

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 740th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 19.4.2024**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Chairman

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Assistant Commissioner/Urban,
Transport Department
Mr B.K. Chow

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

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

Assistant Director/Regional 2,
Lands Department
Mr Damien C.M. Chan

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Rico W.K. Tsang

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Jimmy C.H. Lee

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 739th MPC Meeting held on 5.4.2024

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 739th MPC meeting held on 5.4.2024 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Deferral Cases

Sections 12A and 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Committee noted that there were five cases requesting the Town Planning 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**.

Deliberation Session

4. 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.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

[Mr Derek P.K. Tse, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK) and Mr Clement Miu, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK) were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K3/598 Submission of Layout Plan and Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restrictions in sub-areas (b) and (c) for Permitted ‘Eating Place’, ‘Shop and Services’, ‘Office’, ‘Place of Entertainment’, ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture’, ‘Private Club’, ‘School’, ‘Educational Institution’, ‘Public Transport Terminus or Station’, ‘Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle)’ and ‘Social Welfare Facility’ Uses in “Commercial (4)” Zone, Kowloon Inland Lot No. 11273, Junction of Sai Yee Street and Argyle Street, Mong Kok, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K3/598)

5. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Mong Kok and Tony Ip Green Architects Limited was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ben S.S. Lui - his former employer conducted a study related to urban renewal in Mong Kok; and

Dr Tony C.M. Ip - being the director of Tony Ip Green Architects Limited.

6. The Committee noted that Dr Tony C.M. Ip had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interest of Mr Ben S.S. Lui was indirect, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, and Mr Clement Miu, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

[Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

8. The Vice-chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

Site Background and Development Context

- (a) whether the Planning and Design Brief (PDB) for the Site had been considered by the Town Planning Board (the Board);
- (b) what the landmarks in the area under the District Study for Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok (the YM Study) commissioned by the Urban Renewal Authority were, and whether the proposed development was one of those landmarks;

Design and Compatibility

- (c) noting that the proposed community hall (CH) located above the proposed social welfare facilities (SWFs) within the same government, institution and community (GIC) Block, whether the activities to be held in the proposed CH would adversely affect the users of the SWFs including Integrated Community Centre for Mental Illness (ICCMW), Neighbourhood Elderly Centre (NEC) and Day Care Centre for the Elderly (DE);
- (d) whether the proposed Community Bridge was necessary since access via escalators and lifts to the GIC facilities within the GIC Block would be provided;

Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height (BH) Restrictions

- (e) the rationale behind the BH restriction of 23mPD stipulated for the building gap (BG) in sub-area (b), and whether there were similar applications for minor relaxation of BH restriction for construction of footbridge on the BG;
- (f) whether the proposed development with the Community Bridge fulfilled the requirements of BG as stipulated on the Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan (the OZP); and
- (g) what criteria should be adopted in considering whether the proposed minor relaxation of BH restrictions was justified; whether the extent of relaxation was considered reasonable; and noting that the barrier-free access in the GIC Block was provided to meet the requirements under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R), whether it could be regarded as a planning gain for consideration of the proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction for sub-area (c).

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

Site Background and Development Context

- (a) a PDB was formulated under the ‘Planning and Design Study on the Redevelopment of Government Sites at Sai Yee Street and MK East Station – Feasibility Study’ (the SYS Study) to set out the broad planning principles and development requirements for the Site as recommended by the SYS Study. Upon incorporation of the comments received during consultation with the public and relevant stakeholders, including the Board, as appropriate, the study findings and PDB were considered and noted by the Board in 2018. According to the Notes of the OZP, for any development/redevelopment in the “Commercial (4)” (“C(4)”) zone (i.e. the Site), a layout plan (LP) should be submitted for the approval of the Board.

The requirement for the submission of LP was to ensure an integrated and compatible layout for the development at the Site with reference to the PDB before development proceeded. Except for the proposed minor relaxation of BH restrictions and the proposed changes to the vehicular ingress/egress arrangement, the proposed development under the current application largely complied with the development restrictions/requirements under the OZP and PDB;

- (b) according to the YM Study, several development nodes were identified in strategic locations to serve as catalysts for urban regeneration and some of them were proposed with iconic landmark, such as the West Kowloon Gateway development node in Jordan. The proposed development on the Site had been taken into account in the YM Study and recognised as a planned landmark commercial building;

Design and Compatibility

- (c) according to the applicant, the general layout of the GIC Block and the location of various GIC facilities therein had taken into account the views collected from operators and users of relevant existing GIC facilities through various engagement exercises with a view to achieving a better design catering for the operational and spatial requirements of future GIC users. Being located on separate floors and with tailor-made floor layout/design for individual facilities, interface issue arising from different GIC facilities within the GIC Block was not anticipated. Relevant government departments, including the Social Welfare Department (SWD) and the Home Affairs Department (HAD), had no objection to the proposal;
- (d) vertical connections through escalators and lifts were proposed within the GIC Block to facilitate barrier-free access for all GIC facilities at different levels. The GIC Block was also directly accessible via a lift lobby on G/F abutting Sai Yee Street and the entrance on 3/F fronting the POS. The proposed Community Bridge and its associated staircase were designed to enhance accessibility to the rooftop public open space (POS) of the GIC

Block, improve connectivity among the CH and Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre on 5/F of the GIC Block and the Commercial Tower, and facilitate barrier-free and all-weather connection between GIC facilities and MTR Mong Kok East Station through escalators, lifts and covered walkways. Apart from being an additional linkage between the GIC Block and the Commercial Tower, the Community Bridge would link up the landscape area on 5/F of the Commercial Tower to serve as a spill-over space during special events in the CH. The meandering design of the bridge was also considered as an architectural feature and could provide shading for the POS underneath on 3/F of the podium;

Proposed Minor Relaxation of BH Restrictions

- (e) according to PDB, the BG with a width of 30m on top of the podium was imposed for better air ventilation and visual permeability. The BH restriction of 23mPD was designated to align with the level of the existing station deck of MTR Mong Kok East Station to the east of the Site. According to the available information, there was no similar application for minor relaxation of BH restriction for construction of a footbridge within a specified BG under the OZP in the district;
- (f) the proposed Community Bridge with roof level ranging from 34.9mPD to 37.5mPD within sub-area (b), which exceeded the permitted BH of 23mPD, would require planning permission from the Board. While the BG was proposed to address the air ventilation and visual concerns, the technical assessments submitted by the applicant had demonstrated that the proposed bridge would be acceptable on these two aspects. The Urban Design and Landscape Section of PlanD and the Architectural Services Department had no adverse comments on the proposal; and
- (g) the relevant criteria for consideration of applications for minor relaxation of BH restriction were stated in paragraph 8.7 of the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP. There was no specified extent for such minor relaxation, and each application should be considered on its own merits. Under the

current application, the proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction for sub-area (b) was for the provision of the proposed Community Bridge to enhance overall connectivity, and the bridge itself was also considered as an architectural feature and would provide shading to POS underneath. As for sub-area (c), in order to provide the rooftop POS of the GIC Block serving the users of GIC facilities and the general public, it was necessary for the applicant to apply for minor relaxation of BH restriction from 40mPD to 46mPD (+15%) so as to accommodate a small-scale lift shaft and stairhood to allow barrier-free access for compliance with B(P)R. Taking into account the applicant's proposal and the technical assessments submitted, the proposed minor relaxation of BH restrictions under the current application was considered acceptable, which was generally in line with the planning criteria in respect of the planning and design merits, as stated in paragraph 8.7(f) of the ES.

10. In response to a Member's question on whether similar footbridge was allowed in other BGs, the Secretary supplemented that unless stipulated under the Notes of the OZP, elevated walkways/footbridges might generally be allowed in the area designated as a non-building area or BG functioning as visual and/or air ventilation corridor provided that such structures would not generate adverse visual and air ventilation impacts.

11. The Vice-chairperson and some Members further raised the following questions:

Provision of GIC facilities

- (a) whether the Government set out detailed requirements on the provision of GIC facilities in tandem with the proposed development, which was targeted for completion in 2029 under Conditions of Sale (C/S);

Transport Facilities and Vehicular Access Arrangements

- (b) the traffic and vehicular access arrangements for the proposed PTI and public vehicle park (PVP); regarding the vehicular access to the proposed PVP via Luen Wan Street, whether there would be a waiting area within the

proposed development to cope with the potential queue, thus preventing traffic tailback onto Luen Wan Street and Argyle Street; and whether the proposed vehicular access and ingress/egress arrangements were considered acceptable by the relevant government departments;

- (c) whether the proposed loading and unloading (L/UL) facilities for cross-boundary (X-B) coaches were part of the PDB requirements and were for relocating the existing X-B coach facilities from other locations in Mong Kok to the Site;

Pedestrian Accessibility

- (d) given the large scale of the proposed development, what design measures were proposed to enhance the pedestrian accessibility across the Site and to its surroundings and whether the layout design of the proposed development had duly taken into account the needs of the elderly;
- (e) whether there would be a covered and all-weather pedestrian route leading from the POS on 3/F of the podium to the adjacent MTR Mong Kok East Station;

POS and Tree Preservation

- (f) whether it was the PDB requirement that the proposed public viewing deck (PVD) on the rooftop of the Commercial Tower should be open to the public free of charge;
- (g) management and maintenance responsibilities of the proposed POSs within the proposed development, and whether the developer could have the right to impose any control on the public access to such POSs;
- (h) the condition of the Old and Valuable Tree (OVT) within the Site and relevant proposed protection measures and long-term management and maintenance responsibilities;

Others

- (i) noting an allegation in a public comment that there was no data in the air ventilation assessment (AVA) to demonstrate the acceptability of the proposed development, whether further information was submitted by the applicant in that regard;
- (j) whether the Committee should consider the commercial viability, building materials, sustainability performance, etc. of the proposed development under the current application;
- (k) possible glare impact of the glass curtain wall of the proposed development on the school to the north of the Site; and
- (l) details of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP)'s comments in relation to the land contamination assessment of the Site.

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

Provision of GIC Facilities

- (a) the technical requirements of relevant government departments on the GIC facilities had been incorporated in C/S, which should be adhered to by the developer. During the pre-submission stage, the applicant had already liaised with SWD and HAD to work out an acceptable layout design, including location and headroom, of all GIC facilities in order to fulfil the operational requirements and government regulations. Relevant government departments had no adverse comments on the provision and layout of GIC facilities under the current application;

Transport Facilities and Vehicular Access Arrangements

- (b) according to C/S, only two vehicular access points to/from the Site were designated. With a view to further enhancing the traffic improvement measures, the applicant proposed a total of four sets of vehicular ingress/egress points (i.e. two via Sai Yee Street and two via Luen Wan Street) for the proposed development. On Sai Yee Street, the northern access would be used exclusively for X-B coaches and service vehicles while the southern access with separate ingress/egress arrangement would be designated for public light bus (PLB) PTI to allow smooth and efficient operation of the PLB routes heading towards eastern Kowloon via Argyle Street. The southern access on Luen Wan Street would serve as an ingress/egress for car parking and PVP with sufficient queueing area within the Site to ensure no traffic tailback onto the public road, while the northern access would provide direct access for the rehabilitation bus to the DE on 2/F and also serve the pick-up/drop-off of retail and office uses on 2/F and 3/F. According to the traffic impact assessment, the proposed development would not cause adverse traffic impact on nearby key road junctions. The overall provision of transport facilities and the proposed vehicular access and ingress/egress arrangements were generally considered acceptable by relevant government departments, including the Transport Department and the Highways Department;
- (c) during the public engagement exercise of the SYS Study, there were local views proposing to consolidate at the Site the existing X-B coach L/UL areas scattering in Mong Kok to help alleviate the existing traffic condition. Such views were subsequently adopted and reflected in the requirements under PDB and C/S;

Pedestrian Accessibility

- (d) various pedestrian facilities were proposed by the applicant to connect the proposed development with the surrounding major destinations and transport facilities, mainly including (i) at-grade pedestrian accesses to/from the Site via Sai Yee Street, Argyle Street and Luen Wan Street; (ii) two covered footbridges on 1/F connecting the existing Mong Kok Road

footbridge and the planned footbridge at Hak Po Street; and (iii) two covered elevated landscaped walkways on 3/F of the podium linking up MTR Mong Kok East Station and the Station Deck POS. Various horizontal pedestrian linkages and vertical connections via internal passages, covered walkways, escalators/lifts were also proposed within the Site to facilitate barrier-free access for all GIC facilities and POSs, which would address the need of the general public, particularly the elderly. Moreover, major pedestrian routes would be opened 24 hours daily as shown in Drawing A-38 of the Paper;

- (e) the POS on 3/F of the podium would be connected to the MTR Mong Kok East Station via an all-weather pedestrian route comprising a proposed elevated landscaped walkway and an existing covered walkway;

POSs and Tree Preservation

- (f) the proposed PVD on the rooftop of the Commercial Tower would be provided for public enjoyment free of charge as required under PDB and C/S;
- (g) all POSs within the Site, including the at-grade POS, would be managed and maintained by the applicant in accordance with C/S. According to the applicant, all POSs would be opened from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. tentatively subject to agreement by the Government under C/S;
- (h) one OVT (T1) and two mature trees (T2 and T3) were identified within the Site, which would be preserved in-situ and integrated with the at-grade POSs. The applicant was required to manage and maintain such trees together with the POSs in accordance with C/S and would work with the arborist team to ensure long-term tree growth through implementation of tree protection measures such as paving removal, erection of tree protection fences and aerial root guiding, no building structures to be constructed on and below the ground level within the respective tree protection zones, etc.;

Others

- (i) the allegation made in the public comment on the lack of data in the AVA to demonstrate the acceptability of the proposed development was not valid. An AVA was submitted by the applicant as a part of the application, which demonstrated that the overall air ventilation performance of the proposed development would be comparable to the baseline scheme under PDB. With the proposed development, no significant adverse air ventilation impact was anticipated;
- (j) in general, the commercial viability of a proposed development should not be a major consideration of the Committee in considering a planning application. Since the proposed uses of the Site were always permitted, the focus of the application should be the acceptability of the proposed LP and minor relaxation of BH restrictions as required under the Notes of the OZP, instead of the detailed design such as building materials. It was not uncommon that the applicant would submit information to demonstrate sustainability of a proposed development, such as compliance with the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, for Members' general reference;
- (k) as shown on Plan A-3 of the Paper, while Hong Kong & Kowloon Chiu Chow Public Association Secondary School was located to the immediate north of the Site, the southern façade of the concerned school facing the proposed development was mainly concrete wall without any windows. It was anticipated that the possible glare impact on the concerned school arising from the glass curtain wall of the proposed development would be minimal; and
- (l) as the Site was previously occupied by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD)'s facilities including vehicle depot, DEP requested that should the application be approved, an approval condition should be imposed requiring the applicant to submit a land contamination assessment to ensure that the potential land contamination issues, if any, could be properly addressed before commencement of any construction

works for the proposed development.

13. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether there were responses to the objecting public comments, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that responses to the objecting public comments were provided in paragraphs 11.8 to 11.12 of the Paper in accordance with the major issues raised as those comments generally expressed similar concerns.

Deliberation Session

14. The Chairman recapitulated the background that the SYS Study was commissioned by PlanD to examine the redevelopment potential of the Site, which was previously occupied by the facilities of the Water Supplies Department and FEHD. Upon completion of the SYS Study in 2018, it was recommended that the Site was suitable for commercial development with provision of open space and GIC facilities. In July 2018, the OZP was amended to take forward the study recommendations, and the Site was rezoned from "G/IC", "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Multi-storey Car/Lorry Park" and "OU(Railway Station Development)" to "C(4)" with stipulation of development restrictions and requirements in the Notes of the OZP. In March 2019, after giving consideration to the representations and comments in respect of the amendments incorporated in the draft OZP, the Board decided to incorporate a statutory requirement on the submission of a LP for the Board's approval in the Notes of the "C(4)" zone so that the Board would be able to further consider the overall design of the proposed development at a later stage. Subsequently, the Site was sold to the applicant by way of public tender in March 2023.

15. The Chairman further remarked that under the current application, the applicant submitted a LP for the proposed development for the approval of the Board and sought minor relaxation of the BH restrictions in sub-area (b) (subject to a BH restriction of 23mPD) for the provision of a Community Bridge and its associated staircase, with roof level of about 34.9mPD to 37.5mPD, and sub-area (c) from 40mPD to 46mPD (including roof-top structures) for the GIC Block. Regarding the LP, the proposed layout design, development parameters, landscape and tree preservation proposals as well as provision of POSs, GIC and transport facilities were generally in line with the development restrictions/requirements under the OZP and PDB. Relevant government departments, including SWD and HAD, had

no adverse comments on the provision of the GIC facilities within the proposed development, and other departmental comments could be duly addressed at the detailed design stage. Taking into account the proposed increase in BH, the justifications and the relevant criteria for considering minor relaxation of BH restrictions as stated in the ES of the OZP, the proposed minor relaxation of BH restrictions was considered acceptable by relevant government departments.

16. In response to a Member's question, the Chairman explained that the development restrictions/requirements for the Site including submission of a LP were mainly based on the recommendations of the SYS Study and requirements as stipulated in the Notes of the OZP. The requirement for LP submission was imposed by the Board during the representation hearing. The Vice-chairperson supplemented that under the prevailing practice, the Board, if necessary, might incorporate the requirement on submission of a LP in the Notes of the OZP for a specific site where the layout and design of the future development should be subject to further consideration.

17. Members in general supported the application. The Vice-chairperson and some Members had the following observations/suggestions:

- (a) noting that the proposed development had to comply with not only the requirements on the provision of minimum gross floor area for GIC facilities as stipulated in Notes of the OZP and PDB, but also the BH restriction of the GIC Block and operational requirements of SWFs in accordance with the government requirements, the applicant's efforts in preparation of the design of the GIC Block and the proposed Community Bridge were appreciated;
- (b) the proposed Community Bridge could be supported as it would provide a separate pedestrian access to the CH from the Commercial Tower without passing through the SWFs on 2/F to 3M/F of the GIC Block, thereby reducing the possible nuisance generated from the users of the CH on the upper floors, and that the meandering design of the proposed Community Bridge would be an interesting architectural feature and provide shading function for the POS on 3/F of the podium;

- (c) given the shortfall in the overall provision of POS in the Mong Kok area, the proposed POSs within the Site could be considered beneficial to the community. Noting that the POSs and PVD were required to be open to the public free of charge under PDB and C/S, there might be possible difficulties in the management of POSs with their extensive area in the proposed development;
- (d) during the detailed design stage, the applicant should explore the provision of additional facilities in the POSs for public enjoyment, and provide sufficient signage within the proposed development to direct the public, especially the elderly, to the POSs and other destinations;
- (e) while the tree treatment measures proposed by the applicant were considered more preferable than maintaining the status quo, where roots were covered with/attached to concrete surface, the OVT and mature trees within the Site should be properly maintained and protected; and
- (f) the potential impact arising from vehicular traffic of the proposed X-B coaches L/UL facilities to the surroundings should be handled properly.

18. In response to Members' view related to the design of POSs, the Chairman said that the Development Bureau had promulgated a set of Design and Management Guidelines for Public Open Space in Private Developments (POSPD Guidelines) to enhance design quality and public accessibility of POSPD, which would be applicable to the provision of POSs within the proposed development. Relevant government departments would provide comments/advice on detailed design of the POSs in accordance with the POSPD Guidelines and other prevailing requirements, where appropriate.

19. Regarding the need for the proposed Community Bridge, Mr Paul Y.K. Au, Chief Engineer (Works), HAD, supplemented that as the CH might involve activities or hosting of events with a considerable number of users, an alternative access route provided by the Community Bridge could help minimise the nuisance to the SWFs on the lower floors. Such arrangement was considered desirable and beneficial to the community.

20. Two Members expressed concern on the small size of lifts to serve the GIC Block, which might not be sufficient to accommodate three to four wheelchairs at one time to meet the needs of facility users. A Member further suggested that the applicant should explore adopting appropriate design or materials to help reduce the potential noise impact between floors, thus minimising the nuisance of the CH during the hosting of events or activities to the ICCMW on the immediate lower floor.

21. The Chairman concluded that Members generally considered the LP and minor relaxation of the BH restrictions acceptable. To address Members' comments/concerns, the Chairman proposed and the Committee agreed to impose additional advisory clauses to request the applicant to explore the possibility of provision of lift(s) with larger size in the GIC Block, adopt appropriate design to reduce/mitigate potential noise impact of the CH, and provide additional facilities in the POSs and appropriate signage within the proposed development.

22. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Board. The permission should be valid until 19.4.2028, 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. The permission was subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper.

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

“the applicant should explore the possibility of provision of lift(s) with larger size in the government, institution and community Block to address the needs of the facility users and adopt appropriate design to reduce/mitigate potential noise impact of the community hall on the social welfare facilities on the lower floors; and

the applicant should provide additional facilities in the public open spaces (POSs) for public enjoyment and sufficient signage within the proposed development to direct the public, especially the elderly, to the POSs and other destinations.”

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H11/107 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Flat Use in “Residential (Group C) 5” Zone, 105 Robinson Road, Mid-Levels West, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H11/107)

24. The Secretary reported that the application was withdrawn by the applicant.

Agenda Item 10

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

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

**Minutes of 740th Metro Planning Committee
(held on 19.4.2024)**

Deferral Cases

(a) Requests for Deferment by Applicant for Two Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
3	Y/TY/2	1 st
4	A/KC/504	2 nd [^]
6	A/K9/284	1 st
8	A/H10/97	2 nd [^]

Note:

[^] *The 2nd Deferment was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted unless under special circumstances and supported with strong justifications.*

(b) Request for Deferment by Applicant for One Month

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
7	A/H7/185	1 st

Declaration of Interests

The Committee noted the following declaration of Interests:

Item No.	Members' Declared Interests	
4	The application site was located in Kwai Chung.	- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi for being the supervisor of a primary school in Kwai Chung
6	The application site was located in Hung Hom.	- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi for owning a property in Hung Hom
7	The application site was located in Causeway Bay and the application was submitted by Patchway Holdings (HK) Limited, which was a joint venture of Hysan Development Company Limited (Hysan) and Chime Corporation Limited. Otherland Limited (Otherland) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) were two of the consultants of the applicant.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr Ivan M.K. Chung (<i>Chairman</i>) for co-owning with spouse a property in Happy Valley - Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu for having some of his projects sponsored by the Lee Hysan Foundation and being the Director and Chief Executive Officer of Light Be which had recently received donations from the Foundation - Dr Tony C.M. Ip for his firm having current business dealings

		with Otherland and ARUP - Mr Derrick S.M. Yip for co-owning with spouse a property in Happy Valley
8	The application site was located in Pok Fu Lam.	- Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong for having close relative living in Pok Fu Lam - Mr Ben S.S. Lui for being a director of a company owning properties in Pok Fu Lam, co-owning with spouse a property in Pok Fu Lam, and his spouse owning a car parking space in Pok Fu Lam

The Committee noted that Dr Tony C.M. Ip had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the properties/car parking space owned/co-owned by Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung, Stanley T.S. Choi, Ben S.S. Lui (or by his company/his spouse) and Derrick S.M. Yip, and the residence of Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong's close relative had no direct view of the relevant application sites, and as the interest of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi (under Item 4) was indirect, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. As the interest of Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu in relation to Hysan (under Item 7) was direct, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from the discussion of Item 7.

* Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/740_mpc_agenda.html for details of the planning applications.