and community and industrial uses, and the future driving test routes would be planned within the industrial area. Hence, noise impact on residential development was not envisaged. The Director of Environmental Protection had no adverse comment on the proposed development regarding noise impact; and
- (f) subject to a detailed feasibility study, the applicant would consider providing automated parking system and charging facilities for electric vehicles at the proposed PVP.

27. Regarding the issue of potential noise impact, a Member observed that the Site being situated within an industrial area was not in close proximity to noise sensitive receivers and the proposed driving school cum test centre and parking facilities would be accommodated within an enclosed building and such arrangement would help reduce potential noise impact. Mr Ng Kwok Tim, STP/HK, further elaborated that the Site was distanced from the residential area in Heng Fa Chuen, and the potential noise generated by the driving training would be largely contained within the enclosed building, and potential impacts on noise sensitive receivers were not anticipated.

28. Regarding the background of the ALCDS site, a Member recalled that albeit the agreement of the Town Planning Board (TPB) to rezone the site to “O” in 2016, the TPB had urged the relevant government departments to take expeditious action in reprovisioning ALCDS. Mr Ng Kwok Tim, STP/HK, supplemented that the ALCDS site was intended for provision of open space to serve the nearby residents in the long term and there was a genuine need to reprovision ALCDS, and therefore, the Site was identified for such purpose.

Deliberation Session

29. The Chairman recapitulated that the subject application arose from the rezoning of the ALCDS site from “OU(Cargo Handling Area)” to “O”, and it was necessary to reprovision the driving school from a temporary site to a permanent one. The Site was considered suitable for the proposed driving school as it was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The proposed development would also provide a PVP to address the strong demand for parking spaces in the Eastern District, and office accommodation for government departments. The proposed development, being a joint-user complex which integrated the driving school with other compatible facilities could clearly exemplify the policy directive of “Single Site, Multiple Use” for making optimal use of scarce land resources.

30. Two Members echoed that “Single Site, Multiple Use” was a good development approach in making optimal use of scarce land resources, and one of them, whilst supporting the application, further urged the applicant to duly consider providing automated parking and charging facilities for electric vehicles in the proposed PVP as there was a keen demand in the market.

31. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the TPB. The permission should be valid until 13.1.2027, 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 car parking spaces, loading/unloading spaces and vehicular access for the development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB; and
- (b) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

[Mr Horace Hong rejoined the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H24/30 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Aboveground Gas Governor Kiosk)
in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Elevated Walkway” Zone,
Government Land adjoining Site 3 of the New Central Harbourfront,
Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H24/30)

33. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (ARUP) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Franklin Yu had declared an interest on the item for his firm having current business dealings with ARUP. As Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

34. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Karmin Tong, 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.

35. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that the original aboveground gas governor kiosk did not intrude into the adjacent Site 3 of the New Central Harbourfront (Site 3), the reasons for reprovisioning of the original kiosk and whether there were existing underground gas pipes within Site 3; and
- (b) as the proposed kiosk would be situated in a prominent location, whether the applicant had proposed any measures to beautify the façade of the facility.

36. In response, Ms Karmin Tong, STP/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) the original kiosk was located at the immediate north of Site 3 and there were existing underground gas pipes within Site 3. As the construction works at Site 3 would pose a risk to the gas facility, it was necessary to demolish the original kiosk and reprovision it at another suitable location. The current location, which was slightly off the boundary of Site 3, was selected taking into account the minimal diversion of underground gas pipes and potential impacts on the construction works and future development at Site 3; and
- (b) since the proposed kiosk was an associated work of the proposed comprehensive commercial development at Site 3, the exterior design and beautification measures of which would be explored in collaboration with the development of Site 3, for which a planning application would be submitted to the Committee for consideration.

Deliberation Session

37. A Member remarked that as the proposed kiosk would be situated at a prominent location, the aesthetic quality of its exterior design should be carefully considered. In that regard, the Chairman drew Members' attention that an advisory clause for the applicant to consider providing architectural treatments to beautify the kiosk façade had been recommended by the Architectural Services Department and set out at Appendix II of the Paper.

38. 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 13.1.2027, 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.

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

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H3/447 Proposed Temporary Eating Place for a Period of 5 Years in
"Government, Institution or Community" Zone, G/F, 1-2 David Lane,
Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong

(MPC Paper No. A/H3/447)

40. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Sai Ying Pun/Sheung Wan. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Professor Roger C.K.- Chan his spouse owning a property in Sai Ying Pun; and

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui - her spouse being a director of a company owning a
property in Sheung Wan.

41. The Committee noted that Professor Roger C.K. Chan had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the property owned by the company of Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui's spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

42. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Karmin Tong, 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.

43. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

44. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 13.1.2028, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 13.7.2023;
- (b) in relation to (a) above, the implementation of the fire services installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 13.10.2023; and
- (c) if any of the above planning condition (a) or (b) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr Ng Kwok Tim and Ms Karmin Tong, STPs/HK, and Mr Billy W.M. Au Yeung, TP/HK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 10

Any Other Business

46. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 10:55 a.m..