

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 720th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 9.6.2023**

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

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Assistant Comr/Urban, Transport Department
Mr. Chow Bing Kay

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
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

In Attendance

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 719th MPC Meeting held on 19.5.2023

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 719th MPC meeting held on 19.5.2023 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Yau Ma Tei Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K2/24

(MPC Paper No. 5/23)

3. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for the planning area of Yau Ma Tei (the Area) were to take forward some of the recommendations of the District Study for Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok (YMDS) conducted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|---|---|
| Mr Ivan M.K. Chung
<i>(the Chairman)</i>
<i>(as Director of Planning)</i> | - being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its Committee; |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung
<i>(Vice-chairman)</i> | - being a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund (URF) of URA; |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law | - being a former director of the Board of URF of URA and a member of the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) which was currently in discussion with URA on housing development issues; |
| Mr Ben S.S. Lui | - being a former employee of URA; |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | being a member of HKHS which was currently in discussion with URA on housing development issues; |

- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a director of the Board of URF of URA and director and CEO of Light Be (Social Realty) Company Limited which was a licensed user of a few URA's residential units in Sheung Wan;
- Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a director of the Board of URF and a member of Development Project Objection Consideration Committee and Land, Rehousing & Compensation Committee of URA, and a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS which was currently in discussion with URA on housing development issues; and
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Yau Ma Tei.

4. The Committee noted that Messrs Ricky W.Y. Yu, Timothy K.W. Ma and Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting, and according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, as the proposed amendments to the OZP in relation to URA's YMDS were proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung, Wilson Y.W. Fung, Ben S.S. Lui and Daniel K.S. Lau, and Ms Lilian S.K. Law only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting.

5. The following representatives from PlanD were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

- Mr Derek P.K. Tse - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK)
- Miss Maggie H.K. Wu - Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK)

Presentation and Question Sessions

6. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Maggie H.K. Wu, TP/TWK, 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:

- (a) Amendment Item A – removal of plot ratio (PR) restriction and revision of building height restriction (BHR) for the “Commercial” (“C”) zones on the two sides of Nathan Road from 110 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) to 140mPD;
- (b) Amendment Item B – rezoning of the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) sites in the area bounded by Kansu Street, Shanghai Street, Jordan Road, Parkes Street and Woosung Street to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” (“OU(MU)”) and revision of BHR from 100mPD to 115mPD; and
- (c) Amendment Item C – revision of BHR for the “R(A)” zones from 100mPD to 115mPD. In relation to the amendment, the maximum domestic PR for the “R(A)” zones would be adjusted from 7.5 to 8.5.

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

Infrastructural Aspect

Garbage Collection and Sewage Treatment

8. A Member raised concern that the Area had a lot of old and dilapidated buildings with no centralised garbage collection facilities. Although YMDS recommended several larger comprehensive development areas which might provide opportunities to improve the garbage collection and sewage treatment facilities in the area, it was imperative to adopt a forward-looking approach to tackle the problem in the district holistically, instead of in a building-by-building approach. In that connection, a few Members asked the following questions:

- (a) whether there was a standard for provision of refuse collection facilities;
- (b) whether YMDS had recommended a long-term solution to deal with the

garbage collection problem in the Area; and

- (c) the Government's policy and strategy in treating solid waste in the territory and the future plan to improve sewage treatment facilities in the Area.

9. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) according to Chapter 9 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), one refuse collection point (RCP) should be provided to serve the needs of each population of 20,000 persons or areas within a distance of 500m;
- (b) currently, garbage in individual buildings was separately collected and disposed to the nearby RCPs, e.g. Parkes Street RCP. There would be room for more modern and dedicated garbage handling facilities in new buildings or comprehensive developments, in particular those at the Development Nodes and Street Consolidation Areas (SCAs) as recommended under YMDS in the long run; and
- (c) the Drainage Services Department (DSD) had upgraded the sewerage systems in Kowloon and the sewage collected could be diverted to Stonecutters Island Sewage Treatment Plant under Harbour Area Treatment Scheme (HATS). As for the proposed amendments, the Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) under YMDS had identified that Anchor Street Sewage Pumping Station, Sham Shui Po No. 1 and 2 Sewage Screening Plant and some sewers within Yau Mong Areas needed to be upgraded to cater for future developments. DSD commented that sewerage upgrading works might be required as recommended in the SIA for the possible increase in sewerage generation arising from the future developments. The sewerage upgrading works, if required, would be implemented by relevant government departments/project proponents at suitable juncture as detailed planning proceeded.

10. A Member who raised concern on garbage collection earlier asked whether the requirement of improving garbage collection facilities could be stated in the Explanatory

Statement (ES) of the OZP. Another Member considered that any such inclusion in the ES should hinge on whether the Government had policy or a comprehensive plan for garbage collection for Hong Kong.

11. The Chairman, while noting the issues related to garbage collection in old buildings mentioned by Members, said that consideration of the proposed amendments to the OZP should focus on land use planning. In the absence of any clear Government policy steer, it would not be appropriate to include the requirement of improving garbage collection facilities in the ES of the OZP at the current juncture.

12. Miss Queenie Ng, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (PEPO) (Territory S), Environmental Protection Department (EPD), supplemented that EPD had provided advices in municipal solid waste management to URA in the context of their district studies. In addition to the provision of RCPs with more advanced technology to collect municipal solid waste and mitigate their nuisances, a more important initiative was to encourage sorting and recycling of municipal solid waste. While the provision of sorting and recycling facilities was not mandatory for new buildings, EPD had been strengthening public awareness of waste sorting and recycling through promotion and education, and provision of community recycling centres and smart bins in housing estates in pilot projects. EDP would continue to provide environmental advices for development proposals.

Drainage Facilities

13. A Member enquired whether the existing drainage facilities had sufficient capacity to support the increased development intensities of the Development Nodes recommended in YMDS and whether new drainage facilities were needed to prevent flooding in the Area. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that while URA had conducted a Drainage Impact Assessment for YMDS as a whole to confirm the technical feasibility of the recommendations, the drainage impacts of individual Development Node would have to be further assessed by the future project proponent. As for flooding problem, DSD had identified flooding blackspots over the years and would consider building appropriate drainage facilities, e.g. flood storage ponds at appropriate locations, to reduce flood risks in the Area.

Social Aspect

“OU(MU)” and Preservation of Local Characters

14. A Member said that the Area had its own distinctive local characters, e.g. Yau Ma Tei Fruit Market, Jade Hawker Bazaar and Kitchenware Street (i.e. Shanghai Street). Having noted that one of the OZP amendments was to rezone some sites along Temple Street and Woosung Street (i.e. the character streets) from “R(A)” to “OU(MU)” and relax the restriction of commercial uses in general from only the lowest three floors to the purpose-designed non-residential portion of a building (i.e. Amendment Item B), there was a down-side that the proposed amendment might encourage large-scale shopping mall developments. Such mode of urban renewal would transform the Area into a high-end neighbourhood, thus displacing the local shops with special characters as well as existing residents with a high proportion of aged and underprivileged people. The Member asked what could be done under the planning regime to avoid the impacts on local residents and to preserve the local characters.

15. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that there was an urgency to expedite urban renewal in the Area, as the number of old and dilapidated buildings was increasing at phenomenal rate. Although some of the buildings could be rehabilitated to prolong their life span, demolition and redevelopments were unavoidable. There might be opportunities to preserve the local character through re-provisioning of local shops affected by URA’s comprehensive redevelopment within the future development. As for individual sites, the proposed “OU(MU)” zone would facilitate mixed-use developments by allowing more commercial floors. Taking a new development in Temple Street as an example, local shops and restaurants with special characters were accommodated on lower floors of the newly-developed buildings. Hence, with flexibility to enrich the commercial mix within buildings, there was more scope to preserve the local character streets with specialty shops. To strengthen the local character, YMDS also recommended enhancement of signage and streetscape improvement which would be taken forward by relevant government departments.

16. Two Members further suggested that consideration should be given to (i) having a proper place-branding strategy to give the place a distinguishable market position and a recognisable brand identity, and (ii) having a Master Design Plan resembling the one adopted by URA for To Kwa Wan to guide individual developments by different developers for creating a coherent local character, especially in SCA.

17. A Member enquired the details of the requirement for separation between domestic and non-domestic uses in buildings within the “OU(MU)” zone. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, explained that for mixed use buildings in “OU(MU)” zones, physical segregation between the residential and non-residential portions, including separate entrances/lift lobbies/staircases, should be provided to prevent nuisance caused by non-residential uses to the residents. Details of physical segregation would be checked at the building plan submission stage

Population Change

18. A Member enquired whether the proposed amendments to the OZP had taken into account the forecasted population change in the Area. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that according to the latest population projection, the population in the existing Metro areas would be thinning out in the longer run with implementation of the Northern Metropolis and Kau Yi Chau Artificial Islands developments. Nevertheless, YMDS adopted the assumption that the population of the Area would remain at the existing level of about 213,000 which took into account the initiative to increase the average size of living quarters from Gross Floor Area of about 47m² to 55m².

Development Parameters

19. A Member enquired whether the future development on sites which were relatively small in size with setback requirement could achieve the maximum permissible PR stipulated under the OZP. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that a minimum setback of 3m or 6m from the lot boundary above 15m measured from mean street level (i.e. setback at above podium level) abutting various streets had already been stipulated on earlier versions of the OZP for air ventilation purpose. All sites would be able to accommodate the maximum permissible PR even with those setback requirements.

Pedestrian Walkability

20. A Member enquired whether there were measures to improve the walkability of pedestrian footpaths, in particular, provision of all-weather walking environment. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that YMDS had recommended to widen the footpaths

along the primary distributor roads, e.g. Nathan Road, through building setback to achieve the minimum requirements in HKPSG (i.e. 5.5m including 4.5m for Through Zone and 1m for shopping frontage in Building Frontage Zone). The footpath after widening would provide more space for consideration of street beautification measures such as tree planting and greening, as well as the provision of canopies. The same Member added that consideration should be given to enhance walkability of the character streets by pedestrianisation of some sections of the streets.

Other Recommendations in YMDS

21. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether YMDS had recommended ways to encourage amalgamation of small sites for more comprehensive developments ;
- (b) to strike a balance between conservation and development, YMDS had recommended to transfer the plot ratio (TPR) of some sites with low development potential or with buildings worthy of conservation to sites in the Development Nodes, what the implementation details were and whether the ES of the OZP would specify the sites suitable for TPR; and
- (c) details for relaxation of BHR in the Development Nodes recommended in YMDS.

22. In response, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) as shown in the Master Renewal Concept Plan Framework proposed under YMDS, amongst others, five Development Nodes for more comprehensive developments with higher development intensity were identified. The TPR was one of the planning tools to provide incentives for expediting urban renewal;
- (b) the TPR mechanism was not restricted to the Development Nodes. There was flexibility for TPR to be implemented for a larger number of sites and

for provision of planning benefits, e.g. open space etc., on the sites where PR was transferred out; and

- (c) YMDS recommended that the BHRs in the Development Nodes had to be relaxed to accommodate higher PRs. Those mega-tall buildings needed to be supported by technical assessments and be submitted to the Board for consideration.

23. The Chairman supplemented that PlanD was preparing a set of Town Planning Board Guidelines for TPR mechanism, which would soon be submitted to the Board for consideration.

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

24. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Yau Ma Tei Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K2/24 and that the draft Yau Ma Tei OZP No. S/K2/24A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/K2/25 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Yau Ma Tei OZP No. S/K2/24A at Attachment IV of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/K2/25 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the draft OZP.

25. 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 for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/537 Proposed Comprehensive Residential (Flat) and Social Welfare Facility (Child Care Centre) Development with Minor Relaxation of Maximum Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions in “Comprehensive Development Area (6)” Zone, Lots 444, 458, 464, 484 and 488 in D.D. 443 and adjoining Government land, Tsuen Wan, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/537)

26. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan and 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 Tsuen Wan.

27. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for not being able to attend the meeting.

28. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 24.5.2023 deferment of consideration of the application for two months to allow more time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

29. 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.

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H9/18
(MPC Paper No. 6/23)

30. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for the planning area of Shau Kei Wan (the Area) involved proposed public housing developments under the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) and the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| Mr Ivan M.K. Chung
<i>(the Chairman)</i>
<i>(as Director of Planning)</i> | - | being an ex-officio member of the Supervisory Board of the HKHS; |
| Mr Paul Y.K. Au
<i>(as the Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs 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 | - | being a member of HKHS; |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law | | being a member of HKHS and a former Executive Director and Committee Member of The Boys' & Girls' Clubs Association of Hong Kong that had a service unit in Shau Kei Wan; and |

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS.

31. The Committee noted that Mr Timothy K.W. Ma had tendered an apology for not being able to attend the meeting, and according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, the proposed amendments to the OZP in relation to the public housing developments were proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of Members in relation to HKHS and HKHA only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting. As the interest of Ms Lilian S.K. Law relating to the service unit in Shau Kei Wan was indirect, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

32. The following Government's representatives and the consultant were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

Mr Mann M.H. Chow - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK)
Mr K.T. Ng - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK)
Mr Billy W.M. Au-Yeung - Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK)

HD

Ms Emily W.M. Ip - Senior Planning Officer
Ms Edith P.Y. Li - Senior Architect
Mr Kyle K.Y. Chan - Civil Engineer
Ms Ebby Z.H. Leung - Planning Officer

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Civil Engineering Office

Mr Ken K.W. Lee - Chief Engineer/Special Duties (Works)
Mr Samuel C.W. Yau - Engineer/Special Duties (Works)

South Development Office

Ms Maggie H.H. Wong - Engineer (South)

Consultant

WSP (Asia) Limited

Mr Calvin C.W. Li

Mr Paul F.K. Lau

Mr Vicco Y.L. Chan

33. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr K.T. Ng, 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:

- (a) Amendment Item A1 – rezoning of a site at A Kung Ngam Village and its adjacent areas from “Open Space” (“O”), “Green Belt” (“GB”), “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”), “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Recreational Development Area” (“OU(CRDA)”) and areas shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group A)6” (“R(A)6”) with the stipulation of a maximum building height (BH) of 110 metres above Principal Datum (mPD);
- (b) Amendment Item A2 – rezoning of a site at A Kung Ngam Village Lane from “O” and “OU(B)” to an area shown as ‘Road’;
- (c) Amendment Item A3 – rezoning of a site occupied by the Yuk Wong Po Din Temple and its proposed expanded area from “OU(B)” and “O” to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”);
- (d) Amendment Item B – rezoning of a site at A Kung Ngam Road from “O”, “R(A)” and “G/IC” to “R(A)5” with the stipulation of a maximum BH of 100mPD;
- (e) Amendment Item C – rezoning of a site at 5 A Kung Ngam Village Road from “OU(B)” to “OU(B)1” with the stipulation of a maximum BH of 80mPD; and
- (f) Amendment Item D – rezoning of a site at 456 Shau Kei Wan Road from “G/IC”, “O” and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC(1)” with the stipulation of a maximum BH of 11 storeys.

34. As the presentation by PlanD’s representative had been completed, the Chairman remarked that Amendment Items B and C were to take forward the Committee’s decisions to

agree/partially agree to two s.12A rezoning applications; Amendment Item A was for a public housing development and Amendment Item D was to relax the BH restriction of a “G/IC” site to facilitate its redevelopment. Should Members agree to the proposed amendments, it would be gazetted and subject to the plan-making process. The Chairman then invited questions from Members.

Amendment Items A1 to A3

35. Members raised the following questions:

- (a) justifications for the substantial area of land proposed to be rezoned to an area shown as ‘Road’ under Amendment Item A2;
- (b) noting that rezoning of some land zoned “O” would not result in deficit in the provision of open space in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), whether the rezoning would have implications on distribution of open space in the Area; and
- (c) according to the HKHA’s indicative development scheme, the BHs of several housing blocks were lower than the maximum BH of 110mPD. Whether the proposed BHs would be stated in the planning brief.

36. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) the existing access road to the Amendment Item A1 site was sub-standard and the area shown as ‘Road’ was the minimum area required to provide vehicular and emergency vehicular accesses;
- (b) there was no implementation plan for the “O” included in Amendment Items A1 to A3. The local and district open space provision after the rezonings would meet the standard in the HKPSG and the open spaces would be evenly distributed in the Area; and
- (c) whilst a maximum BH restriction of 110mPD was stipulated under the

proposed “R(A)6” zone, according to HKHA’s indicative scheme, Blocks 2 and 3 of the proposed public housing development would be lower, i.e. from 80mPD to 95.6mPD, to protect the views to the harbour from the Lei Yue Mun Park and Holiday Village. The proposed BHs would be stated in the planning brief for the proposed public housing development.

Amendment Item D

37. Members raised the following questions:

- (a) justifications for the BH restriction in terms of number of storeys, instead of absolute BH;
- (b) whether there was a standard for provision of rehabilitation services and hostel places for the mentally handicapped persons under HKPSG;
- (c) in order to make better use of the Amendment Item D site and to harness its locational advantage, whether it was possible to expand the service provision to include child care centre (CCC) and elderly care centre, for which there were deficits in the Area and the project proponent (the Salvation Army) had the expertise; and
- (d) whether the proposed plot ratio of 5.5 under the current redevelopment scheme had fully utilized the development potential of the site under the ‘single site, multiple use’ initiative.

38. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) the BH restriction of 11 storey was proposed by the project proponent. A BH restriction in terms of number of storeys allowed flexibility for changing floor-to-floor heights to meet the requirements for different services at the proposed rehabilitation service centre. The BH of the indicative scheme was not more than 40.7mPD;
- (b) there was no standard under HKPSG for rehabilitation services and hostel

places for the mentally handicapped persons. The provision on the site was proposed by the project proponent in consultation with Social Welfare Department (SWD);

- (c) the Labour and Welfare Bureau (LWB)/SWD launched a Special Scheme on Privately Owned Sites for Welfare Uses (the Scheme) in September 2013, which aimed to make better use of the land owned by non-governmental organisations through expansion, redevelopment or new development on their own sites to provide diversified subvented and self-financing facilities, particularly those related to elderly and rehabilitation services. The project proponent applied under the Scheme to facilitate redevelopment of the site for a building comprising a day activities centre and hostel for medium to severely mentally handicapped persons as well as a family and child development centre. The provision of other services such as CCC was not covered by the submitted application under the Scheme. Furthermore, a CCC would be provided by HKHS in the proposed public housing development under Amendment Item B and a number of social welfare facilities would be provided in the Amendment Item A development to meet the needs in the Area; and
- (d) the provision of other services was constrained by (i) the site layout, as part of the site would be for reprovisioning a sitting-out area to be opened to the public at reasonable hours; and (ii) the building design, as the day activities centre and the hostel had to be located on the lower floors (below 24m) of the proposed building to meet fire safety requirements. The proposed development was already compact and the provision of other services at the site would have to be at the expense of the core services for the mentally handicapped persons.

39. Some Members opined that there appeared to be room for expanding the provision of services on the site and the project proponent should be further incentivized to provide more floor space for additional services. Two Members suggested to expand the development site by (i) developing on the sitting-out area, or (ii) amalgamating with the adjoining site currently occupied by a 3-storey building. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, said that the suggested expansion of the development site were not feasible as (i) part of the sitting-out area

was occupied by a town gas installations pressure regulator; and (ii) the adjoining site, which was currently used for the provision of child care services by the Hong Kong Society for the Protection of Children, had a different nature of services by a different operator, and there was no plan for redevelopment of the site. The project proponent applied to the Scheme more than a decade ago and further substantial alterations of the redevelopment scheme would result in undesirable delay in its implementation.

40. The Chairman remarked that whilst noting Members' concern on the optimization of Amendment Item D, policy support given by LWB for the proposed redevelopment should be taken into account and there was a need to expedite the redevelopment to provide the much-needed services. If expansion of the services was necessary in future, the project proponent could submit a planning application for minor relaxation of the BH restriction.

41. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H9/18 and that the draft Shau Kei Wan OZP No. S/H9/18A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/H9/19 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Shau Kei Wan OZP No. S/H9/18A at Attachment IV of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/H9/19 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP.

42. 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 Government's representatives and the consultant for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H5/418 Proposed Comprehensive Development in “Comprehensive Development Area”, “Residential (Group C)”, “Open Space”, “Government, Institution or Community” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’, 1, 1A, 2 and 3 Hill Side Terrace, 55 Ship Street (Nam Koo Terrace), 1-5 Schooner Street, 53 Ship Street (Miu Kang Terrace), Inland Lot No. 9048 and adjoining Government Land, Wan Chai, Hong Kong (MPC Paper No. A/H5/418A)

43. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Wan Chai. Ms Lilian S.K. Law had declared an interest on the item for her spouse serving an honorary post at Ruttonjee Hospital in Wan Chai. As the interest of Ms Lilian S.K. Law was indirect, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

44. The following Government’s 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 Floria Y.T. Tsang - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK)
Ms Chillie T.L. So - Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK)

Commissioner for Heritage’s Office (CHO), Development Bureau (DEVB)

Mr Ivanhoe C.H. Chang - Commissioner for Heritage (C for H)
Ms Clarissa Y.T. Wan - Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation)
Miss Cecilia M.C. Law - Engineer (Heritage Conservation)

Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO), DEVB

Ms. Fione S. L. Lo - Executive Secretary (Antiquities & Monuments)
Miss Fiona Y.C. Tsang - Curator (Historical Buildings)

Presentation and Question Sessions

45. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. PlanD had no objection to the application.

Provision of Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA)

46. A Member said the concern for non-provision of EVA raised when considering the s.12A application for the subject development was still valid under the current application. With reference to paragraph 10.1.9 of the Paper, although the Director of Fire Services (D of FS) had no in-principle objection to the application, the applicant was advised to observe the requirements of EVA as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Building 2011, which stated that the provision of EVA was normally required unless the fire risk was low or the site abutted stepped street. The current scheme, with an increase in the number of residential units as compared to the indicative scheme in the s.12A application, might not be considered as low fire risk. The Member asked whether the scheme with EVA was viable and whether there were precedent cases with similar site context and development parameters without the provision of EVA.

47. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, said that the applicant was well aware of the Committee's concern on EVA at s.12A application stage but considered that the provision of EVA for the Site was not feasible due to site constraint. Instead, a fire engineering approach was adopted to meet the fire safety requirements that was acceptable to D of FS. The Site (around 34mPD) had huge level differences with Queen's Road East (around 6mPD) and Kennedy Road (around 64mPD). With the stepped topographical profile in this part of Wan Chai, it was not uncommon to have developments without the provision of EVA. For instance, Inland Lot (I.L.) No. 9048 in the north-eastern part of the Site, which was zoned "Residential (Group C)" ("R(C)"), was sold by land sale in 2014 without the requirement for provision of EVA. The Member who raised concerns on the EVA issue further enquired whether the development scale of the quoted precedent case in I.L. No. 9048 was comparable to the current development. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, said that a set of

general building plans for I.L. No. 9048 had been approved by the Building Authority for a development with plot ratio (PR) of 5 (the same as that under the current application) and a building height of 11 storeys without the provision of EVA.

48. A Member opined that some new developments along Queen's Road East and Star Street were able to provide EVA and enquired whether EVA could be provided via Star Street nearby. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, explained that the nearest EVA would be provided in Hopewell Centre II that was under construction. Since the Site would be linked to Hopewell Centre II by a proposed elevated walkway, the future residents could evacuate from the Site towards Hopewell Centre II efficiently and firefighters could make use of the open areas in the Site and in Ship Street public open space in emergency situations. The provision of EVA from Queen's Road East via nearby streets such as St. Francis Street and Star Street was not practical as the route was longer and Sau Wa Fong was currently not for vehicular access.

Provision of Open Space

49. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) noting a total provision of public open space of not less than 2,187m² (including the open-air and covered landscape area), whether there was private open space for exclusive use by the future residents; and
- (b) whether the applicant would take up the management and maintenance (M&M) of public open space together with Nam Koo Terrace (NKT).

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

- (a) the applicant did not specify the area of private open space for exclusive use by the future residents in the planning application. Moreover, with reference to Drawing No. A-13 of the Paper, a public open space of not less than 87m² would be provided on the podium within I.L. No. 9048 included in the Site. It might be the applicant's intention that such area on the podium would be for the exclusive use of the future residents; and

- (b) the applicant would be responsible for the M&M of the public open space and the preserved NKT.

Site Planning and Design

51. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the applicant would be responsible for the M&M of the public passageway on Schooner Street;
- (b) with reference to Drawing No. A-9, whether the cantilevered podium garden with trees and a fountain, which was about 7.8m in width and about 14.3m in height from Schooner Street, was structurally feasible;
- (c) noting that the cantilevered podium might block the sunlight on the public passageway on Schooner Street level, whether the applicant had proposed any street lighting to illuminate the public passageway. Also, whether the applicant had proposed any façade treatment to beautify the podium fronting Schooner Street; and
- (d) noting that the proposed residential building would be erected close to NKT, whether it would impair the visibility of NKT.

52. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant would be responsible for the M&M of the passageway abutting Schooner Street underneath the podium within the Site;
- (b) the Site was on a sloping terrain and the height of 14.3m was the level difference between the main level of the Site and Schooner Street. The structural safety pertinent to the loading on the cantilevered podium garden would be vetted by the Building Authority in accordance with the relevant regulations/legislations during the general building plan submission stage;

- (c) as there would be retail facilities on the ground level podium fronting Schooner Street under the scheme, the public passageway thereat should be appropriately lighted up. Details of street lighting and other façade treatments would be explored by the applicant during the detailed design stage; and
- (d) even without the proposed residential building, NKT was currently blocked by St. Francis' Canossian School as viewed from the west. The provision of podium open space at the north-eastern side of the Site would avoid visual obstruction and provide visual linkage to NKT as viewed from the north of Ship Street, e.g. Ship Street public open space.

Site Accessibility

53. Noting that barrier-free access from Queen's Road East and Kennedy Road to the Site was proposed to be provided via Hopewell Centre II (under construction by the same applicant), a Member enquired whether the provision of the access would be guaranteed even if there was a change in ownership of Hopewell Centre II in the future. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, said that the requirement for public access to be maintained and opened from 6 a.m. to 11 p.m. daily was stipulated in the lease of Hopewell Centre II.

Conservation of NKT

54. In response to an enquiry from a Member regarding the scope of the NKT conservation, Mr Ivanhoe C.H. Chang, C for H, said that the main building of NKT was a Grade 1 historic building. The fountain, pavilion and hexagonal planter pot in the garden were not within the grading boundary of NKT. Nevertheless, the applicant had proposed to preserve those features in tandem with NKT.

Deliberation Session

55. The Chairman remarked that the "CDA" portion of the Site was the subject of a s.12A application (No. Y/H5/5), submitted by the same applicant, to rezone the land for the proposed preservation-cum-development project, which was agreed by the Committee.

Compared with the indicative scheme of the s.12A application, the current scheme had amalgamated the adjoining lot, i.e. I.L. No. 9048, zoned “R(C)” resulting in a larger site area. The current scheme was considered a better one as the “R(C)” portion would only be used for a 3-storey podium for residential recreational facilities with public open space atop instead of a residential development as shown in the indicative s.12A scheme. Although there was an increase in the number of flats, the larger site area allowed better site planning and design of the podium and public open space. In addition, all Government departments had no adverse comment on the technical aspects and the concerns on the non-provision of EVA and structural safety of the cantilevered podium garden would be vetted in the general building plans submission stage.

56. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application and the Master Layout Plan under section 16 and section 4A(2) respectively 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 9.6.2027, 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 (e) 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 submission of a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for the conservation of Nam Koo Terrace (NKT) and all historic features to be preserved as mentioned in the CMP prior to the commencement of any works and implementation of the works in accordance with the CMP to the satisfaction of the Antiquities and Monuments Office of Development Bureau or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of full set of photographic, cartographic, and/or 3D scanning records of NKT, including both the interior and exterior of NKT, prior to the

commencement of any works to the satisfaction of the Antiquities and Monuments Office of Development Bureau or of the TPB; and

- (e) the design and implementation of the pedestrian connection between Ship Street, NKT, Queen's Road East and Kennedy Road to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB.”

57. 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 the Government's representatives for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

[Mr William W.L. Chan and Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, Senior Town Planners/Kowloon (STPs/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K13/326 Proposed Government Refuse Collection Point in Areas shown as 'Road', Government Land at the Junction of Tai Yip Street and Tai Yip Lane, Kowloon Bay, Kowloon (Site A) and Government Land at Tai Yip Lane beneath the Kai Fuk Road Flyover, Kowloon Bay, Kowloon (Site B)

(MPC Paper No. A/K13/326)

58. The Secretary reported that the application sites (the Sites) were located in Kowloon Bay. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong - being an employee of the Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU) which rented a property for campus use in Kowloon Bay; and

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being a honorary court member of HKBU which rented a property for campus use in Kowloon Bay.

59. As the interests of Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong were indirect, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

60. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr William W.L. Chan, STP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

61. A Member, having noted that there were existing trees in Site A (Government land at the junction of Tai Yip Street and Tai Yip Lane) while there were no trees in Site B (Government land at Tai Yip Lane beneath the Kai Fuk Road Flyover), asked whether the applicant had any proposal to increase the amenity value, for example, by planting more trees or adding some greenery. In response, Mr William W.L. Chan, STP/K, said that due to the narrow pavement abutting both sites, there was no room to plant new trees. Instead, the applicant had proposed vertical greening and rooftop greening on the sites. Member said that although vertical greening was a good initiative, the applicant should try to enhance the design and be committed to providing long-term care and maintenance of the proposed vertical greening.

Deliberation Session

62. Members generally supported the application. To address Members' suggestion on the provision of more greening measures, the Chairman suggested and Members agreed to include an advisory clause to request the applicant to consider enhancing the design by providing more greening measures on the sites. A Member remarked that the applicant could

consider exploring design measures to feature low-carbon and environmentally-friendly energy in the building design which could be considered for ‘Platinum’ rating under Building Environmental Assessment Method Plus (BEAM Plus) Certification.

63. 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 9.6.2027, 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 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.”

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

“to enhance the design by providing more greening measures.”

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/822 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Office, Shop and Services and Eating Place Uses in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 25 Tai Yip Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/822A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

65. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

66. A Member raised the following questions:
- (a) whether the proposed building at the application site (the Site) complied with the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG);
 - (b) the location of the proposed green wall and whether at-grade greening was proposed; and
 - (c) noting that the applicant indicated that they would apply for the 'Bronze' rating under the Building Environmental Assessment Method Plus (BEAM Plus) Certification, whether the applicant would strive to achieve a higher rating, say 'Gold', as a new practice note would soon be promulgated which would allow GFA concession only if 'Gold' or above rating was attained.
67. In response, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, made the following main points:
- (a) the Site was small in scale and with a site area of less than 1,000m². Most of the requirements under SBDG were not applicable;
 - (b) the green walls were proposed mainly on the second and third floors of the proposed building, which would be about 10m above the ground level. Whilst the applicant did not propose any at-grade greening, 1.5m-wide setbacks along both Tai Yip Street and the back alley were proposed. A further 1.5m-wide non-building area with clear headroom of 5.1m in height on the ground floor would be provided at the back alley, amounting to a total of 3m-wide setback mainly for loading/unloading purpose; and
 - (c) the applicant advised that currently there was no plan to design the building for a rating higher than 'Bronze' under BEAM Plus Certification. However, the Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office had suggested and an advisory clause was recommended for the applicant to strive for a higher BEAM Plus Certification rating as part of the concerted efforts to make Kowloon East a greener Core Business District.
68. In response to a Member's enquiry on the implementation details and future

maintenance of the green walls, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, said that the applicant had been asked but had not provided any details. Nevertheless, according to the submitted scheme, the applicant had reserved space beyond the curtain wall for installation of the green walls. Noting a remark of ‘subject to approval and for indicative purpose only’ indicated in Drawing No. A-17 of the Paper regarding the proposed weather-proof glass canopy, a Member enquired whether the applicant was committed in implementing the canopy. In response, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, said that the applicant had indicated that if the proposed canopy could not be exempted from GFA calculation at the general building plan submission stage, the concerned GFA would be absorbed in the proposed scheme. This demonstrated the applicant’s commitment to implement the canopy.

Deliberation Session

69. The Chairman remarked that the Committee had approved many similar applications in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone before, which were in line with the Government policy of encouraging redevelopment of aged industrial buildings. As for the implementation of the canopy, the applicant’s pledge to absorb the GFA of the canopy into the proposed scheme could be an indication of the commitment to implement the canopy. PlanD would scrutinize the development at the general building plan stage to ensure compliance with the approved scheme.

70. 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 9.6.2027, 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 land contamination assessment and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to development of the site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of a sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;

- (c) in relation to (b) above, the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of a revised traffic impact assessment with a traffic management plan and implementation of the traffic improvement measures, if any, identified therein, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB; and
- (e) 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.”

71. 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 William W.L. Chan and Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STPs/K, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 9

Any Other Business

72. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:35 a.m..