

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 717<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 21.4.2023**

#### **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 Stanley T.S. Choi

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 South),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Miss Queenie Y.C. Ng

Assistant Director/Regional 2,  
Lands Department  
Mr Ryan M.F. Choy

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

Secretary

**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 L.C. Cheung

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 716<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 31.3.2023

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 716<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 31.3.2023 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

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

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/496                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Warehouse (excluding Dangerous Goods Godown) in “Industrial” Zone, Kwai Chung Town Lot 145 and Adjoining Government Land, 7-11 Wing Kin Road, Kwai Chung, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/496A)

---

3.            The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kwai Chung and Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had declared an interest on the item for being a supervisor of a primary school in Kwai Chung.

4.            The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the interest of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi was indirect, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

5.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 17.4.2023 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow additional time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

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 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 4**

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

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/501                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Information Technology and Telecommunications Industries and Public Utility Installation (Proposed Data Centre Development with Electricity Substation) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone, 563 - 583 Castle Peak Road, Kwai Chung, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/501A)

---

7.                      The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kwai Chung. The application was submitted by CLPe Infrastructure Limited, which was a subsidiary of CLP Holdings Limited (CLP), and 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 Ricky W.Y. Yu                      - being a member of CLP Customer Consultative Group;

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

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - being a supervisor of a primary school in Kwai Chung.

8. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the interests of Messrs Ricky W.Y. Yu and Stanley T.S. Choi were indirect and Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

9. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 4.4.2023 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow additional time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

10. 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.

[Miss Queenie Y.C. Ng joined the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/TY/146                      Proposed Temporary Logistics Centre for a Period of 6 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Boatyard and Marine-oriented Industrial Uses” Zone, Tsing Yi Town Lot 102 (Part), 98 Tam Kon Shan Road, Tsing Yi, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TY/146A)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

11.                      With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr W.C. Lui, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

12.                      Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a)                      definition of a logistics centre and how it was different from warehouse use in terms of traffic flow and built form;
- (b)                      the current business condition and future prospect (in 6 years’ time) of the shipyard at the application site (the Site);
- (c)                      whether the proposed logistics centre would cause adverse traffic impact; and
- (d)                      noting that the proposed logistics centre was to provide back-up service for aviation industry, how far the Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA) was from Tsing Yi North where the Site was located.

13. In response, Mr W.C. Lui, STP/TWK, made the following main points:
- (a) logistics centre was mainly for goods re-distribution while warehouse was mainly for storage of goods. In general, traffic flows generated by logistics centre would be higher as compared to those by warehouse. Yet, there was not much difference in the built form of the two uses;
  - (b) according to the applicant, the shipyard business at the Site was yet to be recovered. The proposed 6-year temporary logistics centre was considered reasonable under the applicant's business cycle. Future use of the Site upon the expiry of the planning permission would be further reviewed;
  - (c) the applicant had submitted a traffic impact assessment in support of the planning application, which demonstrated that the proposed logistics centre would not generate significant traffic flow. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had no objection to the application and relevant approval conditions related to traffic management measures had been recommended; and
  - (d) the Site had easy access to HKIA via strategic highway. Although there was no information at hand on the exact distance between the Site and HKIA, the estimated travel time would be about half an hour with no traffic congestion.

#### Deliberation Session

14. The Chairman recapitulated that the subject application, which sought planning permission to utilize the Site with convenient access to HKIA for temporary logistics centre to support the aviation logistics industry, was temporary in nature. The Site was also the subject of previously approved planning applications for temporary concrete batching plant (CBP). While the permitted temporary CBP use was not implemented, the approvals demonstrated that there was scope for the Site for alternative temporary uses other than



shipyard or marine-oriented industry. Regarding the possible traffic impact that might be generated by the proposed use, C for T had no objection to the application and appropriate approval conditions had been recommended to address such concerns.

15. A Member, while supporting the application, expressed concerns on the cumulative traffic impacts that might be generated by the planned and newly completed developments in Tsing Yi, such as the planned public housing development on Tsing Yi Road West and the multi-storey Transport Department Vehicle Examination Complex. For future planning in the Tsing Yi area, more detailed information on traffic aspect should be provided to facilitate Members' consideration of the cases. The Chairman said that the Member's view would be recorded in the Minutes and the district planning offices of PlanD would take note of Member's concern.

16. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 6 years until 21.4.2029, 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 traffic management measures proposal, as proposed by the applicant, within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Police or of the TPB by 21.10.2023;
- (b) in relation to (a) above, the implementation of the traffic management measures proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Police or of the TPB by 21.1.2024;
- (c) 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 21.10.2023;
- (d) in relation to (c) above, the implementation of the fire service 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 21.1.2024; and

- (e) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c) or (d) 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.”

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

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

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

### **Hong Kong District**

#### **Agenda Item 6**

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

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H20/25

(MPC Paper No. 3/23)

---

18. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments involved a proposed public housing development and a completed public housing development under the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) with the Housing Department (HD) as its executive arm. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Mr Paul Y.K. Au<br><i>(as the Chief Engineer<br/>(Works), Home Affairs<br/>Department)</i> | - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA; |
| Mr Franklin Yu   | - being a member of the Building Committee and the Tender Committee of HKHA;  |

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau  
Ms Lilian S.K. Law

} being members of the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues; and

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

19. The Committee noted that according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, as the proposed amendments to the outline zoning plan in relation to the public housing developments were proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of Members in relation to HKHA only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting.

20. The following representatives from PlanD, the Housing Department (HD), the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

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

Mr Rico W.K. Tsang - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK)

Mr Harvey T.H. Law - Town Planner/Hong Kong

HD

Ms Emily W.M. Ip - Senior Planning Officer/9 (SPO/9)

Ms Kenniss H.T. Cheung - Architect 66

Ms Ebby Z.H. Leung - Planning Officer/T24

Mr Jimmy C.H. Ho - Civil Engineer/30

CEDD

Mr K.H. Tao - Project Team Leader/Project (PTL/P)

Mr Terry T.L. Kea - Senior Engineer 5/Project

Mr H.F. Kwok - Engineer 1/Project

Mr Tony W.K. Lin - Senior Engineer/8 (South)

Mr Tony C.F. Lau - Project Coordinator/1 (South)

AECOM

Mr Peter K.F. Leung

Ms Abby H.L. Lau

Presentation and Question Sessions

21. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the OZP, technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments were as follows:

- (a) Amendment Item A - rezoning of a site to the south of Chai Wan Swimming Pool from “Green Belt” (“GB”) and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) with stipulation of building height restriction (BHR) of 190mPD; and
- (b) Amendment Item B - rezoning of a site to the immediate west of MTR Chai Wan Station from “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) to “R(A)”) with the stipulation of BHR of 25mPD.

[Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui and Mr Franklin Yu joined the meeting during the presentation session.]

22. As the presentation by PlanD's representative had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

Amendment Item A

23. The Chairman, Vice-chairman and some Members raised the following questions:

*Site Selection*

- (a) noting that Site A was mainly densely vegetated, the rationale for identifying it for public housing development;
- (b) clarification on how the rezoning boundary was delineated, and whether there was any proposal for the area outside the southern edge of the public housing development;

*Geotechnical Works and Development Proposal*

- (c) details of the proposed site formation works;
- (d) elaboration on the rationale behind the proposed development intensity and building design;
- (e) noting that Site A was situated at a rather remote location, what the proposed retail gross floor area (GFA) would be;
- (f) the average flat size of the proposed public housing development;

*Provision of Social Welfare Facilities*

- (g) whether there was scope to provide child and youth related social welfare facilities in the proposed housing development, and when the actual provision of social welfare facilities be confirmed;

*Accessibility and Connectivity*

- (h) whether the users of Chai Wan Swimming Pool and the future reprovisioned skateboard ground could benefit from proposed pedestrian walkway, and any special features proposed to enhance pedestrian connectivity;
- (i) accessibility to MTR Chai Wan Station;

*Landscape Proposal*

- (j) details of the tree compensation proposal;
- (k) details of the conceptual landscape plan;

*Reprovisioning of Skateboard Ground and the new Drainage Services Department (DSD) Maintenance Yard*

- (l) whether there was scope to increase the size of the reprovisioned skateboard ground to better serve the youth and the users;
- (m) the function of the proposed DSD Maintenance Yard;
- (n) whether the stormwater stored in the retention tank could be recycled for flushing purpose;

*Others*

- (o) whether there was any reprovisioning plan for the Tin Hau Temple located within Site A;
- (p) information on the ten-year population forecast for Chai Wan area; and
- (q) whether the proposed public housing development at Site A would be the last public housing project in Chai Wan in 10 years' time.

24. In response, with the aid of some Powerpoint slides, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, PlanD, Ms Emily W.M. Ip, SPO/9, HD, Mr. K.H. Tao, PTL/P, CEDD, and Mr Peter K.F. Leung, AECOM, made the following main points:

*Site Selection*

- (a) the Government had adopted a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply in addressing housing needs, including three stages of "GB" review to rezone suitable "GB" sites for residential use. Site A was identified in the second stage of "GB" review for public housing development as it was of a relatively low conservation value and located in close proximity to existing road networks;
- (b) the rezoning boundary was delineated based on the extent of the proposed site formation works. The concerned area outside the southern edge of the public housing development would be the newly formed and vegetated cut slopes upon site formation, which was also included into the "R(A)" zone;

*Geotechnical Works and Development Proposal*

- (c) Site A was located on a sloping terrain with significant level difference ranging from +24mPD to +76mPD. According to the proposed site

formation plan, Site A would be formed and divided into two platform levels at a height of approximately +30mPD and +41mPD with newly formed rock cut slopes (with gradient of 60 to 70 degree) and soil cut slopes (with gradient of 60 degree) along the southern edge of the site. The site formation works were mainly to align the site levels with the adjacent road network. Slope stabilization works (such as soil nailing technique) would be adopted to minimise the extent of excavation works and potential disturbance to the natural environment;

- (d) the proposed development intensity, building mass and podium design under the indicative scheme had taken into account a wide range of factors including site configuration, topographical constraints, site formation level, traffic capacity, the respective maximum flat number and the requirement for provision of social welfare facilities (equivalent to about 5% of the attainable domestic GFA of the development) and ancillary facilities. Under the indicative scheme, two of the three residential towers at the site (i.e. Block A and Block B) would sit on top of a 6-storey podium accommodating the proposed social welfare and ancillary facilities such as retail facilities while the remaining residential block (i.e. Block C) would be solely for residential use. The indicative scheme would be subject to refinement at the detailed design stage;
- (e) a GFA of about 620 m<sup>2</sup> was proposed for retail use at Site A. The provision was only a preliminary estimation based on the assessment of existing retail facilities provision for daily necessities in the neighbourhood;
- (f) given that the housing type of the proposed public housing development at Site A was yet to be confirmed, the average flat size of the development was uncertain at the current stage. In general, public housing units were built with different sizes having regard to the household size, family mix, and demographic pattern. Assuming Site A for public rental housing development, the average flat size would be about 45 m<sup>2</sup>;



### *Provision of Social Welfare Facilities*

- (g) while the proposed social welfare facilities under the indicative scheme were recommended by SWD, the actual type and provision of social welfare facilities within the development could be confirmed in the planning brief preparation stage in consultation with SWD. Member's suggestion for child and youth related social welfare facilities could be conveyed for SWD's consideration. HA would maintain a close liaison with SWD with a view to devising and taking forward the proposals in that regard;

### *Accessibility and Connectivity*

- (h) a pedestrian walkway with barrier-free access running along the future reprovisioned skateboard ground was proposed to facilitate pedestrian travelling between Site A (at +30mPD) and Siu Sai Wan Road (at about +5mPD), and would benefit the future residents in the public housing development and also users of the swimming pool and skateboard ground. The provision of vertical connection facilities, such as escalator and elevator, would be further considered and refined at the detailed design stage;
- (i) Site A was located about 950m from MTR Chai Wan Station. The future residents might consider using public transportation such as bus and mini-bus to travel between the two locations. The Transport Department would further review and adjust the public transport services to cater for the future demand in the area, as appropriate;

### *Landscape Proposal*

- (j) among the 1,162 trees to be affected, two trees of rare species were proposed to be transplanted and the remaining to be felled. About 24 new trees were proposed at the new DSD maintenance yard, the

reprovisioned skateboard ground, and the proposed pedestrian walkway. The tree compensatory proposal, including off-site planting, would be further explored at the detailed design stage;

- (k) the conceptual landscape plan was only for indicative purpose to demonstrate the possible landscape arrangement for the proposed development. Open space, recreation facilities and greenery coverage would be provided in accordance with the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines;

*Reprovisioning of Skateboard Ground and the new DSD Maintenance Yard*

- (l) there were only two skateboard grounds on Hong Kong Island with one located at Site A and another in Morrison Hill. The affected skateboard ground at Site A would be reprovisioned, with a similar area of about 1,200m<sup>2</sup> at the Chai Wan Pool Side Garden. The Leisure and Cultural Services Department had no objection to the reprovisioning proposal;
- (m) the proposed DSD maintenance yard would be used for maintenance and operation of the retention tank which would temporarily hold stormwater during rainstorms and reduce the peak flow and the impact on downstream area. The collected stormwater would be discharged into the drainage system after rainstorms. Relevant government departments would explore the feasibility for providing multiple uses in the maintenance yard such as roof-top greening or providing ancillary use for the adjacent reprovisioned skateboard ground;
- (n) there might be technical constraints in using the collected stormwater for flushing purpose. At present, there was no plan for such proposal;

*Others*

- (o) the Tin Hau Temple at Site A was a privately run temple with government licence granted to the Chai Wan Kai Fong Welfare Association Limited. No reprovisioning of the temple was required and

the clearance and compensation of the temple would be handled according to the established procedure under the prevailing land administration regime;

- (p) the population of the Chai Wan Planning Scheme Area was about 173,200 persons at present. Taken into account the additional population from the proposed public housing development at Site A, the planned population would be about 177,000 persons; and
- (q) except for the 'Light Public Housing' project recently announced by Government, there was no other known programme for public housing development in the Chai Wan area.

25. A Member asked whether it was possible to provide pedestrian connection between Site A and the Cape Collinson Road / Cape Collinson Chinese Permanent Cemetery to facilitate pedestrian connectivity to the later location. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, PlanD, said that an ecological corridor with a minimum width of 15m to the south of Site A was proposed to preserve the existing mature woodland habitat and wildlife thereat. There was no proposal for pedestrian access to the hillside. The Chairman remarked that the matter related to the accessibility to the Cape Collinson Chinese Permanent Cemetery was outside the scope of the OZP amendment exercise, but Member's views could be conveyed to the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department and the Transport Department for consideration.

#### Amendment Item B

26. A Member asked if space was reserved at Site B for small-scale business or start-ups. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, PlanD, said that Site B was currently occupied by a public housing development known as 'Wah Yan House, Wah Ha Estate'. It was previously the Chai Wan Factory Estate (CWFE) accorded with a Grade 2 historic building status. Given the historical value of CWFE and in response to the public aspiration for conserving CWFE, HA undertook to convert CWFE for public rental housing. The subject OZP amendment was only to take forward the decision of the Town Planning Board to rezone the site under the previous "CDA" review to reflect the as-built condition.

The site was proposed to be rezoned to “R(A)” and commercial uses such as shop and services were always permitted on the lowest three floors of the building.

27. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H20/25 and that the draft Chai Wan OZP No. S/H20/25A at Attachment II (to be renumbered to S/H20/26 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Chai Wan OZP No. S/H20/25A at Attachment IV as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.”

28. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before their publication under the Town Planning Ordinance. Any major revision would be submitted for the Board’s consideration.

[The Chairman thanked the representatives from PlanD, HD, CEDD and AECOM, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 7**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H9/84                      Proposed Eating Place in “Open Space” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zones, A Kung Ngam Lot No. 27 S. A, 27 A Kung Ngam Village Road, Shau Kei Wan, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H9/84A)

---

29.            The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Shau Kei Wan and Ms Lilian S.K. Law had declared an interest on the item for being a former Executive Director and committee member of The Boys’ & Girls’ Clubs Association of Hong Kong which had a service unit in Shau Kei Wan.

30.            The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the interest of Ms Lilian S.K. Law was indirect, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

31.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 17.4.2023 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address comments from the Buildings Department. 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.

32.            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.

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 8**

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

[Open Meeting]

A/K9/280                      Proposed Flat with Permitted Hotel, Shop and Services and Eating Place Uses with Minor Relaxation of Gross Floor Area for a Public Car/Lorry Park in “Commercial (3)” Zone, Kowloon Inland Lot No. 11103, 12 Hung Lok Road, Hung Hom, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K9/280A)

---

33.            The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Hung Hom. Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had declared an interest on the item for owning a flat in Hung Hom.

34.            The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the property owned by Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

35.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 3.4.2023 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow additional time to prepare further information to address comments from the Transport Department and the Environmental Protection Department. 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.

36.            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 9**

Any Other Business

37. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 10:15 a.m..