

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 381st Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 19.9.2008**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng

Chairperson

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen

Professor N.K. Leung

Dr. Daniel B.M. To

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr. C.W. Tse

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

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Dr. Ellen Y.Y. Lau

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang

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. Christine K.C. Tse

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms. Doris S.Y. Ting

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 380th MPC Meeting held on 5.9.2008

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 380th MPC meeting held on 5.9.2008 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

(i) New Town Planning Appeal Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 4 of 2008

Proposed Office Development (Amendments to an Approved Master Layout Plan)

in “Comprehensive Development Area” zone,

Taikoo Place, 979 King’s Road, Quarry Bay

(Application No. A/H21/130)

---

2. The Secretary reported that an appeal was received by the Town Planning Appeal Board (TPAB) on 8.9.2008 against the decision of the Town Planning Board (TPB) to reject on review the application (No. A/H21/130) for proposed office development (amendment to an approved master layout plan) in “Comprehensive Development Area” zone. The review application was rejected by the TPB on 27.6.2008 on the following grounds:

- (a) the proposed layout was undesirable in that the disposition of buildings would block visual/breeze corridor, and that most of the open space was only planned to be provided at a later phase of redevelopment, which was subject to uncertainties; and
- (b) the building heights of the proposed Buildings 2A and 2B at 246.6mPD and 270.25mPD respectively were considered excessive in the local context. The information in the submission could not demonstrate that the proposed development would not create any adverse visual impact on the surrounding areas and the ridgeline.

(ii) Appeal Statistics

3. The Secretary also reported that as at 19.9.2008, 13 cases were yet to be heard by the TPAB. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows:

Allowed	:	23
Dismissed	:	108
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	:	129
Yet to be Heard	:	13
Decision Outstanding	:	1
<u>Total</u>	:	<u>274</u>

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

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

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K1/218                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction from 45mPD to 63.3mPD for Educational Institution Use in “Government, Institution or Community” zone, North-western Part of the Main Campus of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Tsim Sha Tsui, (Kowloon Inland Lot No. 9853 RP & Ext. (Part))  
(MPC Paper No. A/K1/218)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

4. The application was submitted by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (HKPU) with AGC Design Ltd. as one of the consultants. The Secretary reported that Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim and Mr. K.Y. Leung had declared interests in this item as Professor Lim had current business dealings with HKPU and its consultant AGC Design Ltd. while Mr. Leung was a part-time lecturer of HKPU. The Committee noted that Professor Lim and Mr. Leung had tendered apology for not attending the meeting.

5. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan, DPO/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application, highlighting that the draft Tsim Sha Tsui Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K1/23 incorporating building height restrictions was exhibited for public inspection on 25.4.2008. The height restriction of 45mPD for the subject “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone was to reflect the predominant existing building height of the HKPU main campus. The proposed development was not known to the Planning Department at that time;
- (b) proposed minor relaxation of building height restriction from 45mPD to 63.3mPD to facilitate the development of an academic building known as ‘Innovation Tower’ for their School of Design at the north-western part of the main campus of HKPU;

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

- (c) departmental comments – the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of Planning Department considered that the submission failed to demonstrate that the proposed Innovation Tower with similar design was not feasible under the existing height restriction; the design presented in the photomontage showed a very solid and impermeable tower that was visually imposing and would significantly reduce the visual openness along this section of Chatham Road South; and the functional efficiency of

internal space on the low side was unsatisfactory. The Chief Architect/Advisory and Statutory Compliance Division of Architectural Services Department (CA/ASC, Arch.SD) considered that the proposed development was not incompatible in terms of building height and architectural scale with the existing buildings in the university campus and in the vicinity; and would not have significant negative visual impact in general on the surrounding areas. Other concerned Government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;

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

- (d) a total of 188 public comments were received during the statutory publication period. Of these, 187 supported the application mainly on the grounds that the proposed minor relaxation was acceptable and reasonable; the design of the Innovation Tower was creative and in harmony with the existing character of the Main Campus and surrounding developments; the creative design by a world famous architect would further enhance the international reputation of HKPU and helped maintain Hong Kong as a world-class city; and the proposed development was a needed facility for the University and it was well served by an effective and user friendly pedestrian system linking the development complex with its surrounding areas. The remaining commenter considered that the proposed relaxation was not minor; such major increase was not consistent with the general height restrictions in the area; and would set a bad precedent. District Officer (Yau Tsim Mong) had no comment on the application; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The relaxation of building height by 18.3m (about 4 storeys) was proposed to facilitate the development of an unconventional, unique and iconic building to meet the space shortfall of HKPU and to help the University establish a new and unique identity in its Main Campus. Nevertheless, whether the innovative design of the Innovation Tower

would bring about improvements to townscape and amenity of the locality could be subjective. Although a higher building height might affect the visual openness at a section of Chatham Road South, the overall visual impact to the surrounding areas was not significant. Moreover, as the design work of the proposed development was completed and accepted by Education Bureau (EDB) before the gazetting of the OZP on 25.4.2008, sympathetic consideration might be given in view of the efforts and resources that had been put into the project and the possible implication to HKPU in the implementation of “3+3+4” academic structure expected to be in operation in 2012. Concerned Government departments consulted had no adverse comments on the application and majority of the public comments received were in support of the application.

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

6. A Member commented that the design, colour and built-form of the proposed Innovation Tower was very different from the character of the existing building clusters in HKPU. This Member asked PlanD to give views on the compatibility of the uniquely designed new building with the overall layout and design of the more traditional existing buildings in the main campus of HKPU.

7. In response, Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan said that CA/ASC, Arch.SD had no adverse comments on the innovative and unique design of the proposed development and considered that the proposed development was not incompatible in terms of building height and architectural scale with the existing buildings in the university campus. Moreover, the proposed Innovation Tower would be used by the School of Design of HKPU, the special design of the building would symbolise the uniqueness of the faculty.

8. A Member commented that the proposed building located right next to Chatham Road South appeared visually imposing on the passer-bys and would create adverse impact on pedestrians and people in the surrounding area. Another Member said that the proposed Innovation Tower might create a wall effect and affect the overall environment and air quality in particular when Chatham Road South was a heavily trafficked trunk road. They asked if the Government departments had considered the impact on the surrounding environment by allowing further development within the HKPU campus.

9. Ms. Heidi Y.M. Chan said that educational institution was a use always permitted within the “G/IC” zone in which there was no plot ratio restriction but only a maximum building height restriction of 45mPD. The proposed Innovation Tower which was located within the “G/IC” zone would be permitted as of right if its building height comply with the OZP restriction. The current application was required as the building height had exceeded the OZP restriction by 18.3m (about 4 storeys). The applicant claimed that if the building height restriction of 45mPD was adhered to, the building would be designed in a rectangular box shape which was massive and monotonous as shown in Drawing A-22 of the Paper. The rectangular box design, with its adverse impact in terms of visual, wall effect and air ventilation to the surrounding area and along Chatham Road South would not be better than the current design which could free up more space at the G/F level for public use.

[Ms. Starry W.K. Lee arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

10. Mr. C.W. Tse also said that if the same floor area was to be maintained, the current proposal of developing a taller and more slender building would have less adverse impact on air ventilation in the surrounding environment. As such, the current proposal with building height taller than the maximum permitted under the OZP would be more desirable from the environmental point of view.

#### Deliberation Session

11. The Chairperson said that it was difficult to determine an appropriate building height restriction for “G/IC” sites, as it depended on the specific use and spot within a large “G/IC” site. In preparing building height review of several OZPs, the building height restrictions for “G/IC” sites would normally reflect the predominant height of the existing and planned/committed developments. The building height restriction proposed for the HKPU site was determined on that basis. The current application was related to the development of an iconic building with unconventional design within the main campus. It would be a subjective judgement on whether such iconic building was appealing and hence merit a relaxation of building height restriction. In considering the application, the Committee should consider whether it was justified to have a signature building for the School of Design and the dynamic built-form of the Innovation Tower with a higher building height was relatively more acceptable than a conventional design with building height complying with the OZP restriction of 45mPD.



12. A Member said that Hong Kong was in need of more iconic buildings. The current design of the Innovation Tower was much better than a standard block design under a building height restriction of 45mPD as illustrated by the applicant. It was legitimate for HKPU to maximise the development potential of its own land within the main campus in order to meet the increasing demand for additional floor space for educational use.

13. Another Member said that the design of this iconic building by an architecture celebrity was attractive but due to its inefficient internal layout, such innovative design would hardly be adopted in commercial buildings because of the lack of business case. This Member also supported the need to have more innovative and iconic buildings in Hong Kong and with the two taller buildings already existed near the proposed development within the main campus of HKPU, the proposed Innovation Tower was considered not incompatible with the overall development in the main campus. The Member therefore supported the proposal.

14. A Member opined that the expansion of tertiary institutions should not be unlimited, in particular institution like HKPU which was located in a congested urban area. The “G/IC” site should more appropriately serve as a breathing space in the Hung Hom district. This Member expressed reservation not only on the proposed relaxation of building height of the Innovation Tower but also the on-going development of new buildings in the main campus as more space should be left for the public. Another Member supported the development of an iconic building on the site but also shared a similar concern on the on-going new development within the HKPU campus. Whilst supporting the proposed relaxation of building height for the Innovation Tower, this Member asked the Government to consider whether further expansion of HKPU should continue to be allowed within the Hung Hom District or better be located in other parts of the territory.

15. Another Member commented that the proposed Innovation Tower was an architectural icon which needed to be located within a large open area setting in order to allow its uniqueness to stand out. The proposed location within a compact campus environment was not an appropriate setting for such an iconic building. This Member opined that HKPU should seriously consider seeking an alternative site for its the long term expansion plan.

16. The Chairperson noted Member's concern on the congested layout of the main campus of HKPU and the long term development of HKPU. While each tertiary institution would have its different means to cater for additional space requirement arising from the implementation of '3+3+4' education policy, those institutions located in the urban area were subject to more constraints in terms of space available for expansion. Whilst the development of tertiary institutions was a policy matter under the jurisdiction of EDB, Members' concern on the long-term campus development of HKPU could be relayed to EDB for their consideration in formulating the long term policy and strategy for the development of tertiary institutions in Hong Kong. As far as the subject application was concerned, the applicant claimed that there was a need to have additional floor space to cater for the demand generated from the implementation of the new academic policy of '3+3+4' for HKPU.

17. A Member appreciated the imminent need of HKPU to develop a new building to implement the new academic policy of '3+3+4' and said that the current design of the proposed Innovation Tower would not generate adverse visual impact when viewed from Chatham Road South and Princess Margaret Road. This Member commented that although the proposed building would take up some existing open space, more open space might need to be taken up for the development of the building if the proposed relaxation of building height was not allowed, thus generating an adverse impact on the overall layout of HKPU. Therefore, this Member supported the application.

[Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

18. Another Member said that the application was related to the proposed relaxation of building height to facilitate the development of the Innovation Tower rather than the long term developments of HKPU. Given the small site area and irregular site configuration, the design of a taller building with smaller site coverage could help relieve the sense of crowdedness in the main campus. Moreover, the disposition of the proposed building which leaned towards Chatham Road South would allow wider separation space from other buildings within the campus. This Member therefore supported the application.

19. To address Members' concern on the congested setting of the proposed development within the main campus, One Member said that HKPU should be advised to explore the possibility of identifying other sites for the development of some

departments/faculties in the long term in order to avoid over-expansion of the main campus should the application be approved.

20. A Member remarked that the Administration should adopt a balanced and long-term approach in planning the development of tertiary education in Hong Kong and should not focus on the development of one individual educational institution like HKPU. Other institutions should be given the same opportunity.

21. The Chairperson said that to cater for the long-term development of tertiary institutions in Hong Kong and to facilitate the relocation of existing tertiary institutions in the urban area with limited expansion space, a site in New Development Area had previously been identified for such purpose. The issue of relocating existing universities to the New Territories for further expansion had also been explored during the public consultation of Hong Kong 2030. However, no strong public support was received at that time. In view of Members' concern on the long-term planning of tertiary institutions, in particular for HKPU, it might be opportune to relay Members' views to EDB for consideration.

22. A Member said that Zaha Hadid was a world renowned architect and the Innovation Tower was a very creative design. However, the space utilisation rate was low resulting in the need for a taller building to maintain the same amount of floor area. This Member, though did not object to having an iconic building at this site, wondered whether the proposed building height of 63.3mPD should be allowed. Another Member considered that given the Innovation Tower was an iconic building designed by a renowned architect firm, it would not be appropriate to suggest reducing the building height which might then change the form and proportion of the unique design. Members would have to consider whether the proposed building, being an unconventional design, in its present height and form was considered acceptable. That said, both Members considered that the application could be approved from an architectural viewpoint.

23. Mr. James Merritt said that the public comments received, with 187 out of a total of 188 commenters agreeing to the application, showed that there was an overwhelming support to the application. He pointed out that the development programme of the project would be significantly delayed if another site was to be identified for accommodating this building.

24. To conclude, the Chairperson said that the majority view was in favour of the iconic and innovative design of the proposed building. Members agreed that the application could be approved after balancing the concerns on the possible adverse visual and environmental impacts of the proposed building on the surrounding area, the site of the building within a congested campus, the need for additional floor space to meet the educational demand and the innovative design of an iconic building. The Chairperson indicated that Members' concern on the lack of space for further development within the main campus of HKPU and the long-term planning of tertiary institutions would be conveyed to EDB separately for consideration.

25. 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 19.9.2012, 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 building height of the proposed development should not exceed 63.3mPD at main roof;
- (b) the submission of a traffic impact assessment (TIA), and implementation of the improvement works identified in the TIA, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission and provision of fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (d) the submission and implementation of a landscape master plan and tree preservation proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

26. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant :

- (a) that the approval of the application did not imply that necessary approvals would be given by any Government department. The applicant should

approach the relevant Government departments direct for any necessary approvals;

- (b) to sort out with the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West, Lands Department (DLO/KW, LandsD) on the net site area of KIL 9853RP & Ext. countable for plot ratio purpose under the Buildings Ordinance as the net site area quoted in the application was different from DLO/KW's record;
- (c) to apply to the DLO/KW, LandsD for a modification of appropriate conditions of the lease documents and there was no guarantee that such application would be approved, which might be subject to the consideration or approval from higher authority (as consider necessary) and also the terms and conditions that might be imposed as considered appropriate;
- (d) to demonstrate to the DLO/KW, LandsD that the parking requirement as stipulated under the lease conditions was complied with at the Traffic Impact Assessment submission stage;
- (e) to ensure proper positioning of the fresh air intake of the central air-conditioning system to avoid adverse air quality impact of nearby air pollutant emission sources (including chimney emissions) on the indoor areas of the proposed development;
- (f) to ensure that the provision of emergency vehicular access should be in full compliance with Part VI of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Fire Fighting and Rescue;
- (g) to consult the Director of Fire Services on the requirements of fire safety provisions within the Site; and
- (h) to consult the Director of Drainage Services in respect of any encroachment upon the drainage reserve within the lot.

[Mr. Felix W. Fong and Professor N.K. Leung left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

**Agenda Item 4**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/KC/336                      Proposed Hotel in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone,  
Topsy Tower, 659 Castle Peak Road, Kwai Chung (KCTL 193)  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/336A)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

27.                      The Committee noted that the applicant on 20.8.2008 requested to further defer a decision on the application for two months in order to allow time for the preparation of a detailed “Hazard Assessment Report” to address concerns from relevant departments and for submission to the Coordinating Committee on Land-use Planning and Control relating to Potentially Hazardous Installations for consideration.

**Deliberation Session**

28.                      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 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 further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

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

**Kowloon District**

[Ms. Annie K.W. To, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Wang Tau Hom and  
Tung Tau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K8/17  
(MPC Paper No. 27/08)

---

29. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms. Annie K.W. To presented the proposed amendments to Wang Tau Hom and Tung Tau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and covered the following main aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) the findings on the review of “Open Space” (“O”) zone, as detailed in paragraph 4 of the Paper, were that amongst 11 “O” sites (about 27.37 ha) on the OZP, nine of them (about 25.35 ha (92.52%)) had been developed. The remaining two undeveloped “O” sites, which comprised Government land only and were currently well vegetated, were recommended to be retained as “O” zone;

[Mr. Felix W. Fong and Professor N.K. Leung returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (b) the proposed amendments to the OZP, as detailed in paragraph 5.1 and Attachment I of the Paper, were mainly to rezone three strips of land to the north and west of Wang Tau Hom Estate from “O” and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone to reflect the as-built development of an open car park and two estate roads of Wang Tau Hom Estate. Moreover, a site at the junction of Wang Tau Hom South Road and Fu Keung Street, comprised the western portion of an existing car park block and the landing of an existing elevated walkway within the lot boundary of Lok Fu Estate, and under the Housing Authority (HA)’s management, was proposed to be rezoned from “G/IC” to “R(A)” to tally with the lot boundary of Lok Fu Estate. Besides, two sites were to be rezoned from “R(A)” to “G/IC” to reflect the as-built developments of the Lo Fu Ngam Electricity Substation and the Wong Tai Sin ‘B’ Electricity Substation;

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

- (c) the proposed amendments to the Notes of the OZP, as detailed in paragraph 5.2 and Attachment II of the Paper; were mainly to update the maximum gross floor area (GFA) for the “Commercial” zone from 15,000m<sup>2</sup> to 17,725m<sup>2</sup> to reflect the as-built maximum GFA of the Lok Fu Shopping Centre Phase 2; to incorporate the minor relaxation clause on GFA/PR restrictions to the Notes of the “C” and “R(A)” zones respectively; to refine the planning intention in the Notes for the “O” zone; and to incorporate the Board’s decision on refinements to the Master Schedule of Notes, the covering Notes and remarks of the Notes of the OZP, taking into account local circumstances;
- (d) opportunity was taken to revise the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP as detailed in Attachment III of the Paper to reflect the latest development and planning circumstances in the Area; and
- (e) no adverse comments on the proposed amendments were received from relevant Government departments. The Wong Tai Sin District Council would be consulted, subject to the Committee’s agreement to the proposed amendments, during the exhibition period of the OZP for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).

30. In response to a Member’s question on whether HA could use the area proposed to be rezoned from “O” to “R(A)” under Amendment Item A1 for development of additional residential buildings, Ms. Annie K.W. To replied that as the concerned area had been designated as a non-building area reserved for open-air car park use under the lease of Wang Tau Hom Estate, no residential blocks could be built on this area. The same Member then asked whether it was appropriate to amend the maximum GFA of the “C” zone from 15,000m<sup>2</sup> to 17,725m<sup>2</sup> which deviated from the original planning intention of restricting the maximum commercial GFA to 15,000m<sup>2</sup>. Ms. Annie K.W. To responded that the commercial centre was constructed prior to the imposition of the maximum GFA for the “C” zone on the OZP. The proposed amendment was technical in nature mainly to rectify the discrepancy between the OZP restriction and the as-built GFA under the lease.



31. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to :
- (a) agree the proposed amendments to the approved Wang Tau Hom and Tung Tau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K8/17 and that the draft Wang Tau Hom and Tung Tau OZP No. S/K8/17A at Attachment I (to be re-numbered as S/K8/18 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment II were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
  - (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment III for the draft Wang Tau Hom and Tung Tau OZP No. S/K8/17A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for various land uses zonings of the Plan and the revised ES would be published under the name of the Board together with the Plan.

[Mr. Walter K.L. Chan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 6**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K13/234            Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone,  
Unit 1A, G/F, Fook Hong Industrial Building, 19 Sheung Yuet Road,  
Kowloon Bay, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K13/234)

---

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

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

- (a) background to the application, highlighting that the application premises was currently used as a real estate agency without planning permission;

- (b) the shop and services use;
- (c) departmental comments – concerned Government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Kwun Tong); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper in that the shop and services use under application complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Development within “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) Zone as it would not generate significant impacts on fire safety aspect and car parking provision in the existing building. The use at the application premises was considered generally in line with the planning intention of the “OU(B)” zone. Concerned Government departments including the Director of Fire Services, the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department and the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban, Transport Department had no objection to the application. No local objection was received. Moreover, planning approvals for ‘Shop and Services’ use at the application premises and other workshop units in its vicinity had previously been granted by the Board. There had been no change in planning circumstances and no complaint was received since approval of the previous application.

33. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

34. The Committee noted that quite a number of similar applications for shop and services use in the Kowloon Bay Business Area had previously been approved.

35. After further 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 safety measures, including provision of a means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion of the building and fire service installations in the application premises, within 6 months from the date of the approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 19.3.2009; 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.

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

- (a) note that prior planning permission should have been obtained before commencing the applied use at the application premises;
- (b) apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department for a temporary wavier or lease modification;
- (c) appoint an Authorized Person to submit building plans for the proposed change of use to demonstrate compliance with the Buildings Ordinance, in particular :
  - (i) provision of 2 hours fire resisting separation wall between the application premises and the remaining portion of the building in accordance with Building (Construction) Regulation 90 and paragraph 8.1 of the Code of Practice for Fire Resisting Construction; and
  - (ii) provision of access for the persons with a disability under the Building (Planning) Regulation 72;

- (d) comply with the requirements as stipulated in the Code of Practice for Fire Resisting Construction; and
- (e) observe road restriction requirements in force when all loading/unloading activities were taking place.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Annie K.W. To, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Ms. To left the meeting at this point.]

[Miss Helen L.M. So, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 7**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/571                      Proposed Shop and Services (Retail Shop) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone, Portion of Unit B2, G/F, Block 1 of Camelpaint Buildings, 62 Hoi Yuen Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/571)

---

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

37.                      With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, 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 shop and services (retail shop);
- (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, indicating support to the application. No local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Kwun Tong); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper in that the proposed shop and services use complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Development within “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) Zone as it would not generate significant adverse impacts on the developments within the subject building and the adjacent areas. The use at the application premises was considered generally in line with the planning intention of the “OU(B)” zone. Relevant Government departments consulted including the Director of Fire Services, the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department and the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban, Transport Department had no in-principle objection to the application.

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

38. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

39. The Committee noted that the application complied with the relevant Town Planning Board Guidelines for Development within “OU(B)” zone.

40. 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 19.9.2010, 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 fire safety measures, including the provision of a means of escape completely separated 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.

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

- (a) apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East for lease modification for the shop and services use at the subject premises;
- (b) comply with the requirements as stipulated in the Code of Practice for Fire Resisting Construction;
- (c) appoint an Authorized Person to submit building plans for the proposed change of use to demonstrate compliance with the Buildings Ordinance, in particular :
  - (i) provision of 2 hours fire resisting separation wall between the application premises and the remaining portion of Unit B2 in accordance with Building (Construction) Regulation 90; and
  - (ii) provision of access and facilities for the persons with a disability under Building (Planning) Regulation 72; and
- (d) strictly follow regulatory restrictions when loading/unloading activities took place, to avoid interfering the main stream traffic, in particular under cumulative effect of nearby road side activities.

**Agenda Item 8**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/572                      Shop and Services (Fast Food Shop) in “Other Specified Uses”  
annotated “Business” zone, Shop G, G/F, Ocean Industrial Building,  
29 Tai Yip Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/572)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

42.            With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, 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, highlighting that the application premises was currently used as a fast food shop without planning permission;
- (b) the shop and services (fast food shop);

[Mr. Walter K.L. Chan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) departmental comments – concerned Government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) one public comment was received during the statutory publication period, indicating support to the application. No local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Kwun Tong); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper in that the shop and services use complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Development within “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) Zone as it would not generate significant adverse impacts on the developments within the subject building and the adjacent areas. The use at the application premises was considered

generally in line with the planning intention of the “OU(B)” zone. Relevant Government departments consulted including the Director of Fire Services, the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department and the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban, Transport Department had no in-principle objection to the application.

43. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

44. The Committee noted that the application complied with the relevant Town Planning Board Guidelines for Development within “OU(B)” zone.

45. After further 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 safety measures, including the provision of a means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion and fire service installations in the subject premises, within 6 months from the date of the approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 19.3.2009; 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.

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

- (a) note that prior planning permission should have been obtained before commencing the applied use at the application premises;
- (b) apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East for temporary waiver or lease modification for the shop and services use at the subject premises;



- (c) comply with the requirements as stipulated in the Code of Practice for Fire Resisting Construction;
- (d) appoint an Authorised Person to submit building plans for the proposed change of use to demonstrate compliance with the Buildings Ordinance, in particular, the reinstatement of the approved access for the persons with a disability under Building (Planning) Regulation 72;
- (e) strictly follow regulatory restrictions when loading/unloading activities took place, to avoid interfering the main stream traffic, in particular under cumulative effect of nearby road side activities; and
- (f) approach the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene for application for food licence.

[The Chairperson thanked Miss Helen L.M. So, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Miss So left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Derek P.K. Tse, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 9**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K18/253                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height  
Restrictions for permitted Residential Development  
in "Residential (Group C) 7" zone, 4 Beacon Hill Road,  
Kowloon Tong  
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/253)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

47. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Derek P.K. Tse, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) restriction from 1.65 to 2.03 and building height restrictions from 5 storeys to 7 storeys for permitted residential development. As advised by the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon of Buildings Department, Level +57.05mPD used for caretaker's office and owner's committee office as shown on the proposed scheme should be counted as a storey. Hence, the proposed residential development should be of 8 storeys;
- (c) departmental comments – the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban, Transport Department (AC for T/U, TD) objected to the application as details of the vehicular access arrangement and the provision and layout of parking and loading/unloading facilities for the development were not provided by the applicant. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) objected to the application as the proposed building height of 84.85mPD (at main roof) would breach the smooth transition of the building height profile of the neighbourhood and the development scheme proposed in the application failed to demonstrate any planning or design merits. The District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department (DLO/KE, LandsD) did not support the proposed inclusion of non-exclusive right of way (ROW) into the total site area for gross floor area (GFA) calculation as it also served adjoining lots;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Kowloon City); and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper in that there were insufficient planning justifications and design merits in the submission to demonstrate the need for the proposed relaxation of PR and building height restrictions by 23% and 60% respectively from planning point of view. The proposed relaxation was not minor in nature and would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications. Moreover, the proposed building height of 84.85mPD would breach the smooth transition of the building height profile of the low-rise residential neighbourhood. AC for T/U, TD objected to the application as the applicant had not provided details of the vehicular access arrangement, and level of provision and layout of parking and loading/unloading facilities for the redevelopment proposal. Besides, the design to include a section of the non-exclusive ROW for internal vehicular access and a parking space on G/F was not acceptable and not supported by DLO/KE, LandsD.

48. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

49. The Committee considered that the applicant had not provided sufficient planning justifications for relaxation of PR and building height restrictions of the OZP.

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

- (a) there were insufficient planning justifications and design merits in the submission for the proposed relaxation of plot ratio and building height restrictions;
- (b) there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the vehicular access arrangement, and the provision and layout of parking and loading/unloading facilities would be acceptable; and

- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications.

[The Chairperson thanked Mr. Derek P.K. Tse, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Mr. Tse left the meeting at this point.]

### **Hong Kong District**

[Ms. Donna Y.P. Tam and Ms. Lily Y.M. Yam, Senior Town Planners/Hong Kong (STPs/HK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 10**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H3/385                      Proposed Hotel in "Residential (Group A)" zone,  
338-346 Queen's Road West, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/385)

---

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

51.            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) proposed hotel;
- (c) departmental comments – the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department advised that the tower above the podium should be setback from the right-of-way so as to maximise the building gap to facilitate ventilation of the area. The Chief Architect/Advisory and

Statutory Compliance Division of Architectural Services Department commented that it was much preferable, if the tower portion (3/F and above) could be set back from the front boundary and the tower facades be broken down with more vertical articulation as to avoid being too imposing over Queen's Road West and also to respect the neighbouring buildings in architectural scale. Other concerned Government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

- (d) a total of 11 comments were received from local residents and members of the public during the statutory publication period. Amongst these, 10 supported mainly on the grounds that the proposed hotel would provide additional job opportunities, help promote tourism and stimulate economic activities in the area; good accessibility and large number of tourist attractions in the district made it suitable for hotel developments; and the plot ratio and building height were compatible with the surrounding developments. The remaining one (with five signatures) objected to the application mainly for the reasons of creating 'wall effect', adverse impacts on air ventilation and traffic; and creating disturbance to the elderly living in the district. Although no local objection/view was received, the District Officer (Central and Western) reminded that the Central & Western District Council had all along been quite sensitive about hotel developments in the district and they were particularly concerned about the traffic burden that hotel development would attract, and the adverse impact that it might have on the environment; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper in that the proposed development with a plot ratio (PR) of 12 was generally acceptable for new hotel developments in the "R(A)" zone as its development intensity was more compatible with surrounding residential developments with permitted PR up to 8 to 10. The use of the proposed hotel with a reduced building height and plot ratio as compared with the previously rejected scheme, were considered not incompatible with the surrounding residential developments. The proposed development would

unlikely generate adverse environmental, traffic, sewerage and drainage impacts on the surrounding areas. Relevant departments including the Director of Environmental Protection, the Assistant Commissioner for Transport /Urban, Transport Department (AC for T/U, TD) and the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department had no adverse comment on the application.

52. In response to a Member's question on the adequacy of the on-site carparking and loading/unloading facilities of the proposed development, Ms. Lily Y.M. Yam said that the AC for T/U, TD was consulted and had no objection to the proposed provision of internal transport facilities.

53. Another Member enquired whether sufficient space would be available for the provision of the required number of carparking and loading/unloading facilities should the building be required to setback. Ms. Lily Y.M. Yam replied that the set back requirement referred to the tower block above the podium and thus would not affect the provision of carparking facilities on the ground floor. Nevertheless, should there be any change in the layout of the proposed development as a result of compliance of the approval condition on the setback requirement, the applicant was required to submit the revised layout to PlanD for comment.

#### Deliberation Session

54. In view of the busy traffic in the vicinity of the site, a Member raised concern that the continued development of high-density building within a congested built-up area might further worsen the traffic condition of the area.

55. The Chairperson said that the concern on the overall density of development in the urban area had to be reviewed in a comprehensive manner as a separate exercise.

56. The Committee noted that similar applications for hotel development within the "R(A)" zone of this district had previously been approved.

57. 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 19.9.2012, 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 upgrading of the existing branch sewer along the northern boundary of the application site (connected to the 225mm diameter trunk sewer along Queen's Road West) from 150mm to 225mm diameter to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the setting back of tower above the podium from the northern and eastern boundaries of the application site to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or the TPB; and
- (d) the provision of water supply for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

58. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant :

- (a) 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) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department with regard to the uses that were/were not qualified as Back-of-house for exclusion from GFA; the facilities accountable for GFA calculation; the unacceptability of the exit staircases discharging into the rear private lane; the exclusion of the right-of-way from site area calculation; the Means of Escape Code; and the provision of a service lane;
- (c) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West & South, Lands Department for a licence to permit the applied use and to note the comment on lease modification;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department and the Chief Architect/Advisory & Statutory Compliance, Architectural Services Department with regard to the setting back of the tower above the podium to facilitate ventilation of the area and to allow tree planting along the pedestrian pavement;
- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department (HyD) on the need to submit foundation plans etc. to the Railway Development Office of HyD and Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited for comments;
- (f) to note the comments of the Head of the Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department that a geotechnical submission should be submitted to the Building Authority for checking in accordance with the provisions of the Buildings Ordinance; and
- (g) to 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 11**

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Further Consideration of Section 16 Application No. A/H8/387

Proposed Residential Development in “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zone,

14-30 King Wah Road, North Point

(MPC Paper No. A/H8/387B)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

59. The application was submitted by a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd.. The Secretary reported that Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan, had declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd.. As the applicant had requested the Committee to defer consideration of the application, Mr. Chan was allowed to stay in the meeting.

60. The Committee noted that the applicant on 1.9.2008 requested to further defer a decision on the application in order to allow time for the applicant to complete and submit the Air Ventilation Assessment, which would be made within two months.

Deliberation Session

61. 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 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.

**Agenda Item 12**

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H15/230            Proposed Hotel in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business(2)” zone,  
39-43 Wong Chuk Hang Road, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/230)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

62.            The Committee noted that the applicant on 1.9.2008 requested to defer a decision on the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare supplementary information to address departmental concerns.

Deliberation Session

63.            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 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.

[Professor N.K. Leung left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 13**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H24/13            Proposed Development of the Red Cross Headquarters and Commercial Offices in “Government, Institution or Community (3)” zone, Junction of Lung Wui Road and Performing Arts Avenue, Central, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H24/13)

---

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

64.            The application was submitted by the Hong Kong Red Cross. The Secretary reported that Professor N.K. Leung had declared an interest in this item as he was a Council Member of the Hong Kong Red Cross. The Committee noted that Professor Leung had already left the meeting.

65.            With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms. Donna Y.P. Tam, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed development of the Red Cross Headquarters (RCHQ) and commercial offices;
- (c) departmental comments – the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban, Transport Department said that the existing RCHQ building was in conflict with the proposed elevated walkway system along the northern side of Harcourt Road/Gloucester Road. Early relocation of the existing RCHQ would facilitate early implementation of the footbridge project. The Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-2, Railway Development Office, Highways Department said that the proposed development fell partly within the land requirement area of the Shatin to Central Link (SCL) and the foundation works of the proposed development might likely encroach upon the tunnels of the SCL underneath. The Chief Town Planner/Special

Duties, Planning Department said that PlanD was currently undertaking an “Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront” which aimed at refining the existing urban design framework for the new Central harbourfront and to prepare planning/design briefs for the key sites. The subject site fell within the study area but was not one of the key sites with specific proposals in the Study;

- (d) two public comments were received during the statutory publication period. One supported the proposed development as the existing RCHQ site would be demolished for pavement widening and the design of the new building would take into account the unique location within the central waterfront. The other comment from the adjacent commercial development raised concern on the design, disposition and height of the proposed building on the environment and the adverse traffic impacts. The District Officer/Wan Chai said that most respondents of the sounding out exercise supported the proposed plan, but some opined that there should not be any commercial element in the development; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – as indicated in paragraph 12 of the Paper, PlanD was currently undertaking the “Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront”. Under the Study, an “Arts and Cultural Precinct” intended for arts and cultural related uses on the harbourfront north of Citic Tower was proposed. Although the application site was not one of the key sites with specific proposals in the Study, as the site was located near the waterfront as well as in close proximity to the proposed “Arts and Cultural Precinct”, there was opportunity to further explore whether the “Government, Institution or Community (3)” zone including the application site should form part of the “Arts and Cultural Precinct”. The use of the site for institutional facilities might not be conducive to complementing the waterfront developments and creating synergy effects with the “Arts and Cultural Precinct”. In view of this and with full appreciation of the re-provisioning need of the existing RCHQ, PlanD was carrying out a site search with a view to identifying a more appropriate re-provisioning site for the RCHQ. It was therefore proposed that a

decision on the application be deferred for two months to allow time for completion of the site search and further discussion with the Hong Kong Red Cross.

66. A Member asked whether there was any timetable in respect of the site search exercise.

67. Ms. Donna Y.P. Tam said that some alternative sites had been identified and PlanD had been liaising with the Hong Kong Red Cross on the suitability of these possible sites. It was anticipated that the site search exercise and the negotiation process would take about two months to complete.

#### Deliberation Session

68. Mr Anthony Loo said that he agreed to PlanD's recommendation to defer a decision on the application pending the result of the site search but he urged PlanD to arrive at an early agreement with the Hong Kong Red Cross on the reprovisioning site so as to allow early implementation of the comprehensive footbridge network.

69. A Member said that given the prime location of the site at the central waterfront, it was more appropriate to reserve the application site for other more compatible uses. This Member supported the action taken by PlanD to identify alternative reprovisioning sites for the existing RCHQ.

70. Another Member shared similar view that the application site was not entirely appropriate for the reprovisioning of non-government organisations. Noting that the existing RCHQ site was affected by various projects including the road widening proposals and the footbridge construction, this Member urged concerned Government departments to assist in identifying a suitable site for the reprovisioning of RCHQ.

71. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application for two months pending the completion of the site search by the Planning Department and further discussion with the Hong Kong Red Cross on the suitability of the reprovisioning sites identified.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Donna Y.P. Tam and Ms. Lily Y.M. Yam, STPs/HK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 14**

Any Other Business

72. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11.05 a.m..