

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 382nd Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 10.10.2008**

Present

Director of Planning
Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng

Chairperson

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Professor N.K. Leung

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Dr. Daniel B.M. To

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),
Transport Department
Mr. Anthony Loo

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr. C.W. Tse

Assistant Director (Kowloon), Lands Department
Ms. Olga Lam

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen

Dr. Ellen Y.Y. Lau

Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang

Assistant Director(2), Home Affairs Department
Ms. Margaret Hsia

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Mr. Lau Sing

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr. C.T. Ling

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms. Kathy C.L. Chan

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 381st MPC Meeting held on 19.9.2008

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 381st MPC meeting held on 19.9.2008 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

2. The Chairperson, on behalf of the Committee, expressed condolences to the family of Dr. Chan Wai Kwan, who passed away in Spain on 8.10.2008. Dr. Chan served on the Town Planning Board from 1996 to 2004 and was the Vice-Chairman of Metro Planning Committee from 2002 to 2004. Dr. Chan devoted a lot of his time serving the community through his active participation in many planning-related activities, including the planning of Kai Tak area and the harbour areas.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

[Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK), and Mr. C.K. Soh, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K2/184 Proposed Educational Institution and
Minor Relaxation of Maximum Gross Floor Area Restriction
in “Government, Institution or Community (1)” zone,
Junction of Chatham Road South and Princess Margaret Road,
Yau Ma Tei
(MPC Paper No. A/K2/184)

3. The application was submitted by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (HKPU) with AGC Design Ltd. as one of the consultants. The Secretary reported that Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim and Mr. K.Y. Leung had declared interests in this item as Professor Lim was the consultant for this project while Mr. Leung was a part-time lecturer of HKPU. Members noted that Professor Lim had not yet arrived at the meeting.

[Mr. K.Y. Leung left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

4. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. C.K. Soh, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed educational institution and minor relaxation of maximum gross floor area (GFA) restriction;

[Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan and Ms. Starry W.K. Lee arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;

- (d) a total of 506 public comments were received during the statutory publication period of the application, of which 86 were in support and nine raised objection to the application whereas the remaining 411 commenters provided comments on the application. The public comments supporting the application opined that the proposed development was essential to support the implementation of the new four-year undergraduate academic system, compatible with the surrounding developments and in line with the Government's objective to maintain Hong Kong as a world-class city. It would also provide public open space (POS) and would not create adverse traffic and environmental impacts. Those commenters who raised objection were mainly concerned about adverse traffic impact, wall effect and the resultant air and environmental impacts, and noise impact due to increase in traffic and activities in the university. They also considered that it would obstruct the views, affect their property value and destroy the existing green area; and that the site should be used for open space development, the building height should not exceed 60m, and incomplete transportation system, no parking space, opening time of the main entrance and the detached location were inconvenient to staff, students and visitors;
- (e) during the statutory publication period of supplementary information submitted by the applicant, a total of 19 public comments were received. One commenter supported and 14 objected to the application whereas the remaining four provided comments on the application. The public comment supporting the application considered that the increase in GFA was due to the need to provide POS and would not affect the building bulk, and the proposed university development would benefit the public as a whole. Those commenters objected to the application on the grounds that the building height should be set at lower level and not be further relaxed; the proposed plot ratio was not reasonable; the provision of 2 000m² private open space by means of public money was not reasonable; it should be built in other locations where more land were available; and the proposal had been revised seven times and it was a waste of resources for the Town Planning Board (TPB) to process the application. The Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Corporation Limited raised concern about the extent of the

application site and the agreed boundary line which should not infringe into the proposed Shatin Central Link (SCL) project. There were also suggestions on converting the roof-top area of MTR Hung Hom Railway Station, the nearby car-parking building and sports stadium to new campus of HKPU; further restriction of GFA and building height of the proposed development; and comments on Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) and implementation of mitigation measures, etc.;

- (f) the District Officer (Yau Tsim Mong) advised that the concerned District Councillor raised objection to the application because it was objected to by many local residents; the proposed development would have traffic, environmental and noise impacts; and the open space area should not be changed to other use. The Chairman of Yau Tsim Mong East Area Committee had no comment on the application but reminded that the proposed development should pay due regard to traffic impact, supporting pedestrian facilities and landscaping treatments;
- (g) the District Officer (Kowloon City) advised that the Planning Department (PlanD) and the TPB should take into consideration all the public comments received; and
- (h) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed development with an area reserved on ground level for the SCL project was in line with the planning intention of the “Government, Institution or Community(1)” (“G/IC(1)”) zone. There were voids and recessed areas at different levels to allow better air ventilation and soften the visual impact of the building mass. In comparison with the previous rezoning scheme (Application No. Y/K2/3), the area of POS at ground level had been increased by 78%, and its accessibility and usability were improved. Apart from the proposed underpass connecting with the existing HKPU main campus, two entrances to the POS were proposed at Chatham Road South. Although about 3 600m² of the POS would be covered, given that the headroom was sufficiently high (not less than 6m), the amenity value of the POS would

not be compromised significantly. The proposed increase in GFA would not have significant infrastructural, traffic and visual impacts. The number of tree felling was reduced from 65 to 48 and the proposed number of new trees was increased from 156 to 170. Two large and mature Banyan trees (Nos. T25 and T44) would also be preserved in-situ. Regarding the public comments, the TIA and the Environmental Assessment (EA) had demonstrated that the proposed development would not create adverse traffic and environmental impacts. The air ventilation assessment (AVA) indicated that the ventilation performance at Wylie Court would be predominantly unaffected by the proposed development. To minimise visual and air ventilation impacts, the proposed building height ranging from 30mPD to 60mPD had not exceeded the maximum permissible building height under the “Government, Institution or Community (1)” zone on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The proposed development was neither an air-polluting source nor a major/potential noise emitter in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, hence it would not create noise impact. Property value of a site was affected by many factors as determined by the market. The landscape proposals including tree compensation and POS at the application site would help improve the environment of the area. There was improvement in the open space provision in terms of quality and accessibility. The proposed relaxation of maximum GFA restriction was needed to accommodate all the required facilities for the implementation of the ‘3+3+4’ academic structure and to improve the accessibility of the POS. The increased floor space for academic facilities was located at lower ground levels and would not have implication on the building bulk above ground.

5. A Member raised the following questions :
- (a) whether the proposed increase in GFA by 22.7% could be considered as minor;
 - (b) as another HKPU development, i.e. the proposed Innovation Tower, had

recently been approved which was located opposite to the application site on Chatham Road South, whether the current submission had taken into account the cumulative impact of the two developments on air ventilation;

[Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) while the applicant claimed that a total of 48 trees would be felled as they were of low amenity value or in poor condition, whether it was possible to retain more trees especially a number of *Macaranga tanarius* would be felled and some of them had a tree girth up to 770mm; and
- (d) as the proposed POS at ground level (+5mPD) was lower than the existing roads, the vehicular emission would be trapped at the POS below thus causing health problem to the people using the POS. Whether the current submission had included an assessment on this aspect.

6. Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan, DPO/TWK, had the following responses :

- (a) minor relaxation of GFA should not be assessed solely on the basis of the increase in percentages, but on the consequence, impact and implication of the proposal. This point had also been taken into account by the Committee when considering the proposed Innovation Tower of HKPU. As far as the current application was concerned, Government departments consulted had no objection to/adverse comments on the proposed relaxation of maximum GFA restriction;
- (b) the applicant had conducted an AVA for the proposed development which had demonstrated no adverse impact on the surrounding areas. The HKPU also undertook an AVA for the proposed Innovation Tower;
- (c) in comparison with the previous rezoning scheme, the number of trees proposed to be felled had been reduced by 17 and the number of trees to be transplanted/retained/compensated had been increased by 8, 9 and 14 respectively. In addition, an approval condition had been suggested

requiring the submission of a tree preservation plan under which further consideration could be given to identify those trees worthy of preservation; and

- (d) there was no particular comment from the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) on the impact of vehicular emission to the people using the POS at ground level.

7. In response to the Chairperson's question, Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan said that of the additional GFA of 8 292m², 3 600m² (i.e. 43.4%) was covered POS that were GFA accountable according to the Building (Planning) Regulations. The remaining 4 692m² for academic facilities was located at the lower ground levels, hence no change in the building bulk above ground.

8. A Member noted that the HKPU had submitted a number of applications for the university development, but there was no overall development plan of the HKPU in the submission to facilitate the assessment of the cumulative impacts of all the new buildings on the surrounding areas. Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan said that a total of three applications for new developments had been submitted by the HKPU, vis-à-vis the Teaching Hotel, the Innovation Tower and the Phase 8 development (i.e. the subject application). According to the applicant, the Innovation Tower would be used by the School of Design whereas the Phase 8 development was to cater for the needs for other teaching faculties. The applicant had indicated in the previous rezoning application that the number of students would be increased by about 3 000 under the new four-year undergraduate programme. The new classrooms would serve both daytime and part-time students. Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan added that, should further expansion of the university was required in future, it could only be dealt with by way of a site search on a territorial basis.

9. The Chairperson remarked that the site was the subject of a previous rezoning application (No. Y/K2/3) submitted by the HKPU to rezone the site from "Open Space" ("O") to "G/IC(1)" to facilitate the Phase 8 development of the university which was agreed by the Committee on 13.4.2007. The justifications for the zoning amendment and the need of the site for the university development had been fully considered by the Committee. Under the "G/IC(1)" zone, HKPU would have to submit a detailed proposal of the Phase 8 development

to the Committee by way of a section 16 application. In the current application, HKPU also applied for minor relaxation of maximum GFA restriction as detailed in the presentation session.

10. A Member enquired about the accessibility of the proposed POS. Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan, by referring to a plan showing the pedestrian network, said that apart from the proposed underpass connecting the POS with the main campus of HKPU, there were two entrances to the POS at the northern and southern ends of the site along Chatham Road South. These two entrances were connected with the existing subways and footbridges at Chatham Road South, Princess Margaret Road, Gascoigne Road, Wylie Court and Hung Hom area, and the northern entrance was in the proximity of an existing bus stop located on Chatham Road South.

11. A Member opined that the layout of the existing main campus of HKPU was already congested and it was undesirable to allow more new buildings to be developed within the campus and in its close proximity. The Chairperson said that Members' concern on the congested layout of HKPU and its expansion programme had been raised when the Committee considered the original rezoning request for Phase 8 development and the application for the proposed Innovation Tower, and had been conveyed to the Education Bureau for their consideration in the long-term planning of tertiary institutions. She drew Members' attention to the fact that while the subject site was originally zoned "O", the site was not an ideal location for open space in view of its isolated location and poor accessibility. With the proposed Phase 8 development, part of the site would be developed as open space for early enjoyment by the public.

12. The Secretary drew Members' attention that in considering the zoning amendment on 13.4.2007, some Members had raised a number of concerns, namely the capacity of the proposed underpass for shared use by vehicles and students; accessibility of the proposed open space for public enjoyment; integration with the SCL project; availability of other development options; and preservation of two Banyan trees. To address Members' concerns, HKPU was required under the Notes of the "G/IC(1)" zone to submit the development scheme to the Committee for approval. In this regard, Members should focus on whether the current application had addressed the above concerns, rather than the suitability of the site for educational institution use which had already been duly considered

and decided on at the stage of rezoning request.

13. A Member, while supporting the development need of HKPU to implement the new '3+3+4' academic structure, considered that the combined effect of the proposed Innovation Tower and the current development should be assessed in terms of traffic, air ventilation and environmental impacts. Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan, by referring to the AVA report submitted by the applicant, said that the site proposed for the development of Innovation Tower fell within the study area of the assessment. However, as the evaluation was mainly focused on the ventilation performance of Wylie Court due to the residents' concern on the wall effect of the proposed development, the proposed Innovation Tower had not been included in the assessment. Mr. C.W. Tse, Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment) of EPD, said that the EA had demonstrated that the proposed development would not impose any adverse air quality impact due to traffic emissions from the nearby road network.

14. A Member suggested that the proposed development should be set back as far as possible so as to provide a wider pavement along Chatham Road South. The widened pavement should be planted with roadside trees to provide a visual relief to both drivers and pedestrians. In response to the Chairperson's question on whether there was scope to widen the pavement along Chatham Road South, Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan said that it would either take up the space designated for the proposed POS or extend onto the road which was heavily trafficked. This Member considered that a wider pavement would facilitate a better public access to the subject site and provide adequate space for pedestrian flow, particularly in the event of emergency. Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan said that as the entrances to the POS were located at the northern and southern end of Chatham Road South, it was expected that the pavement abutting a busy trunk road between these two entrances would not be heavily used by pedestrians. Moreover, some of the trees which were proposed to be retained under the current application might be affected.

Deliberation Session

15. A Member considered that larger area of POS provided at ground level would be much better than smaller pieces of POS located at different levels. The POS at upper levels would not be attractive to the public in spite of the provision of escalators and lifts, and it

might pose security problem to staff and students of HKPU. Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan said that the provision of POS at ground floor was constrained by the need to reserve more than half of the ground level area for railway-related facilities for the SCL. In the current submission, the applicant had revised the building layout and increased the area of POS at ground level from 1 880m² to 3 345m² (34.8% of the site area). Some Members opined that the proposed POS would be welcomed and used by the nearby residents, especially for morning exercise.

16. Members viewed the physical model submitted by the applicant displayed at the meeting. They commented that the recently approved Innovation Tower was not shown, failing to provide a comprehensive picture.

17. A Member noted that the applicant had made efforts in revising the development proposal to address the Committee's concerns on the previous rezoning scheme and relatively fewer objections to the current application were received from residents of Wylie Court. This Member was in support of the application but suggested to include an advisory clause requiring the applicant to consider Members' comments on improving the public accessibility to the POS and placing clear signage to indicate the location of the POS. Moreover, the applicant should be requested to submit an overall development plan of the HKPU campus should new applications were submitted in future.

18. A Member reiterated the concern on the 'sunken' POS at ground level which would be subject to adverse air quality impact due to vehicular emissions from the surrounding roads. This Member also expressed reservation on the tree felling proposal. The Secretary said that the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation and the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD had no objection to the application. Moreover, the assessments were made based on the tree survey results and objective standards. Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan supplemented that, in the previous rezoning scheme, two large and mature Banyan trees (Nos. T25 and T44) were proposed to be transplanted to make way for the proposed development. Under the current proposal, the building layout had been revised to provide more open space on the ground floor and hence these two trees could be retained in-situ.

19. The Vice-chairman said that the subject site was not an ideal location for open space as it was surrounded by major roads and the users would very likely be affected by the

vehicular emissions as traffic jam was common on these major trunk roads. While the popularity of the proposed POS to the general public was doubtful, he pointed out that there were large number of students and visitors going to the HKPU campus to attend classes in the daytime and the evenings. There were also many lectures or seminars which were open to the public on weekdays and weekends. Therefore the proposed POS could still be enjoyed by students and visitors, who were also members of the public.

20. A Member said that as the POS was intended for public use, appropriate signage should be provided to clearly indicate the POS facilities. This Member also asked whether the applicant should be requested to revise the AVA taking into account the cumulative effect of developing the Innovation Tower and the current proposal before the application was considered by the Committee. The Chairperson clarified that AVA was carried out to find out the areas of poor air ventilation performance and identify mitigation measures to improve the situation. To address this Member's concern, the Chairperson suggested that an approval condition would need to be imposed requiring the submission of a revised AVA to assess the cumulative effect of developing the Innovation Tower and the Phase 8 development of HKPU.

21. A Member said that the boundary wall of the proposed development along Chatham Road South should be removed or set back so that the public could have a "free" access to the proposed POS at ground level. A Member said that the design of the POS should be more open so that the POS would be more akin to a public space rather than being part of the university campus. Another Member pointed out that the existing campus of HKPU, though with boundary wall, was always open to the public and the management would not prohibit the public from going into the campus. This Member considered that the provision of adequate entrances for the proposed POS was sufficient to ensure good accessibility. After some discussion, the Chairperson concluded that there should be no boundary wall near the entrances of the POS where an open and inviting design should be adopted to facilitate public access. Members agreed.

22. A Member noted that out of the total additional GFA of 8 292m², 3 600m² was covered POS but the total provision of open space was only increased by 1 755m², and queried whether the proposed increase in plot ratio from 3.81 to 4.68 was acceptable. Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan explained that under the previous rezoning scheme, all the open space was

uncovered and mostly provided on upper levels. In order to address Members' concern on the public accessibility of the POS, the applicant proposed to provide more POS at lower levels including an increase of POS at ground level from 1 880m² to 3 345m². As a result, some of the open space would be covered but the headroom was high (over 6m). For the remaining additional GFA of 4 692m², the applicant indicated that the total GFA figure 36 608m² in the previous rezoning scheme was a preliminary estimate based on a schematic layout. Upon detailed design, it was found that a total GFA of about 41 000m² was required in order to provide a Net Operation Floor Area of 25 600m² as approved by the University Grants Committee to cater for the spatial requirement for the new academic system. The additional GFA of 4 692m² for academic facilities were proposed at lower ground levels and would not increase the building bulk above ground. This Member further said that more tree planting should be provided at ground level apart from vertical greening, and the built form of the proposed development was not compatible with the surrounding roads which were curved in shape. The Chairperson said that the built form was a design matter involved subjective judgement, and the proposed development in rectangular components was similar to some of the existing buildings in the main campus. Consideration should also be made to the functional use of the proposed development.

23. Regarding a Member's comment to widen the pavement adjoining the subject site along Chatham Road South, the Chairperson proposed that an approval condition be imposed requiring the applicant to liaise with the Transport Department on the need for widening and the appropriate pavement width. Members agreed.

24. In response to a Member's enquiry on the compliance of approval condition on the submission of a revised AVA, the Secretary said that as the submission would be technical in nature, it would be more appropriate for it to be dealt with by PlanD on behalf of the Committee. Nevertheless, the approved revised AVA would be circulated to Members for information. Members agreed.

25. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 10.10.2012, 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 following conditions :

- (a) the submission of a risk assessment plan and contingency plan in relation to the construction of the proposed underpass at Chatham Road South to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (b) the design, implementation and maintenance of the proposed underpass to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the re-alignment, implementation and maintenance of the emergency vehicular access at Chatham Road South to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) the design and implementation of a bus lay-by at Chatham Road South to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (e) the design and implementation of the junction improvement works at Chatham Road South/Austin Road/Cheong Wan Road as proposed in the Traffic Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (f) the design and implementation of signal controlled pedestrian crossings facilities and junctions improvement to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (g) the widening of pavement adjoining the application site along Chatham Road South to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (h) the design, implementation and maintenance of an access to the drainage reserve at the application site to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (i) the design and provision of public open space of not less than 7 835m² within the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of

Planning or of the TPB;

- (j) the submission and implementation of a Landscape Master Plan, a tree preservation plan and bimonthly tree monitoring reports to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (k) the submission of a revised tree survey report to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the TPB;
- (l) the provision of water supplies for fire-fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (m) the implementation of local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works, if found necessary, to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (n) the submission of a revised air ventilation assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

26. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to :

- (a) apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West on the lease matters for the proposed development;
- (b) consult Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Corporation Limited on the detailed requirements for the area reserved on ground level for the railway-related facilities of the future Shatin Central Link project and the right-of-way to MTR Ho Man Tin Electricity Substation;
- (c) consult the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department on the building requirements for the proposed development and the arrangement on the emergency vehicular access according to Part VI of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue;

- (d) consult the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban on the need of the provision of disabled lift and the adequacy of provision of one lift to replace the at-grade crossing across Hong Tai Path;
- (e) note that the entrances to the public open space should adopt an open and inviting design to facilitate easy public access;
- (f) place signage to clearly indicate the location of public open space; and
- (g) note that any applications submitted to the TPB in future should include an overall development plan for the Hong Kong Polytechnic University campus so as to facilitate the TPB's consideration of the proposed development.

[Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim and Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee arrived to join the meeting, Mr. K.Y. Leung returned to join the meeting, and Messrs. Nelson W.Y. Chan and Felix W. Fong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K3/508 Proposed Office
 in "Residential (Group E)" zone,
 1/F-7/F, 1125-1127 Canton Road,
 Mong Kok
 (MPC Paper No. A/K3/508)

Presentation and Question Sessions

27. Mr. C.K. Soh, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed office;
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection was received by the District Officer (Yau Tsim Mong); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper.

[Mr. K.Y. Leung and Ms. Starry W.K. Lee left the meeting at this point.]

28. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

29. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 10.10.2012, 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 following conditions :

- (a) the provision of fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (b) the implementation of local sewerage improvement and upgrading works, if found necessary, to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.

30. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to :

- (a) apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West for lease modification/waiver for the proposed use at the application premises;
- (b) submit building plans on the alterations and additions within the application premises to the Director of Buildings to demonstrate compliance with the Buildings Ordinance; and
- (c) note the Commissioner for Transport (C for T)'s comments that loading/unloading activities of goods vehicles on public streets, if any, should be confined to off-peak hours. The C for T had the rights to impose, alter or cancel any parking, loading/unloading facilities and/or any no-stopping restrictions, etc. on Canton Road and other local roads to cope with changing traffic conditions and needs. The applicant should not expect the Government to provide such facilities for use of the application premises.

[Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan returned to join the meeting and Mr. Walter K.L. Chan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/661 Proposed Hotel (Conversion of Existing Building)
in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone,
Comet Commercial Building,
42A Wing Hong Street,
Cheung Sha Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/661)

Presentation and Question Sessions

31. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 17.9.2008 for a deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time to prepare supplementary information to address the departmental concerns.

Deliberation Session

32. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of additional information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within two months from the date of receipt of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan, DPO/TWK, and Mr. C.K. Soh, STP/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Ms. Chan and Mr. Soh left the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

[Miss Helen L.M. So, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Mr. Felix W. Fong returned to join the meeting and Dr. Daniel B.M. To left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/573 Proposed Shop and Services
 in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone,
 Portion of G/F, Hung To Centre,
 94-96 How Ming Street, Kwun Tong
 (MPC Paper No. A/K14/573)

Presentation and Question Sessions

33. Miss Helen L.M. So, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed shop and services;
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) one public comment was received during the statutory publication period indicating support to the application; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

34. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

should be valid until 10.10.2010, 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 following conditions :

- (a) the submission and implementation of fire safety measures, including the provision of a means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion and fire service installations in the application premises, to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB before operation of the use; and
- (b) if the above planning condition (a) was not complied with before operation of the use, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the same date be revoked without further notice.

36. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to :

- (a) apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East for lease modification for the shop and services use at the application premises;
- (b) comply with the requirements as stipulated in the Code of Practice for Fire Resisting Construction;
- (c) appoint an Authorized Person to submit building plans for the proposed change of use to demonstrate compliance with the Buildings Ordinance, in particular, the provision of 2 hours Fire Resistance Period (FRP) separation between the proposed shops and the remaining factory/workshop on G/F of the subject building; and
- (d) strictly follow regulatory restrictions when loading/unloading activities took place and avoid interfering the mainstream traffic, in particular under cumulative effect of nearby roadside activities.

[Mr. Walter K.L. Chan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/574 Shop and Services
 in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone,
 Factory A, Ground Floor, Lladro Building,
 72 Hoi Yuen Road, Kwun Tong
 (MPC Paper No. A/K14/574)

Presentation and Question Sessions

37. Miss Helen L.M. So, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the shop and services;
- (c) departmental comments – the Director of Fire Services (D of FS) did not support the application as the aggregate commercial floor area on the G/F would exceed 460m²;
- (d) two public comments were received during the statutory publication period. One public commenter supported the application while the other one maintained a neutral position on the application provided that the shop and services use did not include food and beverage use; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD did not support the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The total floor area of about 564.24m² had exceeded the maximum permissible limit of 460m². In this regard, D of FS objected to the application from fire safety point of view.

38. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

39. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application and the reasons were :

- (a) the ‘Shop and Services’ use did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Development within “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone (TPB PG-No. 22D) as the total floor area accountable for the aggregate commercial floor area had exceeded the maximum permissible limit of 460m²; and
- (b) the Director of Fire Services had raised objection to the ‘Shop and Services’ use from fire safety point of view.

[The Chairperson thanked Miss Helen L.M. So, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. Miss So left the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

[Ms. Donna Y.P. Tam, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

[Professor N.K. Leung left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Agenda Item 8

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/H10/3 Application for Amendment to the
Approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/15
from “Residential (Group C)” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated
“Residential Development with Historical Building Preserved”
or from “Residential (Group C)” and “Green Belt”
to “Other Specified Uses” annotated
“Residential Development with Historical Building Preserved”,
128 Pok Fu Lam Road, Hong Kong (RBL 324)
(MPC Paper No. Y/H10/3B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

40. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 17.9.2008 for a deferment of the consideration of the application as discussions were still actively continuing with the Development Bureau and relevant Government departments with respect to the application.

Deliberation Session

41. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of additional information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within three months from the date of receipt of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H1/85 Proposed Hotel
 in “Residential (Group A)” zone,
 454-462A Des Voeux Road West and 3 Cheung Kan Lane,
 Kennedy Town
 (MPC Paper No. A/H1/85A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

42. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 26.9.2008 for a deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time to resolve the outstanding technical issues and further fine-tune the building layout for the proposed development with a view to addressing the comments raised by relevant Government departments and to submit further information to substantiate the application.

Deliberation Session

43. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of additional information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within two months from the date of receipt of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Professor N.K. Leung and Dr. Daniel B.M. To returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H5/374 Proposed Hotel
 in “Residential (Group A)” zone,
 43-63 Tai Yuen Street and 242-246 Queen’s Road East,
 Wan Chai
 (MPC Paper No. A/H5/374)

Presentation and Question Sessions

44. Ms. Donna Y.P. Tam, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel;
- (c) departmental comments – the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban commented that the restaurant and conference facilities proposed in the hotel had not been taken into account in the traffic impact assessment, and the trip rates adopted for the hotel development were on the low side. Further assessments and justifications on the ingress/egress, loading/unloading activities, footpath width and dedication of corner splays were also required. The Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department advised that the sewerage impact assessment submitted had underestimated the sewage flow at different discharge lines and the rainwater impact assessment had only estimated the rainwater discharge from the proposed hotel, with no assessment of the impact on the downstream stormwater drains. The Commissioner for Tourism supported the application as the proposal would enhance the provision of new hotel rooms, broaden the range of accommodations for visitors, and support rapid development of the convention and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries;

- (d) a total of 13 public comments were received during the statutory publication period of the application. All the commenters objected to the application. During the statutory publication period of the further information, six public comments were received. Two of them supported while the other four objected to the application. Those commenters objected to the application mainly on grounds of traffic impact, blocking of sunlight and natural air ventilation, excessive development intensity, no demand for hotel use in the area, the need of a thorough assessment on rainwater drainage system and improvement works to avoid future flooding, and destruction of the old and typical neighbourhood in Hong Kong. For those commenters supported the application, they considered that the proposed development would alleviate traffic problems by providing set-back and/or turning area for cars on street level, and could facilitate redevelopment projects in Wan Chai;
- (e) the District Officer (Wan Chai) advised that the locals were concerned about the traffic and pedestrian flow of the hotel development. Traffic flow along Queen's Road East had been unsatisfactory and the hotel would worsen the situation; and
- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed development at a plot ratio of 14.539 was considered excessive when compared with the adjacent residential developments in terms of building bulk and development intensity. The applicant had not provided sufficient information to demonstrate that there would be no adverse traffic, drainage and sewerage impacts arising from the proposed hotel development. The approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar hotel developments within the “Residential (Group A)” zone.

45. Members had no question on the application.

46. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application and the reasons were :

- (a) the proposed hotel development with a plot ratio of 14.539 was considered excessive in terms of building bulk and development density within the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone;
- (b) there was insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development would not cause any adverse impacts on the traffic, and drainage and sewerage systems in the area; and
- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar hotel developments within the “R(A)” zone.

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H5/375 Proposed Commercial Bathhouse and Massage Establishment
in “Commercial/Residential” zone,
Portion of G/F to 2/F, Wah Tao Building,
29 Burrows Street, Wan Chai
(MPC Paper No. A/H5/375)

Presentation and Question Sessions

47. Ms. Donna Y.P. Tam, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed commercial bathhouse and massage establishment;

- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) a total of 1938 public comments were received during the statutory publication period. Two of them supported and 1925 objected to the application whereas 11 commenters had no comment. Those commenters objected to the application mainly on the grounds that the proposed development would attract sex trading and triad activities, and bring about nuisance and disturbance to students, children, teenagers, women and the elderly living in or visiting the area. Nighttime operation of commercial bathhouse and massage establishment and the associated noise and light pollution would damage the tranquil residential environment. Additional traffic generated by the proposed development would lead to safety problem to students, children, elderly and local residents. The proposed commercial bathhouse and massage establishment was not compatible with the residential use of the same building, and there was significant fire risk associated with the proposed use. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent and introduce other related entertainment activities including karaokes, night clubs and game arcades into the area;
- (e) the District Officer (Wan Chai) advised that there were strong public sentiments against the application received from the schools and local residents in the vicinity of the application premises. They had grave concerns on potential problems relating to fire safety, security, noise, traffic and adverse impact on youngsters, and considered that the massage establishment would damage their living environment and incompatible with the surrounding areas with many schools. A District Councillor also raised strong objection to the application; and
- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The application premises were within a tranquil residential neighbourhood with open space, schools, hospitals and other community uses in its vicinity.

Although the residential portion of the building was served by a separate entrance, there was still concern on possible nuisances to residents of the building as the entrances for the application premises and residential portion of the building were very close. The proposed commercial bathhouse and massage establishment was considered not compatible with the residential, open space and community uses in the neighbourhood as well as the residential use within the same building. No similar use was located to the south of Wan Chai Road, which was largely residential in nature with open space and community uses. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent, leading to proliferation of commercial bathhouse and massage establishments in the area. According to the assessment criteria under the Town Planning Board (TPB) Guidelines No. 14B, the views of local residents on the proposed commercial bathhouse and massage establishment should be taken into account in the consideration of the application. In this regard, a total of 1 925 public comments objected to the application and the locals (including District Councillors, nearby schools and local residents) had raised strong objection to the proposed use mainly on grounds of nuisances to the tranquil residential neighbourhood with schools and community facilities.

48. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms. Donna Y.P. Tam said that according to the Definition of Terms adopted by the TPB, a massage establishment referred to a premises used for providing massage services to customers which generally covered the part of body below the shoulders and above the knees. Providing massage services to foot alone would not fall within this definition.

Deliberation Session

49. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application and the reasons were :

- (a) the proposed commercial bathhouse and massage establishment was not compatible with the residential developments and open space and community uses in the neighbourhood as well as the residential use within

the same building;

- (b) the proposed use did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 14B in that there were strong local objections to the proposed development in respect of land use incompatibility, and the adverse impacts on the tranquil environment in the area; and
- (c) the approval of the subject application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in this locality.

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H14/57 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction
for Permitted Residential Development and Proposed Connecting Bridge
in “Residential (Group C) 4” and “Green Belt” zones,
15 Magazine Gap Road and Adjoining Government Land,
Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H14/57A)

50. The Secretary reported that Dr. Daniel B.M. To had declared an interest in this item for having current business dealings with Ma & Fong & Associates Limited, which was one of the consultants for this application. Mr. K.Y. Leung, Professor N.K. Leung and Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen had also declared interests in this item as Mr. Leung was the part-time Lecturer, Professor Leung was the Honorary Professor and Mr. Chen was the Associate Professor of the University of Hong Kong, which was one of the consultants for this application. Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee also declared an interest in this item as he lived near the application site. The Committee noted that Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen had tendered his apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr. K.Y. Leung had already left the meeting.

[Dr. Daniel B.M. To and Professor N.K. Leung left the meeting, and Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

51. Ms. Donna Y.P. Tam, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application, highlighting that development within the “Residential (Group C) 4” zone was restricted to a maximum building height of 12 storeys over 1 storey of carports, or the height of the existing building(s), whichever was the greater. The applicant proposed to redevelop the site based on the plot ratio and building height of the existing building, i.e. plot ratio of 2.768 and overall building height of 14 storeys;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of building height restriction and the proposed connecting bridge, highlighting that the absolute height of the proposed development (measured from the basement level to the main roof level) was proposed to be increased from the existing 42.976m to 49.7m, and the podium of the proposed building to be raised by 13.27m to provide a landscape area below the building at street level for public use. A bridge with a 6m driveway cum 1.5m wide pedestrian walkway was proposed to be erected over an existing drain on Government land within the “Green Belt” zone to connect 15 and 17 Magazine Gap Road;
- (c) departmental comments – the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department advised that the covered area under the proposed connecting bridge and the covered sitting-out area at 15 Magazine Gap Road were gross floor area accountable and the bridge within the sites was site coverage accountable under the Buildings Ordinance;
- (d) a total of 10 public comments were received during the statutory publication period of the application. Six of them supported and three objected to the application whereas the remaining one provided comments on the application. During the statutory publication period of the further

information, 11 public comments were received. Nine of them supported while two objected to the application. The comments in support of the application for the reasons of no increase in development intensity; environmental friendly building design of the proposed development; provision of landscaping and beautification at street level; and improvement to the open drain environment. They also considered that reduced number of ingress/egress would improve traffic safety; redevelopment of existing old building to new luxurious apartments would make the area more vibrant; and Hong Kong was characterised by high-rise developments. Those commenters objecting to the application on the grounds that the Magazine Gap Road area should not be changed to a high-density residential area; the relaxation of building height was not minor and without strong justification; the proposal would encroach on Government land and have adverse landscape impact on the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone; there was no justification for the connecting bridge; and the proposed layout and design of the sitting-out area would only benefit its own residents rather than the public due to the lack of easy accessibility;

- (e) the District Officer (Central & Western) advised that some residents had all along raised concern on the building height in the area. Even though the absolute building height of the proposed development at 15 Magazine Gap Road remained unchanged, the residential tower would be elevated to about 13m higher than the previously approved height, causing adverse environmental and visual impacts; and
- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed bridge would not have any impact on the “GB” zone as the area concerned was at present an open drain with little vegetation cover and there would not be any structure on ground within the “GB” area. As compared with the previously approved scheme, there was no change in the development intensity. The proposed minor relaxation in building height would not have adverse visual impact on the surrounding areas as the proposed development was well below the ridgeline with a green mountain

backdrop at its back. The green architectural features proposed in the previously approved scheme including openable louvers and sun shading device would be retained in the current scheme. Although the podium of the proposed development would be raised by 13.27m to cater for the proposed connecting bridge, the increase in building height was considered not incompatible with the adjacent developments. It was however considered that the landscape garden proposed for public use should not be regarded as a planning gain because the area was not expected to be frequently used by the public and there was no shortfall in the provision of open space in the Peak area. It was suggested that no approval condition be imposed to require the opening of the landscaped area for public use but it should be maintained as a landscape area as proposed by the applicant. As regards the public comments, the proposed development was considered not incompatible with the adjacent development, and was not expected to have adverse visual impact on the surrounding areas nor adverse landscape impact on the “GB” zone.

52. Members discussed and agreed that there was no need to open the landscape garden for public use due to its location which was on private land.

Deliberation Session

53. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 10.10.2012, 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 following conditions :

- (a) the implementation of the environmental measures and sustainable building design as proposed in the previously approved scheme under Application No. A/H14/51 to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the headroom of the proposed bridge between 15 and 17 Magazine Gap Road should not be less than 5.1m and no structure/foundation of the

bridge should encroach upon Government land;

- (c) the provision of car parking spaces to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission and implementation of a tree preservation scheme and landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (e) the design and provision of a landscape garden at the ground level of 15 Magazine Gap Road to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (f) the provision of water supplies for fire-fighting and fire service installation to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (g) the submission of a Geotechnical Planning Review Report to assess the geotechnical feasibility of the proposed development, in particular, to address potential natural terrain landslide hazards that might affect the site to the satisfaction of the Director of Civil Engineering and Development or of the TPB.

54. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to :

- (a) apply to the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South for lease modification for the proposed development;
- (b) note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department on the provision of access and emergency vehicular access (EVA) to 15 and 17 Magazine Gap Road, site classification for 15 Magazine Gap Road, provision of right-of-way to 15 Magazine Gap Road and calculation of gross floor area (GFA). If exemption of GFA was not granted by the Building Authority and major changes to the current scheme were required, a fresh planning application to the TPB might be

required;

- (c) note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that both the new EVA and the connecting bridge forming part of the EVA should comply with the requirements of EVA stipulated under Part VI of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue;
- (d) note the comments of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services on the need to preserve and protect as many existing trees as possible and to observe the guidelines stipulated in Development Bureau Technical Circular No. 3/2006 should application for tree removal was involved;
- (e) note the comments of the Commissioner of Police on the restrictions for delivery and construction vehicles during peak hours; and
- (f) note that there was no need to open the landscape garden for public use because the area was not expected to be frequently used by the public and there was no shortfall in the provision of open space in the Peak area.

[Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H18/57 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction
for Permitted Residential Development
in “Residential (Group C) 5” zone,
21 Tai Tam Road, Tai Tam
(MPC Paper No. A/H18/57)

Presentation and Question Sessions

55. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 22.9.2008 for a deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time for the preparation of additional information to address the concerns of Government departments.

Deliberation Session

56. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of additional information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within two months from the date of receipt of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H21/128 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction
for a Proposed Commercial/Office Development
in “Commercial (2)” zone,
Inland Lots 7737 and 8687,
863-865 King’s Road, Quarry Bay
(MPC Paper No. A/H21/128C)

Presentation and Question Sessions

57. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 18.9.2008 for a deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time for conducting detailed design studies to evaluate various options to improve the proposed scheme.

Deliberation Session

58. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within two months from the date of receipt of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Donna Y.P. Tam, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Ms. Tam left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 15

Any Other Business

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