

**TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**Minutes of 380th Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 5.9.2008**

**Present**

Director of Planning  
Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng

Chairperson

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Professor N.K. Leung

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Dr. Daniel B.M. To

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Ms. 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

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Dr. Ellen Y.Y. Lau

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  
Mr. C.T. Ling

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms. Kathy C.L. Chan

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 379th MPC Meeting held on 15.8.2008

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 379th MPC meeting held on 15.8.2008 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.

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

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

**Agenda Item 3**

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K2/185                      Eating Place  
in “Government, Institution or Community” zone,  
LG/F (Part), Block D, Queen Elizabeth Hospital,  
30 Gascoigne Road, Yau Ma Tei  
(MPC Paper No. A/K2/185)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. Mr. C.K. Soh, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following

aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed eating place (coffee shop);
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) one public comment was received 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 reasons as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper.

4. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

5. 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 was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the provision of fire service installations within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 5.3.2009; 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.

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

- (a) consult the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene on the licensing

requirements for the coffee shop at the application premises; and

- (b) note that prior planning permission should have been obtained before commencing the applied use at the application premises.

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

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

#### **Agenda Item 4**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/660                      Shop and Services (Retail Shop)  
in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone,  
Units C2B (Front Portion) and C2C,  
G/F, Hong Kong Spinners Industrial Building Phase I & II,  
800 Cheung Sha Wan Road, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/660)

---

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

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed shop and services (retail shop);
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;

- (d) one public comment was received 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 reasons as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

8. Members had no question on the application.

### Deliberation Session

9. 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 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 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 5.3.2009; 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.

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

- (a) consult the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department on the submission of alterations and additions proposal in respect of the provision of adequate means of escape, access and facilities for persons with a disability and fire resisting construction to separate the application premises from other existing uses of the same building, and adequate sanitary fitments; and
- (b) note that prior planning permission should have been obtained before

commencing the applied use at the application premises.

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K16/31                Proposed Hotel (Amendment to an Approved Scheme  
for Comprehensive Residential and Commercial Development)  
in “Comprehensive Development Area” zone,  
Kowloon Motor Bus Headquarters Building,  
9 Po Lun Street, Lai Chi Kok  
(MPC Paper No. A/K16/31B)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

11.                The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by a joint venture involving Sun Hung Kai Properties Ltd. (SHKP). Messrs. Raymond Y.M. Chan and Felix W. Fong, having current business dealings with SHKP, had declared interests in this item. The Committee noted that Mr. Chan had already left the meeting temporarily, and Mr. Fong had tendered apologies for not attending the meeting.

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel (amendment to an approved scheme for comprehensive residential and commercial development);
- (c) departmental comments – the Commissioner for Tourism supported the application as the proposal would enhance the provision of new hotel

rooms, broaden the range of accommodation for visitors and support rapid development of the convention and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries;

- (d) fifteen public comments were received during the statutory publication period of the application. Three of the commenters supported and eleven objected to the application whereas the remaining one did not indicate support or objection. The public comments supporting the application opined that the proposed development would revitalise the area and was complementary with nearby residential developments. Those commenters who raised objection were mainly concerned about air ventilation; air and noise impacts during the construction period; traffic impact on Po Lun Street; screening effect caused by the proposed building; lack of supporting facilities for the tourists; and blocking of views for some units of Block 6 of Manhattan Hill;
- (e) during the statutory publication period of supplementary information submitted by the applicant, five public comments were received supporting the application. They considered that road widening would greatly improve the pedestrian flow and reduce traffic hazards. The new hotel might help improve the visual image of the existing Kowloon Motor Bus headquarters (HQ) building and benefit hotel users for its close proximity to public transportation and it might promote tourism in Hong Kong; and
- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The existing HQ building was retained for office use in the approved planning brief (PB) for the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) site. As hotel was regarded as commercial use in planning perspective, the proposed development was considered in line with the planning intention of the “CDA” zone and was not incompatible with the surrounding residential/commercial developments. The hotel development would not generate adverse environmental and traffic impacts. All departments consulted had no objection to or adverse comments on the application. The Committee had previously approved hotel developments in Kowloon



with a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 12 inclusive of the gross floor area for back-of-house (BOH) facilities to ensure that the PR would be in line with development restrictions in the “Commercial” zone. An approval condition was proposed to stipulate the maximum non-domestic PR of 12 to include the BOH facilities for the proposed hotel development. Regarding the local concerns on land use compatibility, environmental/traffic impacts, building height and blocking of views, it was considered that the proposed hotel development was generally in line with the planning intention and was not incompatible with the use of the surrounding developments. Concerned departments had no objection to the application on traffic, environmental and building height aspects.

13. In response to a Member’s enquiry on how to prevent change of hotel rooms into residential flats, Mr. James Merrit, Assistant Director (Kowloon), Lands Department said that if lease modification was required to effect the proposed hotel development, a condition restricting the sale of the hotel building to assignment as a whole would be included in the lease. However, if lease modification was not required, the control would be rested with the Director of Buildings and exercised under the Buildings Ordinance.

14. Noting that the proposed building height was about 26m higher than the existing HQ building, a Member sought clarification as to whether there was any increase in the GFA in the current proposal as compared to the previously approved scheme. Mr. P.C. Mok clarified that as the PB for the “CDA” site had restricted redevelopment of the HQ building to existing GFA, i.e. about 14 559m<sup>2</sup>, the proposed total GFA for the hotel development remained the same as the GFA of the existing HQ building. However, the proposed total GFA had excluded the BOH facilities at 5/F and the electrical/mechanical services at 6/F of the hotel, each with a floor area of 680.7m<sup>2</sup>.

15. By referring to paragraph 13.2 of the Paper, a Member asked for the reasons of amending the approval conditions and advisory clauses imposed on the previously approved scheme, and queried whether such amendments would have implications on the planning intention for the “CDA” zone. Mr. P.C. Mok said that a large part of the “CDA” site had already been developed into a comprehensive residential and commercial development, namely “Manhattan Hill”. As approval conditions and advisory clauses related to

Manhattan Hill had already been implemented/complied with, it was appropriate to delete those completed items and incorporate new items that were relevant to the current application.

16. A Member noted the Director of Environmental Protection's comments that a proper location for fresh-air intake should be selected for the central air conditioning system for the hotel, and asked why it was not included as an approval condition or advisory clause. Mr. P.C. Mok said that this would be dealt with at the detailed design stage when building plans were submitted to the Buildings Department for approval. In reply to this Member's further question, Ms. Shirley Lee, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment), Environmental Protection Department (EPD) said that their comment was a reminder to the applicant. As this was a building design matter, the Authorised Person of the applicant should be in a better position to determine the location of fresh-air intake for proper functioning of the proposed hotel development. Another Member was concerned about the noise impact generated by the air conditioning units to the nearby residents, particularly the surrounding residential buildings were lower in height than the proposed hotel. Ms. Shirley Lee said that ventilation noise was subject to control under the Noise Pollution Ordinance. The hotel management would be required to properly maintain the air conditioning system so that it would not cause adverse ventilation noise impact to neighbouring residents. She informed that if complaints on ventilation noise were received by EPD, their staff would take follow-up actions as appropriate. She further said that hot air nuisance was also subject to control which was under the purview of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department.

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

#### Deliberation Session

17. Members agreed that an additional advisory clause should be imposed to remind the applicant of the comments of EPD as given in paragraph 10.1.8 of the Paper.

18. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the Master Layout Plan (MLP) and the application, under sections 4A and 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The

permission should be valid until 5.9.2012, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the submission and implementation of a revised MLP for the development scheme to incorporate the approval conditions as stipulated in conditions (b) to (m) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of vehicular parking facilities including 3 private car parking spaces, 2 lay-bys for taxis and private cars, 1 lay-by for tour buses, 1 loading/unloading bay for Light Goods Vehicle (LGV) and another loading/unloading bay for shared use of LGV and light bus to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the maximum plot ratio of the proposed hotel development at the existing Kowloon Motor Bus (KMB) Headquarters site, including 'Back-of-House' (BOH) facilities, should not exceed 12 where BOH facilities referred to those uses specified under Regulation 23A(3)(b) of the Building (Planning) Regulations to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (d) the provision of a 24-hour public access from the pedestrian footbridge to the public open space at the adjoining comprehensive residential and commercial development via 2/F and 3/F of the proposed hotel development, as proposed by the applicant, and the footbridge connection to the proposed hotel development should be structurally separated from the pedestrian footbridge to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (e) the design, provision and maintenance of the proposed corner splay at the north-eastern boundary of the proposed hotel development and the footways at the corner splay should be open to the public for 24 hours, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;

- (f) the maintenance of footways along Po Lun Street, Broadway (east) and a footpath (3.5 m wide) along the southern boundary of the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) site, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (g) the design, provision and maintenance of the pedestrian footbridge, with escalator facilities at appropriate landing points and at least 3m wide across Lai Chi Kok Road and Kwai Chung Road connecting the “CDA” site with Mei Foo bus terminus and Mei Foo Mass Transit Railway Station and the provision of a pedestrian footbridge connection point linking with the “Government, Institution or Community” site bounded by Yuet Lun Street and Po Lun Street, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (h) the maintenance of a 24-hour public pedestrian passage of minimum clear width of 4m through the G/F of the commercial/residential development linking Po Lun Street and Broadway, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (i) the design and provision of the sewer connections from the proposed hotel development to the local sewerage system at Po Lun Street and Yuet Lun Street, including the upgrading works to the existing sewerage system, if required, for the handling of additional discharge due to redevelopment, to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (j) the provision of emergency vehicular access and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (k) the design, provision and maintenance of not less than 4,141m<sup>2</sup> public open space to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (l) the submission and implementation of a Landscape Master Plan of the “CDA” site, including a planting strip at Broadway and a planting strip along the site boundary, with a minimum width of 1.5m along the western

and southern sides and 3m along the eastern side, and to ensure that the roadside planting should not be in conflict with any proposed or existing underground utilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and

- (m) the submission and implementation of the development programme of the proposed hotel development to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

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

- (a) note that the approved MLP, together with the set of approval conditions, would be certified by the Chairman of the TPB and deposited in the Land Registry in accordance with section 4A(3) of the Town Planning Ordinance. Efforts should be made to incorporate the relevant approval conditions into the revised MLP for deposition in the Land Registry as soon as possible;
- (b) ensure that the façade of the hotel, including façade material, colour and/or any façade lighting, should be compatible with and minimise impact on the immediate residential neighbourhood, and to further explore the possibility of increasing the permeability of the hotel development due to the bulkiness of the building;
- (c) make reference to the guidelines on universal accessibility for external areas, open spaces and green spaces published by the Architectural Services Department regarding connectivity between the proposed hotel, the footbridge and public open spaces;
- (d) note that the proposed hotel and BOH areas licensed under the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance should be clearly indicated on building plans, and the proposed licensed areas should be physically connected together and not be separated by other occupancies or uses;
- (e) note the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department's comments that all

restaurants and bars in the hotel should obtain valid food business licences prior to commencement of food business. Restaurants in the hotel should take precautionary measures so as not to cause cooking fume nuisance to the nearby residents. The refuse generated by the hotel was trade waste and the hotel management should arrange for proper collection and disposal;

- (f) consult the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West, Lands Department on details regarding the site boundary and site area and the proposed connection to the footbridge over government land at the building plan stage, and to arrange with the owners of the adjoining development for any connection to the public open space concerned;
- (g) consult the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban, Transport Department regarding the vehicular access, ingress and egress of long vehicles at the hotel site;
- (h) submit the street lighting proposals outside the “CDA” site to the Chief Engineer/Lighting, Highways Department for comment/approval;
- (i) liaise with Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited regarding the possible encroachment of the works of the proposed hotel development on the Mass Transit Protection Boundary; and
- (j) note the Director of Environmental Protection’s comments that the fresh-air intake for the central air-conditioning system of the proposed hotel development should be carefully located during detailed design stage to avoid exposing future occupants to unacceptable environmental nuisance/impact.

**Agenda Item 6**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TY/104            Proposed Warehouse (Godown for Storage of  
Steel Plates and Steel Materials)  
in “Other Specified Uses” annotated  
“Boatyard and Marine-oriented Industrial Uses” zone,  
Ground Floor, Tsing Yi Town Lot 14 (Part),  
Tam Kon Shan Road, Tsing Yi  
(MPC Paper No. A/TY/104)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

20.            The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 11.8.2008 for a deferment of the consideration of the application for two months to allow time to resolve departmental concerns and prepare supplementary information.

**Deliberation Session**

21.            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 agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within two 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.

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

[Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

**Hong Kong District**

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

**Agenda Item 7**

[Open Meeting (whole agenda item)]

Proposed Amendments to the

Approved Shouson Hill & Repulse Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H17/9

(MPC Paper No. 26/08)

---

22. The Secretary reported that Mr. Felix W. Fong had declared an interest in this item as he had a property at Repulse Bay Road. The Committee noted that Mr. Fong had tendered apologies for not attending the meeting. The Secretary also informed the meeting that replacement pages 5 and 9 for the Paper had already been sent to Members, and a letter dated 3.9.2008 from Mr. Kenneth Howe on one of the proposed amendments to the Plan was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference.

23. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. David C.M. Lam, STP/HK, presented the proposed amendments to Shouson Hill & Repulse Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and covered the following main aspects as detailed in the Paper :

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

- (a) the proposed amendments to the OZP, as detailed in paragraph 4 and Attachment II(A) of the Paper, were mainly to rezone the Seaview Building (SB) and the adjacent public car park at Repulse Bay Beach from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Beach Related Leisure Use" and "Open Space" ("O") to "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") to facilitate hotel and commercial uses at the site. The "CDA" site would be subject to a maximum building height of 13mPD and a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 4 300m<sup>2</sup> (excluding the public car parking spaces to be



reprovisioned). Also, a piece of natural woodland at Deep Water Bay Valley, which harboured the largest surviving population of a rare shrub *Aristolochia thwaitesii* Hook. f. (Seaside Dutchman's Pipe) in Hong Kong, was proposed to be rezoned from "Green Belt" ("GB") to "Site of Special Scientific Interest" ("SSSI") in order to provide better planning control to deter human activities or developments on it. Moreover, the proposed alignment of Route 81, which was first recommended in 1976 as a very long-term strategic route linking the eastern and southern parts of Hong Kong Island, was proposed to be deleted from the OZP since substantial increase in transport demand in these areas was not anticipated and the road reserve was no longer required;

- (b) the proposed amendments to the Notes of the OZP, as detailed in paragraph 5 and Attachment II(B) of the Paper, were mainly to incorporate a new schedule of uses for the "CDA" zone;
- (c) opportunity was taken to update the Explanatory Statement of the OZP as detailed in Attachment II(C) of the Paper to reflect the latest status and planning circumstances of the OZP;
- (d) the Commissioner for Tourism pointed out that business viability should also be considered in the planning of the site and suggested greater flexibility in the land use for the "CDA" site and less restrictions on the physical form, especially on the design and the GFA control. The Planning Department (PlanD) considered that a range of commercial uses had been included under the "CDA" zoning to allow sufficient land use flexibility. Given the prominent location of the site, it was necessary to impose appropriate planning control on the layout and design of the future development to avoid incompatible development;
- (e) the District Officer (Southern) advised that the Owners' Corporations and residents in the nearby area raised objection to the proposed rezoning of the SB and the adjacent public car park to "CDA". The grounds of objection and concerns raised were that the open space and low-density character of

the area should be maintained and hotel/commercial development was not suitable at this location; the proposed new building would be too tall hence blocking the views, affecting the air circulation and damaging the existing character and beauty; the existing Beach Road could not cope with the increased traffic, and increased traffic flow would adversely affect the environment; large old valuable trees should be preserved on site; air and noise problems caused by construction works, and odour from the kitchen exhaust of the hotel/café would also cause air quality problem; and access to the beach for disabled persons should be addressed;

- (f) the District Development and Environment Committee of the Southern District Council (SDC) was consulted on the proposed rezoning of the SB and the adjacent car park at its meeting held on 10.3.2008. Members generally supported the proposal and development parameters, but requested that the traffic impact of the proposal and historical value of the SB should be assessed;
- (g) the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) advised that the SB was neither a declared monument nor a graded building. Whilst the building was probably built in the 1940s, the authenticity of the building had been compromised by substantial alterations and later additions. As the building was considered of low heritage value, both historically or architecturally, there was no objection to the proposed redevelopment; and
- (h) subject to the Committee's agreement to the proposed amendments, the SDC would be further consulted before or during the exhibition period of the draft OZP for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance), depending on the meeting schedule of the SDC.

[Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

24. Mr. David C.M. Lam said that the Town Planning Board (TPB) received a letter on 4.9.2008 from Mr. Kenneth Howe who proposed to restore and reuse the existing SB for restaurant and tourist facilities. As Mr. Howe mentioned about the historical value of the

SB, comments were sought again from the AMO on this aspect. In reply, AMO advised that the heritage value of the SB was low and they confirmed their no objection to the proposal. Nonetheless, Mr. David C.M. Lam advised that the proposed rezoning would not preclude the option of adaptive re-use of the existing SB.

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

25. A Member said that Repulse Bay had its unique value to Hong Kong and noted that there were local objections to the proposed rezoning for hotel development. While the proposed “CDA” site would be subject to development restrictions, by referring to Plan 7 of the Paper, this Member said that the proposed maximum building height at 13mPD would obstruct the public’s view from the road to the beach. Mr. David C.M. Lam explained that as the subject site was elongated in shape, there were a number of points that the public could view the beach along Repulse Bay Road. The photo was taken from the point where the bus stop at Repulse Bay Road was located. He said that the dotted line at 13mPD on Plan 7 was just an indicative line showing the maximum building height of the future development. As the area of the “CDA” site was about 4 400m<sup>2</sup> and the GFA restriction was 4 300m<sup>2</sup>, the total plot ratio would be less than 1. Since the maximum building height of 13mPD could allow a 2-storey building, it would be unlikely that the whole development would be 2 storeys high. Moreover, a maximum building height of 13mPD would preserve the sea view from Repulse Bay Road and at the same time provide reasonable headroom for future development. In response to this Member’s further question, Mr. David C.M. Lam said that the notional scheme presented in Plan 8 of the Paper was just an indicative scheme to illustrate the development concept. The actual development scheme, together with necessary technical assessments such as visual impact assessment, would be subject to the TPB’s approval at the Master Layout Plan submission stage. In reply to the Chairperson’s enquiry, Mr. David C.M. Lam said that a planning brief with detailed design requirements would be prepared to guide the future development on the “CDA” site.

26. A Member expressed worry that the future development might block the public access to the beach and suggested that consideration could be given to retain the current “O” zoning of the open-air public car park site. Mr. David C.M. Lam said that the proposed inclusion of the car park into the development site was to increase the viability of the project, allow design flexibility and to take the opportunity to enhance the general environment of the

area. The “CDA” zoning for the site would provide a mechanism for the TPB to ensure the provision of convenient public passageway from the roads to the beach.

27. A Member opined that the existing SB might not have significant historical value as it was suspected to be built only a few decades ago with additions and conversions throughout the years. Mr. David C.M. Lam said that departments concerned did not have record on the completion date of the SB. Judging from the external appearance and internal conditions, the AMO estimated that it was built in the 1940s. This Member, however, raised concern on the preservation of trees within the site. Mr. David C.M. Lam said that a row of mature trees along the southern side of the car park were identified to be worthy of protection. No building would be allowed thereat so as to protect these trees. In reply to the Chairperson’s enquiry, Mr. David C.M. Lam said that the proposed non-building area would be included in the planning brief, which would be submitted to the Committee for agreement. The Secretary also drew Members’ attention to paragraph 3.8(c) of the Paper that a non-building area had been proposed within the site which was clearly indicated on Plan 6.

28. In response to the Secretary’s enquiry, Mr. David C.M. Lam said that the existing level of Repulse Bay Road was around 20mPD. Comparing with the proposed maximum building height of 13mPD, there was a level difference of 7m. In reply to a Member’s question, Mr. David C.M. Lam said that as the level of the site was about 5mPD, the building height of 13mPD could allow a 2-storey high building with the floor height of 4m. For the existing SB, the height was about 11mPD.

[Mr. K.Y. Leung returned to join the meeting at this point.]

29. Mr. James Merritt, Assistant Director (Kowloon), Lands Department commented that the drainage reserve as shown on Plan 6 of the Paper could be realigned by the future developer subject to the Director of Drainage Services’ agreement. The Chairperson said that as detailed design requirements would be included in the planning brief to guide the future development, requirements such as the alignment of drainage reserve and provision of public passageway etc. could be further considered at that stage.

30. A Member asked if the rare shrub *Aristolochia thwaitesii* Hook. f. was only found

in the site which was proposed to be rezoned from “GB” to “SSSI”. Mr. David C.M. Lam said that the shrub was also found in other locations, however the site at Deep Water Bay Valley harboured the largest surviving population in Hong Kong. Regarding the major difference between the “GB” and “SSSI” zones, the “SSSI” zone was more restrictive in terms of uses that were included under Column 1 and Column 2. The Chairperson supplemented that apart from *A. thwaitesii*, other plant species of conservation values, including *Camellia hongkongensis* and *Artabotrys hongkongensis* were also present at the site. The Vice-chairman enquired on the logic of delineating the boundary of the proposed “SSSI” site. Mr. David C.M. Lam said that, as advised by the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC), the rare shrub was found at 20-120m above the sea level. Hence, the proposed “SSSI” site was delineated mainly by following the contour lines of 20-120m as well as the natural features. A Member asked for the rationale of designating SSSI sites. Mr. David C.M. Lam said that SSSI sites were proposed by the DAFC who had conducted study and survey on the species to ascertain the boundary and recommended protection. Another Member wanted to know whether the public would be consulted on the designation of SSSI sites. Mr. David C.M. Lam said that the current site only involved government land, thus there would unlikely be any implication on private land interest. He said that the DC would be consulted on the proposed amendments to the OZP when the Plan was published for public inspection under the Ordinance. The Chairperson added that during the plan-making process, the public could submit representations to the TPB during the statutory consultation period of the OZP.

31. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Shouson Hill & Repulse Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H17/9 as mentioned in paragraph 4 of the Paper;
- (b) agree that the draft Shouson Hill & Repulse Bay OZP No. S/H17/9A at Attachment II(A) (to be renumbered as S/H17/10 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment II(B) of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance;
- (c) adopt the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment II(C) of the

Paper as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Town Planning Board (TPB) for the various land use zonings of the OZP; and

- (d) agree that the updated ES was suitable for exhibition together with the draft Shouson Hill & Repulse Bay OZP No. S/H17/9A (to be renumbered as S/H17/10 upon exhibition) and issued under the name of the TPB.

### **Agenda Item 8**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H18/56                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Site Coverage  
from 22.5% to not more than 31% for Proposed House Development  
in “Residential (Group C)4” zone,  
13 Big Wave Bay Road, Shek O  
(MPC Paper No. A/H18/56)

---

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

32.            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;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of site coverage (SC) from 22.5% to not more than 31% for proposed house development;
- (c) departmental comments – the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries & Conservation had no adverse comment on the proposed minor relaxation of site coverage restriction for the site, but pointed out that the 2 trees proposed to be felled (i.e. T159 and T225) were rather mature and in good condition which should be preserved as far as possible. The Director of Leisure and Cultural Services commented that the applicant should

critically review the need of tree felling and preserve all the existing trees as far as possible;

- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection was received by the District Officer; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed relaxation of SC from 22.5% to a maximum of 31% did not exceed the maximum permissible level adopted by the Town Planning Board (i.e. 50%). The proposal was solely to cater for design flexibility to achieve a stepped height design. There would be no adverse impacts and relevant departments consulted had no objection to the application. To ensure that the future tree felling works would be subject to appropriate planning control, an approval condition was proposed requiring the submission and implementation of a tree preservation proposal and the submission of quarterly monitoring reports during the construction stage.

33. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

34. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 5.9.2012, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the submission and implementation of a tree preservation proposal and a landscape proposal, and the submission of quarterly tree preservation monitoring reports during the construction period to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of a Geotechnical Planning Report and implementation of

the necessary stabilisation/mitigation works identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Civil Engineering and Development or of the TPB; and

- (c) the provision of water supplies for fire-fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

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

- (a) note that the approval of the application did not imply that gross floor area (GFA) exemption for the voids, attic spaces and the headroom of the Grand Ballroom proposed in the development would be granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. If GFA exemption for the proposed spaces was not granted by the Building Authority and the proposed plot ratio exceeded the Outline Zoning Plan restriction, a fresh planning application to the TPB would be required;
- (b) note the comments of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation on the tree preservation proposal;
- (c) note the comments and requirements of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department on the sewer connection and drainage system and on the submission of drainage plans for the proposed development at the site;
- (d) note the comments of the Director of Fire Services regarding the compliance of Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue; and
- (e) resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owner of the application site.



[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.]

[Ms. Lily Y.M. Yam, STP/HK, was invited to the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 9**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H1/86                      Proposed Hotel  
                                    in "Residential (Group A)" zone,  
                                    2 & 4 Hau Wo Street, Kennedy Town  
                                    (MPC Paper No. A/H1/86)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

36.            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 hotel;

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

- (c)    departmental comments – the Commissioner for Tourism supported the application as the proposal would enhance the provision of new hotel rooms, broaden the range of accommodation for visitors and support rapid development of the convention and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries;
- (d)    three public comments were received during the statutory publication period. Two commenters objected to the application on traffic ground. The remaining one was attached with 31 questionnaires with 28 objecting

and 3 in support of the application. The objection was raised mainly on grounds of adverse traffic impact on the surrounding area; destruction of the existing tranquil environment of Hau Wo Street; law and order problem; risk to pedestrian safety at Hau Wo Street; and excessive building bulk which was incompatible with the surrounding developments. The comments in support of the application were of the views that the location of the hotel at the junction of Smithfield and Hau Wo Street would not affect the tranquil environment of Hau Wo Street where the residential developments were concentrated along the central portion of the street; and it would help to enhance business opportunities for shops in the area;

- (e) the District Officer advised that the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) had all along been quite sensitive about hotel developments in the district. At the meeting held on 13.12.2006, members of the Food, Environmental Hygiene and Works Committee (FEHWC) of the C&WDC requested the Planning Department to consult DC/FEHWC as and when an application for hotel development was considered. Members were particularly concerned about traffic burden and adverse environmental impacts caused by hotel development; and
  
- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed hotel was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were predominately a mixture of old and new residential developments with commercial use/retail shops on lower levels. The applicant had made efforts to address the Committee's concerns by consolidating the supporting facilities of hotel use and reducing the area for back-of-house facilities by about 40%. The refinement in the architectural design of the hotel development, as well as the provision of landscaped decks, would provide visual relief and greening effect. Regarding the public concern on traffic impact, the Transport Department had no objection to the application.

37. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

38. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 5.9.2012, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the provision of set-back along Hau Wo Street and corner splay at the junction of Smithfield and Hau Wo Street for public use to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of a sewerage impact assessment and implementation of mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (d) the provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

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

- (a) note that the approval of the application did not imply that the proposed non-domestic plot ratio of the proposed hotel development and the proposed gross floor area (GFA) exemption for back-of-house facilities would be granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. In addition, if hotel concession, in particular the non-domestic plot ratio of the development, was not granted by the Building Authority and major changes to the current scheme were required, a fresh planning application to the TPB might be required;

- (b) note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department with regard to the areas accountable for GFA and/or site coverage calculation;
- (c) apply to the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South, Lands Department for a licence to permit the applied use and to note the comment on lease modification;
- (d) note the comment of the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban, Transport Department with regard to surrendering/dedicating the set-back and the corner splay area, and seek agreement with relevant departments on the management and maintenance responsibilities of the set-back and corner splay;
- (e) note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department that the Sewerage Impact Assessment should be prepared and submitted as early as possible in view of the time required for the implementation of any required sewerage works; and the applicant's responsibility to bear the costs and undertake improvement and upgrading works to the existing public sewerage system for handling additional discharge due to the proposed development; and
- (f) note the comments of the Director of Fire Services regarding the compliance of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue.

**Agenda Item 10**

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H3/384            Proposed Hotel  
                         in “Residential (Group A)” zone,  
                         90-100 & 106 Hill Road, Hong Kong  
                         (MPC Paper No. A/H3/384)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

40.            The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 28.8.2008 for a deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time to address the concerns of relevant Government departments. The applicant indicated that the further submission would be made within two months from the date of his letter.

Deliberation Session

41.            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 agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within two 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.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Lily Y.M. Yam, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. Ms. Yam left the meeting at this point.]

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

**Agenda Item 11**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Further Consideration of Application No. A/H5/370  
Proposed Eating Place/Shop and Services in “Open Space” zone,  
6/F, 7/F and 20/F-22/F,  
196-206 Queen’s Road East, Wan Chai  
(MPC Paper No. A/H5/370A)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

42. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by a subsidiary company of Hopewell Holdings Ltd. Mr. Felix W. Fong, having current business dealings with Hopewell Holdings Ltd., had declared an interest in this item. The Committee noted that Mr. Fong had tendered apologies for not attending the meeting.

43. Ms. Donna Y.P. Tam, STP/HK, informed that replacement page 8 for the Paper had already been sent to Members. She then presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed eating place/shop and services;
- (c) the Committee on 20.6.2008 decided to defer a decision on the application pending submission of additional information from the applicant to address Members’ concerns on the cumulative impacts of all the eating places and shop and services uses (including associated delivery activities) in the subject building on the pedestrian flow for the dedicated areas at G/F and 2/F, and on the lift service of the whole building;
- (d) the applicant on 16.7.2008 submitted further information which included a lift traffic study report with detailed calculation showing the queuing time and the capacity of lift services for the whole building. Subsequently, the applicant

on 16.8.2008 and 26.8.2008 submitted further information which mainly consisted responses to the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS)'s comments and a revised lift traffic analysis;

- (e) departmental comments – the DEMS considered that the applicant's assumption of a 2-hour lunch for the clientele of the proposed eating places was on the high side, and suggested using 12% handling capacity which catered for shorter lunch periods. By applying the 12% handling capacity, the result showed that the required 5 minutes handling capacity exceeded that provided by each of the existing lifts;
- (f) one public comment was received during the statutory publication period of the application raising objection to the application on grounds of oily fume and noise problems. During the statutory publication period of the further information, two public comments were received. One of the commenters objected to the proposed eating place use and requested to maintain the office use. The other commenter indicated that there was serious shortage of restaurants around the area during lunch peak hours and the situation should be improved;
- (g) the District Officer advised that some Wan Chai West Area Committee members were concerned about fire and safety problem and the Wan Chai District Council Chairman raised objection to the application. The gradual conversion of office use into eating place deviated from the original planned use of the building and might cause danger; and
- (h) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 5 of the Paper. According to the applicant's lift traffic study for lunch time traffic, by adopting a high, mid and low lift service zone arrangement, the lift services would be adequate to cater for the cumulative impacts of the proposed change of use during peak hours and there would be no obstruction to the dedicated areas at G/F and 2/F as a result of queuing activities. The queuing space area of 20.7m<sup>2</sup> would be able to accommodate a maximum of 42 persons and was

sufficient to ensure no queues within public areas. While the DEMS suggested using 12% handling capacity, it was noted that the 12% requirement was only a British standard and whether it was applicable to the Hong Kong situation was yet to be proven. As the applicant committed to provide high-class eating services, it was not unreasonable to assume a longer lunch period of 1.5 hours, which was equivalent to a required 5 minutes handling capacity of 10.6%. Under this scenario and three lift service zone arrangement, the expected queues would be no more than 50 persons. Noting that queuing space was available on the G/F (for 42 persons as proposed by the applicant) and 2/F, the expected queues could generally be coped with. There would unlikely be obstruction to the dedicated areas at G/F and 2/F due to the queuing activities. The proposed lift services should be adequate to cater for the cumulative impacts of the proposed change of use during peak hours.

44. By referring to the applicant's further information at F-Appendix VI of the Paper, a Member asked about the method in estimating the population of each floor. Ms. Donna Y.P. Tam said that for the floor used for eating place purpose, the number of persons on that floor was estimated on the basis of one person per square metre of the tenable area of the floor.

#### Deliberation Session

45. Mr. Anthony Loo, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), Transport Department said that the Committee had previously raised concern on the cumulative impacts of all the eating places in the subject building and worried that people waiting for lift service might overspill onto the footbridge and the pavement. He expressed his concern on the lift service assessment as the DEMS had reservation on the results of the lift traffic analysis submitted by the applicant, and the two parties had used different assumptions in the assessment.

46. The Chairperson noted that there was no established standard for lift traffic analysis in Hong Kong, and for a commercial building located within the "Commercial" zone, uses like eating place, office and shop and services were always permitted without the need to



obtain planning permission. Also, it was not uncommon that there were queues waiting for lifts in a commercial/office building during peak hours. Some Members echoed this point and opined that without an established standard in Hong Kong, there was no strong justification to reject the application based on the lift handling capacity of the subject building. However, these Members had reservation about the possible obstruction at G/F and 2/F footbridge which were dedicated areas for public passage. A Member asked which department would take enforcement action if the management of the subject building failed to properly manage the queuing activities. The Chairperson said that whilst there were no specific Government departments to enforce, if the queuing activities had become problematic, concerned District Council and users of the building and the footbridge could raise the issue with the management of the building. It would be the community pressure to force the management of the building to take steps to improve the situation. The Vice-chairman stated that it was not desirable to over regulate the change of use between office and eating place within a commercial building as the market force had a role to play in such circumstances.

47. A Member suggested that, if the case was approved, it should be on a temporary basis so that the situation could be monitored by the Committee. Members generally supported, and agreed that a longer period, say five years, would be more desirable so as to balance the need to setting up a business operation in a new building and monitoring the impact on the public.

48. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 5.9.2013, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the provision of adequate space on G/F and 2/F for queuing for lift services during the planning approval period;
- (b) the provision of fire service installations within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 5.3.2009;
- (c) if the above planning condition (a) was not complied with during the

planning approval period, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should be revoked immediately without further notice; and

- (d) if the above planning condition (b) 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.

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

- (a) a temporary approval of five years was granted so as to monitor the operation of the proposed use and the fulfilment of relevant approval conditions;
- (b) to submit a re-assessment on the ratio of the pedestrians generated by the public and the building users for the dedicated areas for public passage on G/F and 2/F of the subject building to demonstrate that the proposed development would have no adverse effect on the granting of gross floor area exemption for consideration by the Building Authority;
- (c) the building management should ensure both smooth operation of the lift services and proper management of any queues, so that there would be no obstruction to the dedicated areas on G/F and 2/F as a result of the queuing activities;
- (d) to ensure that the tenants of the retail/eatery premises within the subject building adopt the loading/unloading arrangement by way of tenancy agreements and through the daily operation/management of the subject building;
- (e) the provision of the total five loading/unloading bays within Hopewell Centre should be for the exclusive use of the subject building and should not obstruct any emergency access; and
- (f) to observe the Noise Control Ordinance and Air Pollution Control

Ordinance, and to minimise any potential impacts of noise and kitchen fume.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Donna Y.P. Tam, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Ms. Tam left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Tom C.K Yip, STP/HK, was invited to the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 12**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H8/390                      Proposed Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture  
   (including Redevelopment of Swimming Pool Complex)  
   in "Open Space" zone,  
   Northeastern Part of Victoria Park, Causeway Bay  
   (MPC Paper No. A/H8/390)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed place of recreation, sports or culture (including redevelopment of swimming pool complex (SPC));
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) the applicant briefed the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) on the proposed

development on 21.5.2008. The Sub-committee members raised concern on the height and massing of the proposed development in a park setting and considered that more greenery should be provided. Members also made some suggestions on the use and design of the SPC roof. The need to improve the accessibility to Victoria Park and the connectivity to the waterfront, though beyond the project scope, should also be addressed where appropriate;

- (e) a total of 39 public comments were received during the statutory publication periods of the application and the further information, of which 15 supported and 10 objected to the application whereas the remaining 14 provided comments and suggestions. The commenters supporting the application for the reasons that there were no indoor public swimming pool and multi-purpose pool in the Causeway Bay area; and there was a need for an indoor SPC of international standard for training and holding aquatic events under all weather conditions. Those commenters raising objection mainly on grounds of loss of public open space at ground level; more greenery should be provided in Victoria Park which served as the ‘city lung’; in-situ redevelopment of the existing SPC and outdoor swimming pool and ancillary facilities could be built outside the complex to reduce the building bulk; excessive building height and mass of the SPC; visual impact of the complex on the surroundings; adverse air ventilation along Hing Fat Street and Electric Road; further aggravating the poor traffic and pedestrian conditions in the Causeway Bay area by holding international sports events at the proposed complex; closure of the existing roller skating rink for 6 years; and public consultation on the proposal should be conducted. Some commenters pointed out that there were other more suitable locations in the territory for a new world-class indoor SPC, and proposed to divide the multi-purpose swimming pool into a public swimming pool and a diving pool for use by the public and athletes respectively; and
- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The proposed use was compatible with the surrounding areas which were mixed

with open spaces, government, institution or community uses and residential developments. The provision of sports and recreational facilities to serve local residents and the public was considered in line with the planning intention of the “Open Space” zone. There would have an increase of public open space from 3 400m<sup>2</sup> to about 7 900m<sup>2</sup> upon redevelopment. The building mass and height of the proposed SPC were similar to other new indoor SPCs. The proposed height of 27m above ground was required mainly to accommodate a 10m high diving platform. To avoid visual impacts on the surrounding areas, the SPC was proposed at the southern part of the site with a half-sunken basement. Further measures such as glass façade and suitable colour scheme would be explored to integrate the proposed SPC with the park. To respect the green setting of the park, a curvilinear form of building was adopted and landscaped areas would be provided at the lower rooftop. Regarding the concerns raised by the HEC and the public, the applicant confirmed that there was a genuine demand for indoor heated SPC to provide year-round services to the public and athletes. The landscaped areas at the lower rooftop of the proposed SPC could serve as viewing platforms for the public. The applicant had also committed to adding more edge planting on the main rooftop so that the building would be in harmony with the surrounding environment. During the temporary closure of the roller skating rink at the site, users could use the rink at King’s Road/Tin Chiu Road in North Point. There would not be any loss in the public open space and most of the affected facilities would be reprovisioned within the Park. The Park was easily accessible from Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Tin Hau Station through Hing Fat Street pedestrian crossing. Apart from existing access connecting the Park to the waterfront and Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter, a new landscaped deck connecting the Park and the waterfront was proposed at the western part of the Park under the Wan Chai Development Phase II Review. The Transport Department had no comment on the application as the existing pedestrian and vehicular routes and the carpark at Hing Fat Street would not be affected by the redevelopment. The applicant’s air ventilation assessment had demonstrated that the proposed development would not cause

insurmountable problem on air ventilation at pedestrian level. The external façade of the proposed development would be of non-reflective material so that the sunlight would not be reflected to nearby residents.

51. A Member raised the following questions :

- (a) as there was an indoor swimming pool at Morrison Hill, whether there was any urgency to redevelop the existing swimming pool in Victoria Park and what was the current usage rate of the swimming pool;
- (b) whether the new SPC would be wholly covered. If affirmative, the height of the SPC at 27m above ground, which was equivalent to 8 storeys high, would adversely affect the openness of the Park;
- (c) whether public car parking facilities would be provided upon redevelopment, in particular for the disabled for the ease of picking up/setting down;
- (d) the size of the proposed Tai Chi area; and
- (e) whether there was space within the application site for an open-air swimming pool because an indoor swimming pool would not be environmental friendly if air-conditioning would be provided during summer.

52. Mr. Tom C.K Yip made the following points :

- (a) while detailed information on the utilisation rate of the Victoria Park Swimming Pool was not provided by the applicant, it was understood that the patronage was very high and it was a popular venue for holding major events by schools and associations. Regarding the urgency for redevelopment, the existing swimming pool was over 50 years and in unsatisfactory condition with water leakage problem, hence the maintenance cost was very high. As informed by the applicant, there was an increasing

demand from the public for indoor swimming pools which could provide year-round services. The Morrison Hill Swimming Pool was located within the Wan Chai district. According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), the standard provision was one standard swimming pool per 287 000 population. For the Eastern District, there were two standard swimming pools, one in Chai Wan and the other in Victoria Park, which had met the standard requirements;

- (b) the SPC was proposed at the southern part of the site in order to be farther away from the harbourfront and to minimise visual obstruction to the nearby residential developments. As there would be a 10m-high diving platform and a 3 to 6m-deep diving pool, together with the filtration plant room, the proposed height of 27m above ground was a minimum requirement. The applicant pointed out that the proposed height of the SPC was lower than that in Shing Mun Valley Park;
- (c) the existing public car park at Hing Fat Street would not be included in the redevelopment proposal;
- (d) the Tai Chi area was 200-300m<sup>2</sup> in size ; and
- (e) while the HKPSG had not specified whether the provision of swimming pool should be outdoor or indoor, it was noted that there was an increasing aspiration from the public for indoor swimming pool so that it could also be used in winter.

[Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang left the meeting at this point.]

53. A Member suggested that the proposed redevelopment had presented an opportunity to provide a direct pedestrian connection from the Tin Hau MTR Station to the Victoria Park to address the traffic and pedestrian flow problems at the Hing Fat Street junction during major events. Mr. Tom C.K Yip said that the applicant would be advised to explore the feasibility of providing an underground connection point with the MTR Station. Mr. Anthony Loo, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), Transport Department

indicated his support to the suggestion which could enhance public access to the Victoria Park as a whole. The applicant could liaise with the Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL) on the technical feasibility of the suggestion. In reply to this Member's further question on greening of the proposed SPC, Mr. Tom C.K Yip said that the applicant had proposed lush landscaping at various levels of the SPC as well as more edge planting at the rooftop and vertical green wall. An approval condition was recommended requiring the submission of a landscape master plan to ensure that the proposed SPC would not be incompatible with the park setting.

54. A Member queried whether the proposed height of 27m above ground was absolutely necessary. While a half-sunken basement had been proposed to accommodate the filtration plant room, the applicant should further explore the possibility of building it wholly underground so as to minimize the overall building height. Effort should also be made to lower the height of the roof structure. Moreover, the applicant appeared to have included too many facilities in the proposed layout plan for the application site and, as a result, the proposed SPC was too bulky causing overwhelming effect along Hing Fat Street. This Member was of the opinion that the applicant should review the layout of the proposal and tried to reduce the bulkiness of the development, particularly along Hing Fat Street. In response, Mr. Tom C.K Yip said that the filtration plant room was 6-7m deep. As the application site fell within the Railway/Route Protection Boundary of the future North Hong Kong Island Line (NIL), the applicant would need to further consult the Highways Department on the possibility of further sunken the filtration plant room below ground. Regarding the proposed layout, Mr. Tom C.K Yip said that it was the applicant's intention to re-provision most of the existing facilities upon redevelopment of the site. In response to another Member's question, Mr. Tom C.K Yip informed that the proposed NIL railway reserve was shown in dotted line on Plan A-1 of the Paper which only indicated the possible alignment and was subject to change.

55. A Member asked if the existing public car park site would be included in the redevelopment proposal. Mr. Tom C.K Yip replied that as the current usage rate of the car park was very high and special transport arrangement such as providing coach parking spaces during the organisation of major events, the car park had to be retained. This Member opined that car parking facilities could also be incorporated in the proposed redevelopment to achieve more efficient use of land. Mr. Anthony Loo agreed with this but was concerned



about the interim traffic arrangement during the construction period of the proposed redevelopment. In response to this Member's further question, Mr. Tom C.K Yip said that no objection was received regarding the provision of tennis courts within the proposed redevelopment. The applicant advised that the affected 9 tennis courts would be reprovisioned to the existing handball court site. From a recent site visit, it was noted that the handball court had already been closed and the applicant intended to relocate the tennis courts before commencing the construction of the new SPC.

56. A Member proposed that the new swimming pool should be built at its existing location, and the applicant should consider the provision of an open-air swimming pool or an indoor swimming pool but with an openable roof which was considered to be more environmentally friendly, particularly in summer.

#### Deliberation Session

57. In reply to a Member's question, the Chairperson said that the visual impact of a proposed development was one of the planning considerations under the purview of the TPB. The applicant should demonstrate that the proposed development would not have adverse visual impact on nearby sensitive receivers. As the view expressed by Members could not be readily addressed in the submission made by the applicant, it appeared that the application was not yet ready for approval. Some of the questions required further studies and analysis. Members shared the Chairperson's view. In this regard, the Chairperson advised that the Committee could either defer the consideration of the application pending submission of further information by the applicant to address the Committee's concern, or to reject the application so that the applicant could present his case before the Town Planning Board (TPB) at section 17 review hearing or submit a revised scheme in the form of a fresh application. A Member opined that it was more appropriate to reject the application if the proposed scheme was considered not acceptable. Moreover, if the applicant decided to seek a section 17 review, he could revise his proposal having regard to Members' views and present his case to the TPB at the review hearing. Another Member commented that the redevelopment project should not be unduly delayed. The Secretary informed that the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong had previously raised concern on the Committee's decision of deferring the consideration of applications since the applicant was not given a chance to present the case before the TPB and in some cases the duration of the deferral

period could be lengthy.

58. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application and the reason was that there was insufficient information in the current submission to demonstrate that the proposed scheme was acceptable including the location of the proposed swimming pool complex (SPC), its compatibility with the surrounding developments in terms of building bulk, height and the design of the SPC.

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

### **Agenda Item 13**

#### **Any Other Business**

59. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:10 p.m..