

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 727th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 22.9.2023

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

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department
Mr Chow Bing Kay

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

Absent with Apologies

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Karen K.Y. Tsui

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 726th MPC Meeting

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 726th MPC meeting, which was conducted by way of circulation of papers to all Members, 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 (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/H5/7

Application for Amendment to the Approved Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H5/31, To rezone the application site from “Residential (Group A)”, “Residential (Group C)” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group A) 9”, 31-36 Sau Wa Fong and 8-12 St. Francis Street, Wan Chai, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. Y/H5/7)

3. 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. The Committee agreed that the interest of Ms Lilian S.K. Law was indirect and she could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

4. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicants' representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

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

Applicants

Great Kinetic Limited/Full Glory Development Limited/Ever Genius Limited

Mr Joseph Li

Mr Johnson Liu

Applicants' Representatives

KTA Planning Limited

Mr Kenneth To

Ms Pauline Lam

Ms Anson Ying

CKM Asia Limited

Mr Kim Chin

Lu Tang Lai Architects Limited

Mr Tommy Ng

Mr Joseph Tang

Asia Art Archive

Mr Anthony Yung

Ms Susana Chung

5. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the background of the

application.

6. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed rezoning to facilitate a private residential development with commercial uses (including art facilities) at the Site, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application and recommended the Committee to partially agree to the application by rezoning the Site to “Residential (Group A) 9” (“R(A)9”) to allow the development intensity on a par with “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone, stipulate appropriate control to ensure provision of direct vehicular access for future development and designate non-building area at Sau Wa Fong (SWF).

7. The Chairman then invited the applicants’ representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Pauline Lam, the applicants’ representative, made the following main points:

- (a) lacking vehicular access was the major consideration due to which several sites in SWF area, including part of the Site, were rezoned from “R(A)” to “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) on the draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H5/8. Under the current proposal, the amalgamation of the seven lots at the Site would enable a single comprehensive development with direct vehicular access from St. Francis Street (SFS). The proposal with appropriate planning and design layout would also improve the visual and air permeability as well as the streetscape in the area;
- (b) the current pedestrian access between SWF and Queen’s Road East (QRE) was via staircases/ramps at SFS without any barrier-free access, and part of the pavement was within private lots and partially obstructed. The current proposal would provide a 24-hour barrier-free public passageway with a lift and staircase to enhance the connectivity between SWF, SFS and QRE for the local residents and visitors in the neighbourhood;
- (c) comparing with the existing pavement of about 1.9m at SFS and the

requirement of 1m setback under the OZP, the proposed setback of 10m from SFS under the current proposal would greatly improve the pedestrian environment as well as the wind and visual permeability of the area;

- (d) the existing right of way within the Site at SWF would be re-provided and enhanced with greenery and landscape design;
- (e) an open turntable area for pick-up/drop-off and loading/unloading activities would be provided at the frontage of SFS for the use of future residents and visitors, which would help minimise the interruption to the through traffic on SFS; and
- (f) retail shops and/or art facilities would be provided on G/F, 1/F and 2/F of the proposed development with a view to strengthening the local character of SWF.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Mr Franklin Yu joined the meeting during presentation of the applicants' representative.]

8. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicants' representative were completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

Fire Safety

9. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that the main building block of the proposed development would be located in the inner portion of the Site with no emergency vehicular access (EVA), whether there would be fire safety concern under the current proposal; and
- (b) whether the Fire Services Department (FSD) had considered formulating a comprehensive plan for improving the fire safety services for the area given the absence of EVA and that there were other ongoing redevelopments with

no EVA in the vicinity.

10. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, made the following main points:
- (a) since the applicants proposed to amalgamate the lots in SWF and those fronting SFS to form the Site, the concern of having no EVA would no longer be an issue as there would be direct access to the Site at SFS for fire fighting vehicles in the event of a fire or other emergency situations;
 - (b) FSD had no in-principle objection to the application. The applicants would need to seek the Building Authority's and FSD's approval for its fire service installations in the general building plan submission stage. Fire service installations would have to be designed and provided to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services (D of FS); and
 - (c) fire safety design and provisions were considered case-by-case by the Building Authority and FSD. For developments where the provision of EVA was impracticable due to site constraints, the Building Authority might grant exemption for provision of such if relevant fire engineering approach could be adopted to meet fire safety requirements. A recent example of adopting such an approach was the proposed development at the adjacent Nam Koo Terrace.

11. Mr Tommy Ng, the applicants' representative, supplemented that FSD could require the applicants to implement relevant enhanced fire services installations, such as sprinkler systems and other fire resisting constructions, to comply with the fire safety requirements during the building plan submission stage.

Proposed Pedestrian Connections

12. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether the proposed public passageway including the lift, staircase and open-air portion (an area currently shown as 'Road') would be open to the

public on a 24-hour basis, and which party would be responsible for the management and maintenance of the public passageway;

- (b) the design of the proposed 24-hour public passageway noting that it might offer an opportunity for beautification with outdoor art installations; and
- (c) how to ensure that the proposed 24-hour public passageway could be duly implemented.

13. In response, Mr Kenneth To, the applicants' representative, made the following points:

- (a) the public passageway, including the lift, staircase and open-air portion within the Site would be open to the public on a 24-hour basis. It would be designed and constructed by the applicants, and managed and maintained as part of the non-domestic portion of the proposed development in the future;
- (b) the lift and staircase would not only form part of the 24-hour public passageway but would also serve the non-domestic portion of the proposed development, in particular for the proposed art facility, namely Asia Art Archive (AAA). Hence, the design of the 24-hour public passageway as a whole was very important for the proposed development and the applicants would make effort to achieve a design that would be in keeping with the local character, especially the cultural ambience of the locality. Although the existing right of way to the southeast of the Site adjacent to Sau Wa Court was not owned by the applicants, the proposed development with the enhanced public passageway, in terms of both connectivity and visual quality, might create an incentive for the adjacent lot owners to improve the design of the right of way within their lots; and
- (c) the applicants had proposed to stipulate the provision of the 24-hour public passageway in the Notes of the proposed "R(A)9" zone and with the stipulation of which, it would not be possible for the Site being developed

in a piecemeal manner or otherwise, such statutory requirement could not be fulfilled.

14. To supplement, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, said that as the leases of the lots of the Site were virtually unrestricted, it might not be possible to impose the requirement of the provision of a 24-hour public passageway as a condition under the leases. Nevertheless, the applicants had proposed to incorporate the requirement for the provision of a 24-hour public passageway in the Notes of the proposed “R(A)9” zone, and such provision would have to be reflected in the building plan submission during the detailed design stage.

15. The Chairman supplemented that once the requirement for the provision of a 24-hour public passageway was included in the Notes of the OZP, as proposed by the applicants, such requirement would be statutory that the applicants would have to comply with for carrying out development at the Site. The provision would be reflected in the building plan submission which would be scrutinised by relevant government departments.

Planning and Design

16. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) if amalgamation of the lots within the Site could not be completely achieved, whether the individual lot owners would be able to develop their own lots as long as the statutory requirements in the Notes could be complied with;
- (b) whether more stringent building height restriction (BHR) would be imposed on the portion of the Site fronting SFS in order to ensure that a low-rise building frontage, which would be more inviting to the public, would be created;
- (c) the increase in population arising from the proposed development; and
- (d) the proposed average flat size.

17. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, made the following points:
- (a) given that the applicants were not the sole owners of the Site, piecemeal/standalone development could not be precluded should the Committee agree to the amendments as proposed by the applicants. As such, PlanD would impose appropriate planning control/development restrictions in the Notes at OZP amendment stage;
 - (b) BHR for the proposed “R(A)9” zone as a whole would be 110mPD and the plot ratio would follow the restrictions under the Building (Planning) Regulations, which would be the same as the adjoining “R(A)” zone; and
 - (c) according to the applicants’ submission, the estimated population from the proposed development would be about 562. However, as most of the flats were vacant, it would not be possible to estimate the net increase in population within the Site due to the proposed development.
18. Messrs Kenneth To and Tommy Ng, the applicants’ representatives, made the following points:
- (a) the applicants intended to develop the Site as a whole. The three current owners of the lots within the Site were all subsidiaries of the same company and there was only a minor ownership issue left to be resolved before they could proceed with the comprehensive redevelopment. They had also consulted various government departments including the Buildings Department on the proposed scheme, and the intended comprehensive development of the Site would be reflected in the building plan submission during the detailed design stage;
 - (b) the layout design under the current proposal echoed with Members’ views of having the high-rise block in the inner portion of the Site at SWF while placing the low-rise structures of the 24-hour public passageway and pick-up/drop-off area at SFS in order to allow for a more inviting design and open view for the public; and

- (c) the average flat size of the proposed development would be about 42m².

Traffic and Transport

19. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) upon completion of Hopewell Centre II, a large-scale development in the vicinity of the Site under construction, whether QRE would still have sufficient capacity for the additional traffic generated by the proposed development, and whether the Transport Department (TD) had any plan to ensure the overall through traffic of the area;
 - (b) whether the turntable on G/F of the proposed development was mainly designed to serve shops at lower floors of the development, and the types of vehicles that would use the turntable; and
 - (c) whether the pick-up/drop-off activities at the Site would affect the through traffic on SFS which was of a steep gradient.
20. Concerning the traffic capacity of QRE, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, said that Hopewell Centre II had been taken into account in the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) conducted for the proposed development as submitted by the applicants, and the junctions analysed (including QRE) were expected to operate with sufficient capacities with the proposed development for design year 2029. Moreover, as the Site was well served by public transport with Admiralty and Wan Chai MTR Stations located nearby, TD agreed that there was no need to provide private car parking spaces within the proposed development.
21. Regarding the internal transport facilities, Messrs Kenneth To and Kim Chin, the applicants' representatives, made the following points:
- (a) the turntable and the open area for passenger pick-up/drop-off and loading/unloading activities were intended to serve the future residents and visitors of the proposed development, and the types of vehicles using such

facilities included private cars, taxis and light goods vehicles; and

- (b) the open area with a turntable on G/F was proposed to be located within the Site, taking into account the need for passenger pick-up/drop-off and loading/unloading activities of light goods vehicle without interrupting the through traffic on SFS. Moreover, it was unlikely for on-street kerbside activities to be taken place in front of the Site on SFS in light of the steep gradient of that part of the road. Adverse impact on the through traffic on SFS was not anticipated.

Proposed Art Facilities

22. Some Members raised questions on the details of the proposed art facilities on 1/F and 2/F of the proposed development and whether the applicants had previous experience in collaborating with arts organisations. In response, Mr Johnson Liu, the applicants' representative, said that the applicants had liaised closely with AAA, a long established non-profit organisation, and they had expressed interest in moving into the proposed development as the location of the Site was considered suitable in view of the nature of AAA.

23. Mr Anthony Yung, the applicants' representative from AAA, explained that AAA was a non-profit organisation established in 2000. It maintained a library with a collection of books and archives related to art history in Asia, which had supported the works of many students, artists, and art professionals and communities. AAA was currently located in Hollywood Road in Sheung Wan, and had been discussing with the applicants for a long-term relocation to the Site. Mr Yung opined that Wan Chai was a place with relatively long history in Hong Kong and had played a significant role in the development of Hong Kong as well as arts and culture, and was thus an ideal place for AAA.

24. A member invited AAA to elaborate further on how it could help shape and strengthen the local character and cultural ambience of the area upon relocation to the Site.

25. In response, Mr Anthony Yung, the applicants' representative from AAA, made the following points:

- (a) AAA could strengthen the cultural ambience of the area by offering an

artistic environment and materials for learning. The major group of visitors to AAA was students and the opening hours were 10am to 6pm from Monday to Saturday. Hence, it was considered suitable to be located in a residential neighbourhood;

- (b) AAA held many free talks, exhibitions and tours for local visitors every month, such as tours/visits of local history and traditional arts and crafts, e.g. Kwong Wah Printing Company in Sheung Wan. Should AAA be relocated to Wan Chai, which was a place full of history, AAA would continue to organise local tours and talks in the area to give more in-depth learning opportunities to the public; and
- (c) as compared to other organisations which aimed to attract a lot of visitors, the nature of AAA made it suitable for locating within a residential neighbourhood and enriching the cultural ambience of the area.

26. In response to a Member's question on the relationship between the applicants and AAA, Mr Johnson Liu, the applicants' representative, said that the applicants had approached various art organisations and finally decided to invite AAA, a non-profit making organisation, to move into the proposed development. The contractual agreement between the applicants and AAA would be proceeded when all the statutory processes to effect the proposed development, including approval from Town Planning Board on the rezoning proposal and approval from the Buildings Department on the general building plan, were completed.

27. As there were no further questions from Members, the Chairman informed the applicants' representatives that the hearing procedure of the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicants of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked PlanD's and the applicants' representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

28. The Chairman remarked that as recommended in the "Study on Redevelopment

along Stepped Streets', part of the Site in SWF without vehicle access was rezoned to "R(C)" with lower development intensity mainly due to fire safety concern. Under the current application, with the applicants' proposal to amalgamate the lots in SWF and those on SFS where vehicular access would be available, the main aforementioned concerns could be addressed. Besides, detailed fire services installations would need to be provided to the satisfaction of the Building Authority and the D of FS at building plan submission stage. In terms of planning and design merits, a 24-hour public passageway and a setback of 10m from SFS were proposed. The applicants also intended to cooperate with AAA to provide arts and cultural facilities within the Site. Should the Committee agree to the rezoning proposal, PlanD would discuss with relevant government departments the appropriate control to ensure the comprehensive development of the Site and the provision of the 24-hour public passageway.

29. Members in general had no objection to rezoning the Site for proposed residential development with commercial uses, including art facilities. Members supported the redevelopment of buildings on the stepped street and the applicants' proposal to amalgamate the lots with stepped height frontage as such a design would be more desirable than piecemeal developments of individual lots.

30. Some Members opined that private-led redevelopment with arts or culture characteristics to strengthen the local character should be supported and encouraged in Hong Kong as it provided an alternative to mainstream residential-cum-retail redevelopment. Considering that there was no contractual agreement between the applicants and AAA, a Member observed that there was a lack of control on the provision of arts facilities at the Site as the proposed requirements under the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP were not statutory. Members generally considered that since the Site would be zoned "R(A)9" for residential development, the provision of art facilities would be a bonus and flexibility should be allowed for the proposed development.

31. A Member expressed concern about the lack of control on the provision of the setback from SFS and suggested that consideration could be given to imposing more stringent BHR for the concerned portion of the Site fronting SFS so as to ensure that a low-rise entrance at SFS could be achieved. A few Members were concerned about the landscaping or design of the 24-hour public passageway. In relation to Members' concerns, the

Secretary clarified that, considering part of the Site fronting SFS was currently zoned “R(A)”, a more stringent BHR would affect the development potential of the lots. In fact, the applicants proposed a setback of 10m fronting SFS, which would allow more space between buildings and achieve a low-rise entrance with stepped height development. It should be noted that the proposed lift and staircase of the 24-hour public passageway would be located at the setback area. Considering that it was the applicants’ proposal to provide a 10m setback at SFS, a setback requirement in the Notes and/or ES of the “R(A)9” zone, rather than BHR, together with the provision of 24-hour public passageway could be explored in stage of proposed OZP amendment, subject to discussion with relevant government departments.

32. The Chairman added that stipulating a setback requirement could help ensure a low-rise frontage at the SFS entrance. As to how such requirement could be specified in the Notes and/or ES of the “R(A)9” zone, it would be further considered by PlanD. PlanD could also follow up with the applicants regarding the provision of art facilities at the Site.

33. A Member reiterated the concern about the fire safety issue and suggested that the Government should review the road design in relation to fire safety for the Wan Chai area. In response, the Chairman remarked that it would be more appropriate to consider the fire safety requirements for each development on a case-by-case basis, given the diversity in site context and constraints. For instance, as no vehicular access could be provided for the development at Nam Koo Terrace, which had previously been considered by the Committee, a fire engineering approach would be adopted to address the fire safety requirements. For the current application, through site amalgamation, the Site would have a street frontage and no longer be landlocked.

34. After deliberation, the Committee decided to partially agree to the application. The proposed amendments to the Wan Chai OZP, together with the revised Notes and ES, would be submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 4

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/K15/6 Application for Amendment to the Approved Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K15/27, To rezone the application site from “Comprehensive Development Area” to “Commercial (1)”, 428 Cha Kwo Ling Road, Yau Tong Bay, Yau Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. Y/K15/6A)

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

36. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant’s representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

Ms Vivian M.F. Lai	- District Planning Officer/Kowloon
Mr Steven Y.H. Siu	- Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)
Mr Kenneth P.C. Wong	- Town Planner/Kowloon

Applicant

Ever Sun International Holdings Limited

Dr Eddy Li Sau Hung
Mr Yau Kit Chi

Applicant's Representatives

Arup Hong Kong Limited

Ms Yeung Wing Shan, Theresa

Mr Lim Tse Kang Mark

Mr Wong Sek Hei

Associated Architects Limited

Ms Lee So Kwan

Mr Ip Kwun Lun

37. Mr Stanley Choi declared that he and Dr Eddy Li Sau Hung both were council members of Hong Kong Chinese Importers and Exporters Association. The Committee noted that as the interest of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi was indirect and he had not discussed with Dr Li about the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

38. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the background of the application.

39. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Steven Siu, STP/K, briefed Members on the history of the application site (the Site), background of the application, the proposed rezoning to facilitate redevelopment of the existing industrial building (IB) at the Site, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application.

40. The Chairman then invited the applicants' representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

Planning Background of the Site

- (a) the Site was located in an area zoned "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") for commercial/residential uses subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 5 and a maximum building height (BH) of 120mPD;

- (b) the existing Wing Shan Industrial Building (WSIB) on the Site had a non-domestic PR of about 11;
- (c) the latest set of building plans pursuant to the wholesale conversion of WSIB for retail use was approved by the Building Authority on 18.2.2011, and the applicant had received the No-objection Letter for lease modification from the Lands Department;
- (d) the planned public waterfront promenade (PWP) along Yau Tong Bay would be blocked by WSIB as the building was constructed before the requirement for provision of PWP was stipulated on the approved Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP);

The Proposed Development

- (e) the current development proposal of WSIB put forth by the applicant could help realise a continuous PWP along Yau Tong Bay, achieving seamless connection and integration with the PWP in Kowloon East;
- (f) the proposed development, namely The Rainbow Tower, would have a non-domestic PR of 11 (the same as the existing WSIB), a BH of 130mPD, and a PWP of about 20m wide which was 5m wider than the 15m minimum requirement stipulated in the Notes of the “CDA” zone;
- (g) the proposed development would form an iconic landmark to help transform Yau Tong Bay into a vibrant eastern gateway;
- (h) apart from offices, the proposed development would provide retail shops as well as food and beverage uses along the harbourfront of Yau Tong Bay, creating a new destination along Victoria Harbour;
- (i) the proposed development would provide a building setback from the proposed residential development to the east, and a 24-hour pedestrian

access connecting Cha Kwo Ling Road and the PWP;

- (j) there was no adverse comments/no in-principle objection from relevant government bureau/departments on the proposed development; and
- (k) it was proposed to rezone the site from “CDA” to “Commercial(1)” (“C(1)”) with a maximum PR of 11, a maximum BH of 130mPD and provision of a PWP of minimum width of 15m. It was also proposed to include ‘Marine Related Facilities’ and ‘Marina’ as Column 1 and 2 uses respectively for the proposed “C(1)” zone to facilitate the proposed public landing step at the PWP and to allow flexibility for the incorporation of marina related uses at the Site in the future, with a view to creating an iconic commercial node and a vibrant harbourfront with marina at Yau Tong Bay for public enjoyment.

41. As the presentations of PlanD’s representative and the applicants’ representative were completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

Planning Gains and Proposed BH

42. A Member considered that while the proposed 24-hour pedestrian access and 20m-wide PWP were beneficial, the former might not be necessary since there was already a planned pedestrian access to the immediate east of the Site to connect Cha Kwo Ling Road and the PWP, and the PWP was only required to be 15m in width under the OZP. The proposed planning gains appeared to have been provided at the expense of an increased BH, and the resulting building bulk might overshadow the surroundings. The Member asked PlanD whether it was necessary to relax the height of the proposed development from 120mPD to 130mPD under the OZP as proposed by the applicant.

43. In response, Mr Steven Siu, STP/K, made the following main points:

- (a) the Site’s planning background was unique in that WSIB was built to a PR of about 11 and the applicant had obtained relevant approvals for wholesale conversion of the existing WSIB. The applicant had proposed a series of

planning gains under the current redevelopment proposal, including a PWP of 20m wide with an area of not less than 1,205m², which was about one quarter of the site area and hence limiting the area available for the tower block. Against such background, the proposed BH of 130mPD to achieve a PR of 11 at the Site was not considered unreasonable;

- (b) to accommodate a PR of 11, the applicant had tried to maximise the site coverage of the proposed development, resulting in a relatively large proposed floor plate. As seen in the approved master layout plan (MLP) under Application No. A/K15/112 and the photomontage of Yau Tong Bay submitted by the applicant, the building frontages of the proposed residential buildings on the northern side of Yau Tong Bay fronting the PWP was comparable to the proposed development at the Site. Given the unique planning circumstances, the proposed development was not considered incompatible with the surroundings; and
- (c) with regard to the pedestrian access to the immediate east of the Site, the developer of that lot had no concrete development programme. There was also no concrete programme to relocate the government uses to the west of the Site. The applicant had pledged to provide a 3m wide at-grade pedestrian path and the 20m wide PWP within the Site as soon as possible to enhance accessibility between the harbourfront and the hinterland for public enjoyment.

44. In response to a Member's question on whether it would be possible to reduce the BH if the width of PWP was reduced to 15m, i.e. the minimum requirement stipulated under the OZP, Ms Lee So Kwan, the applicant's representative, said that in general, a larger building footprint could result in a larger per floor footprint. Under the applicant's proposal, a floor-to-floor height of 4.3m was adopted for the proposed Grade A office floors. For reference, other developers had proposed a 5m floor-to-floor height for Grade A office floors. A 10m reduction in height for the proposed scheme would result in a reduction of three typical floors. A reduction in tower setback from the eastern and western boundaries to compensate for the reduction in floor space would also be undesirable. The applicant had also reduced the proposed BH by proposing a basement carpark.

45. In response the Chairman's enquiry about the design considerations for the proposed BH, Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant's representative, made the following points:

- (a) as compared to the existing WSIB, one-quarter of the total area of the Site was reserved for the PWP under the current proposed scheme. Tower setbacks were also proposed from both the eastern and western boundaries, allowing a building separation with the proposed building to the east and improving the visual permeability;
- (b) in addition to the provision of the 3m wide pedestrian access connecting the hinterland and PWP and the 20m wide PWP, the applicant had also pledged to provide public landing steps at the PWP as a planning gain. Similar to the PWP, the public landing steps would be managed and maintained by the applicant until they were requested to be surrendered to the Government. The proposed development could provide commercial facilities to visitors and residents coming from eastern side of the Site to Yau Tong Bay PWP; and
- (c) the applicant had made reference to the BH of the "C" zone on the same OZP. With a maximum PR of 12, the BH of buildings within the "C" zone could reach up to 140mPD and 120mPD for sites with no PWP provision requirement. The applicant had made efforts to maximise the site coverage and reduce the BH of the proposed development.

46. In response to a Member's enquiry on the feasibility of increasing the current site coverage, Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant's representative, said that the current site coverage was about 45%. The strips along the eastern and western boundaries of the Site were reserved as air ventilation corridors. Further increasing the site coverage of the proposed development would worsen air ventilation performance, which might not be acceptable to government departments.

47. In response to the Chairman's enquiry about the PR should the BH of the proposed development be restricted to 120mPD, Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant's

representative, said that they did not have such calculation as they would not consider a scheme with a PR lower than that of the existing provision. Dr Eddy Li Sau Hung, the applicant's representative, added that they had to take into consideration reasonable floor-to-floor height which would be attractive to the market.

48. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was any means to control the width of the PWP along the harbourfront so that there would not be an abrupt widening of PWP from the adjacent land parcels to the 20m wide promenade at the Site; and
- (b) the design concept of the height profile of the approved MLP for the Yau Tong Bay "CDA" submitted by the Consortium.

49. In response, Mr Steven Siu, STP/K, made the following points:

- (a) according to the Notes of the OZP for the "CDA" zone, a PWP of not less than 15m wide and site area not less than 24,700m² should be provided. The site area of not less than 24,700m² was equivalent to a promenade measured at 20m in width along the entire harbourfront, with undulations in width to allow design variations, taking into account the potential development constraints of the sites;
- (b) for the previously approved MLP, the adjacent lot to the immediate east of the Site would provide a PWP with a maximum width of 18m to 19m, with an undulation further to the east taking into account the footprint of the proposed residential tower. For the Site, as shown in the applicant's proposal, a 20m wide PWP would be maintained along the Site with no undulation; and
- (c) according to the endorsed Planning Brief for the Yau Tong Bay "CDA" zone, a distinct graduation of height profile with descending BH towards the harbourfront should be adopted with innovative design and appropriate disposition in order to avoid a monotonous harbourfront image and wall

effect. The westernmost towers of the “CDA” zone should have BHs of about 60mPD. The height of the building blocks in front of Yau Tong Estate should be kept as low as possible to minimise the adverse visual impact of the development.

50. In response to the Chairman’s question on whether PlanD had any views on the proposed BH of 130mPD, Mr Steven Siu, STP/K, said that given the Site’s unique circumstances and planning background, and that some high-rise development proposals along the harbourfront had also been agreed by the Committee in recent years such as the BHR of 110/130mPD for the committed Cha Kwo Ling Village (CKLV) public housing development to the northwest of the Site, the proposed BH of 130mPD for the Site was considered acceptable in the given circumstances and generally in line with the latest planning circumstances.

51. In response to a Member’s enquiry on whether the proposed development would set a precedent, Mr Steven Siu, STP/K, said that given the Site’s unique circumstances and planning background as presented and discussed at the meeting, the subject application should be considered on its own individual merits and the proposed BH of 130mPD to achieve a PR of 11 was not considered unreasonable in the given circumstances.

52. The Chairman asked the applicant’s representatives whether they had any objection to the incorporation of the requirements for a PWP of 20m-wide and an at-grade north-south pedestrian path of 3m-wide connecting Cha Kwo Ling Road and the PWP, as proposed by the applicant, into the Notes of the OZP as appropriate. Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant’s representative, confirmed that they had no objection to the stipulation of such requirements in the OZP, which would also be reflected in the lease.

53. In response to a Member’s question on whether there were other planning merits for the public (e.g. Government, institution or community (GIC) facilities) apart from the provision of pedestrian connection and PWP, Mr Steven Siu, STP/K, made the following points:

- (a) apart from the 3m wide public passageway and the 20m wide PWP, the applicant had proposed a set of landing steps that would be opened for

public use;

- (b) all the GIC facilities prescribed for the “CDA” zone under the endorsed Planning Brief, such as the Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre, Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Services Centre and Hostel for Moderately Mentally Handicapped Persons, had been committed at the adjacent Phases 1 and 2 development under the approved MLP; and
- (c) other social welfare facilities suggested by the public, such as child care centre, had also been included in the housing development at CKLV and Ex-Cha Kwo Ling Kaolin Mine Site Phase 2 Development in the vicinity of the Site.

54. Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant’s representative, supplemented that landside supporting facilities were not proposed in the “CDA” proposal submitted by others (the Consortism). In that regard, although marina did not form part of the applicant’s notional scheme, the proposed inclusion of ‘Marina’ as a Column 2 use in the Notes would allow flexibility for provision of landside facilities at the Site directly related to marina activities in the future under planning application.

Proposed Commercial Use

55. A Member raised the following questions to the applicant’s representatives:

- (a) the consideration for having a commercial development at the Site against the approved MLP of the “CDA” zone; and
- (b) how to connect the Site with the hinterland, and the planning gains.

56. In response, Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant’s representative, made the following points:

- (a) the planning intention of the Yau Tong Bay “CDA” zone was for comprehensive development/redevelopment of the area for residential

and/or commercial uses with the provision of open space and other community and supporting facilities;

- (b) Phases 1 and 2 under the latest approved MLP for the “CDA” site (submitted by the Consortium) were mainly residential development with a small portion of commercial development adjacent to Yau Tong MTR Station. The proposed commercial development at the Site would bring more vibrancy to the Yau Tong waterfront and provide retail shops for residents in the area. The Site was a prominent location conducive to commercial development with its high accessibility to the nearby Yau Tong MTR Station and the connecting waterfront promenade extending all along to Cha Kwo Ling and the second Core Business District. A 24-hour public passageway was also proposed within the Site to improve the connectivity of the hinterland and the harbourfront; and
- (c) it should be noted that the Government might request the applicant to surrender the PWP and the landing steps area in the future. Nonetheless, the applicant proposed to provide retail shops on the G/F fronting the PWP for public enjoyment in future.

57. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the reason for not proposing a residential development to tally with the adjacent residential developments under the MLP, Dr Eddy Li Sau Hung, the applicant’s representative, made the following points:

- (a) the applicant had no intention and experience in developing residential properties, and residential development was not in line with their business plan;
- (b) in light of the vision to realise a connected PWP, the applicant had put on hold their previous plan to convert the WSIB into retail/F&B use for a decade, waiting for the Yau Tong “CDA” to mature; and
- (c) the Site was considered a prime location for creating an iconic commercial tower and potential marina which could attract visitors on cruise ships

coming into Victoria Harbour from the east.

58. Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant's representative, supplemented that the Site was located at a convenient location in Yau Tong Bay where many planned residential developments were located nearby. For instance, the planned population from Phases 1 and 2 of the Yau Tong Bay "CDA" was about 19,000; while the planned population from the public housing development at CKLV and Ex-Cha Kwo Ling Kaolin Mine Site Phase 2 Development was also about 19,000. The proposed commercial development with complementary retail and office uses would satisfy the locals' daily needs and offer more job opportunities in the area. For areas to the east of Yau Tong MTR Station including Yau Tong Estate and Yau Lai Estate, connection to the PWP was possible via footbridge linking the MTR station with the proposed shopping mall at Phases 1 and 2 of the Yau Tong Bay "CDA".

Proposed Building Design

59. In response to a Member's enquiry about the design concept and materials of the proposed development (The Rainbow Tower) and concern over the advertisement display on the building façade, Dr Eddy Li Sau Hung, the applicant's representative, said that the design of The Rainbow Tower took inspiration from conventional lighthouses with the top of the shaft sitting a rainbow-coloured lantern. The material used for the rainbow-coloured lantern would be coloured solar panels with 30% to 50% optical transparency, which was a newly developed technology increasingly adopted in Mainland China. The rainbow lantern would be stagnant and would not rotate. The diagonal architectural fins on the façade would reflect natural light at different times of the day and angles and attract people from near and afar. The applicant had no intention to post advertisement on the building façade or the rainbow-coloured panels at the top.

Harboufront Planning

60. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the Government had any vision and plan for the harbourfront at Yau Tong Bay;

- (b) whether the planning of the harbourfront at Yau Tong Bay needed to consult the Harbourfront Commission (HC); and
- (c) whether there was any planning for the water bodies within Yau Tong Bay.

61. In response, Mr Steven Siu, STP/K, made the following points:

- (a) according to the Notes of the OZP and the endorsed Planning Brief for the Yau Tong Bay “CDA” zone, a PWP with a site area not less than 24,700m² should be provided at the entire harbourfront of the “CDA” zone, which would be equivalent to a promenade of about 20m in width;
- (b) the Consortium, which submitted planning applications for the Yau Tong Bay “CDA”, was required to provide and reflect the provision of PWP on the MLP in accordance with the approval condition of the previously approved applications. They were in the process of lease modification, and such requirement had also been imposed in the lease;
- (c) for the subject s.12A application, should the Committee agree to rezone the Site, the proposed amendment to the OZP would be submitted to the Board for consideration before exhibition, and the applicant would not need to submit a s.16 planning application for the proposed development under the proposed “C(1)” zoning. PlanD would impose the requirement of PWP in the Notes of the OZP to ensure the provision to be administrated under the building plan submission and the lease;
- (d) as the Site fell within the purview of the HC, the applicant had consulted the HC on their proposal. Members of the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing of the HC provided advice and comments on the proposal, which were addressed by the applicant. Subsequently, the Task Force of HC indicated no further comment; and

- (e) the current OZP did not include the waterbody of Yau Tong Bay. Any proposed marina development would be subject to demonstration of technical feasibility in the future. The applicant would need to consult the Marine Department, nearby stakeholders and the relevant committees on the proposal. Apart from the need for s.16 planning application for marina-related landside development at the Site, the proposal would likely be subject to further scrutiny under the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance and the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance.

62. In response to a Member's enquiry on the planning of waterbodies adjoining a harbourfront, Mr Steven Siu, STP/K, said that the waterbodies would normally not be included in the OZPs except in areas with plan for reclamation for major development or specific uses. In any event, the waterbodies fell within the purview of other Ordinances.

63. As there were no further questions from Members, the Chairman informed the applicant's representatives that the hearing procedure of the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked PlanD's and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Messrs Wilson Y.W. Fung and Stanley T.S. Choi left the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

64. The Chairman recapitulated that the applicant proposed to rezone the Site from "CDA" to "C(1)" for commercial development. While the planning intention of the subject "CDA" at Yau Tong Bay was for comprehensive development/redevelopment of the area, such planning intention had already been achieved for Phases 1 and 2 development where the lease modification was in progress and the building plans were already approved in accordance with the approved MLP. The applicant of the current application had indicated no intention to develop the Site per the approved MLP, which proposed the development of a hotel block at the Site. Instead, the applicant proposed to redevelop the Site for commercial use with a maximum PR of 11 as per the existing IB and a maximum BH of 130mPD to accommodate the floor space aiming to create an iconic landmark. Given the various planning and design merits and unique planning background, the proposed BH of 130mPD

was not considered unacceptable. It should also be noted that the proposed 'Marina' was for illustrative purpose and did not form part of the indicative notional scheme under the current application.

65. Members in general had no objection to rezoning the Site from "CDA" to "C(1)" to facilitate redevelopment of the existing IB. Some Members supported the application as the proposed scheme would phase out a bulky IB/operation in the Yau Tong Bay area and facilitate the provision of a continuous PWP for public enjoyment, thereby promoting a more active and vibrant harbourfront. The proposed commercial use was also supported as it would create job opportunities.

66. A Member expressed reservation that the proposed rezoning might set an undesirable precedent whereby landowners could create planning gains to achieve commercial gain with a BH exceeding the OZP restriction. It might also encourage landowners to propose rezoning for individual site which departed from the planning intention of a "CDA" zone. Besides, the proposal would depart from the general urban design guidelines for a stepped BH profile with lower buildings along the waterfront and taller buildings inland.

67. The Chairman reiterated that the subject application was a special case with unique site circumstances and planning background. Any future rezoning proposals would be considered on a case-by-case basis. In view of Members' concern, the Committee could partially agree to the rezoning of the Site to "C(1)" subject to BH of 120mPD and impose appropriate development restrictions in the Notes of the OZP which PlanD would further examine in detail before proposing amendments to the OZP for the Committee's consideration. Opportunity would also be taken to review the adjoining land uses in light of the latest implementation progress and the outcome of relevant planning application(s).

68. After deliberation, the Committee decided to partially agree to the application and appropriate development restrictions such as a PWP of not less than 20m in width should be imposed for the proposed "C(1)" zone subject to BH of 120mPD. The proposed amendments to the Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun Outline Zoning Plan, together with its revised Notes and ES, would be submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.

[Messrs Franklin Yu, Paul Y.K. Au and Ryan M.F. Choy, and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left the meeting during deliberation.]

[Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu and Miss Queenie Y.C. Ng left the meeting at this point.]

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

[Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho and Mr W.C. Lui, Senior Town Planners/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STPs/TWK), and Ms Annie S.W. Kong, Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K5/859 Proposed Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated
“Business (1)” Zone, Flat B (Portion), G/F, Ka Ming Court, 688 Castle
Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/859)

Presentation and Question Sessions

69. With the aid of some plans, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, 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.

70. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

71. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should

be valid until 22.9.2025, 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 approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K5/860 Proposed Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated
“Business (2)” Zone, Workshop C1 (Portion), G/F, Block C, Hong
Kong Industrial Centre, 489-491 Castle Peak Road, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K5/860)

Presentation and Question Sessions

72. With the aid of some plans, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, 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.

73. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

74. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 22.9.2025, 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 approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Deferral Cases

75. The Secretary reported that there were four cases requesting the Board to defer consideration of the applications. Details of those requests for deferral, Members' declaration of interests for individual cases and the Committee's views on the declared interests were in **Annex**.

76. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer decisions on the applications as requested by the applicants pending submission of further information as recommended in the Papers.

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/KC/503 Proposed Shop and Services and/or Office uses in "Industrial" Zone, Workshops 1 & 2, G/F, iPlace, 303 Castle Peak Road - Kwai Chung, Kwai Chung, New Territories

(MPC Paper No. A/KC/503)

77. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kwai Chung. Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had declared an interest on the item for being the supervisor of a primary school in Kwai Chung. As the interest of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi was indirect, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

78. With the aid of some plans, Mr W.C. Lui, STP/TWK, 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.

79. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

80. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 22.9.2028, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/TWW/128 Proposed Eating Place in “Residential (Group C)” Zone, House 117,
Ting Kau Village, Tsuen Wan, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/TWW/128)

Presentation and Question Sessions

81. With the aid of some plans, Ms Annie S.W. Kong, TP/TWK, 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.

82. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

83. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 22.9.2027, 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 approval condition stated in the Paper.

The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

[Ms Karmin Tong, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H24/32 Proposed Shop and Services (Travel Agency) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Pier and Associated Facilities" Zone, Shop C, Lower Deck, Central Pier No. 8, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H24/32)

Presentation and Question Sessions

84. With the aid of some plans, 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.

85. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

86. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should

be valid until 22.9.2027, 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 approval condition stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked PlanD' representative for attending the meeting. She left the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 13

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Kwun Tong (South) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K14S/24

(MPC Paper No. 7/23)

87. The following representatives from the Development Bureau (DEVB) and the Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting at this point:

DEVB

Ms Paulina Y.L. Kwan - Senior Place Making Manager (Planning)2,
Energizing Kowloon East Office (SPMM(P)2, EKEO)
Mr W.K. Li - Place Making Manager (Planning)3,
Energizing Kowloon East Office

PlanD

Ms Vivian M.F. Lai - District Planning Officer/ Kowloon
Mr Steven Y.H. Siu - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/HK)
Ms Charlotte P.S. Ng - Town Planner/Kowloon

Presentation and Question Sessions

88. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, briefed Members on the background, the proposed amendments to the approved Kwun Tong (South) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and the Notes of the OZP, the technical considerations, consultation conducted and department comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments mainly involved the following:

- (a) Amendment Item A1 (Item A1) – rezoning a site to the west of Lai Yip Street from “Government, Institution or Community (1)” (“G/IC(1)”), “Open Space” (“O”) and areas shown as ‘Road’ to “Commercial (1)” (“C(1)”) with stipulation of a maximum plot ratio of 12 and a maximum building height (BH) of 100mPD;
- (b) Amendment Item A2 – rezoning a residual strip of land to the north of Hoi Bun Road from “G/IC(1)” and “C(1)” to area shown as ‘Road’ in connection with Item A1;
- (c) Amendment Item B – rezoning a site to the south of How Ming Street from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business 1” (“OU(B)1”) to “OU(B)”;
- (d) Amendment Item C1 (Item C1) – incorporating a site at Yuet Wah Street from the Approved Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Kwun Tong Town Centre – Yuet Wah Street Site Development Scheme Plan No. S/K14S/URA2/2 (the DSP) back into the OZP with a “Residential (Group B) 1” zoning with stipulation of a maximum domestic gross floor area (GFA) of 21,630m², a maximum non-domestic GFA of 6,200m² and a maximum BH of 140mPD;
- (e) Amendment Item C2 – incorporating a strip of land along Yuet Wah Street and Hip Wo Street from the DSP back into the OZP as area shown

as 'Road' in connection with Item C1; and

- (f) Amendment Item D – rezoning a strip of land along Hang On Street from “O” to “G/IC”.

89. As the presentation of the PlanD’s representatives had been completed, the Chairman invited questions and views from Members.

90. Mr Ben S.S. Lui had declared an interest in the item in relation Item C1, which was a completed URA project, for being a former Executive Director of URA. The Committee agreed that as the interest of Mr Ben S.S. Lui was indirect and Item C1 was a completed project, he could stay in the meeting.

91. A Member raise the following questions on Item A1:

- (a) whether there was a need to increase the provision of public car parking spaces for the proposed development at the Item A1 site as it was located near Kwun Tong harbourfront, which was a popular harbourfront area for the public; and
- (b) whether the provision of public car parking spaces in the area was sufficient to cater for the public’s needs.

92. In response, Mr Steven Siu, STP/K, said that there were on-street metered parking spaces near the harbourfront and hourly car parks at the commercial developments in the vicinity.

93. To supplement, Ms Paulina Kwan, SPMM(P)2, EKEO, made the following main points:

- (a) the Transport Department had no comment on the Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment under the technical study undertaken for the proposed development on the Item A1 site, and did not require any additional provision of car parking spaces;
- (b) EKEO had launched a mobile app for the public that collected and

disseminated real-time parking vacancy data and related information in Kowloon East. It was observed that the provision of car parking spaces was sufficient in the area; and

- (c) as ‘public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle)’ was a Column 1 use under the “C(1)” zone, the future developer of the Item A1 site could incorporate public vehicle park in the development anytime without the need to seek planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board).

94. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the types of arts, culture and creative industries (ACC) uses to be provided for the public at the proposed development on the Item A1 site, Ms Paulina Kwan, SPMM(P)2, EKEO, made the following points:

- (a) it was not proposed to stipulate the types of ACC uses in the Notes of the subject “C(1)” zone in order to allow flexibility for the future developer. However, the requirement to provide a minimum GFA of about 3,600m² for ACC/retail/food and beverage uses would be stipulated in the land sale conditions; and
- (b) according to the technical study for Item A1, ACC uses could include art centre, art gallery, cultural complex, venue for performances and theatrical entertainment, etc. as detailed in paragraph 3.2 of the Paper. EKEO would consult relevant government departments on the suitable types of ACC uses to be provided when formulating land sale conditions of the Site.

95. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Kwun Tong (South) OZP and that the draft Kwun Tong (South) OZP No. S/K14S/24A at Attachment II (to be renumbered as S/K14S/25 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 Kwun Tong (South) OZP No. S/K14S/24A at Attachment IV as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and agree that the revised ES is suitable for publication together with the OZP.”

96. 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 revisions would be submitted for the Board’s consideration.

[The Chairman thanked DEVB’s and PlanD’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr William W.L. Chan, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 15

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K13/328 Proposed Vehicle Repair Workshop in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 1/F, Sunshine Kowloon Bay Cargo Centre, 59 Tai Yip Street, Kowloon Bay, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K13/328)

97. The Secretary reported that the application site was 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 and an independent non-executive director of MTR Corporation Limited, which had headquarters in Kowloon Bay.

98. The Committee noted that Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong had tendered apology for not being able to attend the meeting and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had already left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

99. With the aid of some plans, Mr William W.L. Chan, STP/K, 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.

100. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether there was any fire services installation to cater for the storage of liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) given that the proposed vehicle repair workshop would provide repair and maintenance service for LPG taxis, Mr William W.L. Chan, STP/K, said that the Fire Services Department (FSD) had no in-principle objection to the application. FSD also suggested imposing an approval condition which required the submission and implementation of a proposal on the fire safety measures to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board before operation of the use. Other relevant government departments, including the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department, had no adverse comments on the application

Deliberation Session

101. A Member supported the proposed vehicle repair workshop uses, but reminded that the associated fire safety concern should not be overlooked.

102. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 22.9.2027, 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 approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked PlanD's representative for attending the meeting. He left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 16

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

103. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 1:00 p.m..

Annex

**Minutes of 727th Metro Planning Committee
(held on 22.9.2023)**

Deferral Cases

Request for Deferment by Applicant for Two Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
7	A/K5/861	1 st
8	A/K5/862	1 st
10	A/KC/504	1 st
14	A/K15/129	1 st

Notes:
*Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/727_mpc_agenda.html for details of the planning applications.

Declaration of Interests

The Secretary reported the following declaration of Interests:

Item No.	Members' Declared Interests	
10	The application site was located in Kwai Chung.	- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi for being the supervisor of a primary school in Kwai Chung
14	Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (ARUP) was one of the consultants of the applicant.	- Mr Franklin Yu for his firm having current business dealings with ARUP

The Committee noted that Messrs Stanley T.S. Choi and Franklin Yu had already left the meeting.