

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 354th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 27.7.2007**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng

Chairperson

Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Dr. Daniel B.M. To

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Mr. K.Y. Leung

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

Principle Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mrs. Shirley Lee

Assistant Director (Kowloon), Lands Department

Mr. James Merritt

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen

Professor N.K. Leung

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

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  
Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr. K.W. Ng

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 353rd MPC Meeting held on 13.7.2007

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 353rd MPC meeting held on 13.7.2007 were confirmed subject to an amendment proposed by the Environmental Protection Department to rephrase the last sentence in paragraph 35 under Application No. A/K15/80 to read “The application therefore might have implications in the wider perspective of the planning intention and overall planning of the area”.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

Section 12A Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

- (i) Y/K18/2 Application for Amendment to the Approved Kowloon Tong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K18/13 from “Government, Institution or Community (4)” zone to “Government, Institution or Community (10)” zone for Redevelopment of an Existing Church Building, Swatow Christian Church of Kowloon City, 39 Grampian Road, Kowloon Tong  
(MPC Paper No. Y/K18/2)
- 

3. The Secretary reported that Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim had declared an

interest in this item as he had current business dealings with AGC Design Ltd., one of the consultants of the applicant. The Committee noted that Professor Lim had tendered apologies for not attending the meeting.

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

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

4. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) was invited to the meeting at this point :

Mr. Eric C.K. Yue - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)  
Mr. C.C. Lau - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)

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

Ms. Betty S.F. Ho  
Mr. Vincent W.S. Ng  
Rev. Timothy Lam  
Mr. Caleb Woo  
Mr. Daniel C.Y. Ng  
Mr. Benjamin Hsu  
Mr. Away T.W. Ng  
Mr. Aubrey L.H. Au  
Mr. Peter K.C. Kwok  
Mr. Terence T.H. Kong

6. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the hearing. The Chairperson then invited Mr. C.C Lau, STP/K, to brief Members on the background to the application.

[Messrs. Nelson W.Y. Chan and Felix W. Fong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

7. Mr. C.C. Lau, STP/K, presented the application as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points :

- (a) the applicant proposed to rezone the application site from “Government, Institution or Community (4)” (“G/IC(4)”) to “G/IC(10)” on the Kowloon Tong Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K18/13 to relax the building height restriction from 5 storeys (excluding basement floor(s)) to 9 storeys for the redevelopment of an existing church building;
- (b) on 24.2.2006, the draft Kowloon Tong OZP No. S/K18/12 was gazetted to incorporate building height restrictions for various land use zones, including the “G/IC” zone. The restrictions for the “G/IC” zone were primarily to reflect the building heights of existing Government, institution or community (GIC) developments. During the plan exhibition period, no representation in relation to the “G/IC(4)” zone covering the application site was received;
- (c) according to the applicant’s indicative scheme in support of the application, the new church building would have a plot ratio (PR) of 6.4, and a building height of 9 storeys or 50.05mPD. The building would set back 6m from Grampian Road. A total of 5 car parking spaces would be provided;
- (d) on 23.5.2007, the Building Authority approved a set of building plans for a 5-storey church building on the application site. The PR for that scheme was 3.39 and the building height was up to 50.67mPD;
- (e) the applicant’s justifications for the applicant were summarized in paragraph 2 of the Paper;
- (f) the comments from concerned Government departments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The District Lands Officer/Kowloon East of the Lands Department (DLO/KE, LandsD) pointed out that the height

restriction of 119ft under the lease was for any building used solely for the purpose of a church with offices for a preacher and church staff. Since the proposed 9-storey development was not solely for the purpose of a church, it would be in breach of a 35ft height restriction under the lease, and lease modification would be required for the proposed development. The Chief Architect/Advisory and Statutory Compliance of the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) commented that the applicant should explore the possibility of further setting back the upper floors so that the building would look visually less bulky in side view. Besides, the number of activity rooms appeared to be excessive. The building height might be reduced if the number of these rooms could be reduced. Other departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

- (g) the Incorporated Owners of 2 adjoining residential buildings and a local resident submitted comments during the statutory publication period. All of them objected to the application for the reasons of possible adverse impacts of the new church building on air ventilation, natural lighting, existing views and reception of television signal; possible wall effect due to short distance between the new church building and the adjoining buildings; noise and traffic problems caused by the church activities; and precedent effect on similar applications in the area; and
  
- (h) the PlanD had reservation on the application for the reasons as detailed in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper. The application site was within a low-rise residential development area with Kowloon Tsai Park to the west. All “G/IC” and “Residential (Group C)” “R(C)” zones within the subject street block are restricted to not more than 8 storeys under the Kowloon Tong OZP. Compared with the existing church building and the building plans approved by the Building Authority, the PR of the indicative scheme in the subject application had significantly increased. ArchSD commented that there would be room to reduce the height and bulk of the proposed development. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications, the cumulative effects of which would

have adverse impacts on the existing townscape, character and visual quality of the area. Nevertheless, to strike a balance between the provision of additional floor space for church and community facilities and keeping the proposed building compatible with 8 storey building height restriction for the adjacent “R(C)9” and “G/IC(6)” zones, the Committee could consider imposing a maximum building height of 8 storeys and 50.05mPD on the application site. To keep the building less bulky, the Committee could also consider incorporating a maximum PR restriction of 5.

8. The Chairperson then invited the applicant’s representatives to present their case. Ms. Betty S.F. Ho made the following main points :

- (a) The existing church building on the application site, built in 1952, was not in good condition. The 5-storey building height restriction on the Kowloon Tong OZP only reflected the height of the existing building;
- (b) in the vicinity of the application site were mainly residential and institutional developments. Some of them were taller than the proposed church, including the Pooi To Middle School at Inverness Road under redevelopment (8 storeys/55.45mPD), and the existing residential developments at 31 Grampian Road (11 storeys/57.9mPD), 148 Nga Tsin Wai Road (17 storeys/82mPD), and 51 Nga Tsin Wai Road (30 storeys/122.15mPD);
- (c) the sites on the other side of Grampian Road were mainly zoned “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) and “G/IC” under the Ma Tau Kok OZP, under which there was no building height restriction for these 2 zones;
- (d) according to the land lease, the building height could be up to 119ft in height. The applicant had obtained a building plan approval for redeveloping the existing church into a 5-storey building up to about that height;

- (e) the applicant intended to optimise, rather than maximize, the development potential of the application site by rezoning it to “G/IC(10)” with a maximum building height of 9 storeys. The proposed church building would have 9 storeys (including one mezzanine floor for the church hall), with an absolute height lower than that permissible under the lease. The PR would be 6.4. The building would set back 6m from Grampian Road;
- (f) there was a need to redevelop the existing church as it was old and the space of the existing building was insufficient to meet the church’s requirements; and
- (g) the redevelopment plan was first proposed in 1981. The Church Council finally approved the plan in 2005. An architectural design competition was then organized for the project but in February 2006, the draft Kowloon Tong OZP No. S/K18/12 was gazetted to restrict the maximum building height of the application site to 5 storeys.

9. Rev. Timothy Lam then made the following main points :

- (a) the church was founded in Kowloon City 70 years ago. It had been using the existing church building for 55 years. In view of the high maintenance cost and insufficient space, the applicant decided to redevelop the church into a 9-storey building. The cost of the whole project was estimated to be \$70 million. So far, more than \$20 million had been raised, through various functions organized by the applicant;
- (b) in view of the increasing number of the church goers and the population living in Kowloon City, the applicant needed more space for its current activities and future development. Due to limited seat capacity of the existing church hall, the applicant had to divide its Sunday worships into 2 sessions. An evening session was also added on Saturdays. In the past, the applicant had rented the classrooms of two nearby schools to hold its



Sunday bible classes. However, one of the schools had already shut down, and the other, Pooi To Middle School, was under redevelopment. As a result, the number of Sunday classes had been significantly reduced, and some of the existing classes were even held at a church member's arts studio. Besides, there was also insufficient rooms for the church fellowships, choirs, etc. to carry out their activities; and

- (c) after carrying out a comprehensive review, it was concluded that the 9-storey redevelopment proposal with PR 6.4 was the minimum development scale which could meet the church's basic requirements.

10. Referring to some photomontages and a physical model presented at the meeting, Mr. Vincent W.S. Ng made the following main points :

- (a) in view of the small application site of 555m<sup>2</sup> and the absence of building height restriction for the "R(B)" zone on the opposite side of Grampian Road under the Ma Tau Kok OZP, the proposal to redevelop the church into a 9-storey building would not result in any significant visual impact on the surroundings, especially after the redevelopment on the adjacent sites to the maximum development intensity stipulated under the concerned Kowloon Tong and Ma Tau Kok OZPs;
- (b) the proposed church building would have greenery façade. Both the podium and the roof would be set back to provide better visual amenity; and
- (c) the current scheme would have similar building height and bulk as those under the building plans approved by the Building Authority on 23.5.2007. According to the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R), the development on the site could be developed up to PR 9.5, even with the building height restriction of 119ft under the lease. The proposed PR of the current scheme was only 6.4. The applicant had also proposed to set back 6m from Grampian Road, in accordance with the relevant Outline

Development Plan.

11. Ms. Betty S.F. Ho concluded that all concerned Government departments, including the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of the PlanD, in general had no adverse comment on or no objection to the application. She further pointed out that a larger scale of the new church building would not mean that the applicant would earn more profits. Instead, the applicant would have to raise more money for the project.

12. In response to some Members' questions, Rev. Timothy Lam clarified that there was a total of about 600 persons attending the two sessions of worships on Sundays, while the seat capacity of the existing church hall was about 500. The church would not generate much traffic on weekdays as there were only some activities for bible classes and women cell groups. The applicant, in the past, had provided community services for an elderly centre in Lok Wah Estate, but the services were ceased early this year. The applicant would consider providing more community services to Kowloon City, after the redevelopment of the church. The target groups might include students, the elderly and women. If possible, the applicant would also consider renting out the rooms of the new church building to other local bodies/organizations for their activities.

13. In response to some Members' questions, Mr. Eric C.K Yue, DPO/K, made the following points of clarifications :

- (a) the Chief Architect/Advisory and Statutory Compliance of the ArchSD had not elaborated why the number of the activity rooms was considered excessive;
- (b) the building height restriction stipulated for the "G/IC(4)" zone under the OZP excluded any basement floor;
- (c) the Building Authority on 23.5.2007 approved the building plans for redeveloping the church into a 5-storey building, i.e. about a year after the imposition of the building height restriction for the "G/IC(4)" zone on the draft OZP No. S/K18/12. No representation was received in respect of

this amendment when the OZP was gazetted; and

- (d) PlanD had taken various factors into consideration before suggesting to impose a PR restriction of 5 (in addition to the 8-storey height restriction) for the application site. The factors included the applicant's demand for additional floor space, the compatibility of the new church building with the surrounding developments, ArchSD's comments on the application, and applicant's building plan approval.

14. On the issue of PR, Mr. Vincent W.S. Ng said that the proposed figure of 6.4 had included the floor space under an open-side cantilever and a covered playground which would be counted as gross floor area by the Building Authority. The same floor space could not be achieved if the development was restricted to 8 storeys. He emphasized that the building bulk of all the 3 schemes, including the one approved by the Building Authority, the one suggested by the PlanD and the one proposed in the subject application, would not be significantly different. The building plan submission was intended to demonstrate the building height that could be achieved under the existing statutory control.

15. As the applicant's representatives had no further point to make and Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson informed them that the hearing procedures 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 and PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

16. Some members did not support the application. Their views were :

- (a) the building height restrictions imposed on the various "G/IC" sites under the OZP were intended to preserve the existing character of the area. The height of the existing church was only 34.5mPD. The proposed building height of 50.05mPD almost doubled the height of the existing building.

This was not permitted as of right under the lease but would require lease modification, as pointed out by the DLO/KE, LandsD;

- (b) the applicant's approach of obtaining building plan approval before making the subject application so as to illustrate that a 5-storey scheme would have a building bulk and height similar to the 9-storey scheme was not agreed by a Member;
- (c) the proposed scheme of 9 storeys with a PR of 6.4 was considered excessive in the current setting. A Member noted that the seating capacity of the proposed church hall might not be fully utilized and the applicant currently did not have strong connections with the community in Kowloon City;
- (d) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area; and
- (e) PlanD's suggestion of 8 storeys and PR 5 was the maximum scale of development that could be accepted for the application site. The plant and pump rooms proposed on the ground floor could be put on a basement floor which would be excluded from the calculation of the number of storeys under the OZP.

17. Some other Members supported the application due to the following considerations :

- (a) the applicant had a long history in providing church services for the Chiu Chow population in Kowloon City, and there might be a genuine need for the applicant to have more floor space to meet the increasing demand for its services;
- (b) the number of activity rooms proposed by the applicant was not considered excessive as they were intended to provide part and parcel of the church's

normal activities;

- (c) the approval of the application would unlikely to set an undesirable precedent for other developments of a commercial nature as it was for a community use; and
- (d) the difference between the applicant's 9-storey scheme and PlanD's 8-storey proposal did not appear to be significant.

18. In respect to a Member's question of the rationale behind PlanD's suggestion of 8 storeys and PR 5, the Secretary explained that in determining the building height restrictions for "G/IC" zone on the draft Kowloon Tong OZP No. S/K18/12, the most important consideration was to maintain the existing character of Kowloon Tong. As such, different building height restrictions for various sub-zones were imposed to reflect the heights of the existing buildings, including GIC developments, with provision for application for minor relaxation of the restrictions to cater for planning and design merits of individual schemes. On the other hand, PlanD also noted that the proposed church was a community use. A balance therefore needed to be struck between the need for the community use and the planning intention to preserve the existing character of the area. For the application site, the PlanD considered that a 8-storey church building at 50.05mPD and a PR 5 could be acceptable. The 8-storey building height was based on the building height restriction for the adjoining "R(C)9" zone on the Kowloon Tong OZP, while the PR 5 was based on the plot ratio restriction for the adjacent "R(B)" zone on the opposite side of Grampian Road stipulated under the Ma Tau Kok OZP.

19. Taking into account the nature of the proposed church development which was a community use, the rational basis of PlanD's proposal, and the minimal precedent effect, Members agreed with the development restrictions as suggested by PlanD.

20. After deliberation, the Committee decided to partially agree to the application by allowing the amendments to the Kowloon Tong Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) to incorporate a maximum building height of 8 storeys (excluding basement floor(s)) and 50.05mPD, and a maximum plot ratio of 5 for the subject site.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

- (ii) Y/K14N/1 Application for Amendment to the Approved Kwun Tong (North) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K14N9 from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Amenity Area” zone to “Government, Institution or Community” zone, Government Land near the Junction of Po Lam Road and Sau Mau Ping Road  
(MPC Paper No. Y/K14N/1)
- 

21. The Secretary said that as the subject application was made by the Housing Department, which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), the following Members had to declare interests in this item :

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng<br>as the Director of Planning                              | - being a member of the Building Committee and the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) of the HKHA                                 |
| Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong   | - having current business dealing with the Housing Department   |
| Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim   | - having current business dealing with the Housing Department   |
| Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong  | - being a member of the HKHA  |
| Mr. Walter K.L. Chan   | - being a former member of the HKHA   |
| Mr. James Merritt<br>as the Assistant Director of<br>Lands Department        | - being an assistant to the Director of Lands who was a member of the HKHA  |
| Ms. Margaret Hsia<br>as the Assistant Director of<br>Home Affairs Department | - being an assistant to the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of the HKHA |

22. The Committee noted that Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim, Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong and Ms. Margaret Hsia had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The Secretary said that as the Vice-chairman had declared an interest, the Chairperson could continue to chair the meeting out of necessity. Members agreed.

[Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong, Dr. Daniel B.M To, Mr. Walter K.L. Chan and Mr. James Merritt left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

23. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting at this point :

Mr. Eric C.K. Yue - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)

Miss Helen L.M. So - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)

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

Mr. Kenneth H.K. Wong

Mr. S.T. Ip

Mr. Philip S.Y. Lo

Mr. Eddie Tsang

25. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the hearing. The Chairperson then invited Miss Helen L.M. So, STP/K, to brief Members on the background to the application.

26. Miss Helen L.M. So, STP/K, presented the application as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points :

- (a) the applicant proposed to rezone the application site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Amenity Area" ("OU(Amenity)") to "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") on the Kwun Tong (North) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) to facilitate the relocation of 4 existing temples (including Tin Hau Leung Leung Temple, Tai Shing Temple, Shing Wong Temple and Guan Yin Temple) which would be affected by the site

formation works of the public housing development at Anderson Road (DAR);

- (b) the 4 temples had been in existence before the Squatter Control Survey conducted in 1982. They were tolerated structures, and there was no direct re-provisioning arrangement under the prevailing land policy;
- (c) each of the 4 temples would be relocated to a separate platform with its own access within the application site. Greening measures, including compensatory planting, would be implemented for each temple;
- (d) the Civil Engineering Development Department would be responsible for the site formation works of the application site, while the new temples would be built by the temple operators. The Chinese Temples Committee had agreed in principle to offer financial assistance for the relocation;
- (e) various assessments, including landscape and visual impact assessment, environmental impact assessment, drainage and sewerage impact assessment, and assessment on the future pedestrian flow were included in the application to demonstrate that the relocation proposal would not have adverse impacts on the area;
- (f) the applicant's justifications were summarized in paragraph 2 of the Paper;
- (g) the comments from concerned Government departments and policy bureau were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. All of them had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (h) one public comment was received during the statutory publication period, supporting the application; and
- (i) the PlanD had no objection to the application for the reasons as detailed in paragraph 10.1.



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

28. Mr. Kenneth H.K. Wong made the following main points :

- (a) the DAR would provide about 20ha of land platforms. They would be used for the provision of public housing, Government, institution or community facilities and open space. The concerned contract would commence in January 2008;
- (b) the DAR would affect the 4 temples within the project boundary, and the sites would need to be cleared by the end of 2007;
- (c) although there should not be any direct re-provisioning arrangement under the prevailing policy, the relocation of the 4 temples were supported by a large number of worshippers, the local community, the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC), some Legislative Council members and the Home Affairs Bureau;
- (d) the applicant had carried out an extensive search for potential relocation sites. After conducting all the technical assessments, the application site was confirmed to be a suitable site;
- (e) the KTDC had closely monitored the relocation project since July 2002. The subject proposal, endorsed by the then Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau in October 2006, was reported to the KTDC in March 2007; and
- (f) according to the tentative programme, the funding for the site formation works would be approved by the end of 2007. The temple reconstruction works would be commenced in early 2009. The new temples were expected to start operation in early 2010.

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

29. In response to a Member's questions, Mr. Kenneth H.K. Wong said that 3 of the temples (i.e. Tai Shing Temple, Shing Wong Temple and Guan Yin Temple) only had one festival day per year, while Tin Hau Leung Leung Temple had 3 to 4 festival days per year. These festival days did not overlap. The maximum pedestrian flow on each festival day was estimated to be 200 to 300 persons. The 3.5m wide footpath, which would serve the temple sites, should be sufficient to cope with the pedestrian flow.

30. As regards the supporting transport infrastructure in the area, Mr. Eddie Tsang said that both Sau Mau Ping and Po Tat Estates opposite to the application site had public car parking spaces, which could serve the worshippers going to the 4 temples in future. Road-crossing facilities were available at the junction of Sau Mau Ping Road and Po Lam Road. There was also a bus stop in front of the proposed Guan Yin Temple at Po Lam Road;

31. In response to two Members' questions, Mr. Eric C.K. Yue, DPO/K, said that there should not be any other new development in the vicinity of the application site. There was no much room for the temples to share facilities as each temple would be located on a separate platform with its own access.

32. A Member asked whether there would be any ancestral tablet inside the future temples. Mr. S.T. Ip revealed that only Tin Hau Leung Leung Temple currently housed ancestral tablets, as shown in the photo on Page 6 of the applicant's report at Appendix Ia of the Paper. Mr. Eric C.K. Yue, DPO/K, pointed out that no ancestral tablet was proposed in the conceptual layouts of the 4 future temples (i.e. Drawings Z-1, Z-3, Z-5, Z-6 and Z-7 of the Paper). Mr. Kenneth H.K. Wong supplemented that the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East of the Lands Department (LandsD) would draft conditions of the short-term tenancy (STT) agreements for the application site to prohibit the temples from operating any commercial use within the application site. As such, there would not be ancestral tablets provided for outsiders on a commercial basis.

33. As the applicant's representatives had no further point to make and Members had

no further question to raise, the Chairperson informed them that the hearing procedures 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 and PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

34. Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan said that he should have declared interest in this item as he currently had business dealing with the applicant.

[Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

#### Deliberation Session

35. Members raised the following concerns on the application :

- (a) the proposal of relocating 4 temples to a single site was very uncommon, although all the stakeholders, including the concerned temple operators, had no objection to the proposal;
- (b) according to the conceptual layouts proposed by the applicant, it appeared that there were a total of 9 instead of 4 temples involved in the relocation. The 5 other included Three King Temple and Three Prince Temple inside Tai Shing Temple, and Loon Mu Temple, Bei Di Temple and Master Fu De Temple inside Guan Yin Temple;
- (c) based on the experience of other Chinese temples in Hong Kong, the assessment of the future pedestrian flow should cover the scenario of numerous worshippers visiting the temples on major festival days. For such scenario, issues including safety of the pedestrians and capacity of the transport infrastructure in the area (including car parks, road-crossing facilities, and passenger lay-bys) should be critically examined. If necessary, measures for controlling the pedestrian flow should also be recommended;

- (d) it might be feasible to have some common facilities, such as burning furnace and loading/unloading facilities, for shared use by the 4 temples within the application site. Such arrangement would help minimize any possible nuisance to the residents nearby and address the pedestrian safety problem; and
- (e) the imposition of a STT condition to prohibit commercial use might not be stringent enough to prevent provision of ancestral tablets for outsiders in the future temples.

36. Referring to paragraph 2(g) on page 3 of the Paper, Mr. Anthony Loo explained that the applicant's assessment of the future pedestrian flow was based on the assumptions that each temple could accommodate about 100 worshippers, and each worshipper would stay inside the temple for 10 to 20 minutes. Two Members said that the Transport Department should examine whether such assumptions were realistic.

37. On the issue of possible abuse of providing ancestral tablets in the temples, the Chairperson pointed out that the Committee should consider the subject application on the terms as submitted. The future operation of the temples could be monitored by LandsD through STT conditions. The Chairperson said that the proposal under application was the result of rather lengthy discussions among the concerned stakeholders. Should Members have concerns on some outstanding issues, Members could require the applicant to submit further information to address the concerns.

38. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application pending submission of additional information from the applicant to address the concerns raised by Members on the lack of assessment of the future pedestrian flow on major festival days; the feasibility of providing common facilities for shared use by the temples within the application site; and the measure(s) to prohibit the provision of ancestral tablets for outsiders in the temples. The Committee also agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within three months from the date of receipt of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the



grounds in view of insufficient information in the application to substantiate that adequate parking and loading/unloading facilities were provided to address the demand so generated by the subject showroom to ensure that the traffic condition at the nearby road network would not be adversely affected;

- (d) one public comment was received during the statutory publication period of the application, objecting to the application on traffic ground. Two public comments from another commenter were received during the statutory publication periods of the further information, also objecting to the application on the grounds that the tour coaches and tourists in relation to the jewellery showroom/workshop/shop uses in the area had already caused air pollution and pedestrian safety problems; and

[Mrs. Shirley Lee returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper in that the ground floor of the subject building was mainly occupied by jewellery showrooms/shops/workshops which had brought many tour coaches to the area. The approval of the application would likely aggravate the existing illegal coach parking problem at Ma Hang Chung Road. The applicant's proposal of using private cars as a transportation means for the visitors/patrons of the subject showroom was not in line with the normal operation of showrooms in the area. TD had grave concern that tour coaches would be used in the actual operation. As such, the provision of one private car parking space within the subject building was not adequate to address the potential coach parking and loading/unloading demand generated by the subject showroom.

40. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

41. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application and the reason was that there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that adequate parking and loading/unloading facilities were provided to support the showroom use and the traffic condition at the nearby road network would not be adversely affected.

[Mr. Anthony Loo left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (ii)           A/K13/221           Temporary Shop and Services (Retail Uses)  
for a Period of 5 Years  
in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone,  
Portion of Unit 5B, Ground Floor,  
Kowloon Bay Industrial Centre, 15 Wang Hoi Road,  
Kowloon Bay  
(MPC Paper No. A/K13/221)
- 

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary shop and services (retail uses) for a period of 5 years;
- (c) departmental comments – concerned Government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) one public comment was received during the statutory publication period,

agreeing with the application; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper. Nevertheless, since the aggregate commercial floor area on the ground floor of the subject building had reached the maximum limit of 460m<sup>2</sup> and the application premises were the subject of a previous application (No. A/K13/192), it was proposed to restrict the duration of the approval to 3 years so that the utilization of the ground floor for shop and services could be closely monitored.

43. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

44. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 27.7.2010, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the submission and implementation of fire safety measures, including fire service installations in the subject premises, within six months from the date of approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 27.1.2008; 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.

45. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant :

- (a) a shorter approval period of 3 years was given so that the utilization of the ground floor of the subject industrial building for shop and services use could be closely monitored;



- (b) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department for a temporary waiver; and
- (c) to appoint an Authorized Person to submit building plans to demonstrate compliance with the Buildings Ordinance, in particular the fire resisting separation and provision of access and facilities for persons with a disability in accordance with Building (Planning) Regulation 72 and Design Manual: Barrier Free Access 1997.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- |       |           |   |
|-------|-----------|---|
| (iii) | A/K14/546 | Proposed Shop and Services<br>in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone,<br>Unit B1 of Factory B, G/F, Lladro Centre,<br>72 Hoi Yuen Road, Kwun Tong<br>(MPC Paper No. A/K14/546) |
| <hr/> |           |   |
| (iv)  | A/K14/547 | Proposed Shop and Services<br>in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone,<br>Unit B2 of Factory B, G/F, Lladro Centre,<br>72 Hoi Yuen Road, Kwun Tong<br>(MPC Paper No. A/K14/547) |
| <hr/> |           |   |
| (v)   | A/K14/548 | Proposed Shop and Services<br>in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone,<br>Unit B4 of Factory B, G/F, Lladro Centre,<br>72 Hoi Yuen Road, Kwun Tong<br>(MPC Paper No. A/K14/548) |
| <hr/> |           |   |

46. Noting that Applications No. A/K14/546, A/K14/574 and A/K14/548 were submitted by the same applicant and similar in nature, the Committee agreed to consider the 3 applications together.

[Mr. Anthony Loo returned to join the meeting at this point.]

### Presentation and Question Sessions

47. Miss Helen L.M. So, STP/K, presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Papers :

- (a) background to the applications;
- (b) the proposed shop and services use under the 3 applications;
- (c) departmental comments – concerned Government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on all the 3 applications;
- (d) one public comment each was received during the statutory publication periods of Applications No. A/K14/457 and A/K14/458, supporting the respective applications. No public comment was received during the statutory publication period of Application No. A/K14/456; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to all the 3 applications for the reasons detailed in paragraph 11.1 of the Papers.

48. Members had no question on the applications.

### Deliberation Session

49. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve all the 3 applications, on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). Each permission should be valid until 27.7.2009, 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. Each permission was subject to the following conditions :

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

provision of a means of escape separating the subject premises from the industrial portion and fire service installations in the subject premises to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB before operation of the use; and

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

50. The Committee also agreed to advise each applicant :

- (a) to apply to District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department for a temporary waiver;
- (b) to comply with the requirements as stipulated in the Code of Practice for Fire Resisting Construction;
- (c) to appoint an Authorised Person to submit building plans to demonstrate compliance with the Buildings Ordinance, in particular, the provision of access and facilities for persons with disability under Building (Planning) Regulation 72;
- (d) to exercise proper care when working in the vicinity of existing drains and sewers in order not to disturb, interfere with or damage the drains and sewers. Any blockage or damage to the said works due to the applicant's activities in the area should be made good at his own cost to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services; and
- (e) to strictly follow regulatory restrictions when loading/unloading activities took place to avoid interfering with the main stream traffic in particular when they were under the cumulative effects of nearby roadside activities.



Deliberation Session

53. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 27.7.2011, 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 permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the submission and implementation of the setting back proposal for footpath widening purpose to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and provision of parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces and manoeuvring space for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of a landscaping proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

54. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that the approval of the application did not imply that the gross floor area exemption and/or bonus plot ratio included in the application would be granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval.

[The Chairperson thanked Mr. Eric C.K. Yue, DPO/K, and Miss Helen L.M. So, STP/K, for their attendance to answer Members' enquires. Mr. Yue and Miss So left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Felix W. Fong left the meeting at this point.]



higher maintenance/management cost for the subject building; and it would also affect the structure of the subject building; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 10.1 of the Paper. Regarding the concern on security problem, it was noted that the proposed hotel would be served by a separate staircase via the entrance of the hotel at Canton Road. As regards the concern on attracting pornographic business, it was considered that public law and order would be subject to the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Police who had no objection to the application. As for the concern on the structural impact on the subject building, this would be subject to compliance with the Buildings Ordinance at the building plan submission stage. Regarding the comment that the hotel demand in the area was low, the provision of hotels should be left to market forces. The concern on increase in maintenance and management cost was not a land use-related issue.

56. A Member said that the provision of an access to the application premises completely separated from that to the domestic portion of the subject building should be a major consideration for the application. Referring to G/F layout proposed by the application in Drawing A-1 of the Paper, this Member noted that the staircase from the entrance at Soy Street serving the domestic portion should theoretically lead to somewhere within the application premises on 1/F. However, the staircase could not be found in the proposed 1/F layout in the same Drawing. The Member therefore doubted whether there was a separate access. Mr. Louis K.H. Kau, STP/TWK, said that there was no detailed information available in the submission to answer the question. In response to another Member's question, Mr. Kau confirmed that there was no lift serving the domestic portion of the subject building.

#### Deliberation Session

57. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application pending submission of additional information from the applicant to clarify whether the access





Deliberation Session

60. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 27.7.2009, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) provision of fire service installations in the subject premises to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB before operation of the use; and
- (b) if the above planning condition was not complied with before operation of the use, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the same date be revoked without further notice.

61. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant :

- (a) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department for a temporary waiver to permit the applied use; and
- (b) to consult the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department on the submission of building plans in respect of separation of the application premises from other existing use of the same building by proper fire resisting construction; design and provision of means of escape; provision of access and facilities for persons with a disability and sanitary fitments.



permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the submission and implementation of fire safety measures to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB before operation of the use; and
- (b) if the above condition of approval was not complied with before operation of the use, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the same date be revoked without further notice.

65. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant :

- (a) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Kwai Tsing, Lands Department for a temporary wavier to permit the applied use;
- (b) to consult the Chief Building Surveyor/ New Territories West, Buildings Department on the submission of building plans for any non-exempted building works for approval prior to commencement of building works; and
- (c) to comply with the requirements of fire resisting construction as stipulated in the Code of Practice for Fire Resisting Construction administered by Buildings Department.

[The Chairperson thanked Mr. Louis K.H. Kau and Mr. P.C. Mok, STPs/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquires. Mr. Kau and Mr. Mok left the meeting at this point.]

### **Hong Kong District**

[Ms. Christine K.C. Tse, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), and Ms. Lily Y.M. Yam, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 6**

### **Section 16 Applications**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (i) Further Consideration of Application No. A/H12/20  
Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction  
in “Residential (Group C)2” zone,  
6 Shiu Fai Terrace, Mid-levels East (IL 2302B1 and Extension)  
(MPC Paper No. A/H12/20)
- 

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

66. Ms. Lily Y.M. Yam, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application, highlight the proposed minor relaxation of the building height restriction, the concerns previously raised by the Committee at the meeting held on 25.5.2007, and the further information submitted by the applicant to address the concerns;
- (b) departmental comments – concerned Government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the further information provided by the applicant;
- (c) the further information was exempted from publication for public comments under the relevant provision of the Town Planning Ordinance. No local objection/view on the further information was received by the District Officer (Wan Chai); and
- (d) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – in response to the Committee’s concerns, the applicant proposed to reduce the storey height of the penthouse level (15/F) from 4m to 3.5m and the height of the rooftop structure from 7.5m to 6.2m, resulting in an overall reduction of the

building height by 1.8m. The applicant also explained the technical and functional needs for the storey height of 6m for the podium floors. For the tree felling proposal, the applicant advised that all the trees on site (3 numbers in total) would be transplanted. The proposed landscaping strip would be widened to 2m and proper green roof installation would be provided on 2/F. As regards the Committee's request for further information to demonstrate the visual impact of the proposed development from different viewing angles with a three-dimensional visualization device, the applicant provided revised photomontages but they were prepared based on the same vantage points as in the original submission. Hence, the Committee's request on this aspect had not been addressed.

67. In response to a Member's question, the Vice-chairman explained that the transfer plate between 1/F and 2/F of the proposed development was a 2m thick concrete plate to separate the upper and lower parts of the building. The upper part was mainly designed with load bearing walls for better configuration of the flat units, while the lower part was mainly designed with columns instead of load bearing walls to cater for car park and driveway uses. The function of the transfer plate was to transfer the loading of the upper floors downwards to the lower part of the building.

#### Deliberation Session

68. A Member commented that while the applicant had explained the need for the 6m storey height of the podium floors and proposed a slight reduction in the overall building height, there was insufficient information provided on whether the proposed development would be imposing and visually obstructive to the pedestrians/drivers looking from Stubbs Road. Noting that the revised photomontages were based on the same vantage points as in the original submission, another Member said that they mainly showed the compatibility of the proposed development with the buildings within the "Residential (Group B)" zone to the south, and not the buildings within the subject "Residential (Group C)2" zone. In order to carry out a comprehensive visual impact assessment, three-dimensional visualization device, such as a physical model, should be used.

69. Members considered that the further information submitted by the applicant could not fully address the concerns previously raised by the Committee, particularly on the aspect of possible adverse visual impact of the proposed development.

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

- (a) there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have any adverse visual impact on the surrounding area and that there were sufficient planning and design merits to justify the proposed relaxation of building height restriction; and
- (b) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent to future developments/redevelopments in the “Residential (Group C) 2” zone and other sub-areas of the “Residential (Group C)” zone in the Mid-levels East area. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would affect the character and amenity of the area.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (ii) A/H8/383 Commercial Bathhouse and Massage Establishment  
in “Commercial/Residential” zone,  
The whole 3/F, Hang Ying Building,  
318-328 King’s Road, North Point  
(MPC Paper No. A/H8/383)
- 

Presentation and Question Sessions

71. Ms. Lily Y.M. Yam, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) the proposed commercial bathhouse and massage establishment;
- (c) departmental comments – concerned Government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Noting that the private sewer serving the subject premises was small in size, the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong and Islands of the Drainage Services Department considered the carrying out of a sewerage impact assessment for the proposed development desirable;
- (d) local residents, Owners' Corporation of the subject building, management offices of buildings in the vicinity, and an Eastern District Council member made a total of 6 public comments during the statutory publication period. Of which, 5 objected to the application mainly for the reasons that there would be undesirable disturbance to the neighbourhood (including noise, drainage, air ventilation and safety problems). The previous massage establishment operated in the subject premises had been involved in some illegal operations and immoral activities for years, and a similar situation would happen again. There was also a concern about the installation of a much complicated drainage system for the proposed development as it might affect the structural safety of the subject building; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper. As regards the local concerns, it was considered that the proposed development, which was located within the commercial portion of the subject building and had an separate access, would not cause any significant nuisance to the occupants of the same building as well as the nearby buildings. Relevant Government departments had no adverse comments on the application. The Commissioner of Police (C of P) would monitor the public law and order through the massage establishment licensing system.

72. Referring to the public comments that there were incidents that the residents

on 4/F were disturbed by some strangers in mid-night, a Member asked whether the subject premises had access to the domestic portion of the subject building. The Chairperson further asked whether there was any staircase within the building which could gain access to all floors. Ms. Christine K.C. Tse, DPO/HK, replied that the domestic portion of the building had an entrance at North View Street separated from that serving the application premises.

73. Another Member asked about the details of the conviction of the vice-related offence of the massage establishment previously operated in the subject premises. Ms. Christine K.C. Tse said that she had no such information at hand. Nevertheless, the C of P would take such factor into account in deciding whether to grant a new massage establishment license for the subject premises.

#### Deliberation Session

74. Noting that the C of P would deal with any vice activity under the licensing system for massage establishments, a Member expressed no objection to the application. Another Member opined that the proposed development on 3/F was not compatible with the existing elderly home on 2/F, even though both were located within the commercial portion of the subject building.

75. In response to a Member's comment on the compliance of the application with the relevant Town Planning Board (TPB) Guidelines, the Secretary referred Members to paragraph 4 of the Paper regarding the relevant assessment criteria in the TPB Guidelines. She explained that separate access was one of the criteria and other criteria, including the compatibility with other uses within the same building and the view of the local residents on the proposed development, should also be considered.

76. Other Members considered that North Point was a neighbourhood with rather mixed land uses. The elderly home and the application premises had separate entrances, and the application premises were located within the commercial portion of the subject building intended for various commercial uses. The alleged possible disturbances to be caused by the proposed development might also appear if the subject premises were used for other



commercial uses like restaurant. Any possible vice activities could be controlled by the C of P. Moreover, a number of similar applications in the area had been approved before.

77. In response to a Member's question, Ms. Christine K.C. Tse, DPO/HK, clarified that the subject premises had been used for commercial bathhouse/massage establishment for over 17 years since 1990. Planning permission was not required previously as the use was always permitted in the "Commercial/Residential" zone in the past.

[Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

78. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 27.7.2011, 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 permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the provision of fire services installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (b) the submission of a sewerage impact assessment for the proposed development and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.

79. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant :

- (a) to apply to the Police Licensing Office for a massage establishment licence; and
- (b) to resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owner(s) of the application premises.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (iii) A/H15/224 Shop and Services (Jewellery Showroom)  
in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business 1” zone,  
Unit B (Part), 1/F, Shui Ki Industrial Building,  
18 Wong Chuk Hang Road, Aberdeen  
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/224)
- 

Presentation and Question Sessions

80. Ms. Lily Y.M. Yam, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed shop and services (jewellery showroom) use;

[Mr. Anthony Loo left the meeting at this point.]

- (c) departmental comments – concerned Government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) an Eastern District Council member made a public comment during the statutory publication period, indicating no objection to the application; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 12.1 of the Paper.

81. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

82. 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

following conditions :

- (a) the submission and implementation of fire service installations for the showroom use 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 TPB by 27.1.2008 ; 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.

83. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant :

- (a) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South, Lands Department for the temporary waiver for the extended part of the showroom;
- (b) to note the comments from Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department regarding the provision of means of escape and the need to appoint an Authorized Person to carry out the necessary remedial works; and
- (c) to note the comments of Director of Fire Services regarding the provision of fire service installations.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Christine K.C. Tse, DPO/HK, and Ms. Lily Y.M. Yam, STP/HK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquires. Ms. Tse and Ms. Yam left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 7**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/H24/4                      Application for Amendments to the Zonings of Different Sites at the Central Harbourfront and the Notes for Various Zones on the Approved Central District Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H4/12 and Approved Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H24/6  
(MPC Paper No. Y/H24/4)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

84.            The Committee noted that the applicant on 23.7.2007 requested for a deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time for the applicant to submit additional information to address comments from relevant Government departments on the application and to clarify components of the rezoning proposals.

**Deliberation Session**

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

**Agenda Item 8**

**Any Other Business**

86.            There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:50 p.m..