

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 753rd Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 8.11.2024

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

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 1,
Lands Department
Ms Catherine W.S. Pang

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Katy C.W. Fung

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Loree L.Y. Duen

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 752nd MPC Meeting held on 25.10.2024

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 752nd MPC meeting held on 25.10.2024 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

Report on Proposed Streamlining Arrangement for Consideration of Section 16 Applications

2. The Secretary reported that the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) was briefed at its meeting held on 25.10.2024 regarding the proposed streamlining arrangement for the consideration of straightforward section 16 applications (s.16 applications) in a group, which had been adopted by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) since July 2022 and had operated smoothly and effectively. At the said meeting, Members agreed in principle to the adoption of streamlining arrangement for straightforward cases in future meetings, and also agreed that the Secretariat would prepare a draft list of streamlined applications, taking into account the planning circumstances of the metro areas, for the Committee's consideration at this meeting.

3. With the aid of a PowerPoint slide, the Secretary reported that the Planning Department (PlanD) had reviewed cases considered by the Committee in the past few years and briefed Members on the five selection criteria and the four proposed types of uses/developments selected for streamlining arrangement. The selection criteria included (a) PlanD had "no objection" to the application; (b) the application site was not within conservation-related zones (e.g. "Green Belt", "Conservation Area", "Coastal Protection Area", "Other Specific Uses" for conservation, etc.); (c) there were no adverse comments from concerned government bureaux/departments or their concerns could be addressed through imposition of approval conditions/advisory clauses; (d) there was no previously rejected application for the same/similar use (excluding those with subsequent approval) at

the application site/premises; and (e) there were no substantial adverse public comments. The same set of selection criteria had been adopted for the streamlining arrangement of RNTPC. Making reference to the selection criteria for the streamlined applications adopted by RNTPC and taking account of the planning circumstances of the metro areas, the following uses or developments were proposed for streamlining arrangement for consideration and agreement of the Committee:

- (a) shop and services on G/F in “Industrial”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” or “Residential (Group E)” zone;
- (b) shop and services, and eating place in pier zone;
- (c) public vehicle park in public housing development; and
- (d) minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction complying with the requirements under Joint Practice Note (JPN) No. 8 by adopting Modular Integrated Construction (MiC) method.

4. The Secretary said that papers would still be prepared and issued, and the Secretariat and/or PlanD’s representatives would address questions raised by Members at the meetings. Compared with the streamlined applications considered by RNTPC, temporary uses for open storage, warehouses, logistics centre, etc. were not included in the list for the Committee, taking into account the context of metro areas. Nevertheless, the list could be reviewed in future. Members were invited to express views on the proposed list and the selection criteria.

5. The Vice-chairperson and a Member had the following questions:

- (a) the reason for selecting shop and services, and eating place in pier zone for the streamlining arrangement, noting that there were discussions on applications related to the pier zone, e.g. a recent application in the Hung Hom ferry pier; and
- (b) details of JPN No. 8.

6. In response, the Secretary made the following main points:
- (a) according to the relevant Notes of Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs), small-scale shop and services and eating place uses (subject to a maximum number of kiosks or gross floor area) in pier zone were considered as ancillary to the pier use and did not require planning permission. For all such cases and those requiring planning permission in pier zone, there was an established mechanism to monitor the use of pier premises by relevant government departments, including the Transport Department and the Government Property Agency, taking into consideration the compatibility and scale of the ancillary uses and their impacts on ferry operation. Those s.16 applications for shop and services and eating places uses in pier zone were generally straightforward, with no adverse comments from concerned government departments. The concerned s.16 application in Hung Hom (North) Ferry Pier was for proposed exhibition hall and shop and services use in the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pier” zone on the OZP (Application No. A/K9/287). As the application involved ‘Exhibition Hall’ use, future similar cases would not be covered by the streamlining arrangement; and
 - (b) according to JPN No. 8, to facilitate the adoption of MiC, favourable consideration might be given to an increase of BH up to 4% of the total storey height of MiC floors.
7. The Chairperson remarked that the list on selected uses or development, the selection criteria and operation could be reviewed and adjusted if required. After discussion, the Committee agreed to the selected criteria and the uses or developments for streamlined applications to be considered in a group starting from the next meeting.

Deferral Case

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

8. The Committee noted that there was one case requesting the Town Planning Board to defer consideration of the application. Details of the request for deferral were in **Annex**.

Deliberation Session

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

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

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/KC/508 Proposed Industrial Use (including industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of dangerous goods) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Workshops No. 14-16, G/F, Man Lee Industrial Building, 13 Kin Hong Street, Kwai Chung
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/508)

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

12. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the types of dangerous goods (DG) to be stored in the Premises and the classification of DG;
- (b) how the Premises could meet the requirements for means of escape from fire safety point of view;

- (c) noting the objecting view from the Incorporated Owners of the subject industrial building (IB) regarding the risk of explosion and blockage of escape route in case of fire, whether the fire safety requirement would be more stringent for the use/storage of DG at the Premises;
- (d) whether the approval conditions on the provision of fire services installations would need to be imposed or such requirement could be dealt with at the DG Licence application stage; and
- (e) any special arrangements required in the transportation of DG, the estimated traffic flow, and any traffic concerns induced by the proposed use.

13. In response, Mr W.C. Lui, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) the DG stored in the Premises were Turpentine, Eucalyptus Oil and Camphor, which were ingredients for manufacturing Chinese medicinal oils and were classified as Class 3 and Class 4 under the Dangerous Goods Ordinance (Cap. 295) administered by the Fire Services Department (FSD). The classification of DG was based on properties and potential risk of the DG;
- (b) regarding means of escape and fire safety, the two proposed DG stores were abutting a public street (Kin Hong Street) and the workshop portion was located next to the corridor on G/F of the subject IB. Block walls with appropriate fire resistance were proposed for the Premises;
- (c) FSD had guidelines on the application for DG Licence which included requirements on DG storage. For example, the location of DG should not jeopardise any exit routes and there should be no DG store directly under or above another DG store. The applicants had revised the fire safety proposal, such as enclosing the Premises with block walls with appropriate fire resistance, in response to FSD's comments. FSD advised that detailed fire services requirements would be formulated upon receipt of formal

submission of general building plan (GBP) and licence application;

- (d) after liaison with FSD, FSD maintained the view that an approval condition in relation to the provision of fire services installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services before operation of the proposed use should be imposed, in addition to compliance with the requirements under the Dangerous Goods Ordinance; and
- (e) according to the applicants' submission, loading/unloading would be conducted within the carpark of the subject IB. The trip rate for transporting DG to the Premises was once a day. The applicants would also need to observe the requirements formulated by FSD on the transportation of DG.

14. A Member enquired whether planning application for the proposed use would be required for other premises located on G/F, noting from Drawing A-1 of the Paper that there were other workshops located on the same floor. The Chairperson said that according to the Notes of the OZP for the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone, 'Non-polluting industrial use (excluding industrial undertaking involving the use/storage of DG) was a Column 1 use which was always permitted. As the proposed use involved the use/storage of DG, planning permission was required.

15. With regard to the fire services installation for DG, a Member said that DG stores were generally placed on G/F of an IB. Submission of GBP was required which would be circulated to FSD for comment. FSD would provide comments related to fire safety, such as the layout, means of escape and provision of fire-resistant block wall, etc..

Deliberation Session

16. A Member noted the concern raised by the Incorporated Owners of the subject IB and suggested that the applicants should be advised to liaise with the owners of the subject IB with regard to the fire safety issue. The Chairperson suggested and the meeting agreed that an advisory clause should be added in this regard.

17. 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 8.11.2028, 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.

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

“to liaise with the Incorporated Owners of Man Lee Industrial Building to address their fire safety concerns.”

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

Hong Kong District

[Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), and Mr. Harvey T.H. Law, Town Planner/Hong Kong, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H19/86 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Submarine Cables and Landing Facilities) in “Coastal Protection Area” Zone, Government Land near Rural Building Lots 1220 and 1221, Chung Hom Kok, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H19/86A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint Presentation, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed installation,

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.

20. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was a cable landing duct of Hong Kong Broadband Network (HKBN) located in close proximity to the proposed one, noting that HKBN had submitted public comment requesting that the proposed cable landing duct should have a minimum clearance of 5m from HKBN's existing route;
- (b) whether a fresh planning application would be required should there be a change in the proposed location after liaison with HKBN;
- (c) whether any mitigation measures were proposed as the application site (the Site) was zoned "Coastal Protection Area" ("CPA"); and
- (d) noting that Chung Hom Kok Teleport, zoned "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Composite Signal Organization Station Complex" ("OU(CSOSC)"), was encircled by a strip of coastal land zoned "CPA", whether any area within the "CPA" zone was designated for consolidating the location of the submarine cables and the associated facilities and installation works for connection to telecommunication facilities at the Teleport holistically to minimise disturbance to the "CPA" zone or a common utility platform could be provided for the purpose to facilitate future management and maintenance, and whether any authority/government department would be responsible for coordinating the installation of facilities by different telecommunication operators.

21. In response, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, STP/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) the Site was in proximity to a land-based cable owned by HKBN with a separation distance of about 3m. As advised by the Office of Communications Authority (OFCA), there was no restriction on the minimum distance between cables for public utility installations. The

applicants were advised to coordinate with other telecommunication operators during the design and implementation stages and an advisory clause was suggested for this purpose;

- (b) changes in the approved scheme, including the location(s), could be dealt with under Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 36C on “Class A and Class B Amendment to Approved Development Proposals” (TPB PG-No. 36C). A fresh planning application would be required if the magnitude of change was beyond Class B amendment under TPB PG-No. 36C;
- (c) ten surveyed trees were proposed to be felled due to direct conflict with the cable installation works, among which three were undesirable species that did not require compensation, and the applicants proposed planting seven new trees within the cable landing station at RBL 1220 to achieve a tree compensation ratio of 1:1. The proposed cable installation works were small in scale and would not induce adverse visual and landscape impacts. The ecological assessment conducted by the applicants indicated that potential ecological impact would be minimal, and the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department had no comment on the application; and
- (d) the applicants would submit detailed proposal during the land administration stage and OFCA would provide comments on the design of the proposed installation works. Besides, OFCA would provide assistance to the telecommunication operators if required.

Deliberation Session

22. While Members generally supported the application, a Member, whilst noting that the site selection for the proposed use had considered the impact on the “CPA” zone in addition to costs and operational needs, opined that there should be more holistic planning/coordination on the location of telecommunication infrastructure for different telecommunication operators in the “CPA” zone by the relevant authority in order to protect the integrity of the “CPA” zone. The Vice-chairperson and some Members shared the same

view that the overall integrity of the “CPA” zone should not be compromised. It would be desirable to have a designated area within the zone for consolidation of telecommunication facilities for better management and maintenance, thereby avoiding scattered locations of such facilities in the “CPA” zone. The Vice-chairperson supplemented that while justifications for site selection were provided by the applicants, there might still be visual impact even with mitigation measures proposed by the applicants.

23. To address Members’ concern, the Chairperson remarked that PlanD would liaise with OFCA on the alignment of the cables in the coastal area.

24. The Committee noted that currently there were five cable landing stations and one proposed satellite earth station in the “OU(CSOSC)” zone and no further proposal on telecommunication station had been received so far. OFCA had been consulted on the comprehensive planning on telecommunication facilities at Chung Hom Kok Teleport. In general, OFCA would offer assistance to telecommunication operators on the installation and shared use of telecommunication facilities. According to the applicants, an exclusive cable system was required for better management. The applicants had minimised the size of the built structures and adopted recessive chromatic treatment for built structures to minimise visual impact, and suitable pollution control measures would be implemented in accordance to with the relevant guidelines of the Environmental Protection Department.

25. The Chairperson remarked that the coastal area of Chung Hom Kok was rezoned to “CPA” in 1994 to conserve the natural coastlines, taking account of the recommendation of the Metroplan Landscape Strategy for Urban Fringe and Coastal Areas in 1989. To address Members’ concerns, it was advised that the District Planning Officer/Hong Kong should liaise with OFCA to explore measures to better coordinate the planning including the locations of the telecommunication infrastructure in the “CPA” zone so as to maintain the integrity of the zone.

26. 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 8.11.2028, 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 Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory

clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

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

Agenda Item 6

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

27. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 10:00 a.m.

**Minutes of 753rd Metro Planning Committee
(held on 8.11.2024)**

Deferral Case

Request for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Time of Deferment
3	Y/K14S/3	1 st

**Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/753_mpc_agenda.html for details of the planning application.*