

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 386th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 5.12.2008**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng

Chairperson

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen

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

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

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. Felix W. Fong

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang

Dr. Ellen Y.Y. Lau

Assistant Director(2), Home Affairs Department  
Mr. Andrew Tsang

**In Attendance**

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr. W.S. Lau

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Miss Alice Y.Y. Cheung

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 385th MPC Meeting held on 21.11.2008

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 385th MPC meeting held on 21.11.2008 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

(i) Approval of Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs)

2. The Secretary reported that on 2.12.2008, the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) approved the following three draft OZPs under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) and approval of the OZPs would be notified in the Gazette on 12.12.2008 :

- (a) Tsuen Wan OZP (to be renumbered as S/TW/26);
- (b) Shap Sz Heung OZP (to be renumbered as S/NE-SSH/9); and
- (c) The Peak Area OZP (to be renumbered as S/H14/9).

(ii) Reference of OZPs

3. The Secretary reported that on 2.12.2008, the CE in C referred the approved Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau OZP to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Ordinance. The reference of the approved OZP would be notified in the Gazette on 12.12.2008

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/KC/336                      Proposed Hotel  
in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone,  
Topsy Tower,  
659 Castle Peak Road,  
Kwai Chung (KCTL No. 193)  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/336)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

4.                      The Committee noted that on 19.11.2008, the applicant’s representative wrote to the Secretary of the Town Planning Board (the Board) stating that the “Hazard Assessment Report” for the application had been submitted to the Coordinating Committee on Land-use Planning and Control Relating to Potentially Hazardous Installations (CCPHI) on 6.11.2008 for consideration and the outcome was still pending. The applicant therefore requested the Board to further defer making a decision on the application for another 2 months or until the availability of decision from CCPHI.

Deliberation Session

5.                      After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending further 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 further 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 that the Committee had already allowed 4 months and a total of 6 months for preparation of submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

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

**Agenda Item 4**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/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**

6.                      Mr. P.C. Mok, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

[Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel (conversion of existing building);
- (c) departmental comments – no adverse comments from concerned Government departments were received;
- (d) 1 public comment was received during the statutory publication period from the Chairman of the Owner’s Committee of the adjacent building objecting to the application on ground of the sewer blockage problem; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed hotel development was in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses (Business)” (“OU(B)”) zone and it was not incompatible with its surrounding land uses. The proposed plot ratio (PR) of 11.986 had not exceeded the maximum permissible PR of 12 within the “OU(B)” zone and the increase of building height from 95.25mPD to 103.77mPD (i.e. +8.52m or +8.94%) was considered acceptable within the Cheung Sha Wan Industrial Area. It was unlikely to have significant adverse impacts on the environment, local traffic condition and provision of infrastructure. To ensure proper control on the bulk of the development and to ensure the intensity of the proposed hotel development would be in line with that permitted under the “OU(B)” zone, an approval condition to restrict the development to a maximum PR of 12 inclusive of the gross floor area for the back-of-house facilities was recommended. As regards the local concerns, Drainage Services Department had no in-principle objection to the application and an appropriate planning condition requiring submission of a sewerage impact assessment and implementation of any necessary upgrading works was recommended.

[Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

7. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

8. 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 5.12.2012, 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 maximum plot ratio of the proposed hotel development (conversion of existing building), including the back-of-house (BoH) facilities, should not

exceed 12 where BoH facilities referred to those uses specified under Regulation 23A(3)(b) of the Building (Planning) Regulations to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;

- (b) the provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire services installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission of a sewerage impact assessment and the implementation of any necessary sewerage upgrading works to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.

9. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant of the following :

- (a) consult the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department on the building requirements for the proposed hotel and alteration and addition building works;
- (b) consult Chief Officer/Licensing Authority, Home Affairs Department on the licensing requirements for the proposed hotel;
- (c) apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon, Lands Department for a licence in the event that there was provision of restaurants and/or bars within the hotel;
- (d) note the comments of the Director of Fire Services regarding the compliance of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue; and
- (e) prepare and submit the Sewerage Impact Assessment as early as possible in view of the time required for the implementation of any required sewerage works and the applicant should bear the costs of improvement and upgrading works to the existing public sewerage system for handling additional discharge due to the proposed development.

[The Chairperson thanked Mr. P.C. Mok, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Mr. Mok left the meeting at this point.]

## **Kowloon District**

### **Agenda Item 5**

#### **Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/K10/1                      Application for Amendment to the  
Approved Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K10/18  
at the time of submission  
(Approved Ma Tau Kok OZP No. S/K10/20 currently in force)  
from "Other Specified Uses" annotated  
"Commercial Development with Public Vehicle Park"  
to "Comprehensive Development Area",  
or "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Residential Development  
with Community Facilities and Public Vehicle Park",  
or "Residential (Group A) 2",  
128 Carpenter Road,  
Kowloon City (NKIL No. 6056)  
(MPC Paper No. Y/K10/1)

---

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

10.                      The Committee noted that on 18.11.2008, the applicant's representative wrote to the Secretary, Town Planning Board (the Board) and requested the Board to defer making a decision on the application in order to allow additional time for further consultation with relevant Government departments to clarify some outstanding issues in relation to the application.

## Deliberation Session

11. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending further information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further 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.

[Ms. Jessica H.F. Chu, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 6**

### Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K10/224            Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development  
with Retail Shops and Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction  
in “Comprehensive Development Area (2)” zone,  
No. 7 Mok Cheong Street and Nos. 70-78 Sung Wong Toi Road,  
Ma Tau Kok (KIL Nos. 7628 and 10578)  
(MPC Paper No. A/K10/224)

---

### Presentation and Question Sessions

12. Ms. Jessica H.F. Chu, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;

[Dr. Daniel B.M. To arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (b) the proposed comprehensive residential development with retail shops and minor relaxation of building height restriction (at Portion A, the major part of the “Comprehensive Development Area (2)” and excluded Portion B);
- (c) departmental comments – Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the application on the grounds of potential road traffic noise impact, industrial noise impact and helicopter noise impact and the lack of relevant technical assessments. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of Planning Department (CTP/UD&L of PlanD) raised objection to the application based on urban design considerations, the scale of increase (54.6%) being not minor, the lack of necessary technical assessments, and unsatisfactory layout, particularly on building set back and large podium design;
- (d) 5 public comments were received during the statutory publication period. 3 objected to the proposed building height as it was substantially higher than the restrictions stipulated in the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), incompatible with the surrounding low-rise environment, and would create wall effect resulting in adverse visual impacts and adverse natural ventilation; 1 supported on the ground of the need for urban housing provision; and the remaining 1 (owner of Portion B of the “CDA(2)” site), raised the concern on the compatibility of MLP with his landholding and the planning intention of the whole “CDA(2)” zone; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The application which only covered part of the “CDA(2)” zone was not in line with the planning intention and would jeopardize the implementation of a comprehensive development of the “CDA” zone and set an undesirable precedent. There was a change in planning circumstances and public aspirations for lower development intensity, and public concern on building height/wall effect upon development since the approval of the last application (No. A/K10/199, in which the building height as approved was the same as the current scheme under application). The building height

restrictions of Ma Tau Kok were reviewed since early 2007 to prevent out-of-context building. Under the OZP gazetted on 18.1.2008, the subject site was subject to a building height restriction of 100mPD. The proposed 154.6mPD was considered not congruous with the surrounding areas. The increase from 100mPD permitted under the OZP to 154.6mPD (i.e. +54.6m and +54.6%) under application could not be considered as minor relaxation and no strong justifications were provided by the applicant to support the application. CTP/UD&L objected to the application from the urban design perspective as there were no quantitative air ventilation assessment (AVA) and visual impact assessment (VIA) conducted for the “CDA(2)” zone as required in the Notes of the OZP. DEP did not support the application on the ground of potential noise problems in the area and the lack of relevant technical assessments by the applicant.

13. A Member asked about the history of the two-storey buildings along Mok Cheong Street and asked for Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO)’s view on the need to preserve the buildings. In response, Ms. Jessica H.F. Chu advised that Portion A of the application site was occupied by the buildings of Good Harvest Air Freight Centre and Eastern Cotton Mills which were low-rise buildings, whereas Portion B was occupied by K K Industrial Building with a building height not more than 30mPD. Areas to the east, south and west of the “CDA(2)” zone were also under “CDA” zonings and were generally characterized by old, low-rise industrial buildings. It was understood that there were no heritage buildings in these “CDA” zonings and AMO was not consulted in this regard.

#### Deliberation Session

14. Members considered that the current design, in particular, the 7-storey high podium structure was excessive and undesirable which would result in adverse impact on natural lighting and ventilation of the area. The proposed building height of 154.6mPD was considered to be excessive as compared to the building height restriction stipulated in the current OZP. Although there was a previous planning approval for the same building height as the current application, the approval had already lapsed and there was a change in planning circumstances which were material considerations for the current application.

15. A Member said that the current low-rise buildings along Mok Cheong Street and the street design provided a neighbourhood atmosphere for the area. Another Member agreed that in redevelopment for high-rise buildings, there was a need to preserve the existing character of the area and the bulky podium design would not be beneficial to preservation of the existing character of the area. A Member also considered that the podium structure in the current design was running perpendicular to these streets which was not facilitating to the air ventilation of the area. Members considered that the proposed MLP had not paid due respect to the existing street character of the area, particularly the neighbourhood atmosphere. The applicant should be reminded to make more effort to achieve a more satisfactory layout with greater design merits, including reduction of the bulk and site coverage of the podium structure, in order to assimilate the unique street character and to improve the natural lighting and air ventilation of the area. Members agreed that given the unsatisfactory MLP and the lack of relevant supporting technical assessments as required in the Notes of the “CDA(2)” zone, there was no ground for the Committee to grant approval for the application. A Member further suggested to include one additional reason for rejection to reflect Members’ concern on the building design as follows:

“the proposed podium structure was excessive in bulk and site coverage which was not compatible with the existing character of the area.”

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

- (a) the planning intention of the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone was for comprehensive redevelopment of the whole area for residential and/or commercial uses with the provision of open space and other supporting facilities. Piecemeal development within the “CDA” zone would defeat the intention of the “CDA” zone to facilitate appropriate planning control over the development area mix, scale, design and layout of development, to require provision of mitigation measures to address various environmental, traffic, infrastructure and other constraints;
- (b) the proposed podium structure was excessive in bulk and site coverage which was not compatible with the existing character of the area;

- (c) there was no information in the submission to demonstrate that potential noise problems arising from nearby industrial and road traffic could be mitigated;
- (d) there was no information in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in adverse air ventilation impacts on the surrounding areas;
- (e) there was no information in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed development would be acceptable from an urban design perspective and that the proposed building height of 154.6mPD would not have any adverse visual impact on its adjoining zones to the inland which was subject to a lower building height restriction of 100mPD; and
- (f) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications.

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

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Jessica H.F. Chu, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Ms. Chu left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 7**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K10/225            Proposed Nurse Training Centre, Hospital  
(Step Down Care Facilities for Recovering Patients confining to  
Recovering Cardiac and Post-stroke Patients, or  
Victims of Industrial/Traffic and Other Accidents), Flat (Staff Quarters)  
and Residential Institution (Student Nurse Dormitory)  
in “Residential Group (B)” zone,  
20 and 22 Lomond Road, Ma Tau Kok (NKIL Nos. 4164 sF and RP)  
(MPC Paper No. A/K10/225)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

17.            The Committee noted that on 18.11.2008, the applicant’s representative wrote to the Secretary, Town Planning Board (the Board) and requested the Board to defer making a decision on the application for two months in order to review the development components within the application site in response to public comments.

**Deliberation Session**

18.            After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending further 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 further 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 returned to join the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 8**

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K10/226            Proposed Hotel (Guesthouse) Development  
                         in “Residential (Group A) 2” zone,  
                         380 Prince Edward Road West,  
                         Kowloon City (NKIL No. 2358)  
                         (MPC Paper No. A/K10/226)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

19.            The Committee noted that on 26.11.2008, the applicant’s representative wrote to the Secretary, Town Planning Board (the Board) and requested the Board to defer making a decision on the application in order to allow adequate time to prepare further information for the Board’s consideration.

Deliberation Session

20.            After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending further 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 further 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.

[Mr. Eric C.K. Yue, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K) and Miss Helen L.M. So, STP/K, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 9**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/576            Proposed comprehensive redevelopment with residential and commercial uses including hotel, office, retail, provision of public open space, Government, Institution or Community facilities, public transport interchange and supporting facilities in “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zone, Kwun Tong Town Centre – Main Site (Area bounded by Kwun Tong Road, Hong Ning Road, Mut Wah Street and Hip Wo Street) (MPC Paper No. A/K14/576)

---

21.            The Secretary reported that as the application was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA), the following Members had declared interests on this item :

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng<br>as the Director of Planning                          | ) being a non-executive director of the URA   |
| Ms. Olga Lam<br>as the Assistant Director of Lands                       | )   |
| Mr. Walter K.L. Chan   | )   |
| Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee   | ) being an ex-non executive director of the URA (The term of office was ended on 30.11.2008.) |
| Mr. Andrew Tsang<br>as the Assistant Director of Home Affairs Department | ) being a co-opt member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of URA        |
| Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan   | ) being a member of Kwun Tong District Advisory Committee of URA (Kwun Tong area only)        |
| Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim   | ) having current business dealings with the URA   |

[Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng and Professor Bernard V.M.F. Lim left the meeting temporarily, while Ms. Olga Lam and Mr. Walter K.L. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

22. The Vice-chairman, Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong, chaired the meeting for this item at this point. Members noted that Mr. Andrew Tsang had sent his apology for being unable to attend the meeting while Mr. Maurice Lee had not arrived to join the meeting. Members noted that Mr. Lee was no longer a non-executive director of the URA on 30.11.2008 and according to the Guidelines for Declaration of Interests in the Town Planning Board Procedure and Practice, Mr Lee was required to declare an interest but he could stay in the meeting to join the discussion.

23. Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan asked whether Town Planning Board (TPB) Members who was a member of the advisory body which had expressed views on projects submitted to the Board was allowed to stay in the TPB meeting to join the discussion. The Secretary reported that in the recent TPB meeting on 3.12.2008 about the further consideration of representations and comments in respect of the Draft Ting Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-TK/14, the Board had discussed on the issue and agreed that one of the Members, being a member of the Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE), which had expressed views on the subject considered by the Board, was allowed to stay at the meeting. To maintain consistency in practice, Members considered that Mr. Chan, who was a member of Kwun Tong District Council and a member of Kwun Tong District Advisory Committee of URA's projects in Kwun Tong, should declare interest but could stay in the meeting to join the discussion. The Committee agreed that in similar situation, Members of the Committee who were members of a public advisory body whose role was only advisory in nature, the concerned Member should declare an interest on the item but could stay in the meeting to join the discussion.

[Ms. Starry W.K. Lee arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

24. Mr Eric C.K. Yue, DPO/K briefly explained that the presentation would be divided into two parts. The first part would be a 5-minutes video presentation prepared by

the URA giving a general introduction of the redevelopment proposals, which included the Main Site (subject of this application) and the Yuet Wah Street Site (subject of another application as per Item 10 below). After the video show, there would be a presentation by PlanD on the development details, the departmental comments and the planning considerations and assessment on the application. Mr. Eric Yue said that the main concern for the application at the Main Site was the proposed building height of 280mPD (at main roof level) for the landmark building and the Committee was requested to consider whether the justifications put forward by the URA were acceptable.

25. After the video show, with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Helen L.M. So presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the comprehensive redevelopment with residential and commercial uses including hotel, offices and retail, with provision of public open space, Government, Institution or Community facilities, public transport interchange (PTI) and supporting facilities;
- (c) departmental comments – relevant Government departments had no adverse comments except for some technical comments such as setback proposal and detailed traffic arrangement for the PTI as per paragraph 9 of the Paper. Notwithstanding, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of Planning Department (CTP/UD&L of PlanD) was concerned about the visual impact and the insufficiency of the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) and the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) for the proposed development. CTP/UD&L considered that the justifications put forward by the URA to justify the proposed 280mPD building height for the landmark building was inadequate;
- (d) 1,002 public comments were received during the statutory publication period. The majority (87%) was in support of whereas 12.6% opposed the application. The public comments were summarized in paragraph 10 of the Paper:

- for those who supported, the major supporting grounds were: regenerating KTTC as a hub for Southeast Kowloon area, acceptable development intensity in metro area; enhancing the town centre image, commercial complex served as a noise barrier for the planned residential area; improved provision of G/IC, traffic and transport facilities, and open space provision; tourist attraction and business opportunities; not affecting the sensitive ridgeline and improving air circulation in Kwun Tong; easy accessibility of the G/IC facilities; preserving the local characters by retaining small street-side shops; job opportunities provided by the proposed social enterprises; and the permanent hawker bazaar providing an all-weathered and convenient shopping place for the public; and
  
  - for those who opposed, the major concerns were: unsatisfactory master layout / development intensity / design / building height resulting in excessive development intensity and podium design which would result in wall effect and air ventilation problems as well as obstructing the ridgeline; unsatisfactory provision and location of G/IC facilities; destruction of the community and the street character; lack of information on implementation phasing and compensation/ acquisition; insufficient public consultation and some misleading information being provided by the URA; unsatisfactory provision of open space and connectivity; need for more tree preservation.
- (e) the District Officer (Kwun Tong) (DO(KT))'s comments were detailed in paragraph 9.17 of the Paper. The DO(KT) advised that the URA should provide the development phasing programme on the provision of the G/IC facilities, government offices, hawker bazaar and open space; and to consult hawkers and street shop operators on the reprovisioning arrangement and time table;
- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

PlanD's assessments of the application were summarized below :

### Building Height

- the TPB was concerned about the proposed landmark commercial building with a building height of 280mPD when the Kwun Tong Town Centre (KTTC) – Main Site Development Scheme Plan (DSP) and Planning Brief (PB) were discussed at the TPB meeting on 7.9.2007. The TPB agreed to delete the building height restrictions in the Main Site and requested the URA to justify the proposed building height at the Master Layout Plan (MLP) submission on the basis of a fresh VIA. In the submitted VIA, the results of the VIA indicated that the landmark tower should be higher than 260mPD in order to be identifiable for the town centre from all vantages points;
- according to the URA, the proposed landmark building was to meet the public aspiration to signify the area as a district town centre. A taller building should be allowed to create a marker within a cluster of commercial buildings in the locality. The submitted VIA had gone through the criteria to measure good visual quality and the vision ahead;
- having considered the permitted development intensity, i.e. total gross floor area (GFA) of 401,250m<sup>2</sup> for the whole KTTC development, further reduction of building height of the landmark building might lead to an increase in the development bulk or the building heights of the residential towers in order to accommodate the permitted GFA. The resultant built form and the overall disposition of the building blocks might aggravate the air ventilation and might even worsen the visual quality of the surrounding area. Hence, it was PlanD's view at the PB preparation stage that a landmark building of 280mPD in the future KTTC was acceptable. Having considered URA's submission, PlanD maintained its view that 280mPD was acceptable though the submitted VIA would need further refinement and substantiation;

- CTP/UD&L, however, considered that a tall building did not automatically represent a landmark while the visibility factor as an argument for landmark was not sound. The submitted VIA had yet to demonstrate the visual impact of the future town centre on the surrounding visually sensitive receivers and to address the issues of integration and visual compatibility;
- the Committee was requested to consider whether URA's justifications for the 280mPD landmark building were acceptable and the issues on integration with the surrounding areas and visual compatibility were fully addressed;

#### Planning Intention

- the proposed comprehensive development for residential and commercial uses integrated with a PTI, at grade public open space and G/IC facilities in the town centre was generally in line with the planning intention of the "CDA(1)" zone;

#### Development Intensity

- the proposed development intensity of domestic and non-domestic plot ratio (PR) of 6.83 and 1.50 respectively for Residential Sub-Area A, and the proposed PR of 12 for Commercial Sub-Area B were in line with the endorsed PB;

#### Open Space Provision

- the provision of 8,700m<sup>2</sup> at-grade public open space (POS) in the town centre would improve accessibility of the site and attract more activities and people to the area;

### Connectivity

- the proposed seven grade-separated connections would enhance the connection between the Main Site and the surrounding areas at multi-levels and provide an improved barrier-free environment to facilitate the movements of the elderly and the mobility of the disadvantaged;

### Improvement to Urban Design

- there was room to improve the building design of the proposed development. For instance, the design of the retail podium and the pedestrian deck along Kwun Tong Road could be improved to reduce the visual impact of the building structure and to improve air ventilation along Kwun Tong Road frontage. As such, attempts should be made to reduce the pedestrian deck and ways to provide more openings in the podium should be explored; and

### Technical Issues

- relevant Government departments had no adverse comments on the proposed development;
- other technical issues like setback proposal and traffic arrangement at the PTI could be addressed at the detailed design stage.

26. The comments / questions raised by the Members were summarized as follows :

### Building Height

- (a) more justifications for the proposed 280mPD building height should be given as tall building did not automatically mean that the building design was good;

- (b) the justification based on the argument that a landmark had to be higher than all the other buildings in the locality and could be seen from all the vantage points (VPs) was questionable. As a matter of fact, a building height lower than 280mPD for the landmark building could still be visible from the VPs at Kai Tak Runway and Hong Ning Road Recreation Ground by adjusting the viewing angle at the two VPs. As such, the proposed building height of 280mPD was not justified;

#### Visual Impact

- (c) more information should be given to illustrate the visual impact of the proposed development;
- (d) the choice of VPs should be clarified and whether the proposed development would breach the ridgeline when viewed from Shau Kei Wan / Lei Yue Mun Park towards Fei Ngo Shan. The URA should be requested to submit further information in these regards;

#### Air Ventilation Assessment

- (e) while it was noted that the 280mPD building height had a better performance than the 220mPD building height in terms of air ventilation, it was not sure about the basic assumptions adopted and more information should be given in this respect;
- (f) whether the AVA had included assessments of various building height scenarios between 220mPD and 280mPD;

#### Building Design

- (g) from the submitted photomontages, it was not sure whether the so-called “marker-like” design could signify the landmark building. While there was no information on the impact of the slanting glass façade at the upper portion of the landmark building on the surrounding environment, the

experience from the Island East Tower was that the reflection of sun light from the glass façade had adversely affected the surrounding environment. PlanD should request the URA to provide information in this regard;

- (h) the design merits for the proposed development should be further elaborated;
- (i) the proposed development and podium structure would result in a significant visual impact with some wall effect;

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

#### Public Comments

- (j) whether the proposed building height of the development had wide public support from the local community of the Kwun Tong district as suggested by the URA as it could not be concluded from the comments from the DO(KT) and the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) as per paragraphs 9.1.17 and 9.1.18 of the Paper;

#### Other Technical Issues

##### (k) Pedestrian Connectivity

- more information should be given on connectivity between the proposed development to the other areas of Kwun Tong district. In particular, 24-hour pedestrians access across Kwun Tong Road should be provided; and

##### (l) Refuse Collection Point (RCP)

- more information should be given on the design and arrangement of the RCP as well as its integration with the KTTC redevelopment.

27. The responses made by Mr. Eric C.K. Yue and Miss Helen L.M. So were summarized as follows :

Building Height

- (a) the justifications put forward by the URA for the proposed building height of 280mPD for the landmark building were set out in sections 2 to 4 of the submitted VIA (Appendix 1b of the Paper refers), namely, to meet the public aspiration for a landmark building with reasonable development intensity and with appropriate building height as an icon for the town centre; the proposed height should be no less than 260mPD in order to be visible from all the 7 vantage points; and the submitted VIA demonstrated that the proposed 280mPD building height would not obstruct the ridgeline of Kowloon Peak (Fei Ngo Shan) and Lion Rock;

Visual Impact

- (b) the justifications of the URA for the proposed building height of 280mPD were presented in the submitted VIA (Appendix D, Vol. 3 - Book 1 of Appendix 1b of the Paper refers):
- in conducting the VIA, 7 vantage points were discussed and agreed with PlanD, viz. V1 – Quarry Bay Park, V2 – Kai Tak Runway, V3 – Hong Ning Road Recreation Ground, V4 – Kwun Tong Recreation Ground, V5 – Sai Tso Wan Recreation Ground, V6 – Devil’s Peak and V7 – Black Hill. Viewing from these 7 vantage points towards the proposed development, geographical information system (GIS) viewshed and 3D model analysis had been used to identify the extent of visibility for different building height scenarios (200, 220, 240, 260 and 280mPD) of the landmark building. The results indicated that the landmark building should be higher than 260mPD in order to be visible and visually significant from all vantages points. In order to achieve the “fair visibility” desired by the URA, a maximum building height of 280mPD for the landmark building was adopted to

achieve an icon roofline;

- photomontages from the 7 vantage points for the proposed 280mPD landmark building were produced to illustrate the visual appraisal of the proposed development. According to the Photomontages, the proposed landmark building when view from V1 (the only vantage point in Hong Kong Island) would not affect the protected ridgeline, whereas for V2 to V7, the proposed landmark building would be identifiable and thus the proposed 280mPD building height would be acceptable to the URA;
  - 3 aerial photomontages and 4 views from local vantage points were prepared to demonstrate that there would be no adverse visual impact and to help visualize the resulting streetscape improvement brought about by KTTC redevelopment;
  - according to the VIA, any reduction in building heights would sacrifice the much needed at-grade public open space serving the town centre and at the same time increase the bulkiness of the towers and reduce the permeability of the town centre in terms of air ventilation and visual penetration. The VIA therefore concluded that no unacceptable visual impacts would be resulted;
- (c) Under the Urban Design Study (commenced in 1998 and completed in 2003), 7 public VPs, which had undergone a long process of public consultation, had been identified upon which the public acknowledged that the view of the ridgeline from these VPs should be protected. Among these 7 public VPs, two of them were at the Kai Tak Runway and the Quarry Bay Park which were included in the VIA for the URA's KTTC redevelopment. The VPs in the VIA, which also included local viewpoints relevant to the application, were discussed and agreed between the URA and PlanD. The proposed development did not fall within the viewing fan of the protected ridgeline identified in the Urban Design Study. As such, the proposed development would not obstruct the ridgeline of Fei Ngo

Shan when viewed from V1 – Quarry Bay Park;

### Air Ventilation Assessment

- (d) the URA submitted a supplementary AVA on 17.10.2008 comparing the scheme adopting the building height of 220mPD and that of 280mPD (Appendix 1f of the Paper). Wind tunnel studies were conducted to investigate the pedestrian level wind environment within and around the proposed KTTC development. The result of the AVA concluded that the air ventilation performance of the scheme with 280mPD was still better than the one with 220mPD on most of the concerned peripheral roads due to taller and slimmer building design and thus better air ventilation improvements were anticipated in the KTTC;
- (e) the supplementary AVA had only compared the schemes with 220mPD and 280mPD and assessment for the building height scenarios between 220mPD to 280mPD was not conducted. As pointed out in paragraph 9.1.14 of the Paper, the AVA had not taken into account some large scale planned developments like Kai Tak Development and mitigation measures to address the relatively poor ventilation performance caused by the bulky podium structure and pedestrian deck should be included;

### Building Design

- (f) regarding the impact from the sun light reflection of the slanting glass façade on the surrounding environment, the URA had not provided information on this issue;
- (g) on the visual impact and wall effect imposed by the podium structure, the URA had committed to mitigate such impacts by incorporating more “openings” and urban windows into the design of the proposed development. A planning condition was suggested to be imposed in the planning permission requesting the URA to submit and implement a design proposal for the retail podium façade and pedestrian deck along Kwun

Tong Road should the application be approved;

### Public Comments

- (h) the public comments received during the statutory publication period were summarized in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The majority of the public comments was in support of the application. In the comments received, quite a number indicated support to the proposed building height with more ground level open space. On the public aspiration for a tall landmark building at KTTC, it was the view maintained by the URA after a series of consultation exercises with the Kwun Tong community. DO(KT) had also referred to the URA's consultation with the KTDC on 8.7.2008 and the comments from the KTDC members were summarized in paragraph 9.1.18 of the Paper. While a number of DC members supported the proposed redevelopment, one member specifically gave specific support to the proposed 280mPD landmark building;

### Other Technical Issues

- (i) Pedestrian Connectivity

- with reference to Plan A-4 of the Paper, a pedestrian deck would be provided by the applicant connecting the proposed redevelopment with the Kwun Tong MTR station. The applicant also proposed to provide new connections to link up three existing footbridges (Nos. 1-3) on Kwun Tong Road for pedestrian access from the Main Site to the APM and the area south of Kwun Tong Road and the Kwun Tong MTR station. The proposed pedestrian connections were considered acceptable. As for night time pedestrian access, it was a matter to be addressed at detailed design and a 24-hour access clause could be imposed in the lease condition. In addition, for the connection points annotated to be provided "by Others" (Nos. 4 and 6 in the Plan), they would be provided under other projects coordinated by relevant Government departments; and the applicant

would be responsible for the provision of the new footbridge (No. 5) connecting the Main Site and the Yuet Wah Street Site; and

(j) RCP

- the issue on RCP was under the responsibility of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD). The FEHD had no objection to the application and their comments on the RCP were stated in paragraph 9.1.9 of the Paper. As the detailed requirements for the RCP could be dealt with at the detailed design stage, an approval condition requesting the applicant to submit details of the RCP to the satisfaction of the FEHD was suggested to be included in the planning permission.

Deliberation Session

28. Members acknowledged the substantial efforts that had been committed by the URA to the current scheme, such as the landscape treatment, and the efforts to resolve the social issues, etc. Notwithstanding, the majority of members considered that the justifications put forward by the URA in the VIA to support the proposed building height of 280mPD were not satisfactory. In particular, Members did not agree to the URA's justifications that a landmark building had to be a tall building which should be visible from all the VPs. A Member considered that apart from having a smaller footprint, the AVA could not justify that the proposed 280mPD building height would give a better air ventilation performance as it had only compared with the scheme of 220mPD but not other scenarios in between. This Member considered that the design merits of the proposed development were not clearly explained to justify for the proposed building height of 280mPD.

29. A few Members considered that it was premature for the Committee to approve the application based on the current scheme which required justifications on the design merits and also further information on the VIA and AVA.

30. A Member enquired the possibility of reducing the development intensity for the KTTC redevelopment in view of the recent scaling down of a number of large scale projects. In response, the Secretary advised that the GFA for the KTTC redevelopment had undergone a long process of discussion between the Government and the URA. The GFA was agreed for the KTTC redevelopment in view of the uniqueness of the project. It was a large scale redevelopment at the town centre of the Kwun Tong district and had evolved for long time with a long implementation programme and substantial financial commitment on the part of the URA. Based on these considerations, it had been accepted that a tall building at the site would be required to accommodate the agreed GFA. The Board had previously accepted the development intensity and it would not be appropriate to request for a reduction of GFA for the KTTC redevelopment at this juncture. With the accepted GFA, the Committee should focus on whether the design of the MLP was acceptable and how to achieve the best layout and design in the MLP.

31. On the issue of building height, some Members suggested that the building design of the landmark building could be adjusted with a larger floor plate and a lower building height. On the other hand, a few Members considered that in order to achieve the agreed GFA, there would not be much room to manoeuvre with regard to the reduction in building height and the effect would not be visually significant. As a related issue, a Member was concerned whether the increase in the floor plate would affect the POS provision at ground level. Some Members noted the URA's argument that the increase in the building footprint resulting from the reduction of building height would affect the POS provision at ground level. Nonetheless, some Members considered that even with a lower building height, the POS provision at ground level would not be affected. Instead, it might affect the provision of private open space at the podium level. In this regard, Members considered that the URA should be invited to substantiate on the effect of reducing building height on the provision of open space within the scheme.

32. A Member considered that, in the Kwun Tong district, the key concern was the need for open space and better pedestrian circulation at ground level, which were in much desired by the local residents. As such, it would be more important for the landmark building to integrate with the local areas of the Kwun Tong district. This Member further considered that to justify the building height for the landmark building, the benefits of the high-rise building should be shared with the public. In this instance, it was a golden

opportunity for the landmark building to be opened for public access to enjoy its open view towards Lei Yue Mun and the South China Sea. To maximize the merits of the scheme, Members agreed to request the applicant to consider incorporating a public viewing deck in the landmark building so that the public could enjoy the panoramic views of the city offered by the high-rise building.

33. Two Members acknowledged that given the site constraint, the need to accommodate the agreed GFA and the requirements of providing the public facilities such as the POS on ground level and the PTI, it would be necessary to pursue a high-rise landmark building for the proposed development. However, the proposed MLP could not be approved at this juncture as the submitted VIA was flawed. While not objecting to the high-rise building per se, Members agreed that the URA should be invited to submit more justifications to support its proposal of a landmark building of 280mPD.

34. Members also noted the need to speedily proceed with the redevelopment of the KTTC in light of the local aspirations and the lengthy redevelopment process, including land resumption and compensation, involved. Members then discussed the best way of processing the project further. After some discussion, the Members agreed to expedite the processing of the application upon receipt of the applicant's further submission to address the Committee's concerns.

35. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application and agreed to request the applicant to provide further information to justify the proposed building height of 280mPD for the landmark building.

[Professor N.K. Leung and Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan left at this point while Ms. Starry W.K. Lee left the meeting temporarily.]

**Agenda Item 10**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/577            Proposed comprehensive redevelopment with residential use, Government, Institution or Community facilities and provision of open space in “Comprehensive Development Area (2)” zone, Kwun Tong Town Centre - Yuet Wah Street Site (Area bounded by Yuet Wah Street, Hip Wo Street and Kai King Building)  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/577)

---

36.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA), and the same group of Members who had declared interests on the last item had also declared interests on this item. They should continue to leave the meeting except Messrs. Nelson W.Y. Chan and Maurice W.M. Lee who had declared interest on the item but were allowed to stay.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

37.            Miss Helen L.M. So, STP/K, presented the application with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the comprehensive development with residential use, Government, Institution or Community facilities and provision of open space;
- (c) departmental comments – no adverse comments from concerned Government departments were received;
- (d) 991 public comments were received during the statutory publication period, majority (88.2%) was in support whereas 11.6% opposed of the application.

Public comments were summarized in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

[Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The planning assessments were highlighted as follows :

Planning Intention

- the proposed comprehensive development for residential use with the provision of G/IC facilities was generally in line with the planning intention of the “CDA(2)” zone;

Proposed Use and Development Intensity

- the proposed domestic development intensity with a domestic plot ratio (PR) of 5.0 was generally in line with the endorsed Planning Brief (PB);

Building Height

- the proposed building height of 140mPD (with actual building height of 118m from Yuet Wah Street (at 22mPD)) was in line with the building height stated in the endorsed PB. As pointed out by the CTP/UD&L, the visual impacts on the surrounding area and the visual compatibility had yet to be fully addressed in the VIA but this could be beefed up with a revised VIA through imposition of an appropriate condition;

Upgrading of G/IC facilities

- the re-provision of the Kwun Tong Jockey Club Health Centre (KHJCHC) at the Yuet Wah Street Site would result in over 40% expansion of the current KTJCHC in terms of net operational floor area (NOFA) which would upgrade the facilities of the Health Centre. The

technical issues raised by user departments on the reprovisioning of the KTJCHC could be resolved by inclusion of appropriate approval conditions in the planning permission and advisory clauses for follow up by the URA; and

#### Open Space

- adequate local open space would be provided within the application site.

38. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

39. The Secretary said that the Committee decided to defer a decision on the previous item regarding the application for the Main Site because of insufficient information provided in the VIA to justify on the building height of the landmark building. Notwithstanding that the VIA concerning the Yuet Wah Site under this item was also considered insufficient, this application could be granted approval subject to the imposition of appropriate approval conditions, including the submission of a revised VIA. The main difference between the two cases was that the TPB had no objection to the building height of 140mPD for the Yuet Wah Street Site which was stipulated in the endorsed PB for the site. With the acceptance of the major development parameters including the building height, the VIA was only a technical matter which could be overcome through a resubmission. On the other hand, the endorsed PB had not accepted the proposed building height of 280mPD for the Kwun Tong Main Site, and the URA was required to submit information to justify the proposed building height. This explained why the two applications were treated differently.

40. The Vice-chairman considered that the application was acceptable in-principle. Other Members agreed that there was no insurmountable problem for the application.

41. 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 5.12.2012, 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) submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan (MLP) to take into account the approval conditions as stated in paragraphs (b) to (p) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) submission and implementation of detailed set back proposal to the satisfaction of Commissioner for Transport and Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (c) submission of a Landscape Master Plan including tree preservation scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or to the TPB;
- (d) implementation of the approved Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (e) submission of the quarterly tree monitoring report to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or to the TPB;
- (f) submission and implementation of a tree preservation and tree replanting scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB;
- (g) submission of a revised visual impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (h) submission of a revised air ventilation assessment and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (i) submission of a revised drainage impact assessment and revised sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;

- (j) submission of a revised traffic impact assessment to the satisfaction of Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (k) provision of a shared vehicular access with an exclusive emergency vehicular access at Hip Wo Street for the Kwun Tong Jockey Club Health Centre to the satisfaction of Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (l) submission and implementation of a revised layout to address the lighting and ventilation issues of the Kwun Tong Jockey Club Health Centre to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (m) provision and installation of a lighting and ventilation system for the Kwun Tong Jockey Club Health Centre to the satisfaction of Government Property Agency or of the TPB;
- (n) provision and installation of a chiller plant system for the Kwun Tong Jockey Club Health Centre to the satisfaction of Government Property Agency or of the TPB;
- (o) submission of a revised water impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB; and
- (p) provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

42. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant of the following :

- (a) that the approved MLP, together with the set of approval conditions, would be certified by the Chairman of the TPB and deposited in the Land Registry in accordance with section 4A(3) of the Town Planning Ordinance. Efforts should be made to incorporate the relevant approval conditions into a revised MLP for deposition in the Land Registry as soon as practicable;

- (b) the arrangement of emergency vehicular access should comply with Part VI of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Fire Fighting and Rescue administered by the Buildings Department;
- (c) to liaise with relevant departments on the management and maintenance responsibility of the Kwun Tong Jockey Club Health Centre;
- (d) to clarify the management and maintenance responsibilities of the areas to be landscaped and improved by Urban Renewal Authority with relevant departments;
- (e) to liaise with District Lands Officer/Kowloon East on land administration matters;
- (f) to liaise with relevant departments on the reprovisioning and management and maintenance responsibilities for the Government, Institution or Community facilities within the site and temporary reprovisioning arrangements;
- (g) to liaise with Commissioner for Transport on the temporary traffic management matter to ensure traffic and pedestrian flow would not be affected during the construction phases;
- (h) to liaise with relevant departments on landscape works on public pavement;
- (i) to take note of Director of Environmental Protection's comments that in the event that noise sensitive uses of the clinics, i.e. diagnostic rooms and wards, would rely on opened windows for ventilation, to assess the potential road traffic noise impact on these uses and explore noise mitigation measures in accordance with Hong Kong Planning Standard and Guidelines as necessary;
- (j) to note Director of Environmental Protection's comment to explore and implement further noise mitigation measures to minimize road traffic noise

impact on the proposed development and to inform the future occupants clearly of the special design of fixed windows or glazing as one of the noise mitigation measures;

- (k) to liaise with Commissioner for Transport on detailed arrangements for the reprovisioning of public transport services including the provision of temporary facilities;
- (l) to take note of Chief Highway's Engineer/Kowloon's comments that a minimum clearance of 500mm to the roadside planter from kerblines should be subject to Commissioner for Transport's comment; and to ensure that the proposed trees would not affect the functioning of road light system and was requested to consult our Lighting Division in this aspect; and
- (m) to liaise with Director of Highways on public footpath landscape and streetscape proposal and maintenance responsibilities.

[The Vice-Chairperson thanked Mr. Eric C.K. Yue and Miss Helen L.M. So for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Mr. Yue and Miss So left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen, Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng and Professor Bernard V.M.F. Lim returned to join the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 11**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K22/4                      Proposed Flat and House with Ancillary Pier (Landing Steps)  
in "Commercial (2)" zone,  
1-5 Kai Hing Road,  
Kowloon Bay  
(NKIL Nos. 5805, 5806 and 5982)  
(MPC Paper No. A/K22/4)

---

### Presentation and Question Sessions

43. The Committee noted that on 6.11.2008, the applicant's representative wrote to the Secretary, Town Planning Board (the Board) and requested the Board to defer making a decision on the application for two months in order to allow sufficient time to obtain feedback from concerned Government departments on the granting of bonus plot ratio in relation to the proposed development.

### Deliberation Session

44. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending further 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 further 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.

## **Hong Kong District**

### **Agenda Item 12**

#### Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/H4/2                      Application for Amendment to the  
Approved Central District Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H4/12  
from "Road" to "Government, Institution or Community" zone  
with "Religious Institution" use under Column 1 of the Notes;  
or "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Synagogue and Open Space  
for Public Use" zone with "Religious Institution" use under  
Column 2 of the Notes; or "Open Space" zone with  
"Religious Institution" use under Column 2 of the Notes,  
Land between Cotton Tree Drive and Kennedy Road Peak Tram Station,  
Central (MPC Paper No. Y/H4/2)

---

### Presentation and Question Sessions

45. The Committee noted that on 21.11.2008, the representative of the applicant wrote to the Secretary of the Town Planning Board (the Board) and requested the Board to defer consideration of the application after further District Council (DC) consultation which was tentatively to be held on 19.3.2009. According to the applicant, the date of DC meeting was the earliest date that could be arranged by DC. The applicant explained that, subsequent to the DC meeting on 24.7.2008, he had provided documentary evidence and had conducted a site visit with the DC members on 8.10.2008 in order to address their concerns on the potential traffic impacts of the application, and to provide justifications for granting the Government land for the proposed uses and the future implementation/management arrangement of the proposed open space on the subject site.

### Deliberation Session

46. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the applicant should submit the further information immediately following further consultation with the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) on 19.3.2009 and in any case no later than end March 2009. The application would be submitted to the Committee for consideration within 3 months upon receipt of further submission from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that the Committee had allowed a further period up to end March 2009 for further consultation with the C&WDC and preparation of the submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Mr. Tom C.K Yip, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 13**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H6/66                      Proposed Government Refuse Collection Point  
mainly in “Government, Institution or Community (1)” zone  
and partly shown as ‘Road’,  
Junction of Victoria Park Road and Gloucester Road,  
Causeway Bay  
(MPC Paper No. A/H6/66)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

47.            Mr. Tom C.K Yip, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a)    background to the application;
- (b)    the proposed Government refuse collection point;

[Ms. Starry W.K. Lee returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c)    departmental comments – no adverse comments from concerned Government departments were received;
- (d)    4 public comments were received during the statutory publication period. The public comments were summarized in paragraph 10 of the Paper. All commenters objected to the proposed RCP on visual, noise, hygiene, traffic and other grounds. District Officer (Wan Chai) advised that the Development, Planning and Transport Committee of the Wan Chai District Council did not oppose to the application given that there was no alternative site available; and
- (e)    the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the

application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Upon an extensive site search, the application site was the only suitable site for the reprovisioning of the RCP. The “G/IC(1)” zone was intended for the RCP use. The proposed RCP was small in scale, and was compatible with the surroundings. There was no objection from the urban design and landscape and environmental points of view. While the Harbour Enhancement Committee (HEC) expressed reservation on the siting of a RCP at a waterfront location, the proposed RCP was merely to replace an existing RCP within the same “G/IC(1)” zone and it would facilitate the implementation of the road widening works bringing traffic improvement in the area. The operation of the RCP would be shielded by its own building disposition, landscape and surrounding vehicular traffic. Regarding the public concerns on the road safety aspect, Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban of Transport Department (AC for T/U of TD) advised that there were two existing signalised pedestrian crossings across Gloucester Road and Cleveland Road which could provide safe crossings for garbage collectors to the site. Regarding the public concerns on the possible adverse visual, noise and hygiene impacts on the surrounding areas, the proposed RCP would not have adverse impact on these aspects.

48. Members had the following comments / questions on the application :

Site Selection and Land Utilization

- (a) whether the petrol filling stations (PFSs) to the west of the application site would be relocated;
- (b) the use of the waterfront “G/IC” sites was not optimized. Apart from selecting an alternative site, consideration should be given to consolidate the RCP at Gloucester Road with the RCP at Paterson Street;

Building Design and Landscape Treatment

- (c) the building design and overall layout should be further improved. The

current layout with two separate building blocks had not optimized the use of the site and further design options, such as putting some ancillary facilities underground, should be explored in order to reduce the building bulk;

- (d) while the effort to reduce the visual impact and to improve the visual appearance of the reprovisioned RCP was appreciated, the landscape treatment in this instance was considered excessive. Consideration should be given to providing appropriate landscape treatment for the RCP such as dense planting at the periphery; and
- (e) whether HEC's concerns had been addressed.

49. The responses made by Mr. Tom C.K. Yip were summarized as follows :

Site Selection and Land Utilization

- (a) the proposed reprovisioning of the Government RCP did not involve and would not affect the two PFSs to the west of the site, which were currently under the Short Term Tenancy (on a 3-months renewable basis) arrangement. However, the PFSs would be affected by the proposed road widening works for a new westbound lane on Victoria Park Road. It was understood that Lands Department and Transport Department were in discussion with the PFS operators about their future operation upon resumption of land for the road widening works, but there was no decision yet;
- (b) an extensive site search had been conducted and the possibility to combine with the RCP site at Gloucester Road had been duly considered by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD). As the provision of RCP facility was governed by the catchment area requirement as set out in the Hong Kong Planning and Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), the application site was the only suitable site for the reprovisioning of the RCP within the catchment area of the exiting RCP. Apart from relocating the

RCP at Gloucester Road to merge with the RCP at Paterson Street, similar option of relocating the Paterson Street RCP to merge with the one at Gloucester Road was considered during the earlier site search exercise. It was concluded that the merging option would not be feasible as the capacity of the respective RCP (the volume of rubbish processed by the RCP was 9 tonnes/day for the Paterson Street RCP and 36 tonnes/day for the Gloucester Road RCP) could not absorb additional refuse from the other RCP. The merging option would also impose operational difficulties and inconvenience for the garbage collectors due to the long travelling distance on handcarts in the busy roads. The merging of RCP would likely generate nuisances inviting objections and complaints from the residents in the area;

[Ms. Starry W.K. Lee left the meeting at this point.]

#### Building Design and Landscape Treatment

- (c) the current building design as proposed by the applicant was carefully designed and the landscape treatment was intended to serve as a visual relief and to improve the visual appearance of the facility for the benefits of the residents in the locality. The proposed building design had taken into account the environmental and other requirements set out in the HKPSG. It was also intended that the ancillary block would serve as a shield/buffer between the residential blocks to the south of the site and the storage area of the RCP. The applicant had already endeavoured to minimize the site area for the RCP. The HEC had raised concern on the location for the RCP and suggested to provide an access from the application site to the waterfront. The proposed access was not feasible and there was other access connecting to the waterfront to the east of the site. As for the provision of landscape treatment, it was a response to the HEC's request that the applicant should provide greening for the RCP. Notwithstanding, the landscape treatment was only a reference for Members' consideration which could be further refined at the detailed design stage.

[Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee left the meeting at this point.]

### Deliberation Session

50. Members accepted that it was difficult to find a suitable site for RCP use in the catchment area and the current location was considered acceptable given all the considerations and reasons presented and discussed. Some Members considered that there were rooms to further improve the building design/disposition and landscape treatment for the RCP. As for the building design and disposition, efforts should be made to reduce the building bulk by breaking up the long façade fronting Gloucester Road and building height of the ancillary block (2 storeys). Explorations should be made to relocate the facilities such as the F.S. pump room and water tank to underground level in order to reduce the visual impact on the lower floors of the residential buildings in the vicinity. As for the operation block, a Member considered that the handcraft storage area was excessive, the high headroom of the water scrubber plant room and the triangular space between the two blocks were not necessary. As such, some Members considered that it was worthy to revisit the overall design of the RCP.

51. After discussion, Members agreed that both the building design and the landscape design of the RCP could be further improved. Members considered that in order not to affect the implementation of the road widening programme of the Victoria Park Road, the application could be approved by the Committee but the revised design, including the landscape treatment, should be submitted again to the Committee for consideration.

52. 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 5.12.2012, 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 building design proposal with a landscaping proposal to the satisfaction of the TPB;

- (b) the implementation of a building design proposal and a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (c) 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.

[The Chairperson thanked Mr. Tom C.K Yip, STP/HK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Mr. Yip left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms. Donna Y.P. Tam, STP/HK, was invited to the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 14**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H14/58                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio  
for Proposed Alteration and Addition Works for House B  
in "Residential (Group C) 1" zone,  
28 Middle Gap Road  
(MPC Paper No. A/H14/58)

---

[Dr. Daniel B.M. To left the meeting at this point.]

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

53. 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 minor relaxation of plot ratio from 0.5 to 0.517;
- (c) departmental comments – no adverse comments from concerned Government departments were received but the Chief Town Planner/Urban

Design and Landscape of Planning Department (CTP/UD&L of PlanD) considered that the applicant had yet to demonstrate the merits to justify a relaxation of plot ratio;

- (d) 4 public comments were received during the statutory publication period. 3 objected to and 1 raised concern on the application. The public comments were summarized in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Although the applicant indicated that the proposed alteration works were mainly for the installation of a disabled lift for the elderly members of the family, the plans submitted by the applicant showed that a major portion of the works was to provide additional floor area. While there would be no increase in the building bulk of the existing building, there was no information provided to justify the proposed additional floor area or to demonstrate that there were planning and design merits to justify the proposed relaxation of plot ratio. The approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for other developments in the area, the cumulative effect of which would have an adverse impact on the development intensity in the area.

54. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

55. While Members generally did not have concern on relaxing the plot ratio relaxation for the provision of the disabled lift, Members were concerned that there was no strong justification for relaxing the plot ratio for the other areas. They considered that approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent.

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

- (a) there were no planning and design merits to justify the proposed relaxation of plot ratio for the proposed development; and
- (b) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for other developments in the area. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would have an adverse impact on the development intensity in the area.

### **Agenda Item 15**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H20/159                      Proposed Flat, Public Transport Terminus and Shop and Services  
(Proposed Amendments to an Approved Scheme)  
in “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” and “Open Space” zones,  
Former China Motor Bus Depot  
at 391 Chai Wan Road,  
Chai Wan Road Bus Terminus,  
and a section of Sheung On Street in Chai Wan  
(Chai Wan Inland Lot No. 88 and Adjoining Government Land)  
(MPC Paper No. A/H20/159)

---

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

57.                      The Committee noted that on 21.11.2008, the applicant wrote to the Secretary of the Town Planning Board (the Board) and requested the Board to defer consideration of the application for 2 months in order to allow time for preparation of additional information to address the concerns of Government departments

#### **Deliberation Session**

58.                      After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending further 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 further 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 16**

Any Other Business

59. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:05 p.m..