

**Minutes of 1305<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 20.10.2023**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)  
Ms Doris P.L. Ho

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Director of Lands

Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong

Transport Department

Mr Horace W. Hong

Chief Engineer (Works)

Home Affairs Department

Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Director of Planning

Mr. Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Mr C.K. Yip

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr C.H. Hau

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

**In Attendance**

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Thomas C.S. Yeung

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

**Confirmation of Minutes of the 1304<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 6.10.2023**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1304<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 6.10.2023 were confirmed without amendment.

**Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

**Matters Arising**

[This item was conducted in Cantonese.]

- (i) **Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plans**

2. The Secretary reported that on 3.10.2023, the Chief Executive in Council approved the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (re-numbered as S/H1/24), the draft Kwai Chung OZP (re-numbered as S/KC/32) and the draft So Kwun Wat OZP (re-numbered as S/TM-SKW/15) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The approval of the OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 13.10.2023.

**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft North Point Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H8/27  
(TPB Paper No. 10931)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

3. The Secretary reported that the amendments to the draft North Point Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) involved the revision of building height restriction (BHR) of a site to facilitate the redevelopment of an existing social services building and the rezoning of two sites to reflect the as-built developments under CK Asset Holdings Limited (CKAHL). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Ms Doris P.L. Ho<br><i>(Chairperson)</i>   | - owning a property in North Point;   |
| Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu   | - co-owning with spouse a property in North Point, and being the Director and Chief Executive Officer of Light Be which rented a residential unit in North Point; |
| Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui   | - co-owning with spouse a property in North Point, and her spouse being a director of a company which owned a property in North Point;                            |
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong  | - having past business dealings with CKAHL; and   |
| Mr Horace W. Hong<br><i>(as Chief Traffic Engineer/<br/>Hong Kong, Transport<br/>Department)</i> | - his spouse owing a property in North Point.   |

4. Members noted that Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. Members agreed that as the properties of the Chairperson and other Members who had declared interests had no direct view of the amendment sites, they could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The Chairperson said that notifications had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present at the meeting, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had

been given to the representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

6. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD), representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

**PlanD's Representatives**

Mr Elton H.T. Chung - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK)

Mr Dino W.L. Tang - Town Planner/Hong Kong

**Representers, Commenters and their Representatives**

R1 - William Brett Hilliard

C2 - Island Evangelical Community Church Ltd.

Mr William Brett Hilliard - Representer and Commenter's Representative

R5 - Phillip Paul Chin

Mr Phillip Paul Chin - Representer

R8 - Chan Tsz Wai Joyce

Mr Ng Wing Shun Anthony - Representer's Representative  
Vincent

R9 - Terese Choi

Mr Ma Wai Hung Vincent - Representer's Representative

R10 - Jessica Richmond

Ms Yeung Wing Shan Theresa - Representer's Representative

R25 - Yau Sang Lung Nelson

Ms Leung Suk Chong - Representer's Representative

R34 / C3 - Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill

- Representer and Commenter

7. The Chairperson extended a welcome. She then briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments. The representers, commenters and their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer, commenter or his/her representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenters and their representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the representers, commenters and their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or the representers, commenters and their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the representers, commenters and their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would then deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

8. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations and comments. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Elton H.T. Chung, STP/HK, PlanD briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the amendments to the OZP, the grounds/views of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10931 (the Paper). The main amendments were:

- (a) Item A – revision of the BHR of a site, zoned “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) at 210 Java Road, from 8 storeys to 110 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) to facilitate the redevelopment of the existing social services building (i.e. North Point Welfare Association) for expanding and improving the provision of social services and to relocate the Island Evangelical Community Church Limited (IECC) at 633 Java Road to the site; and
- (b) Items B and C1 to C4 - rezoning to reflect three completed commercial and composite developments at King Wah Road and Oil Street, which were known

as 18 King Wah Road, Harbour Grand Hong Kong, and Harbour Glory from “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) and “CDA(1)” to suitable zonings with appropriate development restrictions to reflect their as-built conditions. Amongst others, Item C2 was rezoned to “Open Space” (“O”) to reflect the Oil Street Sitting-out area and the open space at Oil Street Art Space.

[Mr Franklin Yu and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong joined the meeting during PlanD’s presentation.]

9. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments:

R1 - William Brett Hilliard

C2 - Island Evangelical Community Church Limited

10. Mr William Brett Hilliard made the following main points:

- (a) as a representative of the IECC, he thanked the Board and relevant government departments for providing assistance to facilitate the project in a timely manner;
- (b) he also expressed appreciation to the two other non-government organisations (NGOs) (i.e. the North Point Kai-Fong Welfare Advancement Association (NPKFAA) and the Women’s Welfare Club (Eastern District) Hong Kong (WWC)) for their expertise and presence in the district for many decades, which had benefited the lives of many. In addition, their eagerness to continue and expand those excellent services to the community allowed them to enter into an agreement with IECC for the redevelopment project;
- (c) should the proposal be approved, they were eager to provide the proposed five areas of social services to the community in which they had experience and expertise, namely carer services for the elderly, special services for the disadvantaged, integrated children and youth services, integrated family services, and services for ethnic minorities. Each of those areas had massive needs in Hong Kong and the North Point district, in particular; and



- (d) IECC was committed to serving the community continuously. The project might bring inconvenience in the short term but the services to be provided in the redevelopment would help improve the quality of life of those with unique needs and required attention and care.

R34 / C3 - Mary Mulvihill

11. With the aid of visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

*Item A*

- (a) strong objection to the proposed redevelopment. The “G/IC” site should be for the provision of additional community services rather than religious uses. The arrangement on the ownership and management of the redevelopment was unclear and dubious. All direct land grants had to be subject to stringent policy scrutiny and should be justified in the public interest with specific approval by the Executive Council. The subject redevelopment proposal amongst the three parties effectively gifted a valuable “G/IC” site to a church body, and charging nil premium for the land could not be justified;
- (b) many of the services to be provided in the redevelopment would in fact be funded by taxpayers and/or charitable bodies like the Community Chest or Jockey Club. That would effectively be a subvention of the religious body as the church would manage how the money was to be used;
- (c) large portions of the floor area in the redevelopment would be devoted to religious use, which was not acceptable in a district with a significant deficit in community services against the planning standards, such as the community care service facilities (-58%) and residential care homes for the elderly (RCHE) (-78%);
- (d) taking the example of a church near her home, many church members would drive to church. Some might illegally park on the nearby streets, causing traffic congestion;
- (e) the new community hall (proposed in the basement) should be located on the floor

where the religious hall was proposed so that it would allow activities for the wider community to be held on weekends instead of being occupied by church activities;

- (f) a plot ratio of 15 for a Government, institution and community (GIC) building was excessive;
- (g) the removal of the Tin Chiu Street Playground (adjacent to the site) for a housing development, together with the redevelopment of the site, had a significant negative impact on air ventilation;
- (h) the limited setback proposed at Marble Road could not compensate for the wall and shadow effect of the bulky building, reduced ventilation, reduction in natural light to the street, loss of view of the sky and an increase in traffic; and

*Item C2*

- (i) the section of the “O” zone facing Oil Street was all paved and used as an emergency vehicular access (EVA) and was not designed for open space use. It could not be used for active nor passive recreation and should be excised from the “O” zone.

12. As the presentations of PlanD’s representative, the representers, commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representers, commenters and their representatives and/or the government representatives. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board nor for cross-examination between parties.

13. Some Members raised the following questions on Item A:

*Roles of Different Parties*

- (a) the role played by IECC in the redevelopment of the North Point Welfare Association; and the ownership of the site and building before and after

redevelopment;

- (b) the roles of the Labour and Welfare Bureau (LWB) and the Home and Youth Affairs Bureau (HYAB) in the redevelopment;

*Floor Uses Allocation*

- (c) the current social services provided in the North Point Welfare Association, and whether NPKFAA and WWC were also the operators of the existing social services;
- (d) the approximate share of floor space within the redevelopment among IECC, NPKFAA and WWC;
- (e) the reason why the proposal of the redevelopment shown in IECC's website was seemingly different from the proposal submitted to the Board;

*Financial Arrangement*

- (f) whether IECC would finance the capital cost as well as operating costs of the whole development, and whether IECC would apply for public funds to finance the redevelopment;

*Operation*

- (g) whether IECC planned to use their own resources to provide all the social services or they would invite other NGOs to operate some services;

*Parking*

- (h) regarding the concern about car parking needs of the church members as raised by a representer, whether traffic jams occurred around the existing church of IECC (at 633 Java Road) when there were church activities;

*Others*

- (i) whether there were guidelines for the provision of religious facilities under the planning regime; and
- (j) how the quality of the social services to be provided would be monitored.

14. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Elton H.T. Chung, STP/HK, PlanD made the following main points:

*Roles of Different Parties*

- (a) IECC was neither the current user nor owner of the existing social services building at the site. They partnered with NPKFAA and WWC, i.e. the owners of the building and the site, for the redevelopment. IECC would finance the entire redevelopment and become one of the grantees in the future private treaty grant (PTG) for the site, together with the existing grantees NPKFAA and WWC;
- (b) LWB and HYAB had reviewed the proposal and the social services to be provided therein, and both provided in-principle support from their respective policy perspectives;

*Floor Uses Allocation*

- (c) the facilities/services currently operated by NPKFAA and WWC at the North Point Welfare Association included a community hall, women welfare activities/social and recreational centre for the elderly and women, and community services and student services centre;

*Others*

- (d) there were no guidelines for say the floor area and locational requirements for religious facilities under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG); and

- (e) the operation and quality of the social services to be provided would be monitored by relevant government departments and/or authorities under the existing mechanisms.

15. Mr William Brett Hilliard (R1 and C2's representative) made the following main points:

*Floor Uses Allocation*

- (a) Drawing H-1 of the Paper showed the share/allocation of floor space within the redevelopment among IECC, NPKFAA and WWC;
- (b) Drawing H-1 of the Paper was an illustration of the redevelopment proposal under planning and design. It was a more detailed version of the illustration on the IECC's website, and was generally in line with the agreed allocation of floor spaces among the three parties and the particular five areas of social services to be provided;

*Financial Arrangement*

- (c) regarding the future funding, there was no plan to apply for public funding from the Government. It involved a huge financial commitment, and the initial construction costs estimated to be around \$800 million would be covered by private donations. For the ongoing operating costs, they aimed to secure 50 years of funding and would continue to seek private donations, mainly focusing on family foundations in the city with care and concerns for elderly or those with special needs, etc. They had employed specialists to take charge of the fund raising;

*Operation*

- (d) NPKFAA and WCC would be allocated specific floors shown in yellow and green respectively in Drawing H-1 of the Paper. IECC would take up the overall management and operation of all other floors shown in blue. IECC would

partner with NGOs that had expertise in specific service areas as operators. IECC would provide the floor space while the operators would provide manpower resources; and

### *Parking*

- (e) in the existing building where the church was located, there were about 30 parking spaces available. There were also some parking facilities available in other buildings nearby and no illegal parking caused by church goers was observed on streets around the church. In the new building, there would only be six parking spaces for the church use. However, the new site would be more accessible to public transport like buses, MTR, etc., and majority of the church goers would use public transport. The study conducted by them showed that there were sufficient parking spaces nearby and the Transport Department had no comment in that regard.

### *Questions to NPKFAA and WWC*

16. Noting that NPKFAA and/or WWC might receive funds from the Community Chest for the services to be provided in the redevelopment, a Member asked whether cross subsidies of the redevelopment was involved. Mr Ma Wai Hung Vincent (R9's representative), who was the president of NPKFAA, said that NPKFAA had received funding from the Community Chest for renovation of their Community Services and Student Services Centre, to support their after-school services as well as the medical services which they previously provided. They might also charge a small fee for users of the social services. Ms Leung Suk Chong (R25's representative), who was the chairperson of WWC, said that all services provided by WWC were self-financed.

17. In response to a Member's question on the naming proposal of the new building, Mr Ma Wai Hung Vincent (R9's representative) said that the reprovisioned community hall would retain the same name (Chan Shu Kui Community Centre) and Ms Leung Suk Chong (R25's representative) said that they had no particular requirement in terms of naming and it would suffice for their organisation name to be shown in the directory of the building.

18. Noting that the ownership share in the land grant would be proportional to the floor space allocation as shown in the proposal (in Drawing H-1 of the Paper), a Member asked the representatives of NPKFAA and WWC how those proportions were agreed and whether such allocation was based on any professional valuation. In response, Mr Ma Wai Hung Vincent (R9's representative) said that no professional valuation of the land value had been conducted. The floor areas to be allocated to NPKFAA and WWC in the new building would be the same as or no less than the current floor space. The floor space allocation was mutually agreed among the three parties.

### *The Land Grant*

19. In response to a Member's question on whether the specific social services to be provided would be clearly stated as requirements in the future PTG, Mr Andrew C.W. Lai, Director of Lands (D of Lands) made the following main points:

- (a) the Government granted the site to NPKFAA and WWC by way of a PTG for 'social service centre' use some 50 years ago. About three years ago, the lot owners applied to redevelop the building together with a church so as to provide additional social services;
- (b) when considering the new PTG application, the Lands Department (LandsD) would follow the established land administration policies. As transfer of the land held under PTG would not be allowed, the three parties (NPKFAA, WWC and IECC) must jointly own the site and be parties to the new PTG. According to the established policy, LandsD could offer nil or nominal premium for PTG granted for social services uses with relevant policy support. For religious use, normally one-third of full market premium would be charged and the only exception for exemption was that the religious use only occupied one floor in the development. When processing the subject PTG application, LandsD had sought advice from LWB and HYAB which had provided the necessary policy support. As such, LandsD had given in-principle support to the PTG application subject to completion of other procedures, including the statutory town planning procedures and provision of proof of financial capability to implement the redevelopment; and

- (c) for the uses to be specified in the PTG, normally broad uses would be specified to allow more flexibility to the grantees. This was also relevant to this land application when the site was zoned “G/IC”.

#### *Examples of Similar Redevelopments*

20. In response to a Member’s enquiry on whether there were examples of similar redevelopment proposal for social welfare services by the private sector, the Chairperson said that LWB had a programme to encourage and support NGOs in redeveloping the privately owned sites for welfare uses to better utilise land resources and provide new and additional social services. The subject proposal was slightly different because in addition to the two existing NGOs, a third party was involved in the redevelopment. As advised by the D of Lands, the site would be jointly owned by the three parties. The two existing NGOs would retain the same amount of floor space for them to continue their social services.

#### *Social Services Provision*

21. A Member asked PlanD’s representative the following questions:

- (a) whether the details about the types of social services to be provided in the redevelopment had implication on the Item A amendment under consideration; and
- (b) the views on R34’s ground that the proposed redevelopment should accommodate those GIC facilities that were in deficit rather than to accommodate the religious uses.

22. In response, Mr Elton H.T. Chung, STP/HK, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) the Item A amendment was to amend the BHR of the site from 8 storeys to 110mPD, and the main consideration should be whether the proposed building height was acceptable from planning perspective. There was no amendment to the “G/IC” zoning under which the proposed religious and other social services



uses were all Column 1 uses and always permitted; and

- (b) as shown in the GIC table in Annex V of the Paper, there were deficits in some population-based GIC facilities in the North Point area according to HKPSG. Nevertheless, Item A was to facilitate a privately-initiated redevelopment proposal within a private lot. Most of the proposed social services were not population-based and were not reflected in the GIC table, but it did not mean that there was no need for such social services, and the provision of such social services normally relied heavily on the private sector. The Social Welfare Department had been consulted and had no adverse comment on the proposal.

23. The same Member asked the representatives of NPKFAA and WWC to explain the social services which they currently operated at the North Point Welfare Association. In response:

- (a) NPKFAA - Mr Ma Wai Hung Vincent (R9's representative) said that NPKFAA was established in 1950. Previously, they had provided medical services and currently they mainly provided elderly and educational services. There was a small office in the existing building and many volunteers assisted in their operations. Upon redevelopment, they would continue to operate the Students Services Centre mainly to provide afterschool care for students, and continue to partner with the Hong Kong Family Welfare Society to provide elderly care and rehabilitation services; and
- (b) WWC - Ms Leung Suk Chong (R25's representative) said that WWC was established in 1955. Their organisation operated two kindergartens and some elderly facilities in the district. The kindergarten previously operating on the site had moved out. Within the subject building, they currently had a central administration office and a centre for providing elderly and women services. The activities and services being operated in the building were self-financed. Upon redevelopment, they would retain the same floor space for their central administration office and an elderly centre.

24. A Member asked IECC about their experience in the proposed social services, and details of the proposed special services for the disadvantaged. In response, with the aid of

visualiser, Mr William Brett Hilliard (R1 and C2's representative) made the following main points:

- (a) IECC had over 22 years of experience in providing social services either on their own or in partnership with other NGOs in areas including Quarry Bay and Sham Shui Po to serve the needs of the marginalised groups;
- (b) IECC currently had a programme called "Marvel" (as in the Marvel Heroes) that was an example of special services for the disadvantaged. Marvel kids who were kids/teens from birth to mid-twenties with special needs (mostly on the autism spectrum) were matched with Marvel buddies and Marvel families. Such programmes allowed the children with different abilities to interact, and helped children with special needs and their families integrate into the community;
- (c) IECC offered extensive support for ethnic minorities, particularly Filipino and Indonesian domestic helpers, so that they could gather on a weekly basis on their holiday and participate in activities such as cooking classes and Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation classes, enabling them to provide more effective care for employers' families;
- (d) IECC also provided extensive counselling services, free of charge, to anyone in need (i.e. not limited to members of the church), which covered issues such as mental health problems and suicide concerns;
- (e) IECC provided services for prisoners, both during their time in prisons and after their release, helping them reintegrate into the community; and
- (f) the services provided by IECC were not commonly offered by other service providers but they were essential to the society. IECC took pride in serving those in need and endeavoured to improve their quality of living, which aligned with their religious beliefs.

*Item C2*

25. The Vice-chairperson and two Members enquired on Item C2 and asked whether the EVA was part of the open space and if any improvement work was being planned. With the aid of some Powerpoint slides, Mr Elton H.T. Chung, STP/HK, PlanD responded that the EVA area was currently paved with some shelters and seatings, serving passive open space. The EVA area was only about 275m<sup>2</sup> or 7% of the Oil Street Sitting-out Area. It was not uncommon in Hong Kong to have an EVA within an open space, e.g. the EVA at Quarry Bay Park, Cherry Street Park and Lai Chi Kok Park. The EVA did not affect the integrity of those open spaces. The Government had plans to enhance the Oil Street Sitting-out Area with more proper seating provision with shelters/tables and to further improve accessibility and connectivity etc., which was generally supported by the Eastern District Council. The north of the open space would be connected to the future waterfront promenade.

26. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the representations and comments in closed meeting and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers, commenters, their representatives and the government's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

27. Ms Lilian S.K. Law declared an interest at this juncture as Ms Leung Suk Chong (R25's representative) was her close friend, but they had not discussed the matter before the meeting. Members noted and agreed that the interest was indirect and Ms Law could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

28. For Item A, Members generally agreed that relaxation of the BHR of the "G/IC" site to 110mPD was acceptable and agreed with the recommendation in the Paper of not upholding the adverse representation of R34.

29. Members generally supported the redevelopment proposal under Item A which would allow continuation of the existing and provision of more social services that would

benefit the community while allowing better utilisation of land resources. In addition, some Members expressed the following views and concerns on Item A:

- (a) the existing building was dilapidated and there was a pressing need for redevelopment. Without the involvement of IECC, the two existing NGOs would unlikely proceed with the redevelopment and the building would remain in its current state for the foreseeable future;
- (b) the allocation of floor areas was subject to the mutual agreement amongst the three parties though it might appear inequitable for NPKFAA and WWC. It was also reckoned that the proposed allocation of floor areas was dependent on the financial and resources capabilities of the respective parties to manage and operate the social services in the allocated floor space;
- (c) although IECC might not be most experienced in providing all of the proposed social services, they could rent out some premises and/or partner with other NGOs to provide the services. Private sector participation in the provision of social services was strongly supported, and encouraging less experienced service providers like IECC to participate would enhance the level and scope of social services for the underprivileged in society; and
- (d) some of the proposed social services were not reflected in the GIC table based on the HKPSG standards, such as services for mental health, educational services for those with special needs, etc. Those services were not typically provided by the Government through public funds, but the need for such services had to be recognised and be catered for where opportunities existed.

30. The Chairperson remarked that the existing social services building was dilapidated and would likely remain in the current state if the two existing NGOs continued to operate the place on their own. Upon redevelopment, both of them would benefit from the new facilities albeit without additional floor areas. Knowing that NPKFAA's daily operation relied on the funding support from the Community Chest and WWC operated their services on a self-financing basis, they might be subject to financial constraints to take up additional floor spaces. In that regard, the third party involvement would facilitate redevelopment of the existing

building and achieve land use optimisation while bringing more and better facilities and services to the local community.

31. In response to some Members' concerns, Mr Andrew C.W. Lai, D of Lands made the following main points:

- (a) under the lease, LandsD would ensure that the three parties would be grantees to jointly hold the land and the grantees would be stated in the lease;
- (b) as it would be a self-financing project, the grantees would need to provide proof of financial capability to complete construction of the project and a financial plan for the continued operation of the relevant social services, for which advice from LWB and SWD would be sought;
- (c) for the user control, mainly broad uses such as social services and church use (on one floor) would be specified. It was not possible to control the use of each floor in the new building under the lease as flexibility should be provided. Uses in contravention of the user control, such as commercial and residential uses in the case, would be enforced under the lease;
- (d) regarding whether IECC could charge a fee for allowing other NGOs to operate in the building, based on LandsD's experience, operators of GIC buildings could partner with NGOs under different terms from time to time, e.g. by charging rents and/or service fees, etc.; and
- (e) the chance of granting a new site in urban area purely for religious purpose was not high under the present day circumstances. However, the consideration might be different if it included social services with policy support from the relevant bureaux. For religious uses, one-third of full market premium would be charged.

32. Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning, said that Item A was to amend the BHR of the "G/IC" site from 8 storeys to 110mPD. The focus should be on whether the amended building height would be compatible with the surroundings from planning point of view. The

proposal provided by IECC (in Drawing H-1 of the Paper) was only indicative, and the Board was not dealing with a scheme-based section 16 application. As such, the other issues related to the implementation of the project, land grant, operation of the social services and naming of the new building, etc. might not be material considerations. In view of Members' concerns on the future use of the site, Members might consider amending the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP for the "G/IC" zone to state clearly the intended use of the site after redevelopment as mentioned in paragraph 4.1.2 of the Paper.

33. While agreeing to Item C2, a Member commented that the connection point at the northern side of the Oil Street Sitting-out Area was too narrow and was not the most desirable design. Possible improvements to enhance the future connection to the waterfront should be explored in future.

34. Members agreed to the other amendments (Items B, C1, C2, C3 and C4) as they were to reflect the as-built conditions.

35. The Chairperson concluded that Members had no comment on Item A and agreed to amend the ES to add some description that the subject "G/IC" site would mainly be used for the proposed social services and the religious institution use. Members also agreed with the other amendments (Items B, C1, C2, C3 and C4) and that the OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representation (R34) and that all grounds of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper and the presentations and responses made by the government representative at the meeting.

36. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1** to **R33** and decided not to uphold R34 and considered that the draft North Point Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reasons:

"Item A

- (a) it is considered appropriate to amend the building height restriction of the site from 8 storeys to 110mPD, taking into consideration the planning context of the area and that the proposed development would not induce insurmountable impacts in respect of traffic, visual, air ventilation, and environmental aspects as

confirmed by relevant technical assessments. The proposed redevelopment shall provide enhanced and a wider range of Government, institution and community facilities serving the community with the support by the Labour and Welfare Bureau and the Home and Youth Affairs Bureau; and

Item C2

(b) it is considered appropriate to rezone the site from “Comprehensive Development Area”, “Government, Institution or Community” and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Open Space” to tally with the land allocation boundaries for the existing public open space. While a small portion of item C2 is currently serving the function of an emergency vehicular access, it remains an integral part of the open space development for public enjoyment.”

37. The Board also agreed to amend the ES of the draft North Point OZP No. S/H8/27 as follows:

New paragraph added after paragraph 8.9.4 of the ES of the OZP

“The site currently occupied by the North Point Welfare Association at 210 Java Road, an existing social services and community centre operated by the North Point Kai-Fong Welfare Advancement Association and the Women’s Welfare Club (Eastern District) Hong Kong, is subject to a building height restriction (BHR) of 110mPD. The site is planned to be redeveloped to re-provide the existing services as well as introduce expanded social services, such as Integrated Children and Youth Services, Integrated Family Services, Carer Services, services for the disadvantaged and ethnic minorities, etc. Other than the social services mentioned above, one level of religious hall will be provided.”

38. The Board also agreed that the draft OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, were suitable for submission under sections 8(1)(a) and 29(8) of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

**Sha Tin, Tai Po & North District**

**Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferment of Review of Application No. A/NE-KLH/623

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Village Type Development” and “Agriculture” Zones, Lot 975 S.A RP in D.D. 7, Wai Tau, Tai Po, New Territories

(TPB Paper No. 10932)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

39. After deliberation, the Board decided to defer a decision, being the first deferment, on the application for two months as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information, as recommended in the Paper.

**Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

40. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:55 a.m.