

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 347th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 13.4.2007

Present

Director of Planning
Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng

Chairperson

Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen

Professor N.K. Leung

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Dr. Daniel B.M. To

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Mr. K.Y. Leung

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr. Elvis W.K. Au

Assistant Director (Kowloon), Lands Department
Mr. James Merritt

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Professor Paul K.S. Lam

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

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Mr. Lau Sing

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr. Simon C.K. Cheung

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 346th MPC Meeting held on 23.3.2007

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 346th MPC meeting held on 23.3.2007 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

2. The Secretary reported that there were no matters arising from the last meeting.

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/K2/3 Application for Amendment to the
Approved Yau Ma Tei Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K2/17
from "Open Space" to "Government, Institution or Community",
a site at the junction of Chatham Road South
and Princess Margaret Road, Yau Ma Tei
(MPC Paper No. Y/K2/3)

3. The application was submitted by The Hong Kong Polytechnic University. (HKPU). Mr. K.Y. Leung, being a part-time Lecturer of the HKPU, had declared an interest in this item. Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim had also declared an interest in this item as he

had current business dealings with the HKPU. The Committee noted that Professor Lim had not yet arrived at the meeting.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

4. Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK), and Mr. Louis K.H. Kau, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), and the following applicant's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point :

Professor Poon Chung-kwong

Mr. Chan Shu-keung

Mr. Daniel Suen

Mr. Eric Tam

Mr. Kenneth To

Ms. Pauline Lam

Mr. David Fok

Ms. Vicky Lam

Mr. Edmond Chu

Mr. Christopher Foot

Mr. Tong Cheng

5. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the hearing. The Chairperson then invited Mr. Louis K.H. Kau, STP/TWK, to brief Members on the background to the application.

6. Mr. Louis K.H. Kau drew Members' attention to the applicant's letter of 12.4.2007, which was tabled at the meeting, clarifying the proposed pedestrian arrangement for the proposed development. He then presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) the applicant's proposal as detailed in paragraph 1 of the Paper. The application site was currently a vacant site located at the junction of

Chatham Road South and Princess Margaret Road (the Site) and was proposed for rezoning from “Open Space” (“O”) to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) on the approved Yau Ma Tei Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K2/17 for the development of an educational institution comprising four interlinked multi-purpose building blocks with building heights ranging from 5 to 13 storeys (or from 30 to 60mPD);

- (b) two previous rezoning applications as detailed in paragraph 5 of the Paper;
- (c) comments from concerned Government bureaux/departments as detailed in paragraph 8 of the Paper. In particular, the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) commented that the Site was surrounded by the various heavy-traffic roads. The location of the proposed development would not be in accordance with the environmental principles set out in Chapter 9 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). The Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) had no objection to the application provided that the planned open space provision could be compensated in the Yau Tsim Mong District. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L), PlanD recommended that the building footprint should be revised to avoid felling all large trees in the southern section of the Site;

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

- (d) 76 public comments were received during the statutory publication period. 51 objected, 11 raised concern on the adverse traffic, landscape, visual and environmental impacts, 13 supported and 1 had no comment on the application. The commenters included the residents/Incorporated Owners of Wylie Court, District Councillors, the Tsim Sha Tsui District Kai Fong Welfare Association, the HKPU Students Association, the HKPU Post-graduate Students Association and HKPU Alumni Association. The commenters’ views were summarized in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and

[Messrs. Leslie H.C. Chen and James Merritt arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (e) PlanD had no objection to the application for reasons given in paragraphs 10.1 to 10.6 of the Paper. Part of the Site was required for the Shatin to Central Link (SCL) project and hence its potential for an open space development was severely constrained. The compensatory open space (about 6,080m²) was considered acceptable, and could be implemented for the public enjoyment. The overall future open space provision in Yau Tsim Mong district could still meet its demand in accordance with the HKPSG. The requirements for submission of tree felling and preservation proposal could be incorporated in the future lease conditions and be addressed at the detailed design stage. The visual impact of the proposed development could be addressed by stipulating building height restrictions for “G/IC” zone. EPD did not raise objection to the proposed mitigation measures.

7. The Chairperson then invited the applicant’s representatives to elaborate on their justifications for the application.

8. Mr. Kenneth To said that the Site was the subject of 2 previous rezoning applications. Both were subsequently withdrawn, to allow time for preparation of a revised scheme, having regard to departmental and public comments and the requirements of the SCL project.

9. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Professor Poon Chung-kwong made the following main points :

Need for the development

- (a) the proposed development was mainly to cater for the change from three to four-year undergraduate academic structure, a Government policy announced in 2004. Under the new academic structure, the number of students would be increased by one-third and the required additional facilities could not be provided within the existing main campus;

- (b) the Site was proposed for Phase 8 development of the HKPU. It was considered most suitable for the purposes due to its close proximity to the main campus which could provide essential core facilities such as library, language laboratory and administrative offices, and there was no other suitable and available land which was in close proximity to the main campus;
- (c) it would take about five year from application for Government funding support to the completion of development. In order to ensure timely provision of the required additional facilities to cope with the implementation of the new four-year programme by 2012, the site selection for Phase 8 development had to be finalized by June 2007, which was a prerequisite for applying Government funding;
- (d) the HKPU submitted the first rezoning application in January 2006 and had revised the scheme three times over the past year to address the concerns and needs of relevant parties and Government departments. In view of tight time schedule, support from the Committee for the subject s.12A application was of utmost importance for the HKPU to proceed with application for Government funding;
- (e) the Phase 8 development of the HKPU would enhance the development of Hong Kong as a education hub;

Tree preservation

- (f) the HKPU would strive to preserve as far as possible the existing trees within the Site. Striking a balance between tree preservation and need for new educational facilities, some of the trees would have to be felled or transplanted. The loss of existing trees could be compensated by planting of new trees; and

Early provision of open space

- (g) the Site had been left vacant for ten years. If the proposed development was supported, part of the Site would be developed as open space for early enjoyment by the public.

10. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Kenneth To made the following points :

The site and its surrounding

- (a) the Site, previously used as a livestock transfer station and later as a temporary construction site by Kowloon Canton Railway Corporation (KCRC), had been left vacant;
- (b) it occupied an isolated location with poor accessibility and was surrounded by major roads;

The proposed development

- (c) the HKPU submitted the first s.12A application in January 2006 to rezone the Site for the proposed development with a total net floor area (NFA) of 40,000m² and a building height ranging from 4 to 18 storeys. The application was subsequently withdrawn following the discussions with the Incorporated Owners of Wylie Court which raised objection against the application. Taking into account the owners' concern on visual impact, the development scheme was revised with the total NFA reduced to 20,000m² and the building height to 3 to 12 storeys, as contained in the second s.12A application submitted in June 2006. The second application was later withdrawn and the development scheme was further revised to take account of the requirements for the SCL project;
- (d) under the current scheme, an area of 30m wide and 10m high headroom had been reserved for possible future incorporation of the SCL project's railway related facilities. The proposed total NFA was changed to

25,600m² with a building height ranging from 5 to 13 storeys (or from 30 to 60mPD);

Visual impact

- (e) a varied building height profile was proposed with lower building block nearer the Wylie Court to minimize visual impact. By adopting a careful building layout and façade design as well as a varied building height profile, the proposed development would not create significant visual impact on the surrounding developments;

Tree preservation

- (f) every effort had been made to preserve as far as possible the existing trees in or around the Site. However, two *Ficus microcarpa* needed to be transplanted because they, being located in the middle of the Site, would severely compromise the disposition of the new building block. It was therefore recommended that these two trees be transplanted to a peripheral location;

Provision of open space

- (g) in order to address the LCSD's concern, the HKPU would allow free public access to the open space (about 6,080m²) in the proposed development. In this way, the provision of the public open space would be expedited;

The proposed underpass

- (h) in order to meet the Transport Department's (TD) requirements, no vehicles and pedestrians would be allowed to access the Site via the access road at Chatham Road South, which only served as an emergency vehicle access for the nearby Electricity Sub-station. Instead, all vehicles and pedestrians accessing the proposed development would be made via the main campus and the proposed underpass running underneath Chatham

Road South. The arrangements were detailed in the letter of 12.4.2007 tabled at this meeting; and

- (i) the proposed scheme presented a win-win situation which benefited the public and all concerned parties.

11. Members raised the following questions and concerns :

Need for the development

- (a) the utilization rate of the existing classrooms in the HKPU;
- (b) the number of students to be accommodated in the Phase 8 development;
- (c) whether there would be further extension of the HKPU and noting that the Site was the last piece of land in the vicinity that could be considered for the purpose, where would the future expansion be accommodated;

Accessibility

- (d) poor accessibility of the proposed open space to the public especially the residents in Wylie Court;
- (e) apart from the proposed underpass, whether any alternative access to the Site would be provided;

Development option

- (f) noting that the Site was zoned "O" on the OZP, whether it was feasible to relocate the existing football pitches in the main campus to the Site, and the area so released could be used for developing the new academic facilities;

Reserve for SCL project

- (g) whether any superstructure was proposed within the reserved area of the SCL project;
- (h) whether KCRC had been consulted on the current scheme regarding its integration with the SCL project; and

Tree preservation

- (i) the possibility of preservation in-situ of the two Banyan trees (*Ficus microcarpa*), namely T25 and T44 as shown in drawing Z-19 of the Paper.

12. In reply, Professor Poon Chung-kwong, Mr. Kenneth To, Mr. Chan Shu-keung and Mr. Daniel Suen made the following points :

Need for the development

- (a) under the new four-year undergraduate programme, the number of students would be increased by about 3000;
- (b) the classrooms would serve not only both the day-time and part-time programmes and the existing facilities had the highest utilization rate among the universities in Hong Kong;
- (c) there would be further extension of the HKPU. Site search was underway for the provision of additional student hostel;

Accessibility

- (d) notwithstanding the Site was reserved for public open space on the OZP, it was surrounded by major roads with poor accessibility. The proposed scheme would allow public access to the public open space via the main campus of the HKPU. The proposed underpass was a two-lane

carriageway with pavements for use by both vehicles and pedestrians. Students in the main campus accessing the proposed development could be made via the underpass within a few minutes walk. The subway located to the north of the Site would also serve as an alternative access to the Site;

Development option

- (e) it would not be technically feasible to relocate the existing football pitches to the Site taking into account the constraints imposed by the SCL project;

Reserve for SCL project

- (f) three meetings had been held with the KCRC and the Railway Development Office, Highways Department (RDO, HyD) and the current scheme was acceptable to them; and

Tree preservation

- (g) it would be technically feasible to revise the current scheme to preserve the two Banyan trees if the building height restrictions could be relaxed. It might however have adverse visual impact on Wylie Court.

13. Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan, DPO/TWK made the following responses :

- (a) the development programme and alignment of the SCL project were yet to be finalized;
- (b) during the publications of the application for public comment, the KCRC had no objection to the application on the understanding that sufficient space would be reserved for the SCL project, the specific requirements of the SCL project would be catered for, and the access road via the Site would be maintained at all times for railway operation, maintenance and emergency use; and

- (c) the Secretary for Environment, Transport and Works (SETW) and RDO, HyD had no objection to the application.

14. While raising no objection to the proposed underpass underneath the Chatham Road South, Mr. Anthony Loo was concerned about the adverse traffic impact generated during the construction of the proposed underpass. In reply, Mr. Daniel Suen said that as advised by their geotechnical consultant, the proposed underpass would be constructed by using jet-tunnelling method which would not cause significant traffic impact during the construction stage to the Chatham Road South.

15. Members noted that a physical model submitted by the applicant was displayed at the meeting.

16. As the applicant's representatives had no further comment to make and Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson informed them that the hearing procedures for the application had been completed and the Committee would further deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the applicant's representatives as well as PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

17. Members generally raised no in-principle objection to releasing the "O" zone for the development of an educational institution by the HKPU. They were however concerned about the following aspects :

- (a) the capacity of the proposed underpass for shared use by vehicles and students to the Site;
- (b) the accessibility of the proposed open space for public enjoyment;
- (c) the integration of the proposed development and the SCL project;
- (d) more development options should be explored such as developing the new

academic facilities in the existing football pitches in the main campus by relocating the sport facilities to the Site; and

- (e) the two Banyan trees should be preserved as far as possible.

18. In response to a Member's suggestion of swapping the existing football pitches in the main campus with the proposed development, Mr. Elvis W.K. Au said that the applicant should ensure that the provision of active open space at the Site could comply with the air quality requirement set out in paragraph 3 of Chapter 9 of the HKPSG.

19. Members considered that the development scheme should be revised to address concerns raised at this meeting and the revised scheme should be submitted for consideration by the Committee. The Chairperson said that under the "G/IC" zoning, there was no requirement for the applicant to re-submit the revised development scheme to the Committee. The Site could however be rezoned to a subzone of "G/IC" with stipulation requiring the applicant to submit the development scheme to the Committee for approval.

20. A Member asked whether the proposed rezoning would affect the timing for the applicant to seek funding support from the Government. In reply, Mr. James Merritt said that if the Site was rezoned as proposed, the applicant could apply to the Education and Manpower Bureau (EMB) for funding support. With the policy support from the EMB, the Lands Department would proceed with the land grant which would take about one year.

21. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree to rezone the application site to a subzone of the "Government, Institution or Community" zone and the applicant would be required to submit the development scheme to the Committee for approval under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance.

[Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau and Mr. Walter K.L. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

[Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim arrived while Mr. K.Y. Leung returned to join the meeting at this point.]

22. The Chairperson noted that as the meeting was behind schedule and the applicant's representatives of application No. Y/H8/4 had already arrived, the meeting should

proceed to consider Agenda Item 7 first. The Committee agreed.

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 7

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (i) Y/H8/4 Application for Amendment to the
North Point Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H8/19,
Oxford Court,
24-26 Braemar Hill Road, North Point
(Inland Lot 8356)
(MPC Paper No. Y/H8/4)
-

Presentation and Question Sessions

23. Ms. Alice K.F. Mak, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), and the following applicant's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point :

Mr. C.K. Chan

Mr. Daniel Fung

Mr. Kim Chin

Mr. Au Kwok-shing

Miss Jenny Yeung

24. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the hearing. The Chairperson then invited Ms. Alice K.F. Mak, STP/HK, to brief Members on the background to the application.

25. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms. Alice K.F. Mak presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) the application was to amend the Notes of “Residential (Group B)2” (“R(B)2”) zone on the North Point Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) to allow for an increase of the maximum plot ratio to 5, upon obtaining permission of the Town Planning Board, provided that the traffic impact from the proposed development on the local roads would be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the applicant had submitted an indicative scheme of a 20-storey residential building with a plot ratio (PR) of 5 and gross floor area (GFA) of 13,005m². In order to address the traffic problem, the applicant had conducted a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA). The TIA proposed a gyratory road network in which a new road was proposed along a drainage reserve connecting Braemar Hill Road (BHR) to Cloud View Road (CVR). The TIA concluded that the redevelopment of Oxford Court would have no adverse traffic impact on the local road network. The proposed new road fell within an area shown as “Major Drainage Reserve and Footway” on the OZP, and it was currently used as a temporary open parking area (storage) of motor buses;
- (c) the history of the “R(B)2” zoning of the application site as detailed in paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 of the Paper;
- (d) the Transport Department (TD) considered the TIA unacceptable for the reasons given in paragraph 8.1.1 of the Paper. There was insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed increase in PR to 5 would not result in adverse traffic impact on the local roads, and that the proposed new road was acceptable in terms of its alignment, width, junction location/sight line and the number of trees to be affected. The Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) commented that tree felling was proposed in the new road proposal but the applicant had not submitted a detailed tree survey report and compensatory tree planting proposal. The Drainage Services Department (DSD) commented that the applicant was required to carry out a Sewerage Impact Assessment. The

Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) considered that the building in the indicative scheme looked quite massive and visually intrusive;

- (e) 26 public comments were received during the statutory publication period, of which 11 supported, 4 objected and 11 gave comments on the application. Those in support were mainly the residents of Oxford Court while those who objected were residents and management offices of the nearby buildings. The objections were mainly raised on grounds of adverse traffic, noise and air quality impacts. One objector specifically requested the Government to adopt a planning review and TIA of the Braemar Hill area; and
- (f) PlanD did not support the application for the reasons given in paragraph 10.1 of the Paper.

26. The Chairperson then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on their justifications for the application.

27. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. C.K. Chan made the following main points :

- (a) the applicant did not intend to apply for an immediate increase in PR. Under the proposed two-tier system, the PR would be increased to 5 only if the traffic impact from the proposed development on the local roads could be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Town Planning Board at the s.16 application stage;
- (b) Oxford Court, being a 31-year old building, suffered from defects like water leakage on external walls and sewage overflow. The lower 3 storeys were below street level, with poor natural lighting and ventilation. The building conditions and design were sub-standard and did not commensurate with the character of the area. Redevelopment was the only solution;

- (c) the application site was originally zoned “R(B)”. The site could be developed up to a maximum PR of 5 before it was down-zoned to “R(B)2” in August 2001. Under the current “R(B)2” zone with a maximum GFA of 9,775m² (i.e. about a PR of 3.76) there was no incentive for redevelopment;
- (d) the traffic congestion at the junction of CVR and BHR especially during peak hours was severe, causing some 750m long vehicle queue along CVR;

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

- (e) TD’s concerns on the traffic impact and arrangement were addressed in the TIA. The proposed new road in the gyratory system was one of the feasible options to resolve the traffic congestion at the junction of CVR and BHR;
- (f) the proposal would present a win-win situation to resolve the severe traffic problem and to facilitate redevelopment of Oxford Court;
- (g) the short-term waiver covering the existing parking area could be terminated to make way for the proposed new road; and
- (h) the cumulative effect of the proposed development was considered insignificant as the opportunity for redeveloping the nearby Braemar Hill Mansion (zoned “R(B)1”) and Braemar Heights (zoned “R(B)3”) was slim. The two sites fell within density zone 3 in which only a PR of 3 was permitted in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG).

28. Mr. Au Kwok-shing made the following points :

- (a) although \$8 million had been spent in renovating the existing building in the past two years, there were still water leakage and drainage problems which could only be resolved by redevelopment; and

- (b) there was severe traffic congestion at road junctions of the area during peak hours. The proposal presented an option to resolve the severe traffic problem.

29. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Kim Chin made the following main points :

The proposed new road

- (a) a new road was proposed to resolve the traffic congestion problem at the junction of CVR and BHR. The ratio-of-flow to capacity (RFC) at morning and evening peak hours were 1.125 and 0.594 respectively. As RFC of 0.85 or above was not considered desirable, the findings concluded that this junction was very congested at the morning peak hours. One of nearby schools had changed the school opening hour from 8:00 to 8:30 a.m. because of the traffic congestion;

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

- (b) the causes of traffic congestion were mainly due to limited sightline along CVR, and on-street bus stopping and school bus drop-off, resulting in a vehicle queue of more than 300m at CVR, and more than 180m and 150m at southern and northern sides of BHR respectively. Students of the nearby schools and local residents were affected by the traffic congestion;
- (c) two methods had been considered to improve the road junction, including signalling or widening the junction. After investigation, it was found that both methods could not resolve the traffic problem and a new road was proposed;

Benefits of the proposed new road

- (d) the new road was proposed to be built on the drainage reserve currently

used as a temporary coach park. With the proposed new road, a gyratory road system with three 1-way streets with 2 lanes would be introduced. The junction of CVR and BHR would have free flow movement, and the 2 lanes at CVR and BHR could allow on-street bus/coach stopping. The footpath could also be widened. As a result, the traffic gridlock at junction could be resolved;

Responses to TD's comments

- (e) the additional traffic generated by the proposed development was only 5-6 passenger car units/hour (pcu/hr) 2-way. It meant that one car would leave or enter the application site for every 10 minutes during peak hours and the additional traffic was thus minimal. The junctions which were not assessed were located 0.6 to 1.3 km from the application site;
- (f) a traffic survey was conducted, which showed that the peak hours ranged from 7:15 to 8:15 a.m. and 17:15 to 18:15 p.m. The school evening peak was less than the road network peak. Hence, road network evening peak was used for the analysis;
- (g) noting TD's comment that the RFC of the assessed junctions was not in line with TD's records, a traffic survey was re-conducted on 8.3.2007 and a video recording of the survey was given to TD. The survey and the TIA report had come to the same conclusion;
- (h) the trip rate was calculated based on the existing development with similar flat sizes of 127m² and a ratio of 1.55 to 0.88 car parking spaces/unit. Hence, the trip rate adopted in the TIA was considered representative. A survey was also conducted at Sky Horizon at 35 CVR with an average flat size of 127.5m² and 1.0 car parking space/unit. The additional traffic generated by the proposed development would only increase by 9 pcu/hr. The difference between the trip rates generated at the existing development and Sky Horizon was minimal;

- (i) in response to TD's comment that the alignment and width of the proposed road and the footpath at both sides of the carriageway were not clear, a drawing was submitted showing a road width of 3.5m with a 3.3m hard shoulder. The footpath would not be provided because the proposed new road was constructed as an elevated structure;
- (j) the design of the junction of CVR and BHR and the run-in/out of Braemar Hill Mansion complied with the Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM). The run-in/out was one of the two access points to Braemar Hill Mansion which was the secondary access and carried some 30% and 55% of the morning and evening peak traffic respectively;

[Mr. Elvis W.K. Au left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (k) the two proposed traffic islands were larger than that of the existing islands;
- (l) under the proposed gyratory system, free flow movement was allowed and one 'Give Way' sign was proposed at the BHR for vehicles to right turn into the new road. A sightline of 120m was allowed which was more than the standard requirement of 70m;
- (m) if TD considered that the proposed new road at BHR was too close to the existing bus stop, the two existing bus stops could be relocated southward away from the proposed new road; and

The conclusion

- (n) the proposed development would generate negligible traffic flows. The proposed new road was a solution to solve traffic congestion problem at the junction of CVR and BHR, and was acceptable from traffic engineering point of view.

30. Members raised the following questions :

- (a) referring to Plan Z-2 of the Paper, clarification was sought on whether the level marked '138.0' was the proposed level for the new road;

[Mr. Elvis W.K. Au returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (b) whether the proposed road improvement could cater for the cumulative traffic impact generated by the redevelopment of other residential sites;
- (c) clarification was sought on the decrease in provision of car parking spaces;
- (d) whether the traffic impact arising from an increase in number of flats and a decrease in provision of car parking spaces had been taken into account in the TIA; and
- (e) whether alternative proposal had been considered to resolve the possible traffic impact arising from the proposed redevelopment.

31. In reply, Messrs. C.K. Chan, Kim Chin and Au Kwok-shing and Miss Jenny Yeung made the following points :

- (a) under the two-tier system, the increase in PR of the proposed development could only be allowed if the applicant could demonstrate at the s.16 application stage that such increase in PR would not have adverse impact on the surrounding area. Likewise, the redevelopment of the two nearby residential sites would need to satisfy the same requirements;
- (b) the nearby 50-storey high Shue Yan University Residential and Amenities Complex had caused adverse visual impact to the surrounding developments;
- (c) the number of car parking spaces was calculated in accordance with the requirement in the HKPSG. The decrease in the provision of car parking spaces for the proposed development with a higher PR was due to a change in the parking standard for different flat sizes as set out in the HKPSG;

- (d) the trip rate was calculated on the basis of all types of vehicles including taxis which left and entered the development; and
- (e) noise impact might be generated during the construction phase. Nevertheless, the proposal could improve the traffic conditions of the area in the long-run.

32. Ms. Alice K.F. Mak said that the level marked '138.0' as shown in Plan Z-2 of the Paper was the existing level, not the proposed level of the new road.

33. Mr. Anthony Loo commented that the traffic flow should be related to the number of flats instead of the number of car parking spaces. The traffic flow would be increased should there be an increase in the total number of flats from 76 to 102. Mr. C.K. Chan said that according to the TIA, the estimated additional traffic generated of 9 pcu/hr 2-way was considered insignificant, and could be addressed by the proposed road improvement measures. Mr. Kim Chin added that the trip rate generated by the residents taking taxis had already been taken into account in the TIA. Reference had also been made to the TD's published document DR 439 and the difference in the trip rates was minimal.

34. As the applicant's representatives had no further comment to make and Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson informed them that the hearing procedures for the application had been completed and the Committee would further deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the applicant's representatives as well as PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

35. The Secretary pointed out that there was no 'down-zoning' of the application site as claimed by the applicant's representatives. The application site was originally zoned "R(B)" on the OZP with no PR restriction. In 2001, the site was rezoned to "R(B)2" with a maximum gross floor area restriction of 9,775m² to reflect the development intensity permitted under the lease conditions, and a maximum building height restriction of 20 storeys

to allow some design flexibility upon future development.

36. A Member opined that the two-tier approach proposed by the applicant was not acceptable as it amounted to a delaying tactic to resolving the traffic problem of the proposed development.

37. Another Member considered that the applicant had not provided sufficient information to demonstrate that the cumulative effect of approving the current application would not generate adverse traffic and visual impacts on the surrounding area and jeopardise the well-established medium-density residential environment.

38. Mr. Anthony Loo maintained the view that the TIA was considered unacceptable despite some of TD's comments had been addressed.

39. Some Members considered that the proposed gyratory system appeared to be an idea for the District Council to consider and the relevant authorities to explore. Such idea was not a sufficient justification for an increase of development intensity.

40. After deliberation, the Committee decided not to agree to the application for amendment to the Outline Zoning Plan and the reasons were :

- (a) the applicant had not provided sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed increase in plot ratio to 5 would not result in adverse traffic impact on the local roads;
- (b) the applicant had not provided sufficient information to demonstrate that there would not be adverse visual impact on the surrounding area and it would not affect the well-established medium-density local character;
- (c) the applicant had not provided sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed new road was acceptable in terms of its alignment, width, junction location/sight line and the number of trees to be affected; and
- (d) the approval of the rezoning application would set an undesirable precedent

for similar applications from other “Residential (Group B)” sub-areas. The applicant had not provided sufficient information to demonstrate that the cumulative effect of approving the current application would not generate adverse traffic and visual impacts on the surrounding area and jeopardise the well-established medium-density residential environment.

[Dr. Daniel B.M. To and Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen left the meeting at this point.]

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

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

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Proposed Amendments to the

Draft South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K20/18

(MPC Paper No. 6/07)

Presentation and Question Sessions

41. Mr. Louis K.H. Kau, STP/TWK, presented the proposed amendments to the draft South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) rezoning a strip of land at Yen Ming Road from “Industrial” to “Government, Institution or community” and an area shown as ‘Road’ mainly to reflect the existing uses;
- (b) rezoning a site at the junction of Hoi Fai Road and Sham Mong Road from

“Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) to “Residential (Group A)10” (“R(A)10”) and an area shown as ‘Road’ to reflect the existing use and to tally with the boundaries of the lot under the lease;

- (c) revising the Remarks of the Notes for the "R(A)" zone to incorporate the new "R(A)10" sub-zone with development restrictions of a maximum domestic and non-domestic Gross Floor Area of 103,152 m² and 1,300m² respectively; and
- (d) revising the Remarks of the Notes for “CDA” zone by deleting the CDA at Airport Railway Olympic Station.

42. Members had no question on the proposed amendments.

Deliberation Session

43. The Chairperson said that when considering the Review of Sites Designated “Comprehensive Development Area” on Statutory Plans in the Metro Areas for the Year 2006/2007, the Committee had already agreed to rezone the Hoi Fai Road from “CDA” to “R(A)”.

44. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree that the proposed amendments to the draft South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) as mentioned in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Paper and that the amendment plan No. S/K20/18A (to be renumbered as S/K20/19 upon exhibition) at Annex A of the Paper and its revised Notes at Annex C of the Paper were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) at Annex D of the Paper as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (TPB) for the various land use zonings of the draft South West Kowloon OZP and the updated ES would be published together with

the Plan under the name of the TPB.

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K20/98 Proposed Minor Relaxation of
Maximum Non-domestic Gross Floor Area Restriction
for Permitted Ancillary Storage Use
in “Residential (Group A)9” zone,
Hoi Lai Estate, West Kowloon Reclamation
(MPC Paper No. A/K20/98)

45. The application was submitted by the Housing Department on behalf of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests on this application :

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng | - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee of the HKHA |
| Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong | - having current business dealings with the Housing Department |
| Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim | - having current business dealings with the Housing Department |
| Mr. James Merritt | - being an assistant to the Director of Lands who was a member of the HKHA |
| Ms. Margaret Hsia | - being an assistant to the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidized Housing Committee of the HKHA |

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong - being a member of the HKHA

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan - being a former member of the HKHA

46. As both the Chairperson and the Vice-chairman had declared interests on this item, the Chairperson should stay and continue to chair the meeting out of necessity. Members agreed.

47. Members noted that Ms. Margaret Hsia had sent her apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, while Mr. Walter K.L. Chan had already left the meeting.

[Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong, Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim, Messrs. James Merritt and Stanley Y.F. Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

48. Mr. Louis K.H. Kau, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed minor relaxation of the maximum non-domestic gross floor area restriction for ancillary storage use;
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection was received from the District Officer; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for reasons given in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper.

49. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

50. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the condition that the provision of fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB. The permission should be valid until 13.4.2011, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed.

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

[Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong, Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim, Messrs. James Merritt and Stanley Y.F. Wong returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

[Mr. Eric C.K. Yue, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), and Miss Annie K.W. To, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K11/178 Shop and Services
 in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone,
 Workspace A (Portion),
 G/F, Lee King Industrial Building,
 12 Ng Fong Street, San Po Kong
 (MPC Paper No. A/K11/178)

Presentation and Question Sessions

51. Miss Annie K.W. To, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) shop and services use;
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period. The District Officer/Wong Tai Sin advised that some local shop owners had expressed concern on intensification of competition among the existing retailers; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for reasons given in paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 of the Paper.

52. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

53. The Chairperson noted that similar planning approvals for shop and services were previously granted by the Committee and there had been no change in planning circumstances since approval of these applications.

54. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the submission and implementation of fire safety measures, including the

provision of a means of escape and fire service installations in the subject premises, within six months from the date of the approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 13.10.2007; and

- (b) if the above planning condition was not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the same date be revoked without further notice.

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

- (a) appoint an Authorized Person to submit Alteration & Addition Plan to demonstrate compliance with the Buildings Ordinance, in particular, the application premises should be separated from the remaining premises by walls of minimum 2 hours fire resisting period in accordance with Building (Construction) Regulation 90;
- (b) consult Food and Environmental Hygiene Department regarding food licence under Food Business Regulation; and
- (c) note that no vehicular access from public road to the application premises would be allowed.

[The Chairperson thanked Mr. Eric C.K. Yue, DPO/K, and Miss Annie K.W. To, STP/K, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Mr. Yue and Miss To left the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 7

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (ii) Y/H4/1A Application for Amendment to the Approved Central District Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H4/12, Proposed replacement of “Bank”, “Fast Food Shop”, “Retail Shop”, “Service Trades” and “Showroom (excluding Motor-vehicle Showroom)” with “Shops and Services (excluding Motor-vehicle Showroom)” under Column 2 of the Notes of the “Other Specified Uses (Pier)” zone, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pier”, Level 2, Central Pier 3
(MPC Paper No. Y/H4/1A)
-

56. The application was submitted by a subsidiary of HKR Properties Ltd. (HKR). Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with the HKR. As the applicant had requested for a deferment of consideration of the application, Dr. Wong could be allowed to stay at the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

57. The Committee noted that on 2.2.2007, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information. The applicant had written to the Secretary of the Town Planning Board on 2.4.2007 and 4.4.2007, requesting further deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time to resolve Buildings Department’s comments.

Deliberation Session

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

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Applications

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (i) A/HK/4 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary
'Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle)' Use
under Application No. A/HK/2 for a Period of 3 Years
from 17.4.2007 up to 16.4.2010 in "Residential (Group A)"
and "Government, Institution or Community" zones,
Car Park, Sai Wan Estate, Kennedy Town;
Wah Fu (I) Estate; Wah Fu (II) Estate;
Wong Chuk Hang Estate; Yue Fai Court, Aberdeen;
and Lung Tak Court, Stanley
(MPC Paper No. A/HK/4)
-

59. The application was submitted by the Housing Department on behalf of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests on this application :

Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng - being a member of the Strategic Planning
Committee of the HKHA

- Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong - having current business dealings with the Housing Department
- Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim - having current business dealings with the Housing Department
- Mr. James Merritt - being an assistant to the Director of Lands who was a member of the HKHA
- Ms. Margaret Hsia - being an assistant to the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidized Housing Committee of the HKHA
- Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong - being a member of the HKHA
- Mr. Walter K.L. Chan - being a former member of the HKHA

60. As both the Chairperson and the Vice-chairman had declared interests on this item, the Chairperson should stay and continue to chair the meeting out of necessity. Members agreed.

61. Members noted that Ms. Margaret Hsia had sent her apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, while Mr. Walter K.L. Chan had already left the meeting.

[Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong and Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong left the meeting, while Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim and Mr. James Merritt left the meeting temporarily, at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

62. Mr. David C.M. Lam, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application, highlighting that the car parks in the four public housing estates and two Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) developments in the Western and Southern Districts, together with the car parks of the other six public housing estates/HOS courts, were the subject of a previous planning application No. A/HK/2 for public vehicle park, which was approved by the Committee on 16.4.2004 on a temporary basis for 3 years until 16.4.2007. The applicant proposed to let the surplus car parking spaces in the six housing developments to non-residents;
- (b) the subject application was for renewal of planning approval for temporary 'public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle)' use under Application No. A/HK/2 for a period of 3 years from 17.4.2007 up to 16.4.2010;
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) four public comment was received during the statutory publication period, raising objection on the ground of possible adverse security and traffic implications, noise nuisance and conversion of the vacant parking spaces to non-parking uses; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for reasons given in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper. The application was to continue the change of the ancillary car parks in the six housing developments to public vehicle parks. There was no material change in planning circumstances or change in the land use of the surrounding areas since the granting of previous temporary approval. In order to ensure that there would be sufficient parking spaces to meet the parking need of the residents, it was suggested that approval condition be imposed, requiring the applicant to seek the Transport Department's agreement on the actual number of parking spaces to be let to non-residents. Regarding the public concerns, as pointed out by the applicant, letting the vacant car parking spaces to non-residents was already the current

arrangement and no complaint from the application estates/courts had been received in the past year.

63. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

64. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 17.4.2007 to 16.4.2010, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the condition that the proposed number of car parking spaces should be let to non-residents to be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.

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

- (a) note that a temporary approval period of 3 years was granted so that the vacant car parking spaces could be let to non-residents flexibly while the parking demand of the residents could be further reviewed;
- (b) explain the proposal to the residents of the public housing estates and Home Ownership Scheme developments concerned and to liaise with the mutual aid committees/owners' corporation of the affected housing developments regarding the management and security aspects in letting the vacant parking spaces to non-residents;
- (c) note that in letting the vacant parking spaces, priority should be given to residents of the public housing estates and Home Ownership Scheme developments concerned;
- (d) note the comments of the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban of Transport Department that letting of the parking spaces to non-residents should be on short-term basis;
- (e) apply to the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West & South of Lands

Department for temporary waiver/lease modification to permit the proposed uses at Wah Fu (II) Estate, Lung Tak Court and Yue Fai Court; and

- (f) resolve any land issue relating to the development with other concerned owners of Yue Fai Court and Lung Tak Court.

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

[Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim and Mr. James Merritt returned to join the meeting at this point.]

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (ii) A/H3/377 Proposed Office, Shop and Services and Eating Place
in "Residential (Group A)" zone,
20-26 Staunton Street, Central
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/377)
-

66. The application was submitted by a subsidiary of Sino Land Co. Ltd. (Sino). Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with the Sino. As the applicant had requested for a deferment of consideration of the application, Dr. Wong could be allowed to stay at the meeting. The Committee noted that Dr. Wong had already left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

67. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested on 4.4.2007 for deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time to obtain traffic related information to address the Transport Department's comments.

Deliberation Session

68. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application

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

Agenda Item 9

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/H24/3 Application for Amendment to the
Approved Central Outline Zoning Plan S/H24/6,
by adding a statement “On-site preservation of the Queen’s Pier
located at the north of the City Hall” to paragraph (8)
of the covering Notes and the Remarks in the Notes for “Open Space”
and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Elevated Walkway” zones; and
by adding a statement “On-site preservation of the Queen’s Pier
located at the north of the City Hall”
and “Government, Institution or Community (1)” (G/IC(1))”
to the Remarks in the Notes for “G/IC” zone,
Queen’s Pier, Central
(MPC Paper No. Y/H24/3)

Presentation and Question Sessions

69. The Secretary reported that in the Paper issued to Members on 10.4.2007, the Planning Department (PlanD) recommended that the consideration of the application be deferred pending the outcome of the Government’s discussions with the Legislative Council and its decision on the arrangements for the Queen’s Pier. After issuing the Paper, the applicant submitted a letter dated 12.4.2007 to the Committee, which was tabled at the meeting, requesting a deferment of consideration of the application until the Government had a more detailed proposal on the on-site preservation of the Pier.

Deliberation Session

70. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the PlanD and the applicant until the Government had a more detailed proposal on the on-site preservation of the Queen's Pier.

Agenda Item 10

Any Other Business

71. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:25 p.m..