

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 736<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 16.2.2024**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Chairman

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Vice-chairman

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon,  
Transport Department  
Mr Vico P. Cheung

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

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

Assistant Director (Regional 1),  
Lands Department  
Ms Trevina C.W. Kung

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

**In Attendance**

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms W.H. HO

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Melissa C.H. Kwan

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 735<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 26.1.2024

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 735<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 26.1.2024 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

## Deferral Case

### Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

### Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Secretary reported that there was one case requesting the Town Planning Board to defer consideration of the application. Details of the request for deferral, Member's declaration of interest for the case and the Committee's view on the declared interest were in the **Annex**.

### Deliberation Session

4. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information, as recommended in the Paper.

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/K5/3                      Application for Amendment to the Approved Cheung Sha Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K5/39, To rezone the application site from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Hotel” to “Commercial (5)” and revise the building height restriction from 84mPD to 100mPD, 412 - 420 Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. Y/K5/3)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

*PlanD*

Mr Derek P.K. Tse	-	District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon (DPO/TWK)
Mr Ringo Y.W. Yeung	-	Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon (STP/TWK)

*Applicant’s Representatives*

Winland Strategies Limited	-	Mr Edwin Lun
	-	Mr Shu Kit Chan
Townland Consultants Limited	-	Mr Vincent Lau
OZZO Technology (HK) Limited	-	Mr Dickson Poon

Egis Engineering and Consulting - Mr Chun Kwok Chan  
Hong Kong Limited

6. 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.

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ringo Y.W. Yeung, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed rezoning of the application site (the Site) from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Hotel" ("OU(Hotel)") to "Commercial(5)" ("C(5)") to better reflect the existing commercial/office (C/O) development and to meet local demand for commercial facilities with greater land use flexibility, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application.

8. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Vincent Lau, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

*Background of the Site*

- (a) the Site was currently occupied by a 26-storey C/O building completed in 1983 with a plot ratio (PR) of 14.999. The Site was zoned as "Commercial/Residential" ("C/R") on the Cheung Sha Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) since 1971. The general building plan (GBP) of the existing C/O building was approved in 1980 before the Site was rezoned to "Residential (Group A)" ("R(A)") in 1981 under the review of "C/R" zones. In 2008, the applicant proposed to rezone the Site from "R(A)" to "OU(Hotel)" to facilitate an in-situ conversion of the building to hotel use;

*Proposed Rezoning*

- (b) in view of the latest market condition, the applicant considered that hotel use at the Site was no longer viable. In response to the foreseeable local

demand for commercial facilities and to allow for greater land use flexibility in the long run, the applicant proposed to rezone the Site from “OU(Hotel)” to “C(5)” with a PR restriction of 12 and a building height (BH) restriction of 100mPD;

- (c) the notional scheme proposed by the applicant involved a 22-storey C/O building over three levels of basement carpark with a PR of 12. The lowest three floors were proposed for shop and services and eating place uses while the remaining floors were proposed for office use. A communal podium garden would be provided on 3/F to enhance natural ventilation and provide a greenery space for communal use of workers. A continuous canopy of 1.5m wide was proposed along the building edges facing Castle Peak Road and Cheung Wah Street for weather protection and walkability enhancement. The redevelopment proposal would comply with the sustainable building design guidelines in that not less than 20% of overall greenery would be provided at the Site despite the relatively small site area of less than 1,000m<sup>2</sup>;
- (d) the proposed rezoning would also allow the redevelopment with a PR of 14.999 of the existing building. Relevant technical assessments were conducted for both development scenarios (i.e. PR/BH of 12/100mPD and 14.999/100mPD) and no unacceptable impact would be caused by the proposed rezoning;

*Planning Justifications*

- (e) the rezoning application was fully in line with the government policy initiative to provide adequate commercial floor spaces to enhance the competitiveness of Hong Kong. As the Site had been occupied by a C/O building since 1983, there was no apparent incompatibility issue. The rezoning application was to reflect the existing use at the Site, which was accepted by the neighbourhood;
- (f) Cheung Sha Wan was an established employment node in West Kowloon. The industrial business area, which was located in the vicinity of the Site,

had been undergoing a progressive transformation into a major business cluster. The C/O development at the Site would provide employment opportunities to cater for the socio-economic needs and helped achieve a balanced mix of land uses in the area. In-situ conversion of the C/O building for hotel use had not been undertaken as the Site was not close to any major tourist attractions, facilities or uses, which rendered hotel development not viable. Given the changes in development and planning circumstances, the “OU(Hotel)” zoning would no longer meet the current market needs. The proposed “C(5)” zone could allow land use flexibility in response to local needs; and

- (g) the rezoning proposal was not incompatible with the surrounding area which was dominated by commercial and residential uses. The proposed BH restriction of 100mPD was in line with the surrounding BH restrictions and allowed for future redevelopers to explore innovative building designs for better visual quality and air permeability. Besides, no undesirable visual, air ventilation, traffic and sewerage impacts would be generated by the rezoning proposal. No adverse comment or objection from relevant government departments was received.

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

*Indicative Development Scheme*

10. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the Site could be redeveloped with the existing PR of 14.999 and a BH of 100mPD should the application be agreed; and
- (b) noting that the development proposal submitted in the section 12A application was only an indicative scheme, whether the planning merits proposed by the applicant, including setbacks from site boundary above podium, provision of canopy on the G/F and communal podium garden on 3/F, would be realised in future.



11. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the application, the Site was proposed to be subject to a maximum PR of 12 or the PR of the existing building, whichever was the greater, and a maximum BH of 100mPD or the height of the existing building, whichever was the greater, i.e. the same restrictions of the “C(5)” zone. As such, should the application be approved and the OZP amended accordingly, the Site could be redeveloped with the existing PR of 14.999 and the BH restriction of 100mPD. The applicant had demonstrated the technical viability for the proposed rezoning under both scenarios of PR/BH of 12/100mPD and 14.999/100mPD; and
- (b) as section 12A application was not scheme-based, the applicant would not be required to proceed with the redevelopment in accordance with the indicative development scheme. Nevertheless, there were incentives to encourage the applicant to provide the planning merits as proposed. For example, gross floor area exemption could be applied for the provision of podium garden and at-grade canopy if the criteria set out in the relevant Buildings Department’s Practice Notes were met. It was also observed that at-grade canopies were provided for recent redevelopments in the area. Moreover, the proposed setback above the podium would possibly remain to a large extent due to the site coverage restriction under the Building (Planning) Regulations.

12. The Member asked the applicant if the proposed redevelopment at the Site would adopt a PR of 14.999 and a BH of 100mPD, and whether the suggested planning merits would be provided. In response, Mr Vincent Lau, the applicant’s representative, said that the applicant would assess the redevelopment plan based on market conditions should the application be agreed. According to the applicant’s current intention, the PR of 14.999 of the existing C/O building would be claimed for the redevelopment. The planning merits proposed in the current application would be provided with a view to improving the environment of the C/O building and details would be subject to further study in the detailed design stage.

13. The Chairman remarked that according to the comments of the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West of Lands Department, the lease governing the Site was virtually unrestricted. As lease modification for the proposed redevelopment would not be required, there would not be an opportunity to incorporate the proposed planning merits into the lease.

*Land Use Compatibility*

14. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) background of the C/O developments at the Site and the site to its immediate west. As the Site was surrounded by residential buildings in the “R(A)8” zone, whether it was more appropriate to retain the “OU(Hotel)” zoning of the Site which was more compatible with residential use;
- (b) given that C/O developments were mainly concentrated at a location to the further south-west of the Site, whether C/O developments at the Site was sensible in respect to the planning concept of Cheung Sha Wan at the area; and
- (c) given the pressing housing needs and the location of the Site in a predominantly residential neighbourhood, whether it was more appropriate to rezone the Site to “R(A)”.

15. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the Site and its surrounding area, which were zoned “C/R” with no development restriction since 1971, were provided with options for commercial and/or residential uses. Some C/O buildings, including those at the Site (with the first set of GBP for the existing C/O building approved by the Building Authority in 1980) and to the immediate west of the Site (completed in 1978), came into existence in the area during that time. In 1981, the “C/R” sites (including the Site) in the area were rezoned to

“R(A)” to reflect the predominantly residential character of the area. In 2008, the applicant submitted a section 12A application for rezoning the Site from “R(A)” to “OU(Hotel)” to facilitate an in-situ conversion of the existing C/O building into hotel use, which was partially agreed by the Board with the considerations that hotel use was not incompatible with the surrounding area given a mix of commercial and residential developments in the area and no objection from relevant government departments regarding technical feasibilities. However, the proposed hotel development had not been pursued;

- (b) the overall planning concept of the concerned area in Cheung Sha Wan had been taken into account in that it was located amid a residential neighbourhood mixed with commercial developments in the western end of Cheung Sha Wan residential area and its proximity to the Cheung Sha Wan Business Area zoned “OU(Business)” to the west, which was being actively transformed into a major business cluster in Cheung Sha Wan. There were also two sites to the southwest of the Site rezoned into “C(3)” and “C(5)”, which were occupied by a commercial building at the time of rezoning and had been developed into a commercial building after rezoning respectively. The Site was currently occupied by an existing C/O building, and no adverse commercial/residential interface was observed. It was considered not unreasonable to rezone the Site to “C” to provide more land use flexibility by allowing a wider variety of commercial uses to meet the market needs and ensure better utilisation of land resource; and
- (c) whether the Site could be redeveloped for commercial or residential use would be subject to initiatives of the applicant (i.e. the landowner) based on market demand. While the applicant had not proceeded with their previous plan to convert the existing building for hotel use, the applicant had also not indicated intention to redevelop the Site for residential use.

*Existing and Proposed Commercial Uses and Demand for Commercial Buildings*

16. Some Members enquired about the type of businesses and the occupancy rate of

the existing C/O building at the Site. In response, Mr Vincent Lau, the applicant's representative, said that the existing C/O building had been renovated in 2020 and was currently available for leasing. The major uses in the existing C/O building mainly included shops and services, restaurants, tutorial schools and offices with an occupancy rate of about 50%. There was a demand for such facilities to serve the local community.

17. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) provision and restrictions in the "OU(Hotel)" zone;
- (b) development intensity of the existing C/O building to the immediate west of the Site; and
- (c) information regarding the demand for and/or occupancy rate of C/O uses in the area.

18. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the Notes of the "OU(Hotel)" zone, 'Hotel' use was the only Column 1 use which was always permitted and 'Office' was a Column 2 use. Other general commercial uses, such as 'Shop and Services' and 'Eating place', were not permitted as they were neither Column 1 nor 2 use. As most of the commercial uses could not be provided through the planning application mechanism under the "OU(Hotel)" zone, the potential of redeveloping the Site for a variety of commercial uses was limited;
- (b) the PR and BH of the existing C/O building to the immediate west of the Site were 7.2 and 38mPD respectively; and
- (c) according to the land demand and supply assessment under the "Hong Kong 2030+ - Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030", there would be a shortfall of land supply for economic uses including grade A offices. However, there was no available information regarding the

demand for and/or occupancy rate of local C/O uses in the area.

19. Noting from the indicative development scheme that most of the floor areas were proposed for office use, the Chairman commented that redevelopment for ‘Office’, which was a Column 2 use under the “OU(Hotel)” zone, could be achieved through planning application under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance. He enquired whether the existing PR of 14.999 could be claimed for redevelopment under the “OU(Hotel)” zone. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that according to the relevant Notes of the OZP, there was no provision to claim the existing PR under the “OU(Hotel)” zone, and thus, redevelopment at the Site could only be developed up to PR of 12. The current section 12A application for rezoning the Site to “C”, if agreed, would allow redevelopment at the Site up to the existing PR of 14.999 and greater flexibility for commercial uses in Column 1, including ‘Office’, ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’.

#### *Traffic and Pedestrian Issues*

20. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) noting that three levels of basement carpark would be provided under the indicative development scheme and the Site was located at the junction of Castle Peak Road and Cheung Wah Street, whether there was sufficient capacity in the existing road network to cater for the additional traffic flow;
  - (b) as there were a number of bus stops opposite the Site across Castle Peak Road with a lot of passengers waiting in the AM peak hours, whether there was an underestimation of the pedestrian flow and whether there was any measure to enhance pedestrian safety; and
  - (c) whether the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) had incorporated the population intake after the redevelopment of Kim Shin Lane.
21. In response, Mr Dickson Poon, the applicant’s representative, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the TIA, the vehicular and pedestrian flows generated by the proposed C/O redevelopment in the AM and PM peak hours, even with a PR of 14,999, were anticipated to be small. The findings of the capacity assessments indicated that all assessed junctions and road links would be operated satisfactorily during the peak hours;
- (b) the capacity assessments for the pedestrian network had taken into account the existing condition of the key pedestrian footways. There would be sufficient spare capacity in the key pedestrian footways and crossings during the peak hours and the Level of Service (LOS) of the major pedestrian footways was Grade A. Besides, there were spare capacities in the public transportation services at the nearby bus stops along Castle Peak Road; and
- (c) redevelopment of Kim Shin Lane had not been included in the TIA. Given that the local junctions/road network would be operated satisfactorily and LOS of the major pedestrian footways was Grade A, it was anticipated that the traffic and pedestrian conditions would not be adversely affected by the redevelopment of Kim Shin Lane.

22. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, supplemented that the pedestrian entrance/exit for the proposed redevelopment would be provided along Castle Peak Road where there was a pedestrian crossing. The vehicle ingress/egress for the proposed redevelopment would be located at the relatively less busy Cheung Wah Street.

*Others*

23. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the redevelopment of Kim Shin Lane would involve both residential and commercial uses; and
- (b) whether planning merits were key considerations for section 12A

applications.

24. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) for the Kim Shin Lane redevelopment which involved redevelopment of the old tenement buildings, the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) intended to redevelop in accordance with the “R(A)8” zone (i.e. a domestic PR of 7.5 and a non-domestic PR of 1.5). There was also another URA redevelopment nearby, i.e. the Cheung Wah Street/Cheung Sha Wan Road Development Scheme Plan, which would adopt an overall PR of 8.5 (i.e. a domestic PR of 7.5 and a non-domestic PR of 1). Both URA redevelopments would provide some commercial floor spaces to serve the local needs; and
- (b) while the notional scheme under section 12A application was not binding on the future development scheme, the associated planning merits would not be the major considerations. Instead, greater weighting should be given to land use compatibility and technical feasibility of the proposed development under section 12A application.

25. 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.

#### Deliberation Session

26. The Chairman recapitulated the zoning history of the Site. In the current application, the applicant proposed to rezone the Site from “OU(Hotel)” to “C(5)” which would allow redevelopment at the Site up to the existing PR of 14.999 with more flexibility in general commercial uses. The Chairman remarked that the Committee should consider if the proposed rezoning was acceptable, taking into account the planning intention of the Site and the surroundings, the demand of commercial uses in the area and the land use

compatibility of the proposed redevelopment. He then invited views from Members.

27. Two Members did not support the application and expressed the following views/concerns:

- (a) in considering the subject section 12A application, the long-term planning intention of Cheung Sha Wan, as well as land use compatibility of the Site and the surrounding area should be the key considerations. As the Site was located in a predominantly residential neighbourhood with “R(A)” sub-zones, it did not appear to be compatible with the surrounding uses. The previously approved application to rezone the Site to “OU(Hotel)” was considered appropriate given its location amid a residential neighbourhood. The applicant failed to provide strong justifications to deviate from the planning intention of the Site;
- (b) the locations for commercial and residential developments should be carefully planned. Given that there were several commercial developments to the further southwest of the Site, it was doubted why such uses would need to be provided at the Site. Rezoning of sites in response to individual applications was piecemeal planning and could not help achieve the planning intention of the wider area;
- (c) given the wide variety of Column 1 uses in the “C(5)” zone, there was no mechanism to avoid uses that were not welcomed by the neighbourhood at the Site. Besides, no information was provided by the applicant to demonstrate that more shop and services and eating places at the Site would be beneficial to the local community; and
- (d) as ‘Office’ was a Column 2 use under the “OU(Hotel)” zone, provision of more office spaces at the Site could be achieved through planning application mechanism. Noting that the current application was aimed to allow redevelopment at the Site with a higher PR of the existing building (i.e. PR of 14.999), the building bulk of the proposed C/O redevelopment would be higher than that of the residential developments in the vicinity and visually incompatible with the surrounding area. Rezoning such a small piece of land to “C(5)” was not justified and might set an undesirable



precedent.

28. Some Members, however, supported the application on the following grounds/views:

- (a) Cheung Sha Wan had been gradually transformed with the phasing out of industrial uses. As the neighbourhood was lacking vibrancy, redevelopment of the Site with a better building design and more diversified uses would enhance the overall quality of the environment and contribute to the transformation of the area;
- (b) apart from residential uses, there was an increasing demand for office spaces from small and medium enterprises in the area. The current application could help release the development potential of the Site by allowing more flexibility for office and general commercial uses such as shop and services and eating places, with a view to responding to market demand;
- (c) in view of the changing circumstance, the applicant's intention to maximise the redevelopment potential of the Site was understandable. The applicant (i.e. the landowner) would be more sensitive to the market demand and the viability of the proposed redevelopment. Given that the Site was already occupied by an existing C/O building, it was considered suitable for C/O redevelopment at the Site, which was not incompatible with the surrounding uses;
- (d) given the small site area, there were limitations for residential developments at the Site. The applicant's intention to redevelop the Site for C/O building should be respected;
- (e) while planning gain was not a key consideration in the subject section 12A application, the applicant was encouraged to provide the proposed design merits to enhance the local environment and pedestrian experience; and
- (f) redevelopment of the Site for C/O building would not set an undesirable

precedent as such development amid the “R(A)” zone was not uncommon in Hong Kong.

29. A Member enquired if the general commercial uses in the existing C/O building were allowed since only hotel use was always permitted in the “OU(Hotel)” zone. The Chairman and the Secretary explained that as the GBP of the C/O building was approved before the Site was rezoned to “R(A)” in 1981, it was considered as an existing use which was not required to conform to the OZP until there was a material change of use or the building was redeveloped. As ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’ uses were neither Column 1 nor Column 2 uses in the “OU(Hotel)” zone, such uses would not be allowed in the redevelopment of the Site. Besides, the Site was governed by a virtually unrestricted lease.

30. Another Member commented that the site to the immediate west of the Site, which was currently occupied by a commercial building but fell within the “R(A)8” zone, might also have difficulties in redevelopment for residential use given its small site area. Consideration might be given to rezoning that site together with the Site to “C” to facilitate a comprehensive redevelopment.

31. The Chairman concluded that while some Members had concerns about the land use compatibility given the original planning intention of the Site and its adjoining area, more Members considered the application acceptable. Granting approval to the current application would facilitate redevelopment at the Site for more diversified commercial uses, which might add vibrancy to the area and meet local needs. Regarding the suggestion to rezone the adjoining site together with the Site as “C” to facilitate a comprehensive redevelopment, it might be immature at the moment given that no information on the intention of the concerned landowner(s) was available and there were also no technical assessments to support such rezoning. However, Members’ views and suggestions would be recorded in the minutes for the consideration of the relevant landowner(s).

32. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree to the application, and the relevant proposed amendments to the Cheung Sha Wan Outline Zoning Plan, together with the revised Notes and explanatory statement, will be submitted to the Committee for agreement prior to its gazetting under the Ordinance.

[Mr Ringo W.Y. Yeung, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 4**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K5/867                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Public Housing Development in “Residential (Group A) 6” Zone, 373 Lai Chi Kok Road, Sham Shui Po, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/867)

---

33.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) with the Housing Department as the executive arm. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

34.            As the interests of Messrs Paul Y.K. Au and Franklin Yu were direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Mr Franklin Yu left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

[Mr Paul Y.K. Au left the meeting at this point.]

##### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

35.            With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ringo Y.W. Yeung, 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.

36. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the rationale for minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction of the permitted public housing development was to accommodate the social welfare facilities and communal garden including play area in the podium;
- (b) whether the social welfare facilities included in the project were office based or providing service-based; and
- (c) whether the communal garden including play area on 5/F of the proposed development would be open for public use.

37. In response, Mr Ringo Y.W. Yeung, STP/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the minor relaxation of BH restriction was mainly to accommodate the social welfare facilities at 24mPD (i.e. 4/F) to allow natural ventilation and to avoid vehicular emission from nearby roads. A higher podium design had been adopted to deal with such environmental constraints. Besides, the proposed development was elongated in shape with a continuous projected façade length of over 60m. Permeability at different levels was required to comply with the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, and therefore there was limited room to reduce the BH by increasing the site coverage. Given the above, minor relaxation of BH restriction was required;
- (b) the social welfare facilities in the proposed public housing development would include After School Care Programme for Pre-primary Children (ASCP(PC)), District Elderly Community Centre (DECC) Sub-base and office base of Social Work Service for Pre-primary Institutions (SWSPPI).

ASCP(PC) and DECC Sub-base would mainly provide various supporting services to the pre-primary children and the elderly while SWSPPI was a district-based social work team which would provide assistance to pre-primary children and their families with welfare needs. As the office of SWSPPI was currently accommodated in leased commercial premises in the vicinity, it would be more cost-effective to relocate it to the Site in the long run; and

- (c) the communal garden including the play area on 5/F of the proposed development was solely for the use of the residents.

38. A Member commented that the two social welfare facilities including ASCP(PC) and DECC Sub-base would provide frontline services to the pre-primary children and the elderly. It was anticipated that DECC Sub-base with about 90m<sup>2</sup> net operational floor area would mainly serve the local residents in the vicinity.

#### Deliberation Session

39. The Chairman recapitulated that the application for minor relaxation of BH restriction from 100mPD to 105mPD for permitted public housing development was mainly to accommodate the social welfare facilities with environmental constraints. Members had no objection to the application.

40. 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 16.2.2028, 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.

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

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

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/KC/505                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Warehouse Use (excluding Dangerous Goods Godown) in “Industrial” Zone, 13-17 Wah Sing Street, Kwai Chung, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/505)

---

42.            The Secretary reported that consideration of the application had been rescheduled.

[Mr Franklin Yu rejoined the meeting at this point.]

**Kowloon District**

[Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au 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/K10/272                      School (Tutorial School) in “Residential (Group B)” Zone, Ground floor, 5 Junction Road, Kowloon City, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K10/272)

---

43.            Noting that the application premises (the Premises) was in close proximity to Kowloon Tong, 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 the Kowloon Tong area. As the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi’s spouse had no direct view of the Premises, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

### Presentation and Question Sessions

44. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au, STP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied 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.

45. Noting the interior setting of the Premises from the site photos on Plans A-4 and A-5 of the Paper, a Member questioned whether the Premises had already been used for school purpose. In response, Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au, STP/K, clarified that the Premises was currently used as a tutorial school. All regulations of relevant government departments should be complied with for the application for school registration under the Education Ordinance (EO).

### Deliberation Session

46. A Member remarked that the applicant should be reminded to fulfil the requirements of relevant government departments, including planning permission, before operation. The Chairman said that a relevant advisory clause had been incorporated in the Paper to remind the applicant to obtain planning permission before commencing the applied use. Given that the applicant had to register as a school under the EO, the Chairman suggested and Members agreed to incorporate the comments of the Secretary for Education in the recommended advisory clauses as appropriate.

47. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB).

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

“to note the comment of the Secretary for Education that according to section 3(1) of the Education Ordinance (Cap. 279) (EO), a “school” means an institution, organisation or establishment which provides for 20 or more persons during any one day or 8 or more persons at any one time, any nursery, kindergarten, primary, secondary or post-secondary education or any other educational course by any

means including correspondence delivered by hand or through the postal services. Any institution, organisation or establishment which provides educational courses with the number(s) of students attending these courses meeting the number(s) stipulated in the above definition of “school” is required to be registered/provisionally registered in accordance with Section 10 of the EO.”

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

### **Agenda Item 8**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/829                      Proposed Public Utility Installation (Underground Stormwater Storage Facility with Ancillary Aboveground Structures) in “Open Space” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, Government Land at Hoi Bun Road Park and Kwun Tong Promenade, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/829)

---

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

49.                      With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, 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.

50.                      Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a)    noting that part of the Kwun Tong Promenade (KTP) would be affected during the 5-year construction period of the underground stormwater storage facility (SSF), whether temporary closure of the affected facilities had been minimised as far as possible;
- (b)    noting that the 1-storey plant room at Hoi Bun Road Park (HBR Park) Site was next to a soccer pitch, whether its rooftop could be opened for public



access with spectator stands and shelters;

- (c) whether stormwater collected in the proposed SSF would be reused for irrigation purpose; and
- (d) whether the aesthetic design and visual compatibility had been taken into account in the façade design of the plant room at the HBR Park Site.

51. In response, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the applicant, the works at the KTP Site would be implemented in phases to minimise disturbance to the public. The project proponent would ensure that certain parts of the walkway be open to allow continuous public passage along the promenade at any given time;
- (b) all the affected at-grade open space facilities (i.e. a 5 a-side soccer pitch and spectator stands) would be re-provisioned in-situ as part of the proposed works and handed back to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department upon completion. Landscaping and solar photovoltaic panels were commonly found on top of the plant room of other similar SSFs in Hong Kong. There was no concrete plan for the Drainage Services Department (DSD) to include other uses at the rooftop of the plant room;
- (c) similar to other SSFs in Hong Kong, DSD would adopt a stormwater collection and recycling system at the proposed SSF for irrigation purpose; and
- (d) according to the applicant's proposal, the concrete façade design of the plant room would echo the industrial style design of the HBR Park. As the plant room would be located next to a soccer pitch, it was not suitable to provide excessive landscaping, such as potted planters and vertical greening, to avoid damage due to soccer playing.

## Deliberation Session

52. Members generally supported the application. A Member expressed concerns about the accessibility of affected facilities and advised that the applicant should be reminded to minimise the temporary closure period so as to reduce adverse impact on the public. He reiterated that the rooftop of the plant room could be better utilised for public use and the feasibility of providing a spectator stand or a rooftop garden should be explored. Noting that DSD was experienced in providing good shared uses in many of their facilities, a Member concurred that the rooftop of the plant room could be better utilised to provide additional space for public enjoyment. Another Member remarked that while the façade design of the plant room would match the industrial style design of HBR Park, an advisory clause should be included to invite the applicant to enhance the façade design of the plant room at the detailed design stage with a view to improving its aesthetic quality.

53. Taken Members' views into account, the Chairman proposed and Members agreed to incorporate three additional advisory clauses to invite the applicant (i) to minimise the temporary closure period for the construction of the proposed SSF and avoid adverse impact on the accessibility of the public facilities at the HBR Park and the KTP; (ii) to explore the feasibility of utilising the rooftop of the proposed plant room at HBR Park Site for public enjoyment; and (iii) to review and enhance the façade design of the proposed plant room at the detailed design stage with a view to making it an integral part of HBR Park with good visual compatibility and aesthetic quality.

54. 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 16.2.2028, 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.

55. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in Appendix III of the Paper and the following additional advisory clauses:

“to minimise the temporary closure period for the construction of the proposed underground stormwater storage facility and avoid adverse impact on the accessibility of the public facilities at the Hoi Bun Road Park (HBR Park) and the

Kwun Tong Promenade;

to explore the feasibility of utilising the rooftop of the proposed plant room at HBR Park Site for public enjoyment; and

to review and enhance the façade design of the proposed plant room at the detailed design stage with a view to making it an integral part of HBR Park with good visual compatibility and aesthetic quality.”

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

**Agenda Item 9**

**Any Other Business**

56. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 11:15 a.m..

**Minutes of 736<sup>th</sup> Metro Planning Committee  
(held on 16.2.2024)**

**Deferral Case**

(a) Request for Deferment by Applicant for Two Months

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.*</b>	<b>Times of Deferment</b>
6	A/TW/538	1 <sup>st</sup>

**Declaration of Interest**

The Secretary reported the following declaration of Interest:

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Member' Declared Interest</b>	
6	The application site was located in Tsuen Wan.	- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi for his spouse being a director of a company owning properties in Tsuen Wan

As the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi's spouse had no direct view of the Site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting for consideration of the application for deferral.

\*Refer to the agenda at [https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/736\\_mpc\\_agenda.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/736_mpc_agenda.html) for details of the planning application.