

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 713th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 17.2.2023**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M. K. Chung

Chairman

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Vice-chairman

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),
Transport Department
Mr B.K. Chow

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory S),
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 Apology

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

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
Ms Charlotte O.C. Ko

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 712th MPC Meeting held on 3.2.2023

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 712th MPC meeting held on 3.2.2023 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/H12/2

Application for Amendment to the Approved Mid-levels East Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H12/12, To rezone the application site from “Residential (Group C) 1”, “Government, Institution or Community (4)” and “Green Belt” to “Residential (Group C) 3”, 15 and 24 Stubbs Road, 7 Tung Shan Terrace and adjoining Government land, Mid-levels East, Hong Kong

(MPC Paper No. Y/H12/2)

3. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Mid-levels East and Mr Franklin Yu had declared an interest on the item for owning a property in Mid-levels East.
4. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting.
5. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 3.2.2023 deferment of consideration of the application for one month so as to allow sufficient time to address comments from the Drainage Services Department. 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 one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of further

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

[Miss Queenie Y.C. Ng, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory S), Environmental Protection Department, and Mr Ben S.S. Lui joined the meeting at this point.]

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

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

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K2/223 Proposed Flat with Permitted Shop and Services/Eating Place in
“Commercial” Zone, 15-15A, 17, 19 and 23 Saigon Street, 13 Chi Wo
Street, 22-28 Cheong Lok Street and adjoining Government Land, Yau
Ma Tei, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K2/223)

7. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Yau Ma Tei. LWK & Partners Limited (LWK) was one of the consultants of the application. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company owning properties in Yau Ma Tei;

- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - having past business dealings with LWK; and

- Mr Ben S.S. Lui - his former employer having conducted the District Study for Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok.

8. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interest of Mr Ben S.S. Lui was indirect and Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

9. 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 Sandy H.Y. Wong and Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui joined the meeting during the presentation session.]

10. Some Members raised the following questions:

Development Parameters

- (a) whether the proposed plot ratio (PR) of about 10.126 was the maximum PR permissible under the Yau Ma Tei Outline Zoning Plan (the OZP);
- (b) whether there was any similar approved application for proposed commercial/residential development with PR ranging from 9 to 10 in the area;
- (c) whether planning permission was required for commercial development at the Site with a building height (BH) of 110mPD;

Canopy

- (d) whether the proposed canopy of 1m wide abutting Saigon Street was sufficient for weather protection, and whether there was any requirement on minimum width and height of a canopy;

Impacts on the Neighbouring School

- (e) noting the public comments of the neighbouring Diocesan Girls' School and Diocesan Girls' Junior School (DGS) expressing concerns about the use of reflective glass for the proposed development and its glare impacts and the privacy concerns arising from the building design with balconies overlooking the sports ground of DGS, what measures the applicant had proposed to address the concerns;
- (f) whether the fence wall along the DGS site fronting Chi Wo Street as shown in site photo No. 4 on Plan A-5 of the Paper could help alleviate the overlooking problem;
- (g) whether there was similar context in which a high-rise residential development was in close proximity to a girls' school in the area;
- (h) whether there was any control on potential noise impacts during the construction phase, in particular for the impacts on schools; and

Provision of Government, Institution and Community (GIC) facilities

- (i) the provision of GIC facilities in the area.

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

Development Parameters

- (a) the proposed PR of about 10.126 was below the maximum PR of 12 permissible for development within "Commercial" ("C") zone on the OZP;
- (b) a similar application (No. A/K2/218) for proposed residential, office and retail development with a total PR of 12 to the north of the Site was approved with conditions by the Committee in 2021;

- (c) the Site fell within an area zoned “C” stipulated with a maximum BH of 110mPD on the OZP. Commercial uses such as ‘hotel’ and ‘office’ were Column 1 uses which were always permitted in the “C” zone under the Notes of the OZP, and planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board) for such uses was not required as long as the proposed development was in compliance with the restrictions, e.g. maximum BH of 110mPD, under the OZP;

Canopy

- (d) under the proposed scheme, a canopy of 1m wide projecting from 1/F of the proposed development along Saigon Street (i.e. at a height of about 5.5m above the ground level) was proposed which was in compliance with the minimum requirement under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R). As compared with the previous applications involving the Site, additional setbacks of 1m and 3m from the lot boundaries abutting Saigon Street and Chi Wo Street respectively, as well as a canopy projecting from 2/F of the proposed development along the northern part of Chi Wo Street were incorporated under the proposed scheme. According to the applicant, such height-to-width ratio for the canopies would be sufficient for weather protection purpose. According to the applicant, in view that an advisory clause on the improvement of canopy design was incorporated in the planning approval of the previous application No. A/K2/220, should the current application be approved, the applicant would consider reviewing during the general building plan (GBP) submission stage the possibility of providing a canopy of 1.5m wide along Saigon Street for better weather protection. Since the extended canopy would protrude over the Government land abutting the Site, the design of canopy and whether the relevant gross floor area (GFA) could be exempted would be subject to the provision under B(P)R and approval by the Building Authority;

Impacts on the Neighbouring School

- (e) to address the potential privacy/overlooking issue, further setbacks were incorporated in the proposed scheme with which the distance between the

Site and the sports ground of DGS would be widened from 8.9m and 9.2m to 9.5m and 9.6m. The applicant also indicated that privacy/overlooking issues would be taken into consideration in the detailed design for the balconies of the proposed development. As compared with the permitted commercial uses (e.g. office and hotel) at the Site, it was anticipated that there would be less people/patrons in the proposed residential development during daytime thereby creating less impact on the surrounding area. According to the applicant's submission, the external reflectance of glass to be adopted for the façades and balconies of the proposed development would not exceed 20% in order to comply with the relevant criteria under Practice Notes for Authorized Persons (PNAP) APP-2. Such details would be scrutinised by relevant departments in the GBP submission stage;

- (f) there was a 2-storey fence wall with vertical greening along the lot boundary of the DGS site fronting Chi Wo Street. While the fence wall might block the views of the lower floors of the proposed residential development towards DGS, the applicant proposed that widening of the distance between the Site and the DGS site would help alleviate the overlooking problem;
- (g) DGS was the only girls' school which was surrounded by high-rise residential developments in the area;
- (h) the applicant would follow all relevant statutory regulations to minimise potential impacts on the surrounding area during the construction phase. No construction work would be carried out at any time on a general holiday. Should the application be approved, the contractor of the Site was required to obtain a Construction Noise Permit (CNP) from the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) prior to the commencement of the construction works. EPD would examine whether the construction works would cause nuisances and noise impacts on the nearby sensitive receivers; and

Provision of Government, Institution and Community (GIC) facilities

- (i) the existing and planned provision of major GIC facilities were generally adequate to meet the demand of the planned population in the area, except for some social welfare facilities such as child care and elderly facilities. The Government had been adopting a multi-pronged approach with short, medium and long-term strategies to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of more welfare services, so as to meet the need for welfare service needs of the area.

12. Regarding the noise issue, Miss Queenie Y.C. Ng, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory S) (PEPO(TS)), EPD, supplemented that should the application be approved, the contractor of the Site was required to obtain a Construction Noise Permit (CNP) under the Noise Control Ordinance for carrying out percussive piling between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. on any day not being a general holiday (including Sunday) and for carrying out general construction works or conducting prescribed construction works during restricted hours (i.e. between 7 p.m. and 7 a.m. on a day not being a general holiday (including Sunday) and at any time on a general holiday (including Sunday)). EPD had also published Recommended Pollution Control Clauses for Construction Contracts which covered good engineering and management practices for the construction industry to minimise environmental nuisance arising from construction works. Given that the submitted Environmental Assessment demonstrated no insurmountable environmental impacts arising from the construction and operation of the proposed development, EPD had no objection to the application from environmental perspective.

[Mr Franklin Yu joined the meeting during the question and answer session.]

Deliberation Session

13. The Chairman recapitulated that the Site was the subject of two previous applications (No. A/K2/220 and No. A/K2/222) for the same uses (proposed flat with permitted shop and services/eating place) as the current application. The former application covered the northern portion while the latter covered the southern portion of the Site, which were both approved with conditions by the Committee in 2022. The current application

involved amalgamating the two sites under the previously approved applications as well as a small site and two scavenging lanes on Government land sandwiched in-between for the same uses. Under the proposed scheme, some design merits were introduced, including further building setbacks from the adjacent DGS, and provision of canopies with the width of which subject to the provision of B(P)R and further discussion between the applicant and the relevant government departments.

14. The Chairman also remarked that as the Site fell within an area zoned “C” on the OZP, planning permission from the Board was not required if the applicant pursued a commercial development with a maximum BH of 110mPD at the Site as long as the proposed development was in compliance with other restrictions under the OZP. In other words, there might still be overlooking issue in relation to the adjacent schools with the existing hotel or a proposed commercial development which did not require planning permission. The Committee noted that it was not uncommon that schools in urban areas were surrounded by high-rise residential developments. A Member opined that the layout of the DGS site had already taken into account the overlooking/privacy concern as the sports ground was the only part subject to overlooking issue of the whole school site, and considered that the proposed scheme with design measures incorporated to address the said concern could be supported.

15. A Member expressed concerns on the potential noise impact on the DGS site during the construction of the proposed development. Another Member advised that the applicant should liaise and work closely with DGS with a view to minimising any potential environmental impacts or nuisance during the construction stage. In that regard, Miss Queenie Y.C. Ng, PEPO(TS), EPD, supplemented that EPD had issued Recommended Pollution Control Clauses for Construction Contracts to contractors in the construction industry, which specified that if the construction site was close to schools, the contractor should liaise with the schools to ascertain the times of the examination periods. Should the specified noise limit during school examination periods be exceeded, the construction should stop and should not re-commence until appropriate measures had been implemented. If all relevant statutory regulations would be followed to minimise potential impacts during the construction and operation of the proposed development, insurmountable environmental impacts arising from the proposed development were not anticipated.

16. The Committee noted that the proposed scheme had incorporated various

building and architectural design features such as setbacks and canopies to promote visual interest and pedestrian comfort. Whilst the applicant would consider reviewing the possibility of providing a canopy of 1.5m wide along Saigon Street at the GBP submission stage, the Building Authority would examine whether the extended canopy protruding over Government land outside the Site could be exempted from GFA calculation under PNAP APP-9 based on its own individual merits. A Member was of the view that the proposed canopy with a width of 1m along Saigon Street was inadequate and suggested that it should be widened for better weather protection.

17. The Chairman concluded that Members generally had no objection to the application. To address Members' concerns, the Chairman proposed and the Committee agreed to add two advisory clauses to invite the applicant to consider widening the canopy along Saigon Street for better weather protection, and to closely liaise with DGS with a view to minimising nuisance and environmental impacts on the school during the construction phase.

18. 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 17.2.2027, 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 submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (b) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the revised Sewerage Impact Assessment in planning condition (a) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of a revised Noise Impact Assessment and implementation of the noise measures identified therein for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;

- (d) the implementation of the traffic mitigation measures identified in the Traffic Impact Assessment for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or the TPB;
- (e) the design and provision of vehicular access, vehicle parking spaces and loading/unloading facilities and manoeuvring spaces for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or the TPB; and
- (f) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

- “(a) to consider widening the canopy along Saigon Street for better weather protection; and
- (b) to closely liaise with Diocesan Girls' School with a view to minimising nuisance and environmental impacts during the construction phase.”

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H24/31 Proposed Comprehensive Office, Commercial and Retail Development (including Shop and Services, Eating Place and Place of Entertainment) and Government Uses with Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone and Area Shown as ‘Road’, Site 3 of the New Central Harbourfront
(MPC Paper No. A/H24/31)

20. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Pacific Gate Development Limited, which was a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD). Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) and Wong & Ouyang (Hong Kong) Limited (WOHK) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Franklin Yu - having current business dealings with ARUP and past business dealings with Wong & Ouyang (Building Services) Limited which was related to WOHK; and

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui - being a former employee of the University of Hong Kong which had received donation from HLD before.

21. As the interest of Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui was indirect and Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr Mann M.H. Chow - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK)

Ms Karmin Tong - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK)

Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au - Town Planner/Hong Kong

Development Bureau (DEVB)

Ms Leonie H.L. Lee - Commissioner for Harbourfront (C for H), DEVB

Mr Peter Y.K. Mok - Project Manager(Harbour)SD, DEVB

23. 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.

The Proposed Scheme

24. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) why Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities and parking facilities were accountable for gross floor area (GFA) calculation for the proposed development; and
- (b) how the layout of the proposed development, especially the disposition of the three commercial towers, was formulated, and whether it was possible to improve the layout by setting back one of the commercial towers (i.e. T3) further away from Jardine House.

25. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) the planning brief (PB) for the subject “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone specified that the GFA for development at the application site (the Site) comprised two portions, i.e. commercial GFA and

non-commercial GFA for various GIC and transport facilities, such as public car parking spaces, district-tied facilities for the existing Government Post Office (GPO), public toilets and the reconstructed Star Ferry Clock Tower (SFCT); and

- (b) with reference to Plan 2 of the endorsed PB (Appendix II of the Paper), some parts of the Site along Lung Wo Road and Yiu Sing Street were designated as Railway Reserve for Airport Railway Extended Overrun Tunnel (AREOT)/North Island Line (NIL) and Tunnel Protection Area for Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) and there was a drainage reserve underneath Lung Wo Road. Having considered these site constraints and other PB requirements such as stepped height profile, with 50mPD for T2 and T3 stepping down towards 47mPD for T1 near the harbourfront, and provision of connections to the existing elevated walkway linking Jardine House and the existing pedestrian subway linking Statue Square, the proposed scheme had already optimised the layout and building disposition and it was difficult to further set back T3 from Jardine House.

26. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether the applicant could amend the development scheme prepared in accordance with the PB, Ms Leonie H.L. Lee, C for H, DEVB, said that the development scheme submitted by the applicant during the tender stage, which set out the indicative and schematic drawings, was in compliance with the PB and had been incorporated in the land lease (the endorsed scheme). Approval from the Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands), DEVB was required for any change to the development scheme. On the other hand, it was noted that some improvements had been made at the detailed design stage to, for example, address comments from government departments. For instance, the alignment of the at-grade crossing across Yiu Sing Street had been adjusted under the proposed scheme to take into account the comments of the Transport Department (TD). The applicant also proposed to provide a public toilet at Horizon Park, which was not required under the PB, and the floor area of which had been included in the commercial/retail GFA calculation. It was considered that these enhancements would improve road safety and public convenience at the roof landscaped deck.

Open Space and Landscaping

27. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether there was any safety concern regarding the extensive planting area at Horizon Park, and in particular whether the proposed soil depth of 1.2m for tree planting was sufficient for healthy tree growth for fear of collapse of trees;
 - (b) response to a public comment expressing doubt on the feasibility and practicality of the proposed tree planting and landscaping at the Horizon Park; and whether there were any guidelines/standards in respect of the maximum structural load capacity for rooftop gardens;
 - (c) details of the proposed urban biodiversity education programme as mentioned in paragraph 2.12 of the Paper;
 - (d) future management and maintenance of the Horizon Park;
 - (e) whether facilities such as age-friendly facilities and drinking fountains as well as street furniture with shelters for providing shading and comfort for pedestrians would be provided in the open spaces within the proposed development;
 - (f) whether the performance area within the private open spaces of the proposed development could be open for public use;
 - (g) whether cycle path or cycle parking facilities would be provided in the proposed development;
 - (h) details of the proposed Art Boulevard which was located outside the Site; and
 - (i) whether the applicant had considered any environmental-friendly ways to

handle fallen trees due to the proposed development, instead of sending them to landfill.

28. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) in formulating the layout design of the Horizon Park, due regard had been given to the safety concern and hence, the planting area would be set back along the perimeter of the Horizon Park to address pedestrian safety due to falling of tree branches, if any, on the surrounding area of the Site. In addition, the future management agent of the open spaces of the proposed development would conduct regular horticultural maintenance to ensure that all plantings were in healthy conditions;
- (b) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD had no adverse comment on the application from landscape planning perspective. The detailed design of Horizon Park, including the structural design, would be scrutinised by relevant government departments, including Buildings Department, at the general building plan submission stage to ensure the structural safety of the proposed development;
- (c) according to the applicant, guided tours for introducing the urban biodiversity strategy adopted in the design of Horizon Park would be organised for the public on a regular basis;
- (d) all public open spaces (POS) within the proposed development (including Horizon Park on R/F) would be provided in the form of “Public Open Space in Private Developments” (POSPD) which would be managed and maintained by the applicant;
- (e) taking into account the comments of the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island of the Harbourfront Commission, the applicant would consider providing drinking fountains, pet-friendly facilities and street furniture with shelters at the proposed open spaces. In addition, a public toilet, which was commercial GFA accountable, would be

provided at the Horizon Park so that the park users needed not go to the commercial podium for using toilet facilities;

- (f) private open spaces would be provided on 1/F, 2/F, 3/F and R/F for visitors to gather for a large variety of private events, performances and functions complementary to the office and retail uses. According to the applicant, those private open spaces managed by the applicant could be opened to the public when they were not used for private events;
- (g) according to the applicant's submission, no cycle path or cycle parking facilities would be provided within the proposed development;
- (h) the proposed Art Boulevard comprising a garden with bespoke seating elements and a collection of sculptures by various artists would be provided at the New Footbridge B (as required under the lease) to the north of the Site. It did not form part of the current application and its implementation would be subject to further liaison with relevant government departments; and
- (i) the applicant did not provide any information on how fallen trees affected by the proposed development would be handled.

Pedestrian Connectivity and Accessibility

29. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed new underground connection at Site 3B would be implemented;
- (b) whether it was possible to provide a pedestrian connection between MTR Hong Kong Station and the Site;
- (c) noting that the proposed development would need to span across and deck over Yiu Sing Street and Lung Wo Road, details of the at-grade north-south pedestrian connections and the two sets of proposed at-grade pedestrian

crossings across Yiu Sing Street and Lung Wo Road;

- (d) whether it was possible to provide a subway underneath the Grand Boulevard to enhance pedestrian connectivity;
- (e) whether the proposed development would provide a footbridge over Yiu Sing Street as per the PB requirement;
- (f) whether there was a direct pedestrian connection linking up the hinterland and the harbourfront along the Landscaped Deck;
- (g) details of the proposed barrier-free facilities; and
- (h) noting the requirement in the PB that provision of traveller(s) running in a south-north direction within the Site should be explored where possible, the feasibility of providing a traveller at Horizon Park or Grand Boulevard.

30. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) a new underground connection would be provided between B3/F of the proposed development and MTR Central Station as required under the PB;
- (b) the applicant indicated the intention to liaise with the MTR Corporation Limited on the provision of pedestrian connection between the Site and MTR Hong Kong Station at a later stage;
- (c) two sets of at-grade pedestrian crossings across Yiu Sing Street and Lung Wo Road were proposed to facilitate the north-south connection between the hinterland and the harbourfront. The applicant had consulted TD on the location and alignment of the proposed pedestrian crossings across Yiu Sing Street but found out that locating the crossings to align with the Grand Boulevard was considered technically not feasible from traffic engineering point of view. The location of the crossing at Yiu Sing Street as currently proposed would only require minimal pedestrian detour from the Grand

Boulevard and was considered a reasonable arrangement. TD had no objection to the planning application from traffic engineering point of view. The existing signalised pedestrian crossings across Man Yiu Street near Lung Wo Road and Man Yiu Street near Yiu Sing Street would be maintained to provide an east-west connection;

- (d) given that some parts of the Site along Lung Wo Road and Yiu Sing Street were designated as Railway Reserve for AREOT/NIL and Tunnel Protection Area for CWB and there was a drainage reserve underneath Lung Wo Road, provision of subways across Lung Wo Road and Yiu Sing Street was not feasible due to such physical constraints;
- (e) elevated pedestrian connection would be provided in the form of Landscaped Deck on 1/F spanning across Yiu Sing Street which would connect with the proposed Clock Tower Piazza and the Hong Kong Observation Wheel near the harbourfront via staircases;
- (f) there would be internal pedestrian passageway within the retail portion of the proposed development on 1/F serving as the major north-south pedestrian connection linking with various elevated passageways, including the existing elevated walkway from Jardine House and IFCII. A pedestrian access was also proposed along the outdoor Landscaped Deck on 1/F to serve as another connection linking with various elevated and vertical connections for better integration with its surrounding developments. These pedestrian connections would be barrier-free and open 24 hours daily for public access;
- (g) vertical connections such as escalators and lifts for barrier-free accesses would be provided within the proposed development to facilitate seamless pedestrian movement between the Site and its surrounding developments; and
- (h) according to the applicant's submission, the feasibility of providing traveller(s) along the pedestrian passageway within the shopping arcade had been examined and was considered not feasible. If a traveller was

provided at Horizon Park or Grand Boulevard, part of the open space area would be taken up by the traveller and its ancillary facilities.

31. In response to a Member's enquiries on how the proposed development could integrate with the existing harbourfront, as well as the safety issue on the shared-use path between pedestrian and cyclist along the harbourfront, Ms Leonie H.L. Lee, C for H, DEVB, said that to enhance connectivity of the harbourfront sites, the next operator of the site where the Hong Kong Observation Wheel currently stood would be required to adopt a fenceless design along the boundary adjoining the Site such that members of the public could access the harbourfront from the Site via the observation wheel site. As regards the safety concern on the shared-use path between pedestrian and cyclist along the harbourfront, Ms Lee said that a pilot scheme on shared-use path was launched at the promenade section between the Central Pier No. 10 and west of the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre from August 2022 for a year. The data collected from the pilot scheme would be taken into consideration when formulating the arrangement to ensure safety of the public under a shared-use path setting.

Reconstruction of SFCT

32. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether sufficient space had been reserved for the reconstruction of the old SFCT upon grading assessment by the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO); and
- (b) noting that there was another SFCT in the adjacent area, whether the role and function of the two SFCTs would be duplicated; and the design concept of the reconstructed of SFCT.

33. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) as advised by AMO, the old SFCT was neither a graded historic building nor an item pending grading assessment. The SFCT would be reconstructed at its original location as required under the PB and the lease; and

- (b) under the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (the UDS), the Statue Square Corridor was recommended to be maintained as a key principle Design Corridor. The old SFCT would be reconstructed together with a proposed fountain at the Clock Tower Piazza with full respect to its original location, orientation, height (i.e. 25mPD) and design, and in compliance with the requirements and recommendations in the UDS, PB and lease. Whilst there was a certain distance between the reconstructed SFCT and the one at Central Pier No. 7, the former would serve as a focal point to reinforce the history and spatial character of the historic landmarks. According to the applicant's submission, the reconstructed SFCT would be used as a backdrop to the 'pool of memory' (3D digital mapping technology) to illustrate the history of the harbourfront.

Others

- 34. Some Members raised the following questions:
 - (a) location of vehicular ingress and egress of the proposed development; and
 - (b) the completion year of the existing GPO.

- 35. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, made the following main points:
 - (a) with reference to Drawing A-44 of the Paper, the proposed vehicular ingress and egress points for T1 (including the transport facilities) would be located at Man Yiu Street and Yiu Sing Street, while those for T2 and T3 were at Man Yiu Street and Connaught Place respectively. TD had no adverse comment on the traffic impact assessment, including the proposed transport and traffic arrangements, submitted by the applicant; and
 - (b) the GPO was built in 1976.

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

Deliberation Session

36. The Chairman remarked that the Site was designated as “CDA” zone for comprehensive office and retail development with landscaped pedestrian deck and provision of POS and other supporting facilities. The proposed development was in line with the planning intention of the “CDA” zone and the requirements as set out in the PB.

37. Members generally supported the application having considered that additional merits, such as provision of POS and greenery exceeding the PB requirements, had been proposed, and the proposed scheme would enhance pedestrian connectivity and accessibility to the surrounding developments and link up the hinterland and the harbourfront via its multi-level pedestrian connection network.

38. Regarding the reconstruction of the SFCT, the Chairman remarked that the old SFCT would be reconstructed at its original location with respect to its original design, height and dimension as per the PB requirements. The reconstruction of the SFCT was intended to reinforce the spatial character and cultural values of the SFCT and the surrounding historic landmarks extending from the hinterland towards the harbour. The Committee noted that the height of the SFCT (25mPD) had exceeded the BH restriction of 16mPD for the eastern part of the Site as stipulated in the OZP, and minor relaxation of BH restriction for only the portion occupied by the SFCT was sought as part of the application. The Committee also noted that the components of the old SFCT were in dilapidated condition and could not be reused for the reconstruction.

39. On a Member’s concern on the design and management of POS within the proposed development, the Committee noted that there was a set of clear Government guidelines in respect of design and management of POSPD, and the applicant would be advised to observe the guidelines and ensure that the provision of POS in the proposed development would be in compliance with the guidelines.

40. With regard to a Member’s suggestion on improving the layout of the Clock Tower Piazza with a view to better integrating the reconstructed SFCT with the landscape setting of the surrounding historic landmarks, the Committee noted that under the lease of the Site, the applicant was required to design, construct and maintain two additional at-grade POS (i.e. Yellow Area A and Yellow Area B under the lease) outside the northern and

south-eastern boundaries of the Site connecting Central Piers and City Hall Complex respectively, and the design of the two POS would be subject to further review amongst the relevant government departments.

41. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application and Master Layout Plan under section 16 and section 4A(2) of the Town Planning Ordinance, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 17.2.2027, 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 submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan, taking into account approval conditions (b) to (k) below, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the design and provision of vehicular accesses (with queuing space), internal transport facilities (including car parking spaces, loading/unloading spaces, picking-up/setting-down facilities and public transport facilities) and public transport facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) the design and implementation of the new pedestrian crossing facility at Yiu Sing Street and the associated traffic review to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (e) the design and provision of the New Post Office Accommodation to the satisfaction of the Postmaster General, Hong Kong Post or of the TPB;
- (f) the design and provision of the two public toilets in Site 3A and Site 3B respectively to the satisfaction of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene or of the TPB;

- (g) submission of a revised Drainage Impact Assessment and implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein and any other stormwater drainage facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services of the TPB;
- (h) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection of the TPB;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (j) the provision of water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (k) the submission of implementation programme indicating the timing and phasing of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

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

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

[The Chairman thanked the government representatives for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Karmin Tong and Mr Ng Kwok Tim, Senior Town Planners/Hong Kong (STPs/HK), and Mr Canon K.N. Wong, Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H3/446 Proposed Eating Place in “Open Space” and “Residential (Group A) 8”
Zones, 2, 4, 6 and 8 Ui On Lane, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/446)

43. The Secretary reported that the application premises (the Premises) was located in Sai Ying Pun. The following Members had declared interest 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.

44. As the properties owned by Professor Roger C.K. Chan’s spouse and the company of Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui’s spouse had no direct view of the Premises, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

45. 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.

46. In response to a Member’s enquiry regarding the operation hours of the proposed eating place and whether the applicant would obtain a liquor licence for the proposed eating place, Ms Karmin Tong, STP/HK, said that according to the applicant, the proposed eating place would provide food and beverage services to the locals and visitors and its operation hours were from 8:00 am to 11:00 pm. The applicant had not indicated whether a liquor licence would be obtained.

Deliberation Session

47. 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 17.2.2027, 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; and
- (b) the submission and implementation of drainage and sewerage proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H8/436 Proposed Office in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pier” Zone,
Shop A of Upper Deck and Shop C, D & E of Lower Deck, North Point
(East) Ferry Pier, North Point, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H8/436)

49. The Secretary reported that the application premises (the Premises) was located in North Point. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - co-owning with spouse a property in North Point and being the Director and Chief Executive Officer of Light Be (Social Realty) Company Limited which rented a residential unit for social housing in North Point; and
- Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui - co-owning with spouse a property in North Point and her spouse being a director of a company owning a property in North Point.

50. As the concerned properties of Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu and Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui had no direct view of the Premises, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

52. A Member asked why some premises at the North Point (East) Ferry Pier (the Pier) were vacant despite that a number of planning permissions had been granted for various uses at the Pier. In response, Mr Ng Kwok Tim, STP/HK, said that some commercial uses at the Pier as previously approved had commenced and operated for some time, and subsequently closed due to business decision of the operators. Mr Ng remarked that the proposed office use at the Premises under the current application was an extension to the office use at the adjoining premises at lower deck of the Pier which was approved by the Committee under application No. A/H8/433 submitted by the same applicant. According to the applicant, renovation works for office use at the premises under application No. A/H8/433 was in progress.

Deliberation Session

53. Members generally supported the application having considered that the proposed office use was not incompatible with the pier use and a temporary approval of five years could encourage better utilisation of the Premises whilst the long-term planning intention of the “Other Specified uses” annotated “Pier” zone for the Pier would not be jeopardised.

54. A Member expressed concern that many premises at various piers in Hong Kong were left unused for a long time and suggested that the Government should explore possible beneficial uses of the premises at the piers with a view to better utilising the scarce land resources. Another Member remarked that the Pier was dilapidated and in need of renovation. The Committee noted that there was currently no proposal to renovate/redevelop the Pier.

55. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of five years until 17.2.2028, 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 water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

[Mr Timothy K.W. Ma left the meeting during the deliberation session.]

[The Chairman thanked Ms Karmin Tong and Mr Ng Kwok Tim, STPs/HK, and Mr Canon K.N. Wong, TP/HK, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 8

Any Other Business

57. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:30 a.m..