

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 598<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 9.2.2018**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban)  
Transport Department  
Mr Peter P.C. Wong

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department  
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Tony W.H. Cheung

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department  
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Dennis C.C. Tsang

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 597<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 26.1.2018

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 597<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 26.1.2018 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

[Mr Simon S.W. Wang arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/KC/14                      Application for Amendment to the Draft Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/KC/28, To Rezone the Application Site from “Industrial” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Columbarium (2)”, Kwai Chung Town Lot 383, 19-21 Wing Kin Road, Kwai Chung, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. Y/KC/14)

---

3. The Secretary reported that LLA Consultancy Limited (LLA) was one of the consultants of the applicant and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had declared an interest on the item as he had past business dealings with LLA. The Committee noted the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Lau had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.
4. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 24.1.2018



- (b) the proposed temporary shop and services for a period of five years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed use was not incompatible with the existing uses in the same building and the surrounding area, and it was not expected to generate adverse impact on the surrounding areas. The aggregate commercial floor area on the ground floor, including the proposed use of the application, was within the maximum permissible limit of 230m<sup>2</sup> for an industrial building without a sprinkler system. The Director of Fire Services had no in-principle objection to the application.

7. In response to a Member’s enquiries on whether redevelopment for residential use had taken place in the area and whether applications for residential development had been approved in the subject “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) zone, Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang, STP/TWK, said that according to PlanD’s record, there was no planning application for residential development in the subject “R(E)” zone and no redevelopment for residential use had taken place in the area. As the application was for proposed shop and services use on a temporary basis, the approval of the application would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the “R(E)” zone.

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

#### Deliberation Session

8. The Committee noted that in the long term, the area would undergo

transformation by phasing out the existing industrial uses through redevelopment. A Member said that as there were still many industrial buildings in the area, redevelopment should be encouraged to realise the planning intention.

9. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of five years until 9.2.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

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

10. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 5**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/495                      Proposed Religious Institution in “Green Belt” Zone, Lot 1212 (Part) in D.D. 453 and Adjoining Government Land, Lo Wai, Tsuen Wan, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/495)

---

11. The Secretary reported that Landes Limited (Landes) and DrilTech Ground

Engineering Limited (DrilTech) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with Landes; and

Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with DrilTech.

12. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

13. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 26.1.2018 deferment of the consideration of the application so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address the departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

14. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. 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 6**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H5/409 Proposed Commercial Development (including Office, Eating Place and Shop and Services) in “Residential (Group A)” Zone, 153-167 Queen's Road East, Wan Chai, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H5/409)

---

15. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Wan Chai and the application was submitted by Eldridge Investments Limited which was a subsidiary of Hopewell Holdings Limited (Hopewell). AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - having current business dealings with AECOM;  |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho   | } having past business dealings with AECOM;   |
| Mr Franklin Yu      |   |
| Dr Wilton W.T. Fok  | - co-owning with spouse a shop in Wan Chai;   |
| Mr Stephen H.B. Yau | - his office locating at Southorn Centre, Wan Chai; and   |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung | - being a Director of the Hong Kong Business Accountants Association which had obtained sponsorship from Hopewell before. |

16. The Committee noted that Messrs Patrick H.T. Lau and Wilson Y.W. Fung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the property co-owned by Dr Wilton W.T. Fok and his spouse and the office of Mr Stephen H.B. Yau did not have a direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

17. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 31.1.2018 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments of relevant government



- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having past business dealings with Jetweal and current business dealings with Centaline;
- Mr Raymond K.W. Lee (the Chairman) - co-owning with spouse and his spouse owning properties in Chai Wan;
- Mr Sunny L.K. Ho - owning and co-owning with spouse properties in Chai Wan; and
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - being a director of a company which owned a property in Chai Wan.

20. The Committee noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had left the meeting temporarily. As Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application and the properties owned by the Chairman and/or his spouse, Mr Sunny L.K. Ho and jointly with his spouse did not have a direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

21. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Jerry J. Austin, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning permission for temporary shop and services (property agency) under application No. A/H20/185 for a period of two years;
- (c) departmental comments - departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment indicating no objection to the application was received; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The current application was the same as the previously approved application in terms of area/boundary, applied use, development parameters and layout as well as the period of planning permission. The applied use generally complied with the relevant assessment criteria on the fire safety and traffic aspects as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D (TPB PG-No. 22D). The application also generally complied with TPB PG-No. 34B in that there had been no major change in planning circumstances since the last approval, no adverse planning implication would arise from the renewal of the planning approval, the approval condition under the previously approved application had been complied with, and the approval period sought was considered reasonable.

22. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

23. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of two years from 19.3.2018 until 18.3.2020, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission and implementation of the fire safety measures including the provision of fire service installations and equipment, and means of escape separated from the industrial portion within six months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 19.9.2018; and
- (b) if the above approval condition (a) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

24. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Jerry J. Austin, STP/HK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Tom C.K. Yip, District Planning Officer/ Kowloon (DPO/K) and Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng /Kowloon, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam returned to join the meeting at this point.]

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 7A**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K10/22  
(MPC Paper No. 1/18)

---

25. The Secretary reported that one of the proposed amendment items to the approved Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K10/22 involved rezoning of a site to facilitate a proposed public housing development by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) with the Housing Department (HD) as its executive arm. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee  
(the Chairman) (SPC) and the Building Committee of HKHA;  
*as the Director of Planning*

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs  
*as Chief Engineer (Works),* who was a member of SPC and the Subsidised  
*Home Affairs Department* Housing Committee of HKHA;

- |                       |   |   |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau   | } | having current business dealings with HKHA;                           |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho     |   |   |
| Mr K.K. Cheung        | - | his firm having current business dealings with HKHA;                  |
| Mr Franklin Yu        | - | having past business dealings with HKHA; and                          |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - | his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work. |

26. The Committee noted that according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Board, as the proposed public housing development in relation to the rezoning site was one of the subjects of amendments to the OZP proposed by the Planning Department, the interests of the Chairman and Members in relation to HKHA would only need to be recorded and they could be allowed to stay in the meeting. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

27. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, STP/K, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

##### *Background of the Proposed Amendments*

- (a) under the 'Special Scheme on Privately Owned Sites for Welfare Uses' (the Special Scheme) launched by the Labour and Welfare Bureau (LWB), the Lok Sin Tong Benevolent Society (LSTBS) had submitted a redevelopment proposal for a welfare complex at the junction of Lung Kong Road and Carpenter Road, Kowloon City. The Food and Health Bureau, LWB/Social Welfare Department and Home Affairs Department had given policy support to the proposed redevelopment;

- (b) to meet the pressing need for housing supply, a piece of government land of about 3,000m<sup>2</sup> abutting Ko Shan Road (the KSR site) had been identified for public housing development;

Proposed Amendments

- (c) proposed amendments to matters as shown on the OZP and to the Notes were set out in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Paper respectively;

Departmental Consultation

- (d) relevant bureaux and departments consulted had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed amendments; and

Public Consultation

- (e) on 18.1.2018, the Housing and Infrastructure Committee (HIC) of the Kowloon City District Council was consulted on the proposed amendments. Members of the HIC generally supported the proposed amendments.

Amendment Item A

*Conservation of Historic Elements*

28. Noting the historic background of the LST site, a Member asked whether the historic elements of the existing buildings, e.g. tablets and inscriptions on the ground floor, would be preserved. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, said that the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) advised that although the existing buildings of LST were not graded, the existing tablets and inscriptions inside the site could be preserved and incorporated into the redevelopment.

29. Some Members considered that the history of the LST site should be preserved and suggested to provide an exhibition hall or a corner inside the proposed redevelopment to display the historic elements or features. The Chairman said that Members' views would be

conveyed to LSTBS for consideration at the detailed design stage.

*Building Design and Additional Facilities*

30. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether the proposed BH had allowed flexibility in design and provision of additional facilities in the redevelopment;
  - (b) whether it was feasible to relocate the social welfare facilities at the lower level to the higher level so as to reserve more space near the entrance from Lung Kong Road and to retain the existing tree;
  - (c) whether it was feasible to provide a footbridge connection between the proposed social welfare complex and the Carpenter Road Park; and
  - (d) whether the design of the proposed social welfare complex could be revised to include an assembly hall and a roof top garden.
31. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, made the following responses:
- (a) there was no gross floor area restriction on the “Government, Institution or Community” site. The proposed BH at 60mPD had allowed flexibility in design and incorporation of additional facilities at the detailed design stage;
  - (b) the current scheme was proposed after consultation with relevant government departments. LSTBS had considered various options to achieve optimal and efficient usage of floor space, including transferring some social welfare facilities from the lower level to the higher level. However, noting the small site area and some social welfare facilities had to be provided at no more than 24m above the ground floor for operational need, the current scheme was adopted; and

- (c) Members' views on the design aspect and suggestion to provide a footbridge connection to the Carpenter Road Park would be conveyed to LSTBS for consideration at the detailed design stage.

32. In view of some Members' suggestions to include more facilities in the proposed redevelopment, which might have implications on the proposed building height (BH), the Vice-chairman enquired whether LSTBS should be further consulted before exhibiting the proposed amendments for public inspection. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, said that the proposed BH had already allowed sufficient flexibility to incorporate additional facilities. The Chairman added that Members' concerns on the design aspect could be considered at the detailed design stage.

33. A Member said that as the proposed amendments to the OZP also covered the proposed public housing development at the KSR site (i.e. Amendment Item B), this Member considered that the plan-making process should be expedited.

34. Some Members had expressed concerns on future fees that might be charged for the social welfare services to be provided upon the completion of the redevelopment. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, said that the proposed social welfare complex was supported under the Special Scheme. In seeking LWB's support, LSTBS had to demonstrate that the financial arrangement for the proposed redevelopment project was feasible by providing details and sources of funding for LWB's consideration. As the operation of LSTBS was under section 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance, the provision of social welfare facilities/services would be on a non-profit making basis.

### Amendment Item B

#### *Design Aspect*

35. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether the proposed open space fronting Chatham Road North would be separated by fence wall, and whether retail shops could be provided in the podium to improve the vibrancy of the proposed open space;

- (b) whether it was feasible to provide an underground pedestrian connection to facilitate future residents crossing Chatham Road North; and
- (c) whether the proposed amendment of the Shansi Street site from “G/IC” to an area shown as ‘Road’ (i.e. Amendment Item C1) would have implication on the site classification.

36. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, made the following responses:

- (a) the proposed local open space mainly served the future residents. The design of the open space and the suggestion to include shops in the podium would be conveyed to HD for consideration at the detailed design stage;
- (b) there were constraints in providing underground pedestrian connection across Chatham Road North as the sites nearby were mainly privately owned and the construction of an underground pedestrian walkway would have adverse impacts on road traffic. Future residents could use the pedestrian connection facilities in the To Kwa Wan Station to cross Chatham Road North; and
- (c) as the proposed Amendment Item C1 was to reflect the existing Shansi Street, there was no change in site classification of the proposed public housing site, which was classified as a Class C site under the Buildings Ordinance.

*Provision of Social Welfare Facilities and Public Car Parking Spaces*

37. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether it was feasible to provide social welfare facilities for the elderly at the podium level; and

- (b) the feasibility to include one more basement for public car park and whether planning permission was required if the public car parks were rented to non-residents.

38. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, made the following responses:

- (a) HD advised that while the podium level would be used for ancillary and public car parks, electrical and mechanical plant room and refuse collection point, there would not be enough space left for social welfare facilities for the elderly due to the site constraint;
- (b) taking into consideration the technical constraints imposed by the Shatin-Central Line and the cost implication, HD considered that it was financially and technically infeasible to provide one more basement level for public car park; and
- (c) according to the Notes of the OZP, public car park was a Column 1 use under the “R(A)3” zone and no planning permission was required.

39. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the safety aspect of the liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) compound in Lok Man Sun Chuen, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, said that the quantitative risk assessment for the LPG compound conducted by HD had concluded that with the proposed public housing development, the risk level still complied with the required standard and the societal risk was within the acceptable region.

40. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Ma Tau Kok OZP and that the draft Ma Tau Kok OZP No. S/K10/22A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/K10/23 upon gazetting) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper were suitable for public exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the



- Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang (the Vice-Chairman) - being the Deputy Chairman of the Appeal Board Panel of URA;
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being a non-executive director of the Board of URA and a member of the Lands, Rehousing and Compensation Committee and PDCC of URA, and a director of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA;
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with URA and AECOM;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with URA and past business dealings with AECOM;
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with URA;
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA;
- Mr Stephen H.B. Yau - being a past member of the Wan Chai District Advisory Committee of URA; and
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with AECOM.

42. The Committee noted that Messrs Patrick H.T. Lau and Wilson Y.W. Fung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of the Chairman, the Vice-chairman, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Messrs K.K. Cheung and Thomas O.S. Ho were direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. The Committee also noted that according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, as a matter of necessity, the Chairman or the Vice-chairman should continue to assume the chairmanship. As the interest of the Vice-chairman was comparatively less direct than the Chairman, the Committee agreed that the Vice-chairman should take over the chairmanship for the item but a conscious effort should be made to contain his scope of involvement in an administrative role to minimise any risk that he might be challenged. As the interest of Mr Stephen H.B. Yau was indirect and Mr Franklin Yu

had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

[The Chairman left the meeting temporarily and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Messrs K.K. Cheung and Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

### Presentation and Question Sessions

43. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed comprehensive redevelopment with residential (flats) and commercial uses (including hotel, offices, retail), hawker bazaar, educational institution, public open space (POS), public transport interchange (PTI), other government, institution and community (GIC) uses (government uses) and supporting facilities (amendments to approved Master Layout Plan (MLP));
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) raised concern that the proposed right turning run-in at Hong Ning Road northbound to Development Area (DA) 5 might have adverse traffic impact on the junction performance and bring about vehicle queue along Kwun Tong Road. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had reservation on the application as the proposed building bulk might have adverse impacts on the proposed retained trees and opportunities for more tree planting should be explored. The District Officer (Kwun Tong) advised that members of the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) generally accepted the refined architectural design of the development but requested the applicant to make continuous efforts to foster communication with KTDC and the general public. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or

no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, a total of 607 comments were received. 575 were objecting views mainly on the consultation process, architectural design of the proposed scheme and provision of multi-purpose activity centre. 21 supported the application mainly for the reasons that the separated development of DA4 and DA5 would expedite the redevelopment process and upgrade the surrounding living environment. 11 provided comments on the application, including the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Corporation Limited. Major views and comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
  
- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The current scheme generally complied with the planning and design requirements as set out in the planning brief. The proposed revised boundary between DA4 and DA5 and change in podium design would allow the two phases to be developed in a flexible manner and enhance the connectivity between the MTR Kwun Tong Station, the office/hotel tower and Yue Man Square rest garden (YMSRG) in DA 4 as well as the permanent PTI in DA2 and DA3. With the proposed increase in building height (BH), the office/hotel tower could achieve a slimmer footprint to allow improvement on air ventilation, visual permeability and day-light penetration to the YMSRG. The revised tower design also fulfilled the Sustainable Building Design (SBD) Guidelines for environmental improvements. The at-grade POS of not less than 9,350m<sup>2</sup> would be provided to meet the requirement under the Development Scheme Plan and easily accessible, and the landscaped areas and podium gardens would be open to the public at reasonable hours. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on urban design, visual permeability, air ventilation, environmental, sewerage, drainage and waterworks aspects. To address C for T's concern, an approval condition to require the applicant to submit a revised traffic impact assessment was recommended. Regarding CTP/UD&L's concern on the adverse impacts on the retained trees, the approval conditions in

relation to the Landscape Master Plan and quarterly tree monitoring report would be retained.

*Public Access to the Proposed Facilities*

44. Some Members raised the following questions/suggestions:

- (a) noting that the proposed elliptical parabola building would be a landmark in Kwun Tong Town Centre (KTTC), whether the top level would be open for public enjoyment; and
- (b) whether there were any intended uses of the proposed observation deck of the office/hotel tower and consideration should be given to opening the observation deck for public enjoyment free of charge.

45. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, made the following responses:

- (a) GIC facilities, including KTDC and Home Affairs Department offices, social welfare facilities would be provided at the upper floors of the proposed elliptical parabola building. Members' suggestion to open the top level of the building for public enjoyment would be conveyed to the applicant for consideration at the detailed design stage; and
- (b) the proposed observation deck was required by the Committee in considering the first planning application in 2008 and an approval condition requiring the opening of the observation deck for public enjoyment was included. The applicant indicated that the operation of the observation deck would be investigated at the detailed design stage. The applicant was also advised in the previous applications that the observation deck should not form part of the hotel development. Such requirement was expected to be included in the lease conditions.

*Interface of Commercial/Institution Uses*

46. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) noting that 'commercial/institution' was indicated as proposed uses at the commercial podium in DA5, whether there were any details on the gross floor area (GFA) split of the two uses; and
  - (b) whether it was a normal practice to allow flexibility for provision of a range of car parking spaces in the MLP.
47. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, made the following responses:
- (a) it was a normal practice that only general land uses were indicated on the MLP. The proposed 'commercial/institution' use indicated in the current scheme was to allow flexibility at the detailed design stage without the need to amend the approved MLP. The institution use proposed mainly included educational institution. While the applicant had not provided any details on split of the GFA for commercial and institution uses, it was understood that there was no intention to use the whole commercial podium for educational institution; and
  - (b) the provision of a range of car parking spaces was in accordance with the requirement of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. The actual provision of parking facilities was subject to agreement between the Transport Department and the applicant based on the demand of parking space and local traffic condition.

*Increase in BH*

48. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether the proposed increase in BH of the office/hotel tower was only due to the increase in headroom of each storey;
  - (b) whether it was a trend for a higher floor height for Grade A office and

whether the proposed floor height of 4.3 m was appropriate;

- (c) whether it was possible to reduce the number of storeys to achieve the same floor height instead of relaxation of the proposed BH; and
- (d) whether the proposed relaxation of BH would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications.

49. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, made the following responses:

- (a) the proposed increase in BH was due to a slimmer footprint of the office/hotel tower with a reduction from 2,465 m<sup>2</sup> to 2,235 m<sup>2</sup> (about 9.3% reduction) and the increase in floor-to-floor height for office floors from 4 m to 4.3 m;
- (b) the modern requirement of floor-to-floor height for Grade A office buildings was in a range of 4 m to 4.5 m. The floor height of new offices in Kwun Tong was about 4.3 m. Redevelopment projects undertaken by the government in Sai Yee Street and Queensway had assumed a floor height of 4.2 m. Considering that the proposed office/hotel tower would become a landmark building at KTTC, the proposed floor height of 4.3 m for office floors at the office/hotel tower was not unreasonable;
- (c) in considering the request for relaxation of BH, PlanD would take into consideration whether there was any site constraint, planning/design merits, and any technical/operational requirements to justify the proposed BH relaxation. In the current application, the proposed increase was to follow the prevailing trend of an increased floor-to-floor height of Grade A office buildings. On the design aspect, the proposed increase in BH with a slimmer tower would improve the permeability, and allow greater building separation and setback from the surrounding developments. The technical assessments carried out by the applicant had demonstrated that the proposed increase in BH was acceptable; and

- (d) since the application was a unique case for redevelopment of KTTC, the approval of the application would not set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications.

*Design Aspect*

50. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the GFA of the current scheme remained the same as the approved scheme;
- (b) noting that there was a decrease in footprint of the office/hotel tower at the podium level, whether the provision of open space would remain unchanged; and
- (c) whether there was any improvement in permeability of the buildings in the current scheme.

51. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, made the following responses:

- (a) the current scheme only involved an increase in BH while the total GFA would remain the same as the approved scheme;
- (b) the provision of the at-grade public open space remained largely the same while the public accessible landscaped area at the podium level would be increased by about 230 m<sup>2</sup>; and
- (c) both the approved and current schemes had met the permeability requirements of the SBD Guidelines. In the current scheme, there were a larger separation between the developments in DA4 and DA5 and a larger set back from Hong Ning Road while the set back from Hip Wo Street was reduced.

52. In response to a Member's enquiry on the completion dates for DA4 and DA5,

Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, said that as land within DA5 was involved in a court case, it was necessary to revise the boundaries of DA4 and DA5 to separate the podium development of the two so as to advance the development of DA4 to facilitate pedestrian connection to the MTR Station and PTI. The revised completion date to 2026 was due to the need to submit a revised planning application with amendment to the podium design and the carrying out of related technical assessments. However, the estimated completion date might be advanced, subject to the progress of the court case.

53. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, said a planning permission from the Board was required for the current scheme as it involved major amendments to the approved scheme with respect to an increase in BH and change in the building separation and podium design for DA4 and DA5.

### Deliberation Session

#### *Public Access to the Proposed Facilities*

54. Some Members raised the concern that the proposed elliptical parabola building and the observation deck of the office/hotel tower should be open to the public. A Member considered that the observation deck could be used for GIC facilities, for instance, library or study room, and open to the public while another Member considered that it could be used for commercial activities to achieve a vibrant and financially viable operation but open for public enjoyment free of charge for certain hours of the day. Members noted that an approval condition requiring the opening of the observation deck was recommended and considered that an advisory clause specifying that the observation deck should not form part of the hotel development should also be added.

#### *Clarification on Commercial/Institution Uses*

55. Some Members noted that the commercial podium in DA5 was indicated for commercial/institution (including educational institution) uses which might involve a wide range of uses and were concerned that the future uses might not be compatible. There were also worries that a majority of the floor space would be used for educational institution which might not be the original planning intention. Some Members suggested that the different

uses should be clearly demarcated at the detailed design stage.

*Increase in BH*

56. A Member said that in considering the previous application in 2009, the Committee agreed that the maximum BH of 260 mPD was appropriate upon review of relevant factors. This Member considered that should the Board decide to approve the proposed BH increase under the current application, the rationale should be clearly set out.

57. Some Members considered that the current proposal would generally bring about an improvement to the approved scheme in terms of better air ventilation, pedestrian environment, visual quality and office environment. The proposed increase in floor-to-floor height for the proposed office/hotel tower was acceptable for a landmark office/hotel building at this location but such relaxation should not apply to all buildings. The resultant BH at 285mPD might appear high from some vantage points but not unacceptable.

58. In summary, Members generally had no objection to the application. Members also agreed (a) to add an advisory clause specifying that the observation deck should not form part of the hotel development; (b) to convey their views/concerns on the need to clearly demarcate the various commercial/institution uses and allowing free public access to the proposed elliptical parabola building and observation deck to the applicant for consideration at the detailed design stage.

59. 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 9.2.2022, 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 (t) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the building height of the proposed commercial development within the

application site should not exceed 285mPD;

- (c) the proposed observation deck should be open for public enjoyment;
- (d) the submission of detailed breakdown of the site area and Gross Floor Area for each of the Development Package Areas to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (e) the submission and implementation of the public transport interchange proposal to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (f) the submission and implementation of detailed setback proposal to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (g) the submission and implementation of a Landscape Master Plan (LMP) including tree preservation scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (h) the submission of the quarterly tree monitoring report to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (i) the submission and implementation of a LMP for the proposed at-grade public open space and a tree preservation and tree replanting scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB;
- (j) the 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;
- (k) the submission of a revised drainage impact assessment and revised sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services and the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;

- (l) the submission of a revised traffic impact assessment and implementation of traffic mitigation measures (i.e. roads, footpaths and junctions improvement) identified therein for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (m) the submission of a revised water impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB;
- (n) the submission and implementation of interim sewerage diversion scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection and the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (o) the provision of a refuse collection point and a hawker bazaar to the satisfaction of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene or of the TPB;
- (p) 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;
- (q) the submission and implementation of a detailed risk assessment and contingency plan on potential road unsettlement of Hip Wo Street, Mut Wah Street, Hong Ning Road, and Kwun Tong Road arising from construction activities of the proposed car park and sunken bazaar to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (r) the submission and implementation of a design proposal for the retail podium façade and the pedestrian deck along Kwun Tong Road to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (s) the submission of a revised noise impact assessment and implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein for the proposed

development to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and

- (t) the provision of social welfare facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Social Welfare or of the TPB.

60. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VIII of the Paper in addition to the following:

- “(z) to take note of TPB Members’ views that the observation deck should not form part of the hotel development.”

[The Vice-chairman thanked Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K and Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[The Chairman returned to join the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 9**

#### **Any Other Business**

61. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 11:50 a.m.