

**Minutes of 1138th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 24.3.2017**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong)
Transport Department
Mr Peter C.K. Mak

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr C.W. Tse

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

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

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planners/Town Planning Board
Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen (a.m.)
Mr Kevin C.P. Ng (p.m.)

Senior Town Planners/Town Planning Board
Miss Anissa W.Y. Lai (a.m.)
Ms Doris S.Y. Ting (p.m.)

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1137th Meeting held on 10.3.2017

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1137th meeting held on 10.3.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1133rd Meeting held on 10.3.2017

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The minutes of the 1133rd meeting held on 10.3.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Approval of Draft Plans

3. The Secretary reported that on 14.3.2017, the Chief Executive in Council approved the following draft plans under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance:

- (a) Tseung Kwan O Outline Zoning Plan (renumbered as S/TKO/24); and
- (b) Yi O Outline Zoning Plan (renumbered as S/I-YO/2).

4. Members noted that the approval of the above plans was notified in the Gazette on 24.3.2017.

(ii) Reference Back of Approved Plans

5. The Secretary reported that on 14.3.2017, the Chief Executive in Council referred the approved Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TP/26 and approved South Lantau Coast OZP No. S/SLC/19 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. Members noted that the reference back of the OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 24.3.2017.

(iii) Abandonment of Town Planning Appeals

(a) Town Planning Appeal No. 2 of 2016

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House) in Area designated as “Unspecified Use”, Government Land in D.D. 289, Ko Tong, Tai Po

(Application No. A/DPA/NE-TT/64)

(b) Town Planning Appeal No. 3 of 2016

Proposed House (NTEH – Small House) in Area designated as “Unspecified Use”, Government Land in D.D. 289, Ko Tong, Tai Po

(Application No. A/DPA/NE-TT/66)

6. The Secretary reported that two appeals had been abandoned by the Appellants on their own accord. Town Planning Appeals No. 2 and 3 of 2016 were received by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) (TPAB) on 24.3.2016 against the decision of the Town Planning Board on 15.1.2016 to reject on review two applications (No. A/DPA/NE-TT/64 and 66) for Small House development at two adjacent sites falling within an area designated as “Unspecified Use” on the then approved Tai Tan, Uk Tau, Ko Tong and Ko Tong Ha Yeung Development Permission Area Plan No. DPA/NE-TT/2.

7. The appeals were abandoned by the Appellants on 15.3.2017. On 16.3.2017, the TPAB formally confirmed that the appeals were abandoned in accordance with

Regulation 7(1) of the Town Planning (Appeals) Regulations of the Town Planning Ordinance.

(iv) Appeal Statistics

8. The Secretary reported that as at 17.3.2017, a total of 13 cases were yet to be heard by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) and the decision of a case was still outstanding. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows:

Allowed	:	35
Dismissed	:	147
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	:	197
Yet to be Heard	:	13
Decision Outstanding	:	1
<hr/>		
	:	393

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft North Point Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H8/25
(TPB Paper No. 10260)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

9. The Secretary reported that the proposed Amendment Item A to the draft North Point Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H8/25 was related to a proposed public housing development to be undertaken by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). Ove Arup Partners HK Limited (Arup) and MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) were consultants of HD. Ms Mary Mulvihill

(R406/C3) was a representer and commenter on the item. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
<i>(as Director of Planning)</i> | - | being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and the Building Committee of HKHA |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan
<i>(as Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department)</i> | - | being the representative of the Director of Home Affairs who is a member of the SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA |
| Mr H.F. Leung | - | being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA |
| Dr C.H. Hau |] | having current business dealings with HKHA |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu |] | |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - | having current business dealings with HKHA, Arup and MVA |
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai | - | having current business dealings with HKHA and Arup |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with HKHA and MVA, and owning a flat at Braemar Hill Mansion, North Point |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - | having current business dealing with Arup and MVA, and past business dealing with HKHA |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | having past business dealing with HKHA, MVA and Arup |
| Mr K.K. Cheung |] | their firm having current business dealings with HKHA and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai |] | |

- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealing with HKHA and Arup
- Professor S.C. Wong - being an engineering consultant of Arup and the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil Engineering of University of Hong Kong where Arup had sponsored some activities of the Department before
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work
- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok - co-owning with spouse a flat at Cloud View Road, North Point
- Mr Stephen H.B. Yau - owning a flat in North Point

10. Members noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had left the meeting temporarily. Since the interest of Mr Raymond K.W. Lee and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan were direct, they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for this item. Members agreed that Professor S.C. Wong, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Mr Franklin Yu, Mr Stephen H.B. Yau and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok should be allowed to stay in the meeting as they had no direct involvement in the project or their properties did not have a direct view of the representation site. Members also noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr H.F. Leung, Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting and the interest of Mr Lai and Mr Yu was indirect.

[Mr Raymond K.W. Lee and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

11. The Chairman said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters,

Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

Government's Representatives

Mr Louis K.H. Kau - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK),
Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Irene W.S. Lai - Senior Town Planner/HK(2) (STP/HK(2)), PlanD

Representers/commenters and their Representatives

R6 / C1 - Green Sense

R27- Estella Lam

R423 - Chan Chun Ho

Green Sense - Representer/Commenter and Representers'
(represented by Mr Roy Tam Representative
and Mr Szeto Pok Man)

R20 - Cherry

R30 - Ted T.H. Cheng (Eastern District Councillor)

R245 - Man Chin Wa Miranda

Mr Ted T.H. Cheng - Representer and Representers' Representative

Mr Ho King Long] Representers' Representatives

Mr Ching Chi Ho]

R155 - Wan Chung Hei

Mr Jonathan Wan Chung Hei - Representer

R173 - Chan Po King, Kelly

Ms Chan Po King, Kelly - Representer

R365 - Ip Sin Man Carmela

R370 - Ho Chee Choi

Ms Ip Sin Man Carmela - Representer and Representer's Representative

R406/C3 - Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer/Commenter

R407 - Chan Fung Nei

Mr Wong Kwok Yuen - Representer's Representative (Attending only)

R435 - Au Yeung Sing

Mr Au Yeung Sing - Representer

R441 - Ma Ka Po

Ms Ma Ka Po - Representer

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

14. The Chairman then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the representations and comments.

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the proposed amendments, the grounds and proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments, as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10260 (the Paper).

[Mr Franklin Yu and Mr Alex H.T. Lai arrived to join the meeting during the presentation of DPO/HK.]

16. The Chairman then invited the representers, commenters and their representative to elaborate on their representations and comments.

R20 - Cherry

R30 - Mr Ted T.H. Cheng (Eastern District Councillor)

R245 - Man Chin Wa, Miranda

17. Mr Ted T.H. Cheng made the following main points:

- (a) they had conducted a local survey in the area and most people opposed the proposed housing development. North Point was a densely populated area with a shortage of open space. PlanD's response in paragraph 6.3 of the Paper that there would be an overall surplus of 5.66 hectares (ha) of open space was incorrect. Besides, most of the open space were located at the hillside rather than along King's Road where local residents could easily access;
- (b) as regard the consultation with the Eastern District Council (EDC) in April 2016, it should be noted that the EDC supported public housing development in generally but not particularly at the representation site. As such, he considered that the EDC should be consulted again of the subject public housing development;

- (c) regarding the traffic aspect, there were always tourist coaches parking along Java Road. Although there would be provision of 30 public coach parking spaces in the ex-North Point Estate (ex-NPE) redevelopment, it would not help improve the traffic in the area as it was to re-provision the existing coach parking spaces currently located in Quarry Bay. There would be no traffic improvement at Marble Road. The proposal to convert part of the hawker area at Marble Road into a bazaar was recently rejected in the EDC meeting on traffic ground;
- (d) in respect of site suitability, the proposed 34-storey single-block housing development providing only about 240 flats could not help address the housing shortage. The Government should identify other sites such as to redevelop the Model Housing Estate and the Healthy Village Estate for provision of more residential units. However, those proposals were not being taken forward as the Government considered redevelopment would involve a long lead time and could not help increase the short-term housing supply;
- (e) the Government had not yet compensated for the residents' loss of a soccer pitch. The site was taken away from the local residents for development of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Headquarters (ICAC HQ) ten years ago. Although PlanD said that a site at Tong Shui Road had been rezoned from "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") to "Open Space" ("O") for the development of the Tong Shui Road Garden in return, it was developed as a sitting out area with a children playground and not comparable to a soccer pitch which was for active recreational use. Besides, the two sites were about 10 minutes walking distance apart and the size of the replacement site was much smaller with many site constraints;
- (f) the Harbourfront Commission's Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (TFHK), which was the authority in developments along the harbourfront, was consulted and objected to the proposed housing project, further consultation would be required;
- (g) opportunity should be taken to consider the comprehensive redevelopment

of the representation site together with the adjacent North Point Welfare Association Chan Chui Kui Hall. The enlarged site would probably enhance the local air ventilation;

- (h) it was expected that the property price and management fee of the proposed public housing development would be high, which was against the intention for provision of low cost public housing; and
- (i) Tin Chiu Street was one of the three major air ventilation corridors in the area. The proposed public housing development at the site would block the air ventilation corridor affecting the local residents.

R6 / C1 - Green Sense

R27- 林君宜

R423 - Chan Chun Ho

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Roy Tam of Green Sense made the following main points:

Housing Supply

- (a) scattered open spaces and “G/IC” sites in densely population urban areas had been rezoned in recent years for residential use which had generated adverse impacts on the living environment, community facilities and urban climate. The Government should stop scrambling for land and squeezing residential buildings into the already congested areas as it would bring social problems;
- (b) since there were plenty of housing land supply in Kai Tak, there was no need to rezone an infill site in the North Point area. The Government should understand what Hong Kong people needed and stop using public spaces for infill development. The admission scheme for talent, professionals and entrepreneurs and the quality migrant admission scheme had brought a lot of migrants and temporary workers into Hong Kong which increased the demand for flats. According to the Government

statistics, the population increase of Hong Kong was 860,000 from 2002 to 2016, but there was no population policy and planning. Hence, the Government should tackle the land supply and housing problem at source by reviewing its population growth strategy;

- (c) referring to paragraph 6.3.2 of the Paper, PlanD stated that housing was one of the most important livelihood concerns of the community. To achieve the housing supply target, the Government adopted a multi-pronged approach to make available sufficient supply of housing land. However, the Board was formed to promote the general welfare of the community, it should not allow proposals such as the current one which would damage the welfare of local residents in North Point. Moreover, the site selection process was not transparent, the public and concerned groups were consulted only in the late stage and the comments provided were usually not being taken into account. He requested the Government to consult the stakeholders and concerned groups in the early planning stage;

Open/Public Space Provision

- (d) while the local open spaces in North Point were concentrated in the mid-level, there were insufficient open space in the densely populated downtown area. The proposed repositioning site to the northeast of the representation site was farther away from the residential neighbourhood that residents would find it inconvenient to access. Even if there was no reduction in the size of the open space, its quality would obviously be downgraded. The Board should make reference to the recent research report published by the Civic Exchange, *Unopened Space : Mapping Equitable Availability of Open Space in Hong Kong* (Civic Exchange's Report), which encouraged the Government to consider to provide more open space in the future planning;
- (e) with regard to the concern on the lack of open space/recreational facilities in North Point, PlanD had advised that 1.5 ha of public open space would be provided for public enjoyment in the ex-NPE redevelopment to the northwest of the representation site (paragraph 6.3.15 of the Paper).

However, the proposed public open space appeared to be situated in the centre of the development. He doubted whether the so called 'public open space' would be managed by the private developer, repeating the Time Square incidence. Public spaces could help providing landscape, social connection, and enhancing the environment. The public open space provision in Hong Kong was much worse than those in Shanghai, Singapore, Taiwan and New York. Hence, the Government should not treat public space as a land bank and rezone them to other uses. Land was still available in Hong Kong. It was a matter of government policies which allowed property speculation, for example, the recent high land sale prices in Kai Tak and Ap Lei Chau. The Government should consider changing some of the private housing sites in Kai Tak to Home Ownership Scheme (HOS), using the vacant school site in Cheung Shan Estate, Tsuen Wan or the proposed reprovisioning site for Tin Chiu Street Playground (TCSP) for residential development as an alternative of rezoning the representation site;

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Air Ventilation

- (f) the representation site was now occupied by ball courts. As the prevailing wind for the area mainly came from the north-east, the proposed high-rise development of 110mPD with a plot ratio of 10 was unreasonable as it would likely block the air ventilation corridor and reduce air ventilation. The adjacent Customs Headquarters Building (CHQ) was already a wall-like building;

- (g) North Point was one of the first statutory plans adopting the wind tunnel test. The building layout and development intensity of the ex-NPE redevelopment had been revised during the planning application stage to reduce the wall effect and to maintain ventilation corridors including the one at TCSP (i.e. the representation site). The approval of a high-rise building at TCSP would violate the agreed planning concept and damage

the living environment. The representation site formed part of the air ventilation corridor at Tin Chiu Street;

- (h) while PlanD claimed that the wind data adopted in the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Expert Evaluation (EE) were appropriate and in line with the general approach of conducting an AVA (paragraph 6.3.8 of the Paper), the AVA EE conducted by HD used the wind data from a wind tunnel test previously conducted in 2008. It was merely a qualitative assessment of the area without taking into account the latest development proposals in the surrounding area, in particular the ex-NPE redevelopment which was near completion;
- (i) according to the Technical Guide for AVA for Developments in Hong Kong, an AVA was to identify the sensitive receivers and to assess the impact of the development and effects on its surroundings. Referring to extracts of the AVA EE report, the qualitative analysis in the report was not correct as not all the airflows were aligned with the streets as stated in the AVA EE report. An objective assessment using updated wind data in the wind tunnel or computational fluid dynamics (CFD) test should be carried out; and
- (j) to conclude, infill housing development at the site would affect air ventilation. Green area and open space were basic needs of the residents. The Government should develop brownfield sites and formulate a population policy. Besides, the hearing procedures of the Board should be reviewed.

R155 - Wan Chung Hei

19. Mr Jonathan Wan Chung Hei made the following main points:

- (a) he grew up in North Point and opposed the proposed amendment at the representation site. The proposed development would affect his living environment. The TCSP provided the only soccer pitch in the downtown area of North Point which was accessible easily by the local residents.

They had to take public transport in order to use the soccer pitches in the Victoria Park and Quarry Bay Park, and pitches in the Victoria Park were often used for other community activities such as flower show, etc. Besides, the other existing local open spaces in the downtown area were sitting out area and very small with limited facilities. Although there would be re-provisioning of TCSP, there were still inadequate active recreational facilities in North Point;

- (b) with his background in building surveying, he anticipated that the flat size of the proposed 34-storey public housing development with about 200 flats would be quite small in view of the small site area. The flat production at the site would be available at least five years later. Hence, the proposed amendment could not help address the housing shortage in the short-term nor enhance the living quality; and
- (c) adverse environmental impacts including air ventilation and sun light penetration would be expected. The proposed infill housing development would bring adverse impacts rather than benefits to the local residents. The Government should work out a comprehensive long-term housing strategy and identify other suitable sites for housing development, for example redeveloping the Model Housing Estate. He thus requested the Board to reconsider the proposed amendment to the OZP.

R365 - Ip Sin Man Carmela

R370 - Ho Chee Choi

20. Ms Ip Sin Man Carmela made the following main points:

- (a) she had lived in North Point for more than 30 years and opposed the proposed public housing at Tin Chui Street. There was a shortage of local open space in the area. According to Annex V of the Paper, there was a surplus of 10.15 ha in district open space provision but a shortfall of 4.49 ha in local open space provision. The surplus in district open space provision should not be used to offset the deficit in local open space, or otherwise, the

Government would rezone all the local open space to residential use in the future. According to the limited information on planned/existing open spaces provided in the Paper, she could only spot two large “O” zones on the OZP, i.e. the Choi Sai Woo Park and an area along the waterfront near the Victoria Centre. However, both sites were too far away from the area and access roads to the former were very steep making accessibility difficult. Local open space should be located close to the local residents;

- (b) the construction of ICAC HQ had taken away a considerable amount of active recreation facilities from the local residents and the Government had not yet compensated the loss of the affected soccer pitch. The representation site had provided a 5-a-side soccer pitch, upgrading the facilities to provide a standard 5-a-side soccer pitch at another site was considered not necessary. A standard 7-a-side was required to meet the local demand;
- (c) the proposed 34-storey public housing development with 110mPD would be taller than the adjacent private development at the ex-NPE site which was only 80mPD. It would be incompatible with the surrounding residential neighbourhood. It was not reasonable to compare the proposed development with the predominantly high-rise buildings such as the Island Lodge and CHQ; and
- (d) with reference to the recent high property price in Hong Kong, the property price and management fee of the proposed subsidised housing development would be high and would not be affordable to the general public, even if the applicants of HOS would only need to pay 70% of the market price. Moreover, it would be unfair to the taxpayers to subsidise those who could afford such high property price. The response that future property price and management fee of the proposed residential development were not land use related issues and fell outside the purview of the Board was not acceptable as the Board was to promote the general welfare of the community and should take into account the feeling of the local residents.

R406 - Mary Mulvihill

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

Open Space Provision

- (a) she referred to the recent research report published by the Civic Exchange which analysed the nature and distribution of open spaces in relation to the population distribution by districts. The representation site was previously zoned “G/IC” and provided active recreational facilities to the neighbourhood for decades. Noting that playground and playing field for local recreational use were always permitted in both “G/IC” and “O” zones, the Government’s argument that the site was zoned “G/IC” and not for “O” development was just an excuse for the proposed change of use;
- (b) the major open space providers in the urban area included the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), HKHA and private developers. Both HKHA and private developers of large developments provided sufficient local open space to their residents. However, those not living in public housing or large private residential developments had been neglected and the provision of public open space depended mainly on LCSD. Referring to Appendix 8 of Civic Exchange’s Report, most of the countable open space in North Point was provided by LCSD (80%), whereas only a small amount was provided by HKHA (6%) which was even less than those provided by private developers (12%). The findings indicated that there was a great need for more local open space provision in the area. As shown in page 48 of Civic Exchange’s Report, the percentage of population aged 65 and over in North Point was more than 15% but the open space per person was less than 2m². Open space was essential to the social and physical well-being of the elderly and they were the greatest beneficiaries of local green space. Local open space should be located within easy walking distance as ageing decreased physical mobility, and locations required crossing busy road should be avoided. Though the elderly people might not be able to participate in active recreation, they usually enjoyed

just sitting and watching others played. Victoria Park provided extensive open space, but it was too far away for the residents in North Point;

- (c) the Government should stop rezoning open space and “G/IC” sites for residential use and avoid infilling additional housing sites into the already congested urban area. As indicated in page 25 of Civic Exchange’s Report, North Point was ranked 9 in the 20 districts with the lowest countable open space. It did not meet the minimum requirement of 2m² per person. While the provision of open space in North Point was insufficient, its median monthly household income was among the upper middle range and only about 10% of the population lived in public housing. Most people in North Point were living in buildings without private recreational facilities nor clubhouses. According to their finding, even if the potential open space were included in calculation, the total open space would only be 2.3 m² per person which still could not meet the vision of 2.5m² per person as proposed by the Hong Kong 2030+ Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030 (Hong Kong 2030+). Members were urged to read Civic Exchange’s Report and reconsider the current OZP amendment;
- (d) as stated in paragraph 3.2 of the Paper, the views of the Planning, Works and Housing Committee (PWHC) of EDC were reported to the Board when the proposed amendments were considered. It was noted by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board that the proposed development would not cause significant adverse impacts nor insurmountable problems, the TCSP would be reprovisioned nearby, and there was surplus in the open space provision. MPC was misled as North Point had a serious deficit of open space according to the finding of Civic Exchange’s Report;

Housing Supply

- (e) PlanD was also manipulating the statements in the Policy Address, for example, paragraph 6.3.2 of the Paper stated that government land which was vacant or held under short term tenancies or different short-term government uses would be reviewed for residential use to increase housing

land supply. However, the TCSP had been used as ball courts for decades. In paragraph 6.3.3 of the Paper, it said that preliminary technical assessments and relevant departments had confirmed that the proposed residential development would not result in ‘significant’ adverse impacts, which meant that there would be some impacts. There were no details regarding the potential impacts and whether they could be resolved was doubtful;

- (f) while the Government was undertaking the Hong Kong 2030+ to set out long term broad directions for land supply and town planning, PlanD said that in order to address the acute housing shortage problem, measures to increase land supply in short to medium terms including rezoning the representation site were still required. However, according to the 2016 By-census, the population in Hong Kong had decreased, whether it would still be necessary to increase the housing land supply was questionable;

Air Ventilation

- (g) an AVA EE had been carried out to evaluate the wind performance of the site and concluded that the proposed development would induce some localised impact. It was stated that with the proposed design measures including setbacks at the splayed street corners and ground floor, the proposed development was not anticipated to have significant adverse air ventilation impact. The AVA EE report had thus indicated the proposed development had negative impacts on the ventilation performance. The proposed development would affect the air ventilation corridor at Tin Chiu Street which was an essential mitigation measure in the ex-NPE redevelopment. It was irrational to say that the impact on air ventilation would not be significant for the proposed housing development at the representation site;

Response to PlanD’s Views

- (h) paragraph 6.3.11 of the Paper stated that the Eastern District had a planned

population of about 538,600 and there would be an overall surplus provision of open space. However, according to the 2016 By-census, the population of the Eastern District was 555,034. Paragraph 6.3.12 of the Paper stated that there was neither designated GIC use for the representation site nor request from the relevant departments to use the site for standalone GIC facilities. The site had been used for the existing ball courts for decades, and was zoned “G/IC”. The active recreation uses had not deviated from the planning intention of the “G/IC” zone. Regarding the point that the ex-NPE site were under construction and 1.5 ha of public open space would be provided at that site, past experiences indicated that privately managed public space would hardly perform its genuine function for public enjoyment; and

- (i) to sum up, the lack of open space would create many health, social, and environmental problems as open space could promote social interaction and community cohesion, as well as reducing adverse health and environmental impacts. She requested the Board to perform its role in promoting the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community through proper land use planning and control to bring about a place desirable to live in.

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of 5 minutes.]

R435 - Au Yeung Sing

22. Mr Au Yeung Sing made the following main points:

- (a) he would not repeat similar points already made by other representers. As a local resident in North Point for many years, he felt a much hotter environment than before because of poor air ventilation. The representation site was located at a major ventilation corridor previously identified during the approval of the ex-NPE redevelopment and he doubted if the adverse air ventilation impact of a proposed 34-storey housing development could be mitigated;

- (b) the TCSP providing open-air active recreational facilities had improved the health of children compared with those playing at indoor areas because direct sunlight was an important element for good health; and
- (c) the Government should identify other suitable sites for housing development, for instance, development on top of the Pak Fuk Road Safety Town near Healthy Village Estate should be considered as development at that site would not induce any adverse air ventilation impact.

R441 - Ma Ka Po

23. Ms Ma Ka Po made the following main points:

- (a) she lived in the Eastern District and visited North Point very often. She opposed the proposed subsidised housing at the TCSP site. She felt that North Point was much hotter compared with other districts due to the built up environment. The air flow would be found better if there were more open areas. The proposed development would block air ventilation and worsen the heat island effect in North Point;
- (b) the site was located on one of the major air ventilation corridors in North Point and should be retained for air ventilation purpose. The proposed amendment for residential use would have adverse impact on air ventilation and had ignored the residents' need for open space and living quality. The Government's response that there was sufficient open space in North Point was doubtful. Identification of "G/IC" and "O" sites for housing development might be convenient for the Government, however, foregoing an open space for public enjoyment should not be supported; and

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) the proposed housing development would not help solving the housing shortage problem as property had become an investment tool rather than for

self-use. The most recent high land sale price of a site in Ap Lei Chau was ridiculous. The residential flats were no longer affordable to the Hong Kong people. As such, it was irrational to sacrifice an existing public space for property investment purpose, and there was still vacant land available, such as in Kai Tak. Priority should be given to revising the population policy and controlling investment from the Mainland.

R173 – Chan Po King Kelly

24. Ms Chan Po King Kelly made the following main points:

- (a) she was a local resident and opposed the proposed amendment as there was insufficient ball court in North Point. The Government had not yet compensated the residents' loss of the soccer pitch due to construction of ICAC HQ. The reprovisioning site for TCSP was already intended for open space use. Thus, there should be an additional site to reprovision the existing TCSP; and
- (b) as the population was increasing in the area, the neighbourhood required two soccer pitches and more local open space. The existing TCSP served many children, in particular students from the adjacent primary school, and was accessible by the elderly on foot. The basic principle for locating the local open space and recreation facilities was that road crossing should be avoided and facilities should be within walking distance of the local residents.

C3 - Mary Mulvihill

25. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) sufficient provision of open space and GIC facilities was not adequate, their location and meeting local need were also essential. The proposed reprovisioning site was farther away and visitors had to cross a few roads to access the site. Local open space should be located close to the local

residents especially for elderly people. The current OZP amendment did not bring improvement to the open space provision in the area;

- (b) the prevailing winter winds of North Point mainly came from the harbour side, and there would be no air ventilation problem in winter if no blockage existed;
- (c) referring to PlanD's response in paragraph 6.4.1 of the Paper which stated that for the existing built up area, opportunities would be seized to meet those target under the Hong Kong 2030+ as far as practicable. Those remarks were not clearly stated in the consultation documents of the Hong Kong 2030+ ;
- (d) it was proposed to convert the proposed reprovisioning site into an open space to include a memorial to the refugees and prisoners of war interred at the North Point refugee camp during World War II to remind people the history of the district;
- (e) the proposed subsidised housing scheme would become a repeat of the Hung Hom Bay public housing incident where the public housing was subsequently turned into a private residential development when the housing market crashed; and
- (f) she had also raised comments on the meeting procedures, meeting hours, submission of further information in relation to OZP hearing, and coverage of the minutes of meetings in relation to planning application.

26. As the presentation from government's representative, and the representers/commenters/their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairman explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairman would invite the representers/commenters/their representatives and/or the government's representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board, or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairman then invited questions from Members.

27. A Member requested Mr Ted T.H. Cheng (R30) to provide more details on the proposal for comprehensive redevelopment of the representation site together with the adjacent North Point Welfare Association Building and how the enlarged site would result in a better development. Members noted that Mr Cheng had already left the meeting.

Air Ventilation

28. Some Members raised the following questions on the air ventilation aspect:

- (a) whether the current AVA EE which used the data of a wind tunnel test conducted eight years ago and did not include detailed calculations and figures had affected the reliability of its findings;
- (b) details of the proposed air ventilation mitigation measures and their implementation, and whether further building tower setback along Tin Chiu Street could enhance the air flow along the street; and
- (c) whether the proposed development would affect the existing air ventilation corridor and worsen the heat island effect and increase local temperature.

29. In response, Mr Roy Tam (Representative of R6/C1) made the following points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the AVA EE conducted by HD for the proposed development was a rough assessment without sufficient data support. Taking into account the annual prevailing, summer and winter winds as shown in the PowerPoint slides, it was clear that the proposed housing development would block the air flows. He wondered why the AVA EE report could draw the conclusion that the proposed development was not anticipated to have significant adverse air ventilation impact on the overall surrounding pedestrian wind environment; and
- (b) according to the AVA report of 2008, the representation site was not planned for other development. The government now proposed to change

the existing playground to high-rise residential use which would affect the wind environment.

30. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau made the following points with the aid of the visualizer/some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) according to the Technical Guide for Air Ventilation Assessment for Developments in Hong Kong (the Technical Guide), AVA EE was useful and cost effective to be conducted in the early stage and it provided a qualitative assessment and facilitated the identification of problems and issues. An AVA EE might also point to further quantitative studies depending on the nature of the development. At plan making stage, a qualitative assessment on the air ventilation implication of the proposed housing development was considered appropriate. HD would conduct an AVA Initial Study to further investigate quantitatively the proposed wind enhancement measures at the detailed design stage and such a requirement would be specified in the planning brief for the proposed public housing development. The AVA for the planning scheme area of the North Point was also carried out in accordance with the Technical Guide. An AVA EE was first undertaken to assess qualitatively the likely impacts arising from the proposed building height restrictions and to identify problematic areas. Subsequently, an AVA using the wind tunnel modelling was conducted to provide detailed specific assessments quantitatively for the problematic areas identified in the AVA EE;
- (b) the annual winds were from north, east-northeast, east and east-southeast, while summer winds were from east-northeast, east, south, southwest and west-southwest. Under the north and south wind conditions, the prevailing winds mainly flowed along Tin Chiu Street. Winds from other direction would mainly flow along Marble Road and/or Java Road. The proposed development, which was in alignment with Tin Chiu Street, Marble Road and Java Road would not induce any significant disturbance to the air flows and only localised wind shadows were expected. With the proposed design measures to facilitate air flow, including 2m setback from the two

splayed street corners and provision of a 3.5m empty bay at the ground floor abutting Tin Chiu Street, the overall surrounding pedestrian wind environment would not be significantly affected;

- (c) the proposed design measures to enhance air ventilation performance would be incorporated in the planning brief of the proposed public housing development for implementation; and
- (d) the AVA carried out for the building height review on the OZP had assumed that the representation site, which was a playground at that time, was for low-rise GIC use, however, it had not precluded any future development at the site.

Open Space Provision

31. Some Members raised the following questions on open space provision:

- (a) information on the distribution of open spaces, the location of existing open spaces with soccer pitch(s) in North Point, and whether the proposed waterfront promenade was included in the open space calculation;
- (b) whether the Tong Shiu Road Playground was popular used and if it could be upgraded to include a soccer pitch;
- (c) the development programme of the proposed open space at the proposed reprovisioning site; and
- (d) how to ascertain that the land use of the proposed reprovisioning site would not be changed in future if the Government did not rezone the reprovisioning site from “G/IC” to “O”.

32. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau made the following points with the aid of a visualiser:

- (a) a plan indicating the distribution of open spaces in North Point was shown;

- (b) there were soccer pitches provided at the North Point Service Reservoir Playground at Tin Hau Temple Road, Cloud View Road Service Reservoir Playground, Victoria Park, and Quarry Bay Park;
- (c) the proposed waterfront promenade along the ex-NPE redevelopment had been included in the open space calculation;
- (d) the Tong Shui Road Garden was about 2,600m² in size which would not be sufficient to accommodate a standard 7-a-side football pitch. No information on its utilisation rate was at hand;
- (e) as regards the programme for implementation of the reprovisioning site, it was currently occupied by the Drainage Services Department as a temporary works area and would be vacated in the second quarter of 2017. The existing TCSP would only be closed after the new playground at the reprovisioning site was in operation in 2019 to ensure the continuity of the services to the public; and
- (f) there was no intention to develop the reprovisioning site for other uses. Given the reprovisioning site was near the waterfront, very strong justifications would be required if it was proposed for other uses.

33. In response, Ms Chan Po King (R173) said that the public open space at Tong Shui Road was a popular children playground and should not be replaced by a soccer pitch.

34. In response, Mr Jonathan Wan Chung Hei (R155) said that HD could identify other alternative sites for public housing development and the representation site should be retained for open space uses.

Alternative Sites

35. Some Members asked whether the proposed reprovisioning site and other alternative sites proposed by the representers were suitable for housing development and a Member asked whether the traffic noise problem for residential use at the reprovisioning site

could be resolved since the Government had previously advised that acoustic windows/balconies could be used to reduce noise level while allowing natural ventilation in another public housing development.

36. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that the reprovisioning site for TCSP was close to the Island Eastern Corridor which would have adverse traffic noise impact on residential use. Other than traffic noise, the reprovisioning site was next to the North Point Vehicular Ferry Pier which provided dangerous goods vehicular ferry service. There were underground drains and drainage reserves would be required. The development constraints would significantly reduce the development site area that could be used for residential development. Besides, the reprovisioning site was located at the waterfront. According to the Harbour Planning Principles, the planning of harbourfront areas should maximize opportunities for public enjoyment.

37. Mr Roy Tam said that the Government should consider seriously their proposal of changing some of the private housing sites in Kai Tak to subsidised housing to increase the flat supply for Hong Kong residents. For new housing sites, scientific assessments, such as a quantitative AVA, should be adopted to demonstrate they would not pose adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. He had doubts that the potential traffic noise impact on residential use at the proposed reprovisioning site could not be resolved as the ex-NPE site was even closer to the Island Eastern Corridor.

38. Mr Au Yeung Sing (R435) reiterated that residential development on top of the Pak Fuk Road Safety Town near Healthy Village Estate would not induce any adverse impact on the surrounding areas.

39. Ms Ip Sin Man Carmela (R365) said that noise barrier could be erected at the Island Eastern Corridor in order to mitigate the potential noise impact on the proposed reprovisioning site for residential use. Information on the area for the drainage reserve should be provided to demonstrate the impact on the developable site area.

Other Aspects

40. In response to a Member's question regarding EDC's rejection of the proposal to

convert part of hawker area at Marble Road into a bazaar on traffic ground, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that the proposed development was small in scale which would not have adverse traffic impact on the road network. In response to another Member's question on parking facilities at the representation site, Mr Kau said that they would be provided in accordance with the requirement of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG).

41. A Member asked if there was any existing tree within and near the representation site and whether more information on the built form and parameters of the proposed public housing such as site coverage was available. In response, Mr Kau said that no tree was recorded within the representation site. There were 12 trees located on the pavements immediately outside the site and they were all common species. According to HD, the existing trees would be retained as far as practicable. While information on the detailed building design of the proposed development was not available, the proposed site coverage would not exceed that stipulated under the Building (Planning) Regulations.

42. In response to a Member's question on the potential adverse impact of sunlight penetration, Mr Kau said that the representation site was surrounded by roads with a width of not less than 17m which would be conducive to sunlight penetration.

43. A Member asked whether it was possible to include some community facilities in the proposed housing development. Mr Kau said that according to the current public housing scheme, GIC facilities would not be provided, however, HD would further liaise with concerned departments on the requirements during the detailed design stage.

44. As the representers/commenters or their representatives had finished their presentations and Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman said that the hearing procedures had been completed. The Board would deliberate on the representations/comments in the absence of all representers/commenters or their representatives and would inform them of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked them and the government's representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

45. The Chairman recapitulated that the main concerns of the representers and commenters and he invited Members to express their views.

Open Space Provision

46. A Member agreed to the proposed amendment noting that the existing ball courts would be reprovisioned nearby for uninterrupted enjoyment of the local residents before the site would be taken back for housing development.

47. Two Members opined that the area of the reprovisioning site was almost double the size of the representation site and would be put into use before the existing ball courts were closed. There would also be an enhanced design with upgraded facilities in the reprovisioning site. The safety of users would be improved as the reprovisioning site would not be bounded by roads like the representation site. Besides, locating the open space at the waterfront would have more public benefits.

48. A Member said that since the reprovisioning site was zoned "G/IC" and not "O", it could not preclude the Government from changing the land use later.

Air Ventilation

49. A Member considered that the AVA EE had concluded that the air ventilation issues could be resolved and appropriate requirements could be imposed, if considered necessary.

50. The Secretary explained that an AVA EE was usually sufficient during the OZP amendment stage to confirm whether imposition of development restrictions such as building height and/or non-building area would be required. Some proposed design measures to enhance air ventilation performance were incorporated in the indicative scheme submitted by HD as shown in Drawings H-1 and H-2 of the Paper.

Housing Supply and Other Aspects

51. The Vice Chairman and some Members made the following main points :

- (a) the representation site might not be the most desirable, but was considered suitable for housing development;
- (b) the housing shortage problem in Hong Kong was very serious, the new development areas such as those in the North East New Territories and Hung Shui Kiu were not yet available to meet the current demand, and those sites were also far away from the urban area. New development at the fringe of Country Parks and green areas were also very controversial and opposed by the green groups;
- (c) though the representation site was small, it was not subject to many development constraints nor causing adverse impacts. It was a comparatively less difficult site. There was an urgent need to increase the flat production to meet the housing target even if the number of flat production was small at the representation site;
- (d) the better-off public rental housing tenants would release their rental unit to the less advantage groups if they had bought a subsidised flat;
- (e) housing development at the representation site was supported but consideration should be given to incorporating some community facilities in the future development; and
- (f) the “G/IC” zoning of the representation site did not preclude development at the site and the proposed housing development was compatible with the surrounding residential developments.

52. Some other Members took a different view and made the following main points :

- (a) a macro perspective on housing land supply was required. Using in-fill sites to meet the housing target might create tension in the local community.

To enhance social coherence, the Government should think out of the box and consider other suitable sites outside the densely populated areas;

- (b) the proposed amendment was not supported as the flat production was too small. Piece-meal development of small housing sites could not solve the housing problem;
- (c) though subdivided flat was a serious problem in Hong Kong, land use planning was essential to enhance the living environment. Many existing open spaces in the downtown area of North Point were provided only with children playgrounds. Active recreational facilities were important to the development of young people and thus should be retained; and
- (d) there would still be deficit in local open space even after the re-provisioning of the TCSP and the existing ball courts at the representation site were popular to the local residents, and should not be taken away from the local residents for residential development.

53. As Members' views were divided, the meeting agreed to take a vote. A majority of Members were in support of the rezoning of the representation site from "G/IC" to "R(A)". The Board noted the supportive view of Representation No. R1 and decided not to uphold Representations No. R2 to R442 and considered that the Draft North Point OZP No. S/H8/25 should not be amended to meet the representations. The reasons were:

- “(a) the Government has adopted a multi-pronged approach to make available sufficient supply of housing land with a view to identifying more suitable sites for residential use in the short and medium term in view of the acute market demand. Review on “Government, Institution or Community” sites is one of the key measures of the government to increase the housing land supply. The representation site is considered suitable for residential development;
- (b) the proposed residential development at the representation site would not generate unacceptable adverse impacts on the surrounding areas in terms of traffic, environmental, air ventilation, visual and infrastructure;

- (c) there is no shortfall of open space as per the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines requirement in the area. The representation site is neither zoned “Open Space” nor designated for any specific Government, institution and community (GIC) use. There is no request from the relevant government departments to use the site for standalone GIC facilities;
- (d) the Tin Chiu Street Playground (TCSP) will be reprovisioned nearby with upgraded facilities for public enjoyment. The existing TCSP will only be closed after the new playground is in operation to ensure the continuity of the services to the public; and

For R324 to 326, R331, R332, R344, R345, R349, R350, R358 to R361, R366 to R368, R372 to R375, R377 to R380, R384, R385, R387, R388, R393, R402, R405, R407, R424, R427, R428 and R431 to R434 only

- (e) the amendments to the Notes of the OZP are to support art development in industrial buildings or industrial-office buildings and to reflect the existing practice of plot ratio/gross floor area exemption. They are considered appropriate.”

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok, Mr Stephen H.B. Yau, Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung, Mr Franklin Yu and Mr Peter C.K. Mak left the meeting at this point.]

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:20 p.m.]

54. The meeting was resumed at 2:45 p.m.

55. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the afternoon session.

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr C.W. Tse

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

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

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

[Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr H.F. Leung and Dr C.H. Hau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

56. Since some of the applicant's representatives attending the review hearing under Agenda Item 5 had not yet arrived, Members agreed to consider Agenda Item 6 first.

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

Review of Application No. A/TM-LTYT/324

Temporary Open Storage of Construction Materials and Containers, and Temporary Open Parking of Crane Trucks, Container Tractors, Trailers, Light Goods Vehicles and Private Cars for a Period of 3 Years in "Residential (Group D)" and "Village Type Development" zones, Lots 1677, 1684 (Part), 1685 (Part), 1687 (Part), 1688 (Part), 1689 (Part), 1690 (Part), 1693 (Part) and 1694 (Part) in D.D. 130, Yick Yuen, Tuen Mun, New Territories
(TPB Paper No. 10262)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese]

57. The Chairman informed Members that the applicant had indicated that he would not attend the review hearing. As sufficient notice had been given to the applicant to invite him to attend the meeting, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the applicant. He then invited Mr David C.M. Lam, District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West, Planning Department (DPO/TM&YLW, PlanD) to the meeting at this point.

58. The Chairman extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited DPO/TM&YLW to brief Members on the review application.

59. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr David C.M. Lam briefed Members on the background of the review application including the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), departmental and public comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10262.

60. As the presentation of DPO/TM&YWL was completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

61. As Members had no questions, the Chairman thanked DPO/TM&YWL for attending the meeting. He left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

62. In response to a Member's question, Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Director of Planning, said that if the site was the subject of an enforcement case, appropriate enforcement action will continue to be taken by the Planning Authority irrespective of whether a review application had been submitted by the applicant.

[Mr Philip S.L. Kan arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

63. The same Member did not support the application as the applicant had not provided any new grounds to support the review application and there was no strong planning justification to warrant a departure from the RNTPC's decision.

64. The meeting noted that the applicant had not submitted any further written submission in support of the review application; the development was not in line with the planning intentions of the "Residential (Group D)" and "Village Type Development" zones and not compatible with the surrounding environment predominated by residential dwellings and agricultural/unused land; the application did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E in that no previous planning permission had been granted for the site and there were adverse comments from the Environmental Protection Department and the Transport Department; and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications in the area.

65. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review for the following reasons:

- “(a) the development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group D)” zone, which is for improvement and upgrading of existing temporary structures within the rural areas through redevelopment of existing temporary structures into low-rise, low-density permanent residential buildings subject to planning permission from the Town Planning Board. It is also not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” zone which is to reflect existing recognized and other villages, and to provide land considered suitable for village expansion. There is no strong planning justification in the current submission for a departure from such planning intentions, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the development is considered not compatible with the surrounding areas which are predominated by residential dwellings;
- (c) the development is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E for Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses in that the applicant has not provided any strong planning justifications to demonstrate that the applied open storage use in Categories 3 and 4 areas should be treated as exception under the Guidelines. No previous approval has been granted for the Site, there are adverse departmental comments and the applicant fails to demonstrate that the development would not generate adverse environmental and traffic impacts; and
- (d) approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications in the area, the cumulative effect of which will result in a general degradation of the environment of the area.”

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/H21/143

Proposed Comprehensive Development for Office, Shop and Services, Eating Place, Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Fitness Centre or Art Gallery) and Private Club Uses, and Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Phase 2B of Redevelopment of Taikoo Place (Amendments to an Approved Master Layout Plan) in “Comprehensive Development Area” zone, Taikoo Place, 979 King's Road, Quarry Bay, Hong Kong

(TPB Paper No. 10261)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

66. The Secretary reported that the site was located in Quarry Bay area and the application was submitted by Taikoo Place Holdings Ltd., which was a subsidiary of Swire Properties Ltd. (Swire). Masterplan Limited (Masterplan), MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA), Urbis Ltd. (Urbis), Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup) and JLL were five of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with Swire and MVA; his firm having current business dealings with Urbis; and owning a flat in Quarry Bay area |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu | - | having current business dealings with Swire |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - | having current business dealings with Swire, Masterplan, MVA, Urbis and Arup |
| Mr K.K. Cheung |] | their firm having current business dealings |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai |] | with Swire and JLL |

- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - her firm being a tenant of a property of Swire; having current business dealings with Urbis and Arup; and owning flats in Quarry Bay area

- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with MVA and Arup, and had past business dealings with Swire

- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - had past business dealings with Arup

- Mr Franklin Yu - had past business dealings with MVA, Urbis and Arup

- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok]
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung] co-owning flat(s) with spouse in Quarry Bay
- Mr Martin W.C. Kwan] area
- Mr Simon S.W. Wang]

- Professor S.C. Wong - co-owning a flat with spouse in Quarry Bay
- (the Vice-chairman) area; being an engineering consultant of Arup and the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil Engineering of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) where Arup had sponsored some activities of the department

67. Members noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Stephen L.H. Liu, Ivan C.S. Fu, Dominic K.K. Lam and Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting, and Mr Franklin Yu and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok had already left the meeting. As Messrs K.K. Cheung, Alex T.H. Lai and Patrick H.T. Lau had no involvement in the application, the properties of Messrs Wilson Y.W. Fung, Martin W.C. Kwan and Simon S.W. Wang and their spouses had no direct view on the site, and the interest of Professor S.C. Wong was indirect, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

68. Mr H.F. Leung declared interest in the item for being an Associate Professor of the Department of Real Estate and Construction of HKU which had provided training courses to Swire. Dr C. H. Hau also declared interest for being an Honorary Associate Professor and Principal Lecturer of the School of Biological Sciences of HKU and his department had received donations from Swire Trust before. Members agreed that their interests were indirect and they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

69. The following government representatives and the applicant's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr Louis K.H. Kau	-	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (DPO/HK, PlanD)
Ms Irene W.S. Lai	-	Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), PlanD
Mr Tim Blackburn]	Applicant's representatives
Ms Babby Fung]	
Ms Elsa Man]	
Ms May Lam]	
Ms Diamond Cheng]	
Mr Ian Brownlee]	
Ms Kira Brownlee]	
Mr Lam Wo Hei]	
Ms Margaret Wong]	
Mr Lau Chun Kong]	
Ms Linsey McAlister]	

70. The Chairman extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedure of the hearing. He then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the review application.

71. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Irene W.S. Lai, STP/HK, PlanD, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the consideration of the application by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), public comments and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10261 (the Paper).

[Mr C.W. Tse returned to join the meeting and Professor T.S. Liu arrived to join the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

72. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the review application. The meeting noted that a brochure previously submitted during the s.16 application stage (Appendix Ia(ii) of Annex A of the Paper) was tabled for Members' reference.

73. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee made the following main points as introduction:

- (a) in the past 20 years or so, Swire had been reviewing the phased redevelopment of Taikoo Place with a view to implementing a high quality comprehensive development;
- (b) the consolidation of ownership of Cornwall House in December 2016 had provided opportunity for implementation of the final phase of the comprehensive redevelopment;
- (c) ArtisTree currently located in Cornwall House was created by Swire in 2008 and had become an important venue for various community activities. The applicant's inclusion of ArtisTree in the proposed Building 2B without requesting additional gross floor area (GFA) would in effect involve the replacement of a commercial floor by a public facility. The commercial and community components were complementary to each other, and their viability was inter-dependent; and

- (d) the current application would include a change in the use in the lower floors to provide flexibility for various types of uses to meet the changing needs for the tenants and the neighbouring community. It was more than just a request for relaxation of building height restriction (BHR) but related to the design of the whole development. The Board was requested to consider the application in a holistic manner and assessed how this application could better achieve the planning intention for the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone.

74. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tim Blackburn from Swire made the following main points:

Company Vision

- (a) Swire had a long term commitment to the development of Quarry Bay and its vision was to establish Taikoo Place as a world-class, highly-integrated, commercial district within Hong Kong’s “Metropolitan Business Core”;
- (b) for several decades Swire had invested significantly in a “creative transformation” process to ensure that, in addition to Grade A commercial accommodation, tenants, residents nearby and visitors were able to enjoy quality public spaces with a diversity of retail, food and beverage options, as well as vibrant visual and performing arts programmes and activities;
- (c) the vision also echoed the planning vision and strategy of the “Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030” (Hong Kong 2030+) which sought to promote Hong Kong’s liveability and competitiveness in the region;

Fit for the Future

- (d) in the interests of long term sustainability and to enhance Hong Kong’s competitiveness, it was essential that the office provision in the proposed Building 2B could meet not only current but anticipated future demand, in

particular when the future supply for premier Grade A offices was very limited as revealed in JLL's research;

- (e) Hong Kong would lose out to other regional cities such as Shanghai, Shenzhen and Singapore if a vibrant, thriving community with quality public spaces and modern office accommodation was not created to suit the demand of those prospective tenants from major international law firms and financial institutions;

The Scheme in Totality

- (f) the proposed scheme was in accordance with the planning intention for the "CDA" zone and had maximised the role the proposed Building 2B could play as an integral part of the overall Taikoo Place redevelopment;
- (g) the total investment associated with providing ArtistTree was approximately HK\$500 million taking into account the construction costs and office rental foregone, and excluding its ongoing operating or programming costs;
- (h) the individual elements of the proposal were not mutually exclusive and should be considered as a total package;

Community Engagement

- (i) the company had been developing Taikoo Place by working closely with the whole community. Regular communication and engagement with stakeholders had taken place throughout the redevelopment process; and
- (j) 13 briefings and question & answer sessions in relation to the planning application was conducted for the external stakeholders last year in order to introduce and explain the proposal and gathered their valuable feedback. The proposal had gained overwhelming public support with only four objections received during the public consultation process of the planning

application.

75. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lau Chun Kong from JLL made the following main points:

- (a) it was anticipated that the supply of office space in Hong Kong in the coming years would be very limited and the non-core commercial areas like Hong Kong East and Kowloon East would play an important role in future office supply, in particular, Taikoo Place which had attracted a number of law firms and international financial institutions to move in;

Trend of Increased Standard Floor Height for Grade A Offices

- (b) the trend of standard floor height of typical floors and special floors of Grade A offices in Hong Kong, Asia Pacific Region and international cities were presented as follows:

	Hong Kong Core Business Area (CBA)		Hong Kong non-CBA		Asia Pacific (Singapore and Shanghai)		New York	London	
	1998-2008	2012-16	2007-08	2010-17	Pre-2010	Post-2010	2002-09	2002	2018
Typical floors (m)	4-4.5	4.5	4.1-4.2	4.2-4.5	4.1-4.3	4.4-4.8	4.3-4.4	4.1	4-4.3
Special floors (m)	4.6-6	4.7-6.3	4.6-5.2	4.8-5	4.5-4.7	4.7-8.5	8.5-8.8	5.4	5-5.1

- (c) there was a trend of increased floor height of typical floors and special floors in Grade A offices, in particular for those cities in the Asia Pacific Region. It was necessary to provide higher quality office buildings with higher floor height in Hong Kong in order to cater for the changing needs of the tenants and to maintain its competitiveness as a World City;
- (d) although the non-CBA of Kowloon East would also be a major supply of

office space for Hong Kong in the coming years, not all the office buildings could be developed up to the standard floor height of 4.5m due to the BHRs imposed on the area;

Special Floors of Office Buildings

- (e) apart from the need to accommodate additional IT and telecom cables which required a higher raised floor system, special floors were used for other ancillary facilities such as auditorium, client centre, meeting venue and function room;
- (f) citing Two IFC as an example, 43% of its office floors had been designed as special floors with a high floor height from 4.4m to 6m. Hong Kong Monetary Authority being its major tenant occupying nine special floors had used the special floors for exhibition area and library uses;
- (g) as compared with other office developments such as One Bay East, Hysan Place and CCB Tower, with the percentage of special floors ranging from 17% to 23% and floor height ranging from 4.7m to 5.5m, the percentage of special floors in Building 2A in Taikoo Place currently under construction, which only accounted for 8.3% of the office floors, was considered very low. Such percentage would further reduce if the entire Taikoo Place development was taken into account. As such, there was a need to provide more special floors with higher floor height in Taikoo Place; and
- (h) Taikoo Place was a unique development being the largest single-owned office portfolio in Hong Kong, with a total GFA of 650,000m² upon completion of Buildings 2A and 2B. The redevelopment project had been taking place for more than two decades. For those pre-2000 office buildings in Taikoo Place, the floor heights of typical floors and special floors were only at a range of 3.3-3.8m and 3.7-5.3m respectively which were considered sub-standard for premier Grade A office. Although the floor height of the approved Building 2A had been increased to 4.3m for

typical floors and 4.9-5.65m for special floors in order to meet international standard, the proposed Building 2B should have better provisions to cater for the future demand with a view to maintaining the economic competitiveness of Hong Kong in the region.

76. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Babby Fung from Swire made the following main points:

- (a) a wide variety of community and engagement programmes had been organised in Taikoo Place over the past decades including free artwalk tours, Sunday Markets, lunch time concerts and dancing in the fountain, etc. which were free place-making programmes for the enjoyment of families and kids, residents, office tenants and the wider community;
- (b) ArtisTree was not only a special place to nurture art and young talents, but also a key place making initiative through which many visitors were attracted to enjoy its programmes;
- (c) various programmes and events had been organised at ArtisTree, including the 'Vivienne Westwood: A Life in Fashion' Exhibition; concerts by the Hong Kong Philharmonic Orchestra; fund-raising dinner for Cancer Fund; Books for Love for raising funds for the Boys' & Girls' Clubs Association of Hong Kong; and 'Project After 6' tenant engagement programme, etc. However, the success of many programmes was limited by the constraints of the existing ArtisTree in various aspects such as insufficient ceiling height for world-class exhibitions, insufficient space for food preparation and storage, and the presence of huge columns;
- (d) since its opening, over 130 programmes were organised in ArtisTree. More than 80% were art, charity and community events and nearly all of them were free which had attracted over 100,000 visitors a year; and
- (e) if the headroom of the new ArtisTree in the proposed Building 2B could

be increased to 12.5m as currently proposed, artists and art groups would have opportunities to develop more innovative ideas and programmes.

77. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Lindsey McAlister from Hong Kong Youth Arts Foundation (HKYAF) made the following main points:

- (a) HKYAF worked with over 800,000 young people aged between 5 and 25 every year. Over 100 projects in various art forms, free of charge to the community, were created last year. Through those projects young people learned life skills such as communication, collaboration, creative thinking, in addition to art skills;
- (b) HKYAF was not funded by the Government, but had received invaluable support from corporations such as Swire;
- (c) apart from the lack of money, the biggest challenge currently faced by arts organizations was the lack of suitable venues. The existing ArtisTree, though with some restrictions, was a great venue with a high ceiling and spacious environment and occupied a good location; and
- (d) the proposed ArtisTree in the proposed Building 2B, with a floor area of 16,000 ft², high ceiling, column free and multifunctional space located in the centre of an already established arts hub, would reinforce Hong Kong's claim to be a cultural capital.

78. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lam Wo Hei from Wong & Ouyang made the following main points:

Planning Merits of the Development Scheme

- (a) the planning merits provided by the current application involving Buildings 2A and 2B in the last phase of the "CDA" development would not only benefit the people working in Taikoo Place but also improve the urban environment of the whole Quarry Bay district;

- (b) the provision of two open spaces within the Taikoo Place development, namely Taikoo Square (about 5,100m²) with lush planting and interesting water elements and Taikoo Garden (about 1,350m²) providing street-level food outlets and outdoor seating area, would benefit both the office community as well as the general public;
- (c) the proposed footbridge system, passing through the green open space, would provide the necessary pedestrian connection between Taikoo Shing and the King's Road area in Quarry Bay;
- (d) the street level commercial accommodation under Buildings 2A and 2B next to Taikoo Square and Taikoo Garden would provide a social interaction node for the Quarry Bay community;
- (e) the additional building height for the proposed Building 2B under the current application was required to accommodate ArtisTree with a high ceiling height of 12.5m; to provide extra headroom for the two commercial floors at 2/F and 3/F; to slightly increase the floor height of typical office floors from 4.2m to 4.3m to meet the international standard; and to provide four special floors with a higher floor height of 4.9m for trading floors and reception floors with large meeting and presentation rooms;

Alternative Design for the Proposed Building 2B

- (f) the proposed Building 2B was bounded by two 15m wide notional air corridors required under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) to the north and east; Pan Hoi Street to the south; and the proposed Taikoo Garden to the west. Any change in the massing to accommodate the features proposed without building height increase would require enlarging the footprint of Building 2B in the westerly direction, thus reducing the area of Taikoo Garden which would provide spatial relief and public benefit to the surrounding area;

- (g) if the building height of the proposed Building 2B was restricted to 195mPD, the footprint of the lower floors would need to be enlarged to accommodate the proposed features. Given that the office tower floor plate was already long and narrow of about 72m in length, any further lengthening of the plan would make the layout inefficient. Moreover, the floor height of typical offices would be reduced to 3.9m which would be undesirable and unacceptable to its client;

Visual Impact

- (h) the skyline of Quarry Bay area was dominated by the existing One Island East and Building 2A under construction. The visual impact of this office cluster would reflect the significance of Taikoo Place as the largest office hub outside of the Central Business District (CBD);
- (i) the proposed building height of 212mPD for Building 2B would not protrude the ridgeline. Being further away from the waterfront, it fell naturally into the silhouette of the building cluster and was visually unobtrusive; and
- (j) the Board was recommended to accept the proposal having regard to the many benefits of the current proposal to the community and the local built environment.

79. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee made the following main points:

Planning Context

- (a) the planning intention of the “CDA” zone to encourage comprehensive redevelopment of the area for commercial uses with the provision of open space and other supporting facilities provided the statutory basis for consideration of the application;

- (b) the current application was a fresh application with a Master Layout Plan (MLP) covering the entire “CDA” zone and not an amendment application. Reference could be made to the previous application but it was not correct to focus only the amendments to the approved scheme;
- (c) the relevant criteria in consideration of minor relaxation of BHR as set out in paragraph 7.7 of the Explanatory Statement of the OZP should be taken into account. Out of the five criteria as stated therein, only four were relevant and the current application complied with all four;

Policy Context

- (d) as stated in the Hong Kong 2030+, Hong Kong was a global financial hub with a modern-services economy where the services sector accounting for 93% of the gross domestic product. Hong Kong was facing global and regional competition and would need to move up the value chain in future economic transformation;
- (e) there was a need to provide premier Grade A offices including in the non-CBD areas;

Responses to Rejection Reason (a) on Planning Merits and Public Benefits

- (f) while there was no working definition of planning merits and public benefits in Hong Kong, reference would be made to literature and various international cases;
- (g) there were sufficient planning merits and public benefits in that the application in its full context was related to the overall improvements in implementing the “CDA” zone; the proposed development achieved more than that required by the planning intention and complied with the four relevant criteria for minor relaxation of BHR; actual planning benefits were wide and diverse, of social, community, environmental, urban design and economic benefit to the community and neighbourhood;

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

Responses to Rejection Reason (b) on Building Height and Ridgeline

- (h) when imposing BHRs on the OZP for the Quarry Bay area, the Board had already accepted that Taikoo Place would be a high-rise node where some buildings might be permitted in the 20% building free zone (BFZ) below the ridgeline but not above the ridgeline, as evidenced by the BHRs for Cambridge House and One Island East. The proposed relaxation of BHR for Building 2B was in line with that planning intention;
- (i) according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), the height profile was to enhance the relationship of the city and natural landscape and the 20% BFZ below the ridgeline was a starting point and flexibility was allowed for relaxation on individual merits in order to give punctuation effects at suitable locations. Moreover, the building height profile should respect the character of neighbourhood and echo the natural topography;
- (j) the proposed minor relaxation of BHR would not create a new node and there was no significant change in the visual context profile of the Taikoo Place area when viewed from the former Kai Tak Runway;

Responses to Rejection Reason (c) on Undesirable Precedent

- (k) the High Court had defined that a precedent needed to have a factual basis and in setting a precedent, another application would need to have identical or very similar planning and other characteristics;
- (l) there was no other similar “CDA” zone on Hong Kong Island and it was not possible to have another application of similar development content as the current development of being part of an established and recognized high rise node, providing similar public benefits and with significant public support. The approval of the current application would therefore

not set an undesirable precedent. Each application had to be considered on its own merits; and

- (m) a video was shown to summarize the vision and public benefits of the whole Taikoo Place project.

80. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicant's representatives were completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

Alternative Design of the Proposed Building 2B

81. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) why the option of reduction in number of storeys for the proposed Building 2B so as to accommodate ArtisTree and higher office floor height under the current building height of the approved scheme was not adopted;
- (b) whether it was possible to shift the proposed air corridor to the east of Building 2B slightly eastward towards the proposed open space such that the footprint of the proposed Building 2B could be enlarged to accommodate ArtisTree without increasing its building height; and
- (c) whether alternative design such as redesigning or rearranging the office floors of the proposed Building 2B had been explored to accommodate ArtisTree and a higher office floor height without relaxing the BHR.

82. In response, Mr Tim Blackburn and Mr Lam Wo Hei made the following points:

- (a) the proposed replacement of commercial GFA by the community facility of ArtisTree had already incurred a significant investment of HK\$500 million by Swire. Further reduction in commercial floorspace would result in considerable loss;

- (b) the proposed air corridor to the east of Building 2B had already made a change in direction by 15 degrees which was the maximum extent permitted under SBDG. Moreover, the proposed air corridor had already encroached onto the future open space and hence there was no scope to further shift the air corridor eastward; and
- (c) given that the applicant was required to provide about 6,400m² of open space under the approved scheme, only a slim building footprint for the proposed Building 2B could be built on the remaining available land. The current design had taken into account the applicant's vision to provide a premier Grade A office building with floor height of 4.3m to strengthen the economic competitiveness of Hong Kong beyond 2020 and a community facility ArtisTree. Measures to reduce building height had already been adopted such as provision of three levels of basement carpark in the approved scheme. The provision of office use at basement floors did not comply with the requirements under the Buildings Ordinance.

Long-term Provision of ArtisTree

83. The Chairman and some Members raised the following comment or questions:
- (a) they appreciated the applicant's efforts in providing art and community facilities over the past decade and its intention to continue providing such facilities in Taikoo Place in future;
 - (b) what the financial investment of Swire on ArtisTree was over the past few years;
 - (c) what the future of ArtisTree would be should the review application be rejected by the Board;
 - (d) given that the provision of ArtisTree within the proposed Building 2B was put forth by the applicant as a strong justification for relaxation of BHR,

whether there was any existing mechanism to ensure that the proposed ArtisTree would be provided, maintained and operated as a kind of community facility for free public access for most of the events on a long term basis;

- (e) whether the applicant could consider initiating a lease modification in order to ensure the provision of ArtisTree within the proposed development under the lease conditions; and
- (f) whether enforcement action could be taken by the Buildings Department (BD) if there was a subsequent change of use of the ArtisTree not in compliance with the approved building plans.

84. In response, Mr Tim Blackburn and Mr Ian Brownlee made the following points:

- (a) the total financial investment of Swire on ArtisTree over the past years was not available at the moment. However, for the provision of ArtisTree within the proposed Building 2B, there would be an initial cost of about HK\$500 million for construction and the foregone rental income. Besides, based on past experience, it was roughly estimated that an annual expenses of about HK\$15 million would be required to fund the programming, and staff and operating cost of the facility over the next three years;
- (b) the applicant had been working on the optimal scheme to have an integrated commercial development with art and cultural spaces in the proposed Building 2B which would be the last office development in Taikoo Place. Such an art and cultural facility would be lost if the review application was rejected as there was no alternative proposal to reprovision ArtisTree elsewhere;
- (c) ArtisTree had been consistently used as a space providing community facility to the public at no cost over the past eight years. The applicant had no intention to change it into a fee-paying commercial space as the

provision of ArtisTree, committed to public art and free of charge for the community, was in line with the core vision of the company for Taikoo Place;

- (d) the proposed ArtisTree would be clearly designated on the building plans to ensure its provision within the proposed development. The applicant was willing to accept and comply with any reasonable planning approval condition regarding the provision of ArtisTree for a specific purpose in the proposed Building 2B;
- (e) to demonstrate that the applicant would fulfill the obligation as presented in the application, Swire was prepared to provide some sort of undertakings on reasonable terms to continue operating ArtisTree in the same way as it was operated in the last decade;
- (f) the lack of enforcement power by PlanD was a common problem in the urban area, not only for the proposed development on the site. Given that the applicant had already indicated its intention to provide ArtisTree and if relevant approval condition was imposed, the provision of such facility would have to be shown on the approved building plans and developed accordingly. Any change of approved uses as shown on the building plans would require the approval from the Building Authority and PlanD could raise objection to such application on ground of non-compliance with the approved scheme. Moreover, any variation to the approved scheme involving the deletion of such facility would require planning permission from the Board;
- (g) the applicant was not prepared to modify the existing lease for the site which was virtually unrestricted with a lease term of 999 years. It was considered that there would be sufficient mechanism to ensure the continued provision of ArtisTree in the long term; and
- (h) the rezoning of the “CDA” site to other zoning upon completion of the approved development would require prior approval of the Board. The

Board could incorporate requirements on the provision of community facilities such as ArtisTree and open space previously provided in the “CDA” development into the new zoning to ensure their provision in the long term.

85. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau made the following points:

- (a) while appropriate planning condition requiring the provision of ArtisTree within the proposed development could be imposed should the application be approved, and such use could also be specified on the approved building plans, there was no effective mechanism to monitor the future operation of ArtisTree in the form of a community facility in a continuous manner under the existing planning and building regime. Apart from that, since the planning requirement could not be incorporated into the lease as lease modification was not required for the proposed development at Taikoo Place, there would not be any effective mechanism to ensure the provision of ArtisTree and its operation as a community facility in the long run;
- (b) even if approval condition was imposed requiring the applicant to provide ArtisTree within the development, no enforcement action could be taken in the urban area by PlanD to tackle any non-compliance of approval condition. Enforcement action mainly relied on BD and the Lands Department (LandsD) through the mechanism of building plan approval and incorporation of specific planning requirement into lease conditions. Any non-compliance with the approved building plans and lease conditions would be enforced by BD and LandsD respectively; and
- (c) under the current “CDA” zoning, PlanD could raise objection to the building plan submission if there was any non-compliance with the approved development scheme. However, upon completion of the approved development, the planning permission would lapse. Further changes to the provision of ArtisTree within the development might not be enforceable.

Justifications for Relaxation of Building Height

86. Two Members raised the following questions:
- (a) what the justification was for the proposed floor height of ArtisTree up to 12.5m as the floor height requirement for art space might change over time;
 - (b) whether the global trend of increased floor height for Grade A office should be a major consideration in assessing the current application and whether there were other previous cases where relaxation of building height was approved due to similar consideration; and
 - (c) how to balance the public interests of preserving the BFZ as advocated by PlanD and the provision of ArtisTree at Taikoo Place as proposed by the applicant.
87. In response, Mr Tim Blackburn and Mr Ian Brownlee made the following points:
- (a) based on the past experience, existing knowledge and recent research, it was anticipated that a proposed floor height of 12.5m for ArtisTree should be able to meet the anticipated requirement of about 95% of the possible art and cultural uses; and
 - (b) it was unreasonable to focus on the provision of higher floor height for the proposed Building 2B under the current scheme without seeing the total public benefits and planning gains that were available for the whole “CDA” development. There are public benefits including social, economic, cultural and a whole range of activities rather than just the provision of ArtisTree.
88. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau made the following points:
- (a) for the current application, the approved building height of the proposed

development of 195mPD at the site had already breached the 20% BFZ below the ridgeline when viewed from the public vantage point at the former Kai Tak Runway. Any relaxation of the approved building height would result in further encroachment into BFZ which was undesirable. Very strong justification should be provided to support such relaxation as it would sacrifice the visual asset of the public for a private development. For those areas where preservation of ridgeline was not a concern, some applications for minor relaxation of BHR had previously been approved by the Board taking into account various planning considerations and the individual merits of each application; and

- (b) as mentioned in the planning consideration and assessment of the Paper, the provision of ArtisTree in Building 2B under the current scheme was also considered by PlanD as a kind of planning merits from public interest perspective.

Implications of the Development Scheme

89. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Director of Planning (D of Plan), and another Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposal to include ArtisTree in the current development scheme would result in a double loss for the applicant in terms of commercial GFA and financial investment; and
- (b) with reference to the comments from BD and the Architectural Services Department as detailed in the Paper, whether the proposed floor height for the commercial/office floors and ArtisTree in Building 2B would have any overall GFA implication of the proposed development.

90. In response, Mr Lam Wo Hei and Mr Tim Blackburn made the following points:

- (a) the floorspace of ArtisTree was GFA accountable towards the total approved GFA of 332,471m² for the entire “CDA” development under the

approved scheme. As compared with the latest approved scheme, the area previously proposed for office use in Building 2B had been changed to a community facility of ArtisTree under the current scheme. Such amendment had resulted in a loss of office GFA as well as involved a long-term financial commitment by the applicant which had to fund the programming and operation of ArtisTree in future;

- (b) having regard to the value and importance of ArtisTree, it was considered that the proposal would bring ultimate benefits to the established commercial node in Taikoo Place and the wider community. The applicant was willing to bear the cost albeit a double loss; and
- (c) under the existing mechanism, GFA of any floor with a higher headroom might be double counted if no strong justification was provided during the building plan submission stage. On the understanding that a standard floor height of about 4.5m for a Grade A office building was already considered acceptable by BD having regard to the global trend, the proposed floor height of 4.3m for typical office floors under the current scheme should be acceptable to BD. Besides, it was considered that the floor height of 12.5m for ArtisTree, which was a unique facility, would also be acceptable to BD.

91. In response to D of Plan's question regarding the breakdown on the distribution of the proposed increase in building height of 17m currently under application as shown on the table in paragraph 7.4 of the Paper, Mr Louis K.H. Kau confirmed that the information was correct.

BHR for the Taikoo Place Area

92. The Chairman and two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) why two existing buildings in Taikoo Place were allowed to breach the BFZ;

- (b) more elaboration on the BHR for the two existing buildings in Quarry Bay which had already encroached onto the 20% BFZ of the ridgeline was requested; and
- (c) what the absolute height of the 20% BFZ was.

93. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau made the following points:

- (a) Cambridge House (about 160mPD) had already breached the 20% BFZ while One Island East (about 301mPD) had protruded above the ridgeline. They were existing office buildings completed before the imposition of BHRs for the Quarry Bay area on the OZP;
- (b) the current BHRs for Cambridge House and One Island East were imposed in light of the Board's consideration of the applicant's previous objection to the original BHRs for the subject "CDA" site was detailed in paragraph 5.6 of Annex A of the Paper. In gist, given that the revised BHRs for Buildings 2A and 2B to 225mPD and 195mPD respectively, as agreed by the Board at the further consideration of the applicant's objection, had already breached the 20% BZF, there was no strong reason not to allow future redevelopment of Cambridge House to attain existing building height which did not breach ridgeline. As for One Island East, which was excessively high, out of context and had already breached the ridgeline, the Board considered that redevelopment to its existing building height should not be allowed; and
- (c) there was no information on the absolute height of the 20% BFZ at hand.

Undesirable Precedent

94. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the approval of the application which would further breach the BFZ would create an undesirable precedent for similar applications

having regard to the applicant's argument that the "CDA" development in Taikoo Place was the only development on Hong Kong Island that had breached the BFZ; and

- (b) whether the applicant could justify that the current scheme was unique and the circumstances would not be applicable to other applications for minor relaxation of building height.

95. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau made the following points:

- (a) apart from the existing buildings in the Quarry Bay area, there were also some existing buildings in the Wan Chai area that had breached the 20% BFZ. Should the justifications for minor relaxation of BHR as put forth by the applicant in the review application be considered acceptable by the Board, it would create an undesirable precedent for other similar applications in other areas; and
- (b) apart from the grounds relating to the provision of ArtisTree, other justifications put forth by the applicant were not considered to be planning merits or public benefits which warranted an approval for the relaxation of BHR. There was also concern that approving the proposed relaxation of building height, which was not fully justified by planning merits or public benefits, would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications.

96. In response, Mr Ian Brownlee made the following points:

- (a) as the Court had ruled that there should be a basis for setting a precedent, it was a matter of law not a matter of opinion. Approving the current application in the "CDA" zone should not be considered as setting a precedent in that the planning context and consideration in assessing a planning application within other zones would be completely different. Each application should be considered on its own merits; and
- (b) the proposed comprehensive development in Taikoo Place comprising a

mix of office buildings, commercial and art, and large open space was so unique that no other similar developments could be found in Hong Kong. Besides, the applicant of the current application would have to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Board that the criteria for relaxation of BHR as set out in the Explanatory Statement were complied with. The granting of approval for relaxation of BHR for the current application would not set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications.

Nature of Application

97. A Member sought clarification on the nature of the current planning application, and the procedure for submitting a fresh application rather than an amendment to the approved scheme. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that given that the current planning application was to propose amendments to the approved MLP under previous application (No. A/H21/132), the last approved MLP should serve as a basis to assess if the current proposal could bring any additional planning merits and public benefits. Apart from the provision of ArtisTree in the proposed Building 2B and the proposed relaxation of its floor heights which were the major differences between the current scheme and the last approved scheme, other amendments currently proposed were the same as those of the last approved MLP and its refinement for fulfilling the planning conditions of the last approved application.

98. In response, Mr Ian Brownlee made the following points:

- (a) the current application, which was a fresh planning application submitted under s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance), should be considered afresh in a holistic manner based on its individual merits. Although the current application was related to a previously approved application, the planning merits of the current scheme should not be considered in a progressive way by comparing it to the previous approved scheme; and
- (b) there was provision for minor amendments to the approved development scheme under s.16A of the Ordinance. However, the extent of amendments proposed in the current scheme was beyond the scope of the

s.16A application. While there was no dispute that the current application was an amendment to the approved scheme, it was a fresh application submitted under s.16 of the Ordinance and the current scheme should be considered in its totality.

Others

99. A Member asked whether there was any alternative art venue of similar scale in the district and whether there was a global trend to provide such art and cultural facility within those Grade A office development.

100. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau made the following points:

- (a) according to his understanding, no similar art venue of comparable scale as ArtisTree was found in the district; and
- (b) while it was difficult to assess whether there was a global trend for accommodating art venue within office developments, mixed development of arts and commercial/office developments within the same building was found in other countries such as the Roppongi (六本木) development in Japan. Apart from Taikoo Place, some art exhibition venues were also found in other commercial/office developments such as Pacific Place and Central Plaza.

[Mr H.F. Leung left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

101. As Members had no further question, the Chairman said that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application in the absence of the applicant's representatives and inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the applicant's representatives and government representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of 5 minutes.]

[Mr K.K. Cheung left the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

Relaxation of BHR for the Proposed Building 2B

102. A Member considered that only the provision of ArtisTree could be considered as a kind of public benefit which might justify a relaxation of BHR. In the event that the Board was to approve the relaxation of BHR for the proposed development, the extent of building height increase should only cater for the specific headroom requirement of ArtisTree. The headroom and design requirements of ArtisTree should be subject to scrutiny and it was yet to demonstrate that all the art and cultural activities held at ArtisTree would require a high headroom of 12.5m as currently proposed. However, another Member opined that the proposal of including ArtisTree in Building 2B should not be considered as a public benefit which would merit a relaxation of BHR given that the use might be subject to changes in future.

103. Some Members had the following views:

- (a) the justifications put forth by the applicant in the current application such as the need to increase the floor height of office floors was not for public benefit but a response to the prevailing market need;
- (b) while appreciating the effort of the applicant which had successfully transformed Taikoo Place into a comprehensive development with a mix of commercial/office and art uses, no strong planning justification was provided to justify the relaxation of BHR which would result in further encroachment of the proposed Building 2B into the 20% BFZ. The provision of ArtisTree was a commercial decision and the vision of the applicant, and the need to increase the floor height for Grade A office on par with other international cities might not be applicable to Hong Kong given its unique characteristics;
- (c) on consideration of the adverse visual impact caused by the two existing

buildings in the Taikoo Place area which had already breached the 20% BZF and the ridgeline, the proposed relaxation of BHR for Building 2B should not approved;

- (d) the increased floor height of typical office floors which would enhance the competitiveness of the Grade A office of Hong Kong, as claimed by the applicant, could be achieved by alternative design such as reducing the number of storeys of the proposed Building 2B. There was no strong justification to warrant a relaxation of BHR in that respect; and
- (e) alternative building design such as provision of some proposed facilities at the basement level should also be explored such that it would not be necessary to apply for relaxation of BHR.

Provision of ArtisTree

104. Some Members had the following views:

- (a) the provision of ArtisTree in Taikoo Place should have brought some commercial benefits to the applicant such as attracting quality and premium tenants. To continue the operation of ArtisTree should be to the benefit of the applicant;
- (b) the provision of ArtisTree in Taikoo Place was a commercial decision of the applicant taking into account prevailing market situation. There would not be any effective mechanism to ensure that the facility would be permanently provided even if the application was approved; and
- (c) the applicant's proposal to provide an undertaking to ensure the continued provision of ArtisTree in future would have to be carefully examined given that the undertaking might not be legally binding upon change of ownership of the property over the years.

105. In response to a Member's question, Mr Raymond K.W. Lee said that there was a need to maintain a BFZ below the ridgelines in order to preserve views to ridgelines and mountain backdrop from recognised key and popular vantage points around Victoria Harbour. Selected sections of ridgelines and eight key and popular vantage points in the urban area were set out in the HKPSG. While some existing developments had already breached the BFZ, the recommended BFZ served to provide a guideline in maintaining a desirable building height profile. Flexibility for relaxation might be allowed based on individual merits.

106. To sum up, Members did not support the review application as the applicant failed to demonstrate that there was strong planning merits and public benefits which warranted a relaxation of BHR; further encroachment onto the 20% BFZ under the ridgeline was unacceptable; and approving the proposed relaxation of BHR would set an undesirable precedent leading to an incremental erosion of the natural backdrop.

[Mr Sunny L.K. Ho left the meeting during the deliberation session.]

107. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review based on the following reason:

- “(a) the applicant fails to demonstrate that there are sufficient planning merits and public benefits to justify the proposed relaxation of building height restriction (BHR) for Building 2B;
- (b) the proposed building height of Building 2B would further encroach onto the 20% building free zone from the public vantage point at the former Kai Tak Runway under the Urban Design Guidelines, which is not acceptable; and
- (c) approving the proposed relaxation of BHR would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications not fully justified by planning merits and public benefits, the cumulative effect of which would lead to incremental erosion of the natural backdrop and jeopardise the urban design efforts to preserve this valuable asset of our cityscape.”

Procedural Matters

Agenda Item 7

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comment on the Draft Tai Tan, Uk Tau, Ko Tong and Ko Tong Ha Yeung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-TT/1

(TPB Paper No. 10263)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese]

108. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 19.8.2016, the draft Tai Tan, Uk Tau, Ko Tong and Ko Tong Ha Yeung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-TT/1 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. A total of 10 representations and one comment were received.

109. R3 requested that the hearing of representations be conducted in two groups, separating the green/concern groups from the villagers' group.

110. Since the representations and comment received were interrelated and of similar nature, it was recommended that the representations and comment should be considered collectively in one group by the full Town Planning Board (the Board). The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary.

111. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, it was also recommended that each representer/commenter be allotted a maximum of 10 minutes for presentation in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations and comment by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for May 2017.

112. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) the representations and comment should be considered collectively in one group by the Board itself; and

- (b) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each representer and commenter, subject to confirmation of the number of representers and commenter attending the hearing and the aggregate presentation time required.

Agenda Item 8

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations on the Draft Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H20/22

(TPB Paper No. 10264)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese]

113. The Secretary reported that the Draft Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H20/22 mainly involved the rezoning of a site for public housing development by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests in the item for having affiliations/business dealings with HKHA or owning properties in the area:

- | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
(as <i>Director of Planning</i>) | - | being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA; co-owning a flat with spouse and spouse owning a property in Chai Wan area |
| Mr Martin W.C Kwan
(as <i>Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department</i>) | - | being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA |
| Mr H.F. Leung | - | being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu |] | |
| Dr C.H. Hau |] | having current business dealings with HKHA |

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau]	
Ms Janice W.M. Lai]	
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho]	
Mr K.K. Cheung]	their firm having current business dealing
Mr Alex T.H. Lai]	with HKHA
Mr Ivan C.S. Fu]	had past business dealings with HKHA
Mr Franklin Yu]	
Mr Dominic K.K. Lam	-	being a Director of a company owning a property in Chai Wan area, and had past business dealings with HKHA
Mr Sunny L.K. Ho	-	owning a flat and a car parking space, and co-owning another flat with spouse in Chai Wan area
Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon	-	his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work

114. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting. Members noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Stephen L.H. Liu, Ivan C.S. Fu, Dominic K.K. Lam and Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting, and Messrs H.F. Leung, K.K. Cheung, Alex T.H. Lai, Franklin Yu and Sunny L.K. Ho had already left the meeting.

115. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 18.11.2016, the draft Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H20/22 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. A total of four representations and no comment were received. It was recommended that the representations should be considered collectively in one group by the full Town Planning Board (the Board) as they were of similar nature. The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary.

116. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, it was also recommended that each representer be allotted a maximum of 10 minutes for presentation in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for May 2017.

117. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) the representations should be considered collectively in one group by the Board itself; and
- (b) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each representer, subject to confirmation of the number of representers attending the hearing and the aggregate presentation time required.

Agenda Item 9

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/25

(TPB Paper No. 10265)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese]

118. The Secretary reported that all the representations received were related to the rezoning of a site for a Senior Citizen Residences Scheme by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) and HKHS had submitted a representation (R1). The following Members had declared interests in the item for having business dealings/affiliations with HKHS or owning properties in the area:

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being ex-officio member of the Supervisory
(*as Director of Planning*) Board of HKHS

Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with
HKHS

Mr K.K. Cheung]	their firms having current business dealings
Mr Alex T.H. Lai]	with HKHS
Mr Stephen L.H. Liu]	
Mr Dominic K.K. Lam]	had past business dealings with HKHS
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho]	
Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon	-	being an ex-employee of HKHS
Ms Christina M. Lee	-	co-owning a flat with spouse at Oi King Street in Hung Hom
Dr F.C. Chan	-	owning a flat at Laguna Verde in Hung Hom

119. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting. Members noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Dominic K.K. Lam, Stephen L.H. Liu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Ms Christina M. Lee had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting, and Messrs K.K. Cheung, and Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

120. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 28.10.2016, the draft Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/25 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. A total of 44 representations and 34 comments were received. It was recommended that the representations and comments should be considered collectively in one group by the full Town Planning Board (the Board) as they were of similar nature. The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary.

121. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, it was also recommended that each representer/commenter be allotted a maximum of 10 minutes for presentation in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for May/June 2017.

122. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) the representations and comments should be considered collectively in one group by the Board itself; and
- (b) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each representor/commenter, subject to confirmation of the number of representors and commenters attending the hearing and the aggregate presentation time required.

Agenda Item 10

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Chun Tin Street/Sung Chi Street Development Scheme Plan No. S/K9/URA1/1

(TPB Paper No. 10266)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese]

Agenda Item 11

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Hung Fook Street/Ngan Hon Street Development Scheme Plan No. S/K9/URA2/1

(TPB Paper No. 10267)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese]

123. Members noted that the two procedural items were related to the draft Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Development Scheme Plans (DSPs) located within the same planning area and agreed that they could be considered together.

124. The Secretary reported that the two DSPs were located in Hung Hom and submitted by URA who was also a commenter (C1) for each DSP. AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was the consultant of URA for DSP No. S/K9/URA1/A for Item 10. MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) and Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Limited (Environ) were the consultants of URA for DSP No. S/K9/URA2/A for Item 11. The following Members had declared interests in the two items for having business dealings/affiliations with URA or its consultants, or owning properties in the area:

Items 10 and 11

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
(as Director of Planning) | - | being a non-executive director of the Board, and a member of Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of URA |
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang | - | being the Deputy Chairman of Appeal Board Panel of URA |
| Mr Philip S.L. Kan |] | being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung |] | |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - | being a non-executive director of the Board, a member of the Lands, Rehousing & Compensation Committee and Planning, Development and Conservation Committee, and a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - | having current business dealings with URA |
| Mr K.K. Cheung |] | their firms having current business dealings with URA |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai |] | |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu |] | |
| Ms Christina M. Lee | - | co-owning a flat with spouse at Oi King Street in Hung Hom |

Dr F.C. Chan - owning a flat at Laguna Verde in Hung Hom

Item 10 only

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu]
Ms Janice W.M. Lai] having current business dealing with
Mr Patrick H.T. Lau] AECOM
Dr C.H. Hau]

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam]
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho] had past business dealings with AECOM
Mr Franklin Yu]

Professor S.C. Wong - being the Chair Professor and Head of
(*the Vice-chairman*) Department of Civil Engineering of HKU
where AECOM had business dealings with
some colleagues and had sponsored some
activities of the Department before

Item 11 only

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealing with MVA
and Environ

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau] having current business dealing with MVA
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho]

Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealing with Environ
Mr Franklin Yu - had past business dealings with MVA

125. As the items were procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting. Members noted that Messrs Thomas

O.S. Ho, Stephen L.H. Liu, Ivan C.S. Fu, Dominic K.K. Lam, Lincoln L.H. Huang, Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Ms Christina M. Lee had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting, and Messrs Franklin Yu, K.K. Cheung and Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

126. The Secretary briefly introduced the Papers. On 28.10.2016, the draft URA Chun Tin Street/Sung Chi Street DSP No. S/K9/URA1/1 (Item 10) and draft URA Hung Fook Street/Ngan Hon Street DSP No. S/K9/URA2/1 (Item 11) were exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. A total of 348 representations and 8 comments were received on DSP No. S/K9/URA1/1 and a total of 123 representations and 38 comments were received on DSP No. S/K9/URA2/1. It was recommended that the representations and comments of each DSP should be considered collectively in one group by the full Town Planning Board (the Board) as they were of similar nature. The hearings could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting or a separate hearing session might be arranged if necessary.

127. To ensure efficiency of the hearings, it was also recommended that each representer/commenter be allotted a maximum of 10 minutes for presentation in the hearing session of each DSP. Consideration of the representations and comments of each DSP by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for May/June 2017.

128. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) the representations and comments of each DSP should be considered collectively in one group by the Board itself; and
- (b) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each representer/commenter of each DSP, subject to confirmation of the number of representatives and commenters attending the hearings and the aggregate presentation time required.

Agenda Item 12

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

129. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 6:20 p.m.