

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 405th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 9.10.2009**

#### **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

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Dr. Daniel B.M. To

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Mr. K.Y. Leung

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr. H.M. Wong

Assistant Director/Kowloon, Lands Department  
Ms. Anita K.F. Lam

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Assistant Director(2), Home Affairs Department  
Mr. Andrew Tsang

**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. Cindy K.F. Wong

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 404th MPC Meeting held on 18.9.2009

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 404th MPC meeting held on 18.9.2009 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

Approval of Draft Plans

2. The Secretary reported that on 6.10.2009, the Chief Executive in Council approved the Wo Keng Shan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (to be renumbered as S/NE-WKS/10) and Shouson Hill & Repulse Bay OZP (to be renumbered as S/H17/11) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The approval of the Plans would be notified in the Gazette on 16.10.2009.

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

[Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan, 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/K20/108            Proposed ‘Office’ Use  
in “Residential (Group A) 1” zone,  
Ground Floor (Part) and Upper Ground Floor (Part),  
Kowloon Inland Lot No. 11073,  
Junction of Hoi Wang Road, Yan Cheung Road and Yau Cheung Road,  
West Kowloon Reclamation Area  
(MPC Paper No. A/K20/108)

---

3.            The Secretary reported that the site was jointly developed by Chinese Estates Group, Sino Land Company Limited, Nan Fung Development Limited and K. Wah Real Estates Company Limited. Mr. Raymond Chan and Mr. Felix Fong had declared an interest in the item as they had current business dealings with Sino Land Company Ltd. The Committee noted that Mr. Raymond Chan had yet to arrive and Mr. Felix Fong left the meeting temporarily at this point.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

4.            Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed ‘office’ use on part of the ground floor and upper ground floor;
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection was received by the District Officer (Yau Tsim

Mong); and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The non-domestic floor space mainly served to provide retail/supporting facilities to meet the demand from the local residents. The proposed development with 6 residential towers (638 units) was relatively isolated from retail/services and office centers in West Kowloon Reclamation Area (WKRA). There was insufficient information in the submission to justify the proposed additional office space in WKRA. Approval of the proposed office use at the premises would compromise the availability of retail/services facilities for the residents in the subject development and the adjoining areas in future. There was no guarantee that the developer would respond to the deficiency of retail/services facilities, if any, in future by converting the office space to retail/services uses in a comprehensive manner. Though the HK2030 Study had indicated that the WKRA provided good opportunities to be turned into a high-grade office cluster, the site was relatively in isolation from the retail/services and office centre and the proposed office use did not help realize the high-grade office cluster in WKRA.

5. In response to the Chairperson's question on the land uses surrounding the application site, Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan, with the aid of Plan A-1, explained that the immediate surrounding of the application was mainly reserved for open space and government, institution or community facilities. The nearest shopping centers were found at the Element Shopping Mall at Kowloon Station and Olympic City at the Olympic Station. Some retail shops were found at the ground floor of the residential development across Yan Cheung Road and Man Cheong Street Community Garden. The major office/commercial cluster was planned at the WKRA to the southwest. There was insufficient information to justify the proposed additional office space at the application site.

6. A Member asked about the future use of the "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") site to the north of the application site. Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan said that the "G/IC" site to the immediate north of the application site was reserved for the

reprovisioning of a police station affected by the proposed Central Kowloon Route whereas the “G/IC” site further north was planned for school use. Members noted that there would be provision of retail space in close proximity to the future residents of the application site. The Chairperson concluded that it would be more appropriate to use the application premises for the provision of retail/services facilities to serve the residents in the development and in the adjoining area in future.

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

### Deliberation Session

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

- (a) there was insufficient information in the submission to justify the proposed additional office space in West Kowloon Reclamation Area, where office accommodation had already been provided/planned; and
- (b) the approval of the application would compromise the availability of retail/services facilities for residents within the development and in the adjoining areas in future.

[The Chairperson thanked Mr. Wilson W.S. Chan, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. Mr. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Felix Fong returned to join the meeting at this point.]

[Ms. M.Y. Woo, STP/TWK, was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 4**

**Section 16A Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/KC/336-2            Application for Class B Amendments to the Approved Hotel  
in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone,  
Topsy Tower, 659 Castle Peak Road, Kwai Chung (KCTL 193)  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/336-2)

---

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

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

8.            Ms. M.Y. Woo, STP/TWK, informed the meeting that a replacement page (P. 9) of the Paper to replace the comments made by the District Officer (Kwai Tsing), Home affairs Department had been tabled at the meeting. She then presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application including the previous application No. A/KC/336 for in-situ conversion of an existing 14-storey industrial building to a proposed hotel development, which was approved with conditions by the Committee on 10.7.2009;
- (b) the application for Class B Amendments to the approved hotel involving an increase in the number of storeys from 19 to 21; increase in site coverage from 50% to 55% and change in location of light bus lay-by;
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) District Officer (Kwai Tsing), Home Affairs Department (DO(K&T), HAD) advised that the Kwai Tsing District Office approached the Councillors of Kwai Tsing District Council (DC) who had previously expressed views on the development. The three DC Councillors did not have objection to the

current application. One of the above DC Councillors indicated that he would like to be informed of new development in the future. One had no comment on the application. The remaining DC Councillor insisted that a footbridge should be provided as there was a genuine need for crossing facilities at the location in question; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The current application for Class B amendments involved technical amendments only and the major parameters of the current scheme, including the site area, gross floor area/plot ratio, numbers of guestrooms, remained the same as the approved scheme. Though the building height and site coverage were increased, the proposed increase in building bulk was considered minor and was acceptable. The increase in building height to around 88.08mPD was not visually incompatible with the surrounding buildings. The change in location of the light bus lay-by to rationalize the internal traffic facilities for safety and convenience of the users was considered acceptable. Although the site was located within the 400m Consultation Zone for Potential Hazardous Installation of the Tsuen Wan Water Treatment Works, the Director Environmental Protection had no adverse comments on the current scheme. As advised by DO (K&T), HAD, the three DC Councillors did not express objection to the current application.

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

#### Deliberation Session

9. In responses to a Member's query on the change in number of hotel rooms noting that the proposed hotel had increased by 2 storeys, Ms. M. Y. Woo confirmed that the number of room was within the range of the previous approved scheme. A Member noted that there was no increase in the total gross floor area (GFA).

10. The Chairperson explained that in order to provide incentive for hotel

development, the developer could apply for exemption of GFA for the provision of BOH facilities ancillary to hotel use by the Building Authority under the Buildings Ordinance. The Secretary added that the increase in the number of storeys was a result of the detailed design of the proposed scheme and there was no change to the total plot ratio of 9.5.

11. A Member noted that there was an increase in site coverage for floors at 4/F and above. Another Member opined that there was no significant impact for the increase in building bulk. The Chairperson said that the mechanism of allowing GFA exemption for BOH facilities under the Buildings Ordinance by Building Authority was a government incentive to encourage hotel development.

12. 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 9.10.2013, 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 design and provision of vehicular access, car park and loading/unloading facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the provision of water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of a revised landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

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

- (a) 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 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;

- (b) to note District Lands Officer/Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing, Lands Department's comment that the applicant should consult Lands Department on the lease modification for the applied use;
- (c) to note Director of Fire Services' comment 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 Firefighting and Rescue;
- (d) to note Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department's comment that the proposed site coverage and plot ratio should not exceed the permitted site coverage and plot ratio under First Schedule of Building (Planning) Regulation (B(P)R) 20 and 21 for a Class A site; adequate open space under B(P)R 25 for a Class A site should be provided; and provision of access for disabled and facilities under B(P)R 72 and the requirements laid down in Design Manual: Barrier Free Access 2008 should be complied with; and
- (e) to note Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, Planning Department's comment that the applicant should seek approvals from relevant departments/authorities for the streetscape design, implementation and maintenance.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. M.Y. Woo, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Ms. Woo left the meeting at this point.]

### **Hong Kong District**

[Mr. Derek W.O. Cheung, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Further Consideration of the Draft Planning Brief for the Former Lingnan College Site at Stubbs Road in the “Comprehensive Development” Area zone on the Draft Mid-levels East Outline Zoning Plan (MPC Paper No. 29/09)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

14. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Derek W.O. Cheung, STP/HK, presented the Paper and covered the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

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

- (a) on 10.7.2009, the Committee considered the draft planning brief (PB) for the Site and agreed that the draft PB was suitable for consultation with the Wan Chai District Council (WCDC). The subject site fell within the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone on the draft Mid-levels East Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H12/11 with maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 16,800m<sup>2</sup> (including not less than 15,300m<sup>2</sup> domestic GFA), building height restriction of 7 storeys including carports and a maximum building height of 120mPD (including roof structures);
- (b) the WCDC was consulted on the draft PB on 21.7.2009. In general, the WCDC had no adverse comment on the draft PB. The main views/queries of the WCDC were summarised as follows;
  - (i) whether the proposed loading/unloading area in the north-eastern corner of the Site would be open for public use for picking-up/setting-down of students;
  - (ii) what was the relationship between the building height restrictions of maximum 7 storeys including carports and maximum 120mPD (including roof structures);

- (iii) for the requirement on provision of private open space of 1m<sup>2</sup> per person, how could the person per flat ratio and the amount of private open space required for the proposed development be ascertained; and
  - (iv) whether the 10m wide non-building area (NBA) was a statutory requirement, and whether it could be enlarged to achieve better greening effect.
- (c) Planning Department provided relevant responses at the WCDC meeting, the gist of which was summarised below:
- (i) the existing stairway along the eastern boundary of the Site would be retained and upgraded. The proposed loading/unloading area in the north-eastern corner of the Site would be open for public use (including school bus and private cars) as required in the draft PB to facilitate access to the pedestrian link;
  - (ii) the planning intention of the building height restrictions of maximum 7 storeys including carports and maximum 120mPD was to preserve public view along Bowen Road and the general amenity of the area. The topography of the Site was steep, rising from about 70mPD to over 105mPD. The height restriction of maximum 120mPD would contain the entire development to not exceeding the level of Bowen Road while the restriction of maximum 7 storeys would ensure that the height of proposed buildings would be compatible with the surrounding developments, which were predominately 3 to 4-storey residential buildings;
  - (iii) the provision of private open space within the Site would be based on an agreed “persons per flat” assumption at the Master Layout Plan (MLP) submission stage. Generally speaking, developers would be keen to incorporate landscape features and provide private open space as much as practicable within private developments; and

(iv) the proposed 10m wide NBA was stipulated in the draft PB as one of the planning requirements. As part of the future MLP submission, the applicant was required to submit a landscape master plan and a tree preservation proposal for the Site including the NBA. Within the NBA, existing trees and vegetation should be preserved in-situ as far as practicable and compensatory planting should be provided if felling of the existing trees was inevitable. As the draft PB had also stipulated an overall minimum greening ratio of 30%, the designation of a wider NBA along the north-western boundary of the Site would not be necessary, as it would constrain the design flexibility of the future development.

(d) taking into account WCDC's views on the greening aspect, it was proposed to refine the greening ratio to stipulate further that a minimum of 20% greening should be provided at ground level. The draft PB had been revised to incorporate an amendment to the greening ratio and the other amendments incorporated in the draft OZP No. S/H12/11 which were relevant to the site.

15. Noting that the site was on a sloping ground, the Chairperson asked how the ground level greening would be defined. Mr. Derek Cheung explained that the greening ratio was calculated based on the gross site area of 1.6 ha and 20% of greening area should be provided at ground level. The Secretary said that the ground level referred to the level of the platform upon which the buildings would be erected. Planting on slopes would not be counted towards the greening ratio for ground level. In response to a Members' question, Mr Cheung explained that the future buildings on the site would be erected on at least 2 platforms and the platform level where the buildings would be erected upon could be considered as the ground level and counted towards the 20% greening ratio.

16. A Member asked whether building height of the new development would be lower than the existing buildings. Mr. Derek Cheung explained that building height restriction of maximum 7 storeys was imposed on the site and hence future redevelopment would be lower than the existing buildings which were of 12 storeys in height.

17. The same Member asked whether building was allowed on top of the drainage

tunnel protection zone and whether it would be counted toward the 20% greening ratio at ground level. Mr. Derek Cheung said that no building works would be allowed within the drainage tunnel protection zone and slopes within the zone would be counted towards the overall 30% greening ratio but not counted toward the 20% at grade.

18. The Committee decided to :

- (a) note the views of the Wan Chai District Council as summarised in paragraph 3 and Attachment IV of the Paper; and
- (b) endorse the revised draft planning brief (PB) at Attachment I of the Paper to provide guidance and serve as a reference for the submission of planning application for the Site.

[The Chairperson thanked Mr. Derek W.O. Cheung, STP/HK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Mr. Cheung left the meeting at this point.]

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

### **Agenda Item 6**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H8/397                      Proposed Hotel in "Residential (Group A)" zone,  
Western Part of the ex-North Point Estate Site  
(Proposed Inland Lot No. 9020)  
(MPC Paper No. A/H8/397)

---

19. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong East, Lands Department and the application site was a sale site. Ms. Anita Lam, as a representative of Lands Department, had declared an interest in this item.

[Ms. Anita Lam left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

20. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Tom C.K. Yip, STP/HK, informed the Committee that a memo from Director of Home Affairs incorporated the comments from District Officer (East) was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference. He then presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel;
- (c) departmental comments – the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) advised that the site had an extensive harbour frontage exceeding 110m. In addition to a 60% site coverage restriction, it was prudent to require provision of measures to improve building permeability (e.g. building separation, sky garden, varied building profile, etc.) in the development scheme. The Commissioner for Tourism supported the application as the proposed hotel development would increase the number of hotel rooms, broaden the range of accommodations for visitors, and supported the rapid development of convention and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period. District Officer (East), Home Affairs Department (DO(E), HAD) advised that the residents of the Braemar Hill area were concerned about the height of the newly developed buildings in the North Point area. Besides, the Planning, Works and Housing Committee under the Eastern District Committee (EDC) discussed the development of the site concerned at its meetings on 27.2.2009 and 10.9.2009. During the consultation on the draft Planning Brief (PB) for the proposed development at the ex-North Point Estate (ex-NPE) site on 27.2.2009, several committee members were of the view that there were many hotels in North Point and thus there was no urgent need for a hotel facility in the district. The site should be used

for construction of a theatre instead. However, a committee member supported the proposed hotel use as there was no low-priced hotel facility in the district. During the discussion on a committee paper “To add green lungs for health protection” on 10.9.2009, a member strongly requested the government to withhold the proposed site for hotel from the land sales application list. Several members also reiterated that owing to the high population density of North Point and the lack of open space in the district, the site should be rezoned for construction of a theatre or leisure facilities; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. In the formulation of the proposed uses and development parameters for the ex-NPE site under the PB, due regard had been given to the waterfront setting, surrounding land uses, Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC)’s harbour planning guidelines, the findings of an Air Ventilation Assessment Study, and the comments of Government departments on the relevant technical aspects. The development parameters of the proposed hotel under application were in line with the PB. The proposed hotel development was compatible with the surrounding areas which were mixed with residential, commercial and hotel developments. The maximum gross floor area, building height (BH) and site coverage adopted would ensure compatibility with the harbour-front setting and enhance visual and air permeability to the harbour. The proposed hotel development would not generate any significant adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. Relevant department had no objection to and no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the general concern of the residents of the Braemar Hill area, the maximum BH of the proposed hotel development was 80mPD, which was 20m lower than the maximum BH allowed under the OZP and Chief Architect/Advisory and Statutory Compliance, Architectural Services Department considered that the proposed development was compatible with the adjacent developments and would not generate significant visual impact. Regarding the comment on reserving the site for theatre use, HAB advised that the provision of theatre would need to consider within the context of

overall planning, availability of existing performance venues, the cultural policy and financial commitment. There were existing venues on Hong Kong Island including City Hall, Queen Elizabeth Stadium, Sheung Wan and San Wan Ho Civic Centres and planned venues including conversion of the Yau Ma Tei Theatre, new annex for Ko Shan Theatre and West Kowloon Cultural District. There was no imminent need to provide another theatre in North Point. As regards the comments from CTP/UD&L, an approval condition on the submission of the design and disposition of building blocks of the proposed development was included.

21. Noting that the site had a frontage of 110m along the waterfront, a Member suggested imposing a condition to state clearly the requirement on a minimum separation distance between buildings above the podium, say in the form of a percentage with reference to the overall width of the site, to avoid wall effect and adverse air ventilation impact. Mr. Tom Yip responded that no specific requirement on the separation distance between buildings was imposed so as to allow design flexibility for the future development. Besides, an approval condition requiring the submission of an air ventilation assessment was imposed to ensure that the hotel development would not create adverse impact on air ventilation. Furthermore, as recommended under the Air Ventilation Assessment carried out for the whole ex-NPE site, two wind corridors would be maintained along Kam Hong Street and Shu Kok Street respectively so as to improve air ventilation in the area.

22. While agreeing to the need to allow design flexibility in the future development, the same Member was of the view that a clear requirement on the building separation distance would avoid future argument. Developer and Practitioners preferred certainty in the land sale condition. Referring to the consultation document on the Building Design to Foster a Quality and Sustainable Built Environment, this Member suggested to specify a gap equivalent to as say, 20% of the frontage of the site, between buildings. The Secretary drew Members' attention to the fact that the site was already subject to a maximum site coverage of 60% and the requirement for a separate distance between buildings above podium might create design problem as hotel development was usually built in one block. To address Members' concern, she suggested that Planning Department should be asked to study how a specific requirement could be set and report the findings back to the Committee for consideration. The Chairperson added that there was already a building setback requirement

of 3m on three sides of the site. Further setback on one or both sides could be explored. The same Member had no objection to the suggestion and commented that the main intention to specify a minimum separation distance between buildings was to break up the building mass for the site which had a long frontage and the setting back of buildings in two sides would not achieve the purpose. He cited Provident Centre as an example that developers preferred to maximize the sea view by using up the full length of the lot frontage. This Member also commented that the linking up of two separate tower blocks by a bridge for instance could be a possible design.

23. Dr. Daniel To had declared an interest as he was a Councillor of EDC who had organized the North Point Harbour Conceptual Design Competition. The Committee considered the interest was indirect and Dr. To was allowed to stay.

24. A Member noted that the EDC's comments on the Notional Scheme and the winning entries of the Conceptual Design Competition organised by the EDC were conveyed to the Committee for consideration and he asked how the current scheme had responded to these comments. Mr. Tom Yip responded that the Notional Scheme served as a guideline for future development and the comments of EDC were considered by the Committee together with the PB. The proposed hotel development under application was in line with the PB. This Member also supported the inclusion of building separation but remarked that the requirement should be flexible enough to allow innovative design.

25. A Member supported the suggestion to specify the building separation as it would provide a clear guideline to future developers, allow design flexibility and maintain fairness. Another Member commented that it should be clearly indicated how the separation between buildings should be provided to avoid future dispute such as whether the separation should be perpendicular to the harbour front or could be at a slanting angle. Another Member opined that the same principle should be applied to both Site A and Site B within the ex-NPE site.

26. Noting that Java Road Municipal Services Building and Java Road Market were just opposite to the application site, which had an elongated shape, and built up to the edge of the road, a Member asked whether there was any proposal to enhance the street environment between the market building and the proposed hotel development. Mr. Tom Yip responded that the existing Java Road Municipal Services Building and Java Road Market and the

proposed hotel development were separated by North Point Estate Lane. The Lane would be widened and a 3m setback would be provided on the side of the proposed development, resulting in more than 16m separation between the existing buildings and the proposed hotel development. The setback area would be landscaped to improve the amenity in the area. He would convey the concerns on the future frontage treatment of the existing buildings of the Member to relevant departments for consideration.

### Deliberation Session

27. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to defer decision on the application and requested PlanD to work out a requirement regarding the provision of a minimum separation distance between buildings above podium and report back to the Committee in due course.

[Ms. Anita Lam returned to joint the meeting at this point]

### Agenda Item 7

#### Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H15/238                      Proposed Petrol Filling Station and Proposed Industrial Building  
in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business(2)” zone,  
19 and 21 Wong Chuk Hang Road, Aberdeen  
(Aberdeen Inland Lots 278 and 280)  
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/238)

---

28. The Secretary reported that the applicant was partly owned by a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd (Henderson). Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan had declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with Henderson. As the Paper was on the applicant’s request to defer consideration of the application, Members agreed that Mr. Chan was allowed to stay in the meeting.

29. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative had requested on 17.9.2009 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to

allow time for preparation of additional information to address the comments of Government departments.

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

[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.]

[Professor N.K. Leung, Mr. Walter K.L. Chan and Dr. Daniel B.M. To left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

### **Kowloon District**

[Mr. Vincent T.K. Lai, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 8**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K7/98                      Proposed Redevelopment of Two 6 Storey School Buildings in "Government, Institution or Community (1)" zone, Two Sites within King George V School Campus which were currently occupied by a 2-Storey Classroom Block and a 1-Storey Canteen Block, 2 Tin Kwong Road, Ho Man Tin (KIL No. 10736)  
(MPC Paper No. A/K7/98)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

31. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Vincent T.K. Lai, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application highlighting that the planning application was to amend the previously approved scheme (No. A/K7/95) for redevelopment of two existing school buildings from 1-storey/ 2-storey to two 6 storeys buildings;
- (b) the proposed redevelopment of two 6 storeys school buildings;
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;

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

- (d) during the statutory publication period, one public comment from an individual was received, who commented that the proposed redevelopment would affect the view of the surrounding buildings and air ventilation, and worsen the traffic congestion problem; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed two 6-storey school buildings, namely Science Centre and Performing Arts/Amenities Centre, were considered compatible with the nearby low-rise buildings. The current scheme only involved a minor increase in the building mass. The proposed Science Centre in the current scheme was generally similar to that in the approved scheme in term of orientation, shape and extent. The major revision to the design of the proposed Performing Arts/ Amenities Centre was due to the enlargement of the G/F for better integration with the existing landscape. The height of the proposed 6 storey building complied with the building height restriction stipulated on the approved OZP covering the subject "G/IC(1)" zone. The

air ventilation assessment study submitted by the applicant demonstrated that there was no significant air ventilation impact.

32. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

33. 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 9.10.2013, 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 water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations and equipment to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of a sewerage impact assessment and implementation of the sewage improvement measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission and implementation of tree preservation and landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (d) the provision of parking and loading/unloading facilities for and vehicular access to the proposed redevelopment to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB.

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

- (a) the approval of the application did not imply any compliance with the Buildings Ordinance and Regulations. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department (BD) direct to obtain the necessary approval;

- (b) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that the arrangement of emergency vehicular access should comply with Part VI of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue which was administered by BD;
- (c) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/ Kowloon West, Lands Department on details of the provision of parking and loading/unloading facilities;
- (d) to note the comments of the Antiquities and Monuments Office, Leisure and Cultural Services Department including :
  - (i) the applicant should ensure that no disturbance would be made to the Peel Block, Pavilion and Caretakers' House of the King George V School during the course of works;
  - (ii) monitoring and protective measures on the Peel Block and Pavilion should be implemented during the course of works;
  - (iii) the design and character of the proposed Science Centre and Performing Arts/Amenities Centre (proposed new buildings) should be compatible to the architectural style of the Peel Block; and
- (e) to resolve any land issue relating to the development with the concerned Government departments.

**Agenda Item 9**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K9/232                      Proposed Hotel (Guesthouse) in “Residential (Group A) 4” zone,  
88-102 (Even Number) Wuhu Street, Hung Hom  
(HHILs 508, 511, 512, 513, 516, 519 & 520)  
(MPC Paper No. A/K9/232)

---

[Professor N.K. Leung returned to join the meeting at this point.]

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

35.                      With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Vincent T.K. Lai, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a)    background to the application;
- (b)    the proposed hotel (guesthouse);
- (c)    departmental comments – the Commissioner of Police (C of P) had reservation on the application as manoeuvring of 12m coaches would be difficult when moving out of the hotel onto Wuhu Street. If coaches turned right onto Wuhu Street westbound, traffic on both bounds would be affected. The Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban, Transport Department (AC for T/U, TD) shared C of P’s concerns and suggested adding a condition to ban right turn traffic exiting the development to Wuhu Street westbound in order to eliminate unnecessary disruption to westbound traffic on Wuhu Street. The Commissioner for Tourism supported the application as it would enhance the provision of new hotel rooms, broaden the range of accommodation for visitors, and supported the rapid development of the convention and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries;

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

- (d) during the statutory publication period, one public comment was received. The commenter considered that the building height and plot ratio of the proposed development were too high and would have adverse impacts on the local community in terms of public health, environment and vehicular traffic. He urged the Government to reduce the building height and development intensity of the future developments in Hung Hom district to improve the health and environment of the local community; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Compared with the previously approved scheme (Application No. A/K9/217), there was an increase in the total number of guest rooms from 199 to 434 due to a change in room size and a corresponding increase in the provision of car parking and loading facilities. The application site was located in a predominant vibrant commercial/residential area in Hung Hom. The proposed hotel use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments. The proposed plot ratio and building height did not exceed the restrictions stipulated under the current outline zoning plan. As regards the comments of C of P and AC for T/U, TD, a condition to ban right turn traffic exiting the proposed hotel to Wuhu Street westbound was proposed. The proposed hotel development was not expected to create significant adverse impacts on traffic, environment and infrastructure provisions in the area.

36. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

37. The Chairperson noted that, there was a substantial increase in the number of rooms due to reduction in room size as compared with the previously approved scheme. Since AC for T/U had no adverse comments on the traffic impact, Members generally agreed that planning permission could be granted.

38. 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 9.10.2013, 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 traffic measures to ban right turn traffic from the proposed hotel egress to Wuhu Street westbound to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB; and
- (b) 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 of the following :

- (a) that the approval of the application did not imply that the gross floor area exemption for back-of-house facilities included in the application would be granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval;
- (b) to consult the District Lands Officer/ Kowloon West, Lands Department about the lease matter of the proposed development; and
- (c) to consult the Office of the Licensing Authority of Home Affairs Department on the licensing requirements for a hotel.

**Agenda Item 10**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K18/264            Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction  
                         from Five Storeys to Six Storeys  
                         for a Permitted Residential Development  
                         in “Residential (Group C) 7” zone, 12 Beacon Hill Road, Kowloon Tong  
                         (NKIL 4948)  
                         (MPC Paper No. A/K18/264)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

40.            With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Vincent T.K. Lai, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a)    background to the application;
- (b)    the proposed minor relaxation of building height restriction from five storeys to six storeys for a permitted residential development;
- (c)    departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d)    two public comments were received during the statutory publication period and they had no adverse comments on the application and no local objection was received by the District Officer (Kowloon City); and
- (e)    the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed relaxation of building height restriction from five storeys to six storeys was mainly to facilitate the construction of a lower ground floor for car park at the lower portion of the sloping site. The visual effect of the proposed development would be comparable to a 5-storey permitted

development, particularly when viewed from the highest level along the northern boundary of the site. In terms of building height profile, the existing building heights within the same residential neighbourhood ranged from about 62mPD to 74mPD on the hillside of Beacon Hill sloping from north to south. As the site was located at the upper part of the neighbourhood, the proposed building height of 78.65mPD at main roof level would blend in with the surrounding residential developments. The site was quadrant in shape lying on a sloping area. The proposed lower ground floor car park could help achieve better usage of ground floor space and design flexibility, reducing the height of the fence wall and could also provide better streetscape. Fulfillment of non-building area and setback requirements fronting Beacon Hill Road and provision of at-grade landscaping would enhance the air and visual permeability. The proposed development was considered acceptable on traffic, environment, visual and infrastructural grounds.

41. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

42. 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 9.10.2013, 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 design and provision of vehicular access for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the provision of water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

43. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant of the following :
- (a) the approval of the application did not imply that the proposed gross floor area exemption in the application would be granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval;
  - (b) the Lands Department should be consulted on the required lease modification for the proposed development;
  - (c) the applicant should submit building plans for the building works, including geotechnical design, for approval under the Buildings Ordinance; and
  - (d) the applicant should follow the Environmental Protection Department's Practice Note for Professional Persons No. ProPECC PN 1/97 to complete a Self Assessment Form.

[The Chairperson thanked Mr. Vincent T.K. Lai, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Mr. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 11**

Any Other Business

44. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 10:30 a.m..