

**TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**Minutes of 447th Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 5.8.2011**

**Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung

Chairman

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Vice-chairman

Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Professor P.P. Ho

Professor C.M. Hui

Mr. Clarence W.C. Leung

Mr. Laurence L.J. Li

Mr. Roger K.H. Luk

Professor S.C. Wong

Ms. L.P. Yau

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),  
Transport Department  
Ms. F.F. Ying

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr. Ken Y.K. Wong

Assistant Director/Kowloon, Lands Department  
Ms. Olga Lam

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Ms. Julia M.K. Lau

Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Mr. C.T. Ling

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms. Christine K.C. Tse

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Miss Hannah H.N. Yick

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 446th MPC Meeting held on 22.7.2011

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 446th MPC meeting held on 22.7.2011 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

- (i) Proposed Amendments to the Draft Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K3/28

2. The Secretary reported that Members considered and agreed to the proposed amendments to the draft Mong Kok OZP No. S/K3/28 at the previous MPC meeting held on 22.7.2011. One of the proposed amendments was to rezone the ex-Mong Kok Market site from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Commercial (3)” (“C(3)”) to facilitate a joint-user development with the provision of a community health centre on the lower floors of the building. After further checking by the Secretary, apart from the proposed amendments agreed at the previous meeting, Remark (9) of the Notes for “C” zone should also be amended to incorporate a minor relaxation clause for the subject “C(3)” zone to allow the application for reduction in total gross floor area provided for G/IC facilities. Members agreed.

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/TW/3

Application for Amendment to the  
Draft Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/27  
from “Industrial” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Hotel”,  
368-370 Sha Tsui Road, Tsuen Wan (TWTL 126)  
(MPC Paper No. Y/TW/3)

---

3. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted on 13.12.2010. At that time, the application site was zoned “Industrial” (“I”) on the approved Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TW/26. Subsequently, the draft Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/27 incorporating the amendments to rezone the northern part of the Tsuen Wan East Industrial Area from “Industrial” (“I”) to “Comprehensive Development Area (CDA) (2)” (“CDA(2)”), “CDA(3)”, “CDA(4)”, “CDA(5)”, “CDA(6)”, “Commercial (5)”, “Open Space” and areas shown as ‘Road’ was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance on 24.12.2010. The application site was rezoned from “I” to “CDA(3)” under Amendment Item A2 on the draft OZP.

4. Among the 8 representations and 8 comments received on the draft OZP No. S/TW/27, 3 representations were related to the subject “CDA(3)” zone. One representation (R2) objected to the Notes and Explanatory Statement of the “CDA(2)” to “CDA(6)” zones. Another representation (R5), which was submitted by the Applicant, objected to the “CDA(3)” zone and proposed to rezone the “CDA(3)” zone to “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”), or the application site only to “R(E)” or “Other Specified Use (Hotel)” zone. The last representation (R6) opposed to the extent of the “CDA(3)” zone and proposed to rezone the Edward Wong Industrial Centre and Asia Tone i-Centre to the south of the application site to a standalone “CDA” zone. At its meeting on 10.6.2011, the Town Planning Board (Board) decided not to uphold all the 8 representations on the draft OZP.

5. The application site was the subject of 3 adverse representations in relation to the Amendment Item A2 on the draft Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/27. After consideration of the representations on 10.6.2011, the Board should submit the OZP together with the outstanding representations to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval. Since the outstanding representations were yet to be considered by CE in C, a decision on the subject application by the Committee would pre-empt the decision of CE in C on the representations. In view of the above, the Planning Department (PlanD) recommended the Committee to defer a decision on the application pending consideration of the draft OZP and the representations by CE in C.

6. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by PlanD pending the final decision of the CE in C on the draft OZP and the representations.

[Mr. Andrew Tsang arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

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

#### **Agenda Item 4**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TW/415                      Proposed Shop and Services, Eating Place in “Industrial” zone,  
Metex House, Nos. 24-32 Fui Yiu Kok Street, Tsuen Wan  
(Tsuen Wan Town Lot No. 131)  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/415)

---

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

7. Mr. K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed shop and services, eating place;
- (c) departmental comments –the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) could not give support to the application as the proposed provision of 4 car parking spaces was far from adequate to meet the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) requirements which required the provision of 29 car parking spaces to serve the proposed development. Besides, some of the loading and unloading bays appeared not accessible and Loading and Unloading Bay No. L2 and L3 could not be used simultaneously due to the limited space. Also, all the proposed goods vehicle loading/unloading bays were for light goods vehicles only, which was not in line with the HKPSG requirements of assigning 35% of the loading/unloading bay for heavy vehicles. C for T opined that the lack of car parking spaces at the application site would mean more illegal on-street parking after the wholesale conversion of the building. The use of the carparking spaces in Indi Home and Tsuen Wan Plaza, as proposed by the applicant, might not effectively serve the need of the proposed development on the site. C for T had doubt on whether Indi Home carpark would allow the parking of vehicles that did not belong to their occupiers, bona fide guests, visitors or visitees. Moreover, as Tsuen Wan Plaza was about 1 km away from the Site, it was inconceivable that visitors of the proposed development would make use of this carpark. No objection/adverse comment from other concerned government departments was received;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, two public comments were received. One commenter, who was the Incorporated Owner of Wah Lung Industrial Building, opined that the location of the subject building was not suitable for eating place and shops. The proposed uses might affect the business of other shops and create traffic impact. Besides, there were concerns on the hygiene problems to be brought about by the proposed eating place. Another commenter, who was

the property management company of H Cube, had concerns on the hygiene problems and fume emission to be brought about by the proposed eating place. During the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period of the further information received on 10.11.2010, one public comment from the property management company of H Cube was received, reiterating the same concerns on the hygiene problems and fume emission problem. The District Officer/Tsuen Wan advised that the gist of the application had been passed to the Chairman and Vice-chairman of the Tsuen Wan Central Area Committee and no comment on the application was received; 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. Being located at the northern fringe of the Tsuen Wan East Industrial Area abutting Fui Yiu Kok Street, the proposed shop and services and eating place at the subject building was considered not incompatible with the industrial developments to the south and the new service apartment developments such Chelsea Court, H Cube and Indi Home to the north. The proposed wholesale conversion would not result in any actual increase in building height, building bulk or gross floor area and would also alleviate the interface problems between industrial and residential uses nearby. The proposed conversion was also in line with the Industrial Buildings Revitalisation Policy promulgated by the Development Bureau. Notwithstanding the above, technical feasibility was required to demonstrate that the proposed scheme would not induce any adverse impact on the surrounding areas. In this connection, C for T did not support the application in view of the unsatisfactory car parking layout and insufficient car parking space and loading/unloading bay provision. Approval of this application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for wholesale conversion of existing industrial building for commercial uses without the provision of necessary supporting car parking facilities, the cumulative effect of which would have adverse traffic impacts on the Tsuen Wan East Industrial Area. There was also public concern on the traffic impact of the proposed development.

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

8. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr. K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, replied that the applicant had been trying to address TD's concerns by adjusting the car parking layout and number of car parking space, but was still not able to meet the technical requirements of TD.

[Professor S.C. Wong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

9. Another Member asked whether it was technically feasible to have more car parking spaces taking into account the site area of the development. Ms. F.F. Ying, AC for T (Urban), TD responded that it was feasible to have more car parking spaces in the proposed development by using car lift. By referring to Drawing A-1 in the Paper, she supplemented that the layout of the loading/unloading bays and car parking spaces in the current proposal was technically not feasible.

#### Deliberation Session

10. A Member asked whether there were major technical problems in the wholesale conversion of industrial building to other uses as reflected by the small number of similar cases approved by the Board recently. The Chairman responded that there were many other cases which involved wholesale conversion of industrial buildings to other uses that were approved by the Board, and there were also cases which did not require planning permission from the Board.

11. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. Members then went through the reasons for rejection as stated in paragraph 12.1 of the Paper and considered that they were appropriate. The reasons were :

- (a) the car parking proposals were not acceptable in terms of unsatisfactory car parking layout and insufficient car parking space and loading/unloading bay provision; and
- (b) approval of this application would set an undesirable precedent for similar

applications for wholesale conversion of existing industrial building without the provision of the necessary supporting car parking and loading/unloading facilities, the cumulative impact of which might result in adverse traffic implications in the Tsuen Wan East Industrial Area.

[The Chairman thanked Mr. K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. C.K. Soh, STP/TWK, was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 5**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K2/196                      Proposed Flat, Shop and Services (Retail Shop)  
   in "Commercial" zone,  
   54-60 Portland Street, Yau Ma Tei  
   (MPC Paper No. A/K2/196)

---

12.            The Secretary reported that after the MPC paper was issued, the applicant's representative submitted a letter on 4.8.2011 requesting deferral of the application for two months so that further responses on Planning Department's proposed rejection reason related to planning intention could be provided. The letter from the applicant's representative was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference.

13.            The applicant has applied deferral once on 3.5.2011 as detailed in para. 1.5 of the MPC paper. This was the second request of deferral. The Secretary requested Members to consider whether the deferral request should be acceded to. If not, the planning application would be considered at the meeting.

14.            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 for its 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 Chairman thanked Mr. C.K. Soh, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 6**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/369                      Proposed Hotel and Flats with Shop and Services  
   (Retail/Commercial) Uses (Master Layout Plan Submission)  
   in "Comprehensive Development Area" zone,  
   No. 1-7 Cheung Wing Road, Kwai Chung  
   (MPC Paper No. A/KC/369)

---

15.            The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 20.7.2011 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to resolve comments from government departments and refine the development proposal.

16.            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 for its 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 since a total of three and a half months had been allowed, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

### **Hong Kong District**

[Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 7**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the  
Draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H7/15  
(MPC Paper No. 11/11)

---

17. The Secretary said that she owned a property at Broadwood Road and declared an interest in this item. Members agreed that as the role of the Secretary was to provide information and advice on procedural matters and would not take part in decision-making, she could be allowed to stay in the meeting.

18. The Committee noted a replacement page (page 5) and an additional page for Attachment II(C) of the Paper were tabled at the meeting.

19. With the aid of a powerpoint, Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK, presented the proposed amendments to the draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) as detailed in the Paper:

**Background**

- (a) the proposed amendments to the OZP mainly involved a site at Ventris Road (about 2,659m<sup>2</sup> and at a level of about 20mPD) which was zoned “G/IC” on the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/15. The northern and southern parts of the site were currently occupied by Pioneer Memorial Church and a vacant school i.e. the former Hong Kong Sam Yuk Secondary School and subject to building height restrictions (BHRs) of 2 storeys and 8 storeys respectively, which reflected the height of the existing church and the BH for a standard school. The Pioneer Memorial Church was a Grade 3 historic building;
- (b) Hong Kong-Macao Conference of Seventh-day Adventists approached the

Development Opportunities Office of the Development Bureau for assistance in February 2010 about its proposal to redevelop the site into a new complex of church facilities, residential care home for the elderly and senior hostel;

#### The Redevelopment Proposal

- (c) based on the proponent's latest scheme, the northern part of the site was proposed to be redeveloped into a 5-storey church building, while the southern part was for a 20-storey tower consisting of senior hostel, church facilities and residential care home for elderly. Two additional levels of underground car park would be provided. The proposed plot ratio (PR) was about 5;
- (d) the redevelopment proposal would provide about 1,690m<sup>2</sup> floor space in the new church building for church functions and additional floor space of 685m<sup>2</sup> would be provided in the adjacent complex to house the church's ancillary facilities. The new church building would be accessible from street level and lifts would be installed to facilitate movement of frail members;
- (e) the proponent had agreed to preserve the character defining features in the existing church building, in particular, the wooden scissors trusses supporting the roof, which was a unique sample of this type of structure in Hong Kong. The project proponent would continue to work with the Antiquities and Monuments Office of Leisure and Cultural Services Department (AMO of LCSD) to produce a conservation plan for the redevelopment;
- (f) the Secretary for Home Affairs (SHA) and Secretary for Labour and Welfare (SLW) had given in-principle support for the church and residential care home for the elderly respectively;
- (g) the redevelopment scheme was presented to the Land and Development

Advisory Committee (LDAC) on 14.7.2011. LDAC supported the scheme as the new church building would provide additional floor space and facilities for church activities, and the new senior hostel and residential care home for the elderly would provide elderly people with more housing choices and provide care and support services to elderly people with various intensive care needs.

#### Technical Assessment

- (h) the site was governed by the lease to be used for a church, a non-profit-making school, ancillary offices and quarters, and a playground. In addition, the playground at the southern part of the site was designated as non-building area. The proponent was required to apply for lease modification so as to permit the proposed uses and erection of the proposed building within the non-building area;
- (i) the Traffic Impact Assessment submitted by the proponent had been accepted in principle by the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) subject to further refinement to address the possible upsurge in traffic volume on the adjacent roads during Saturday morning;
- (j) on the land use aspect, about 62% of the total GFA of the proposed redevelopment would be used for the church facilities and residential care home for the elderly. They were regarded as 'Religious Institution' and 'Social Welfare Facility' uses respectively, which were always permitted in the "G/IC" zone. The proposed senior hostel component which was a kind of 'Residential Institution' use required planning permission from the Board. Appropriate planning control could be exercised through the planning permission system on such aspects as heritage conservation works, traffic improvement and environmental mitigation measures as necessary;
- (k) the proposed development was considered compatible with the surrounding developments. The proposed BH of 90mPD for the tower block would be around the podium level of Villa Rocha on Broadwood Road to its further

east. It would be lower than the BHR stipulated for the adjacent “R(A)” (100mPD), “R(B)6” and “R(B)9” (115mPD) zones along Ventris Road under the OZP. As the proposed church building would be only a 5-storey building, the existing gap could still be maintained to allow penetration of north-easterly prevailing wind through the site and the St. Paul’s Secondary School site to the valley floor of Happy Valley;

- (l) in view of the policy support and the above assessment, it was considered acceptable to amend the BHR for the site to facilitate the proposed redevelopment as follows:
  - to amend the maximum BH for part of the “G/IC” site covering Pioneer Memorial Church at 17A Ventris Road from 2 storeys to 5 storeys
  - to amend the maximum BH for part of the “G/IC” site covering the former Hong Kong Sam Yuk Secondary School at 17A Ventris Road from 8 storeys to 90mPD

#### Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (m) the Notes of the OZP had been revised to take into account the proposed amendments above;
- (n) under the current OZP, the Remark in the Notes for the “R(B)9” zone had stipulated a GFA restriction for the development. However, the restriction only controlled the maximum domestic GFA and was silent on the maximum non-domestic GFA. To put it beyond doubt, the GFA control for the entire development was stipulated;

#### Consultation

- (o) the proposed amendments had been circulated to relevant government bureaux/departments for comments. All of them had no objection to or no

adverse comments on the proposed amendments; and

- (p) the Wan Chai District Council would be consulted on the amendments prior to or during the exhibition period of the draft Wan Chai OZP S/H7/15A (to be renumbered to S/H7/16 upon exhibition) depending on the meeting schedule.

20. Noting that the proposed amendments to the BH of the subject “G/IC” zone were based on a proposal submitted to the Government, a Member asked whether there was flexibility for future changes to the development proposal. The Chairman responded that the proposed senior hostel within the redevelopment proposal was regarded as ‘Residential Institution’ use and would require planning permission from the Board. On the BH aspect, there was provision for minor relaxation of BHR on application to the Board.

21. The same Member asked whether the existing church which was a Grade 3 building could be preserved by allowing the BHR of the southern part of the site be further relaxed to 115mPD to align with the BHR of the adjacent “R(B)” sites so as to accommodate the additional floorspace for facilities to be included in the new church originally proposed by the project proponent. This would allow greater flexibility for the project proponent to consider preserving the historic building by transferring some of the floorspace to the high block. Ms. Brenda Au responded that the BH of the surrounding developments had been taken into account in considering the BHR of the subject site and there had been discussion with the project proponent on the different possibilities, in particular, the preservation of the existing church. The proposed BHR of 90mPD for the southern portion would be around the podium level of Villa Rocha and was considered an acceptable height for the high block. For Pioneer Court to the north of the subject “G/IC” site, though the BHR was 115mPD, the future redevelopment at this site would likely be lower than the BHR as the site was subject to a PR restriction of 3.5. The existing BH of Ventris Place to the south was 130mPD. Hence, the proposed 90mPD at the subject “G/IC” site would help achieve a stepped BH profile along Ventris Road and was considered appropriate. As regards the BHR of the northern portion, the project proponent claimed that there was operational need for a new church in view of the existing difficult access which involved a flight of stairs at the entrance and the limited space inside the existing church for gathering and activities. The Commissioner of Heritage of the Development Bureau and the AMO had no objection to the proponent’s

proposal to preserve the character defining features in the existing church and not the church itself.

22. In response to a Member's question, Ms. Au replied that the proposed amendments to the OZP were to amend the BHR of the "G/IC" site only so as to facilitate the implementation of the redevelopment proposal. This Member also asked how the proposed senior hostel would operate and whether the project proponent had entered any partnership with other organisation. Ms. Au replied that according to her understanding, the operation of the proposed senior hostel would be similar to the one in Tanner Hill run by HK Housing Society, but the details were not known. As regards partnership with other organisation, she had no such information but she noted that the project proponent had the experience in other countries in operating similar senior hostel. If Members considered necessary, the project proponent could be requested to submit such information when making planning application for the senior hostel use in future.

23. The Secretary explained that the proposed amendments to the OZP were related to the BHR of the site only. If the project proponent decided not to include senior hostel but to include column 1 uses in its redevelopment proposal and the BH of the proposal did not exceed the amended BHR, the applicant would not have to apply to the Board for planning approval. She added that if the southern part of the site was relaxed to say 115mPD and the northern part be kept at a BHR of 2 storeys, there was also no guarantee that the existing church would be preserved. Members might wish to note that the AMO which was the authority in preservation did not request for preservation of the existing church.

24. Noting that the BHR of the subject "G/IC" site were limited to BH of the existing buildings before the proposed amendments, as similar to the other "G/IC" sites, a Member asked whether it was a practice for the Board to amend the BHR based on a proposal submitted by the "G/IC" operator to the Government. Ms. Au replied that in determining BHR for "G/IC" sites, it should be noted that "G/IC" sites served the functions of visual relief and breathing space in the urban areas as well as providing G/IC facilities to cater for the need of the community. The BHR imposed was mainly to reflect the existing BH of the G/IC developments. However, non-government organisations (NGOs) which had a development scheme could approach PlanD for discussion. If policy support was obtained for the scheme submitted and the scheme was acceptable to concerned government departments, PlanD

would initiate amendments to the BHR on the OZP to facilitate the development.

25. A Member said that the proposed amendments to the BH of the OZP were intended to facilitate the development scheme initiated by the project proponent, and the public consultation process that followed would be based on this specific scheme. However, if proposed OZP amendments could not ensure that the specific scheme would be implemented, the public consultation would become meaningless. This Member was concerned about the lack of control on the scheme to be implemented by just amending the BHR. Another Member agreed. The Chairman considered that the proposed amendments to the OZP were related to the BHR only. Members should consider whether the amended BHRs of 5 storeys and 90mPD were acceptable in terms of the visual and air ventilation aspects as well as other considerations such as traffic implications. In response to the Chairman's question, Ms. Au responded that the downhill wind from the east would pass through the gap between Villa Rocha and Broadwood Twelve, the site of Pioneer Memorial Church and St. Paul's Secondary School to Happy Valley. Therefore, the proposed BHR of 5 storeys at the northern part of the "G/IC" site would not have significant air ventilation impact. For the proposed use in the redevelopment proposal, if the proponent decided not to include senior hostel in future, planning permission would not be required. However, it was noted that under the lease, the site could only be used for church and school purposes.

26. Another Member asked whether the BHR of 90mPD at the southern part of the site would have impact on air ventilation. Ms. Au responded that as a BHR of 100mPD had been imposed on the "R(A)" site on the west side of Ventris Road, the proposed BHR of 90mPD would not have significant air ventilation impact, considering the downhill wind blowing across the site.

27. A Member said that the value of a cluster of historical buildings including St. Paul's Secondary School, St. Margaret's Church along Ventris Road and Pioneer Memorial Church in the vicinity, should be considered from an urban design perspective, and allowing a BHR of 5 storeys for the northern part of the site would encourage demolition of the existing church. Ms. Au responded that the project proponent had reduced the scale of the redevelopment proposal by reducing the site coverage and setting back the podium. Moreover, a gap was left between the new church and the 20-storey tower to avoid wall effect. The visual impact when viewed from Ventris Road had been examined and the proposed

development was considered acceptable.

28. The Secretary said that BHR for “G/IC” site would normally be restricted to the BH of the existing building. If a development scheme submitted by a NGO was given policy support and there was no technical concern from government departments, PlanD would initiate amendments to BHR of the OZP to facilitate the implementation of the development scheme. However, if Members considered that the future development must tie to a specific scheme, the site should be rezoned to a special “G/IC” sub-zone requiring submission of a development scheme through s.16 planning application to the Board for approval.

29. A Member said that if the proposed amendments were related to the proposed scheme, a special zoning for the subject site was a better option as it would ensure the site would be redeveloped in accordance with the proposed scheme. Another Member agreed that it would be more logical to adopt a special “G/IC” sub-zone to ensure control on the implementation of the scheme as proposed, especially when PlanD had proactively initiated the OZP amendments to facilitate the implementation of the development scheme.

30. The Chairman said that the present procedure was related to plan making and the BHR were suggested to be imposed having regard to the impact on air ventilation and visual aspects. This would allow flexibility to the Church to change the uses to meet community needs in the future.

31. The Vice-chairman opined that the proposed amendment to the BHR would need to go through the plan-making process. The public would have the opportunity to make representations on the amendments and the Board could consider making adjustment to the BHR after hearing the representations. There was no need to adopt a special “G/IC” sub-zone to restrict the future development at the subject site to the currently proposed scheme in order to maintain flexibility. If the proponent decided to include other G/IC uses, relevant policy support would still be required before the scheme could be implemented. The Secretary said that Members should consider whether they could accept the proposed amendments to BHR even if the future use was not the same as the currently proposed scheme. If Members considered it necessary to restrict the future development to the current scheme proposed, then more control would be required.

32. A Member considered that it was acceptable to control the BHR only and more flexibility should be given to the NGO on the future use for the site as the G/IC facilities provided would benefit the community. If column 2 use such as senior hostel was proposed, planning permission from the Board would still be required.

33. Another Member said that the Board had been holding a principle that the BHR of "G/IC" site should be kept at the BH of the existing building unless there was an acceptable proposal from the NGO. In the subject case, the proponent had submitted a redevelopment scheme to the Government and the proposed scheme was acceptable from visual and air ventilation perspectives. It was an opportunity for the Board to show to other NGO that the Board was not restricting G/IC development and when there was an acceptable scheme, the Board would facilitate the proposed BHR amendment. Therefore, this Member supported the proposed amendments to the BHR.

34. A Member considered that given the policy support and the insignificant impact to the surrounding areas, the proposed BHRs were supported and this would demonstrate that the Board would consider supporting proposal which had obtained policy support and had no significant impact to the surrounding areas.

35. Another Member said that the Board had previously decided to maintain the existing BH of the "G/IC" site. The reason for the Board to agree to the proposed amendments to the BHR was because the development scheme was considered acceptable by the Board. Therefore, some control should be imposed to ensure that the proposed scheme would be implemented. If it was the genuine intention of the proponent to implement the proposed scheme, the imposition of requirement for planning permission from the Board should not be a problem.

36. The Chairman explained that the proposed amendments on BHR was intended to control the maximum BH of the G/IC development. "G/IC" zone was intended for G/IC uses. If the proponent intended to change to other uses such as office in future, planning permission would be required.

37. Taking into account the above concerns of Members, the Secretary said that there were three ways in considering the proposed amendment. Members might consider adopting

the proposed amendment of BHR only for the “G/IC” site if Members could accept changes in the detailed uses within the proposed scheme. The other way was to require submission of s.16 application to the Board through a special “G/IC” sub-zone so that further redevelopment could tie to a specific scheme. The third way was to incorporate the key features and planning merits of the proposed scheme through special “G/IC” sub-zone with the specific requirements included.

38. A Member considered that the proposed amendments of the BHR could be accepted as they were based on a proposed scheme that had obtained policy support. As the proposed senior hostel was a column 2 use, a special “G/IC” sub-zone requiring the proponent to make s.16 application should not cause additional burden to the project proponent. Moreover, this Member opined that it might not be convincing if Members would only need to consider the air ventilation and visual aspects in deciding to relax the BHR as the same set of considerations had been taken into account by the Board when it previously decided to keep the BHR of “G/IC” sites to the existing BH. The Secretary explained that if Members considered it necessary, the planning merits of the proposed scheme, such as setback requirement and building gap could be incorporated into the special “G/IC” sub-zone and it would not be necessary for the proponent to submit planning application if the specific requirements were complied with.

[Mr. Andrew Tsang left the meeting at this point.]

39. Another Member considered that there was no need to include restrictions in the “G/IC” site to ensure the implementation of the proposed scheme and the focus should be on whether the proposed BHR of 90mPD was acceptable. Although the adjacent “R(B)” zones were subject to a BHR of 115mPD, the subject “G/IC” site should be more restrictive in view of its function as visual relief and breathing space. Ms. Au explained that the site level of Ventris Road was at 20mPD. The proposed BHR of 90mPD would result in a building of about 20 storeys and together with the surrounding developments, it would create a stepped height profile along Ventris Road. As regards air ventilation, the building gap at the northern part of the site where the church was located was 20m in width. With the sloping topography in the area, the downhill wind from the east across Broadwood Road towards St. Paul’s Secondary School would not be affected. From the visual aspect, with the aid of a photomontage at Plan 5 of the Paper, Ms. Au said that the “R(A)” zone in front of the subject

site was restricted to a BHR of 100mPD. Hence, when viewing from the race course, the proposed scheme at the subject “G/IC” site would be blocked when the “R(A)” site was redeveloped and would not have much visual impact. In fact, the project proponent had proposed to setback its development from Ventris Road to reduce its visual impact.

40. A Member opined that the existing church should be preserved in view of the value of a cluster of historic buildings. This Member asked DPO/HK to convey a message to AMO that the Grade 3 status of Pioneer Memorial Church should be further reviewed. The Chairman said that the group value of the historic buildings had already been taken into account when AMO accorded the church a Grade 3 building. Whether the church should be preserved would be a matter for the AMO.

41. A Member asked if the Government could ensure that the future G/IC development at the site be governed by relevant policy support. The Secretary said that if the future G/IC use was a column 1 use and no lease modification was needed, there was no need for such policy support.

42. Another Member asked why there should be a development scheme to justify the BHR of “G/IC” site on the OZP. The Chairman said that “G/IC” zone covered a variety of G/IC uses and there was no standard BHR to cover all of the uses. The Secretary added that the use on a “G/IC” site might change over time and hence it was difficult to work out a BHR that suit a wide range of G/IC uses.

43. In summing up, the Chairman said that Members’ views were rather diverse. Some Members considered that the subject site should be given a special “G/IC” sub-zone requiring submission of s.16 application so as to ensure the implementation of a particular scheme. Some Members considered that it was only necessary to amend the BHR so as to leave more flexibility for the future G/IC development. The Secretary said that on balance, Members might wish to consider stipulating the key features/planning merits of the proposed scheme as development restrictions to the subject “G/IC” site, such as set back, building gap, site coverage (SC) and PR. Members agreed.

44. After discussion, Members agreed to the proposed amendment to the Remark in

the Notes for the “R(B)9” zone. For the “G/IC” site at 17A Ventris Road, other than the BHR proposed, the PR, SC and building gap of the proposed scheme should be imposed onto the concerned “G/IC” site. In this regard, the Board requested PlanD to work out the amendments to the Notes and Explanatory Statement of the OZP for the Board’s further consideration.

[The Chairman thanked Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au, DPO/HK, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms. April K.Y. Kun, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 8**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H3/403                      Proposed Hotel in “Residential (Group A) 7” zone,  
Nos. 291-295 Queen's Road West, Sai Ying Pun  
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/403)

---

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

45.            Ms. April K.Y. Kun, STP/HK, 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 Commissioner for Tourism supported the application as the proposed development would increase the number of hotel rooms, broaden the range of accommodation for visitors, and support the rapid development of convention and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries. No objection/adverse comment from concerned government departments was received;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, which ended on 8.7.2011, five comments raising objection to the application were received. The comments were submitted by a District Councillor of the Central & Western District Council (C&WDC) conveying the objection from the Incorporated Owners of Fung King Court, a local resident and members of the public. The main points included that there were insufficient spaces for picking up/setting down of hotel guests on the street, thus generating adverse traffic impact on the surrounding road network and jeopardizing the safety of pedestrians; the proposal would affect the structural safety of the nearby old buildings, and generate adverse environmental and visual impacts thereby affecting their living standard; and there were already several hotels in Sai Ying Pun and an additional hotel was not needed. District Officer (Central & Western) advised that the C&WDC had all along been concerned about hotel developments in the district, in particular the possible adverse traffic, visual and environmental impact that might result from new hotel developments; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The subject application was for the development of a 25-storey hotel with 99 guest rooms. The application site was located within the “R(A)7” zone covering a predominantly residential area with commercial uses mainly on ground floors. The proposed hotel was considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments in terms of land use, and the proposed building height of 83.99mPD was within the building height restriction of 110mPD on the OZP. However, the proposed development intensity (plot ratio (PR) of 13.2) was much higher than that of the adjacent developments along Queen’s Road West and the group of buildings immediately surrounding the public open space at Sung Hing Lane, with PR ranging from about 3 to 10. It had been the Board’s established practice since mid-2007 to approve hotel applications at suitable locations within the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone on Hong Kong Island up to a PR of 12 only as such development intensity was considered generally compatible with residential developments with permitted PR of 8 to 10. Applications

for hotel development within “R(A)” zone with PR higher than 12 were generally rejected except for some cases involving amendments to a previously approved scheme or in-situ conversion of an existing commercial/office building to hotel use. While there had been a hotel application (No. A/H3/391) at 338-346 Queen’s Road West with a PR of 13.2 approved by the Committee on 18.12.2009, there was a previous approval (No. A/H3/385) for hotel development on the same site at PR 12. That particular application was approved taking into consideration that the additional PR was absorbed within the already approved building bulk, the further set-back of the podium and improvement to hotel façade through the provision of greenery. Similar considerations were not applicable to the current application. Approval of the subject application would set an undesirable precedent for similar hotel developments, the cumulative effect of which would adversely affect the general amenity in the area

46. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Ms. April Kun, STP/HK, replied that the applicant had reached an agreement with Transport Department to voluntarily set back the boundary of the development from Queen’s Road West to provide a 3.5m wide public footpath.

47. By referring to para. 10.2 of the Paper, a Member asked whether the reason for rejecting the subject application was that the proposed PR had exceeded 12 or was because of its incompatibility with the surrounding existing developments with a much lower PR of about PR 3 to 10. Ms. Kun responded that both reasons were applicable in rejecting the application. She explained that it was the Board’s practice to approve hotel applications at suitable locations within “R(A)” zone on Hong Kong Island up to a PR of 12 as such intensity was generally compatible with the permitted PR of 8 to 10 for residential development. In response to the same Member’s enquiry, Ms. Kun replied that the existing developments with PR of around 3 were mainly low-rise tenement buildings.

48. In response to the Chairman’s enquiry, Ms. Kun replied that the proposed PR of 13.2 had already included the bonus PR claimed by the applicant.

49. In response to the Chairman’s enquiry on a hotel application of PR 13.2 approved

by the Committee as highlighted in para. 10.3 of the Paper, Ms. Kun responded that there was a previous planning approval (No. A/H3/385) for hotel development on the same site at PR12. The hotel application of PR 13.2 (Application No. A/H3/391) was approved taking into consideration that the additional PR was absorbed within the already approved building envelop by adjusting the floor-to-floor height, the merits of the application by providing further set-back of the podium and improvement to the hotel façade through the provision of greenery.

50. The Vice-chairman asked if the bonus gross floor area (GFA) arising from the setback proposal was excluded, what the actual PR would that be. Ms. Kun replied that it would be about 13 as the bonus GFA claimed for the proposed setback was about 34.85m<sup>2</sup>.

51. In response to another Member's enquiry, Ms. Kun replied that the applicant of planning application No. A/H3/391 was different from the subject application.

#### Deliberation Session

52. A Member considered the subject application should be rejected as there was no special planning circumstances to justify a deviation from the Board's established practice of not allowing hotel development in "R(A)" zone to exceed PR of 12.

53. By referring to Drawing A-6 of the Paper, the Chairman noted that there were high-rise and low-rise development in the surrounding area. The Secretary said that there appeared to be some distortion in the photomontage at Drawing A-6. The main concern of the subject application was that the proposed hotel with PR 13.2 would be incompatible with the surrounding residential development with permitted PR of 8 to 10 upon redevelopment.

54. A Member said that the development intensity of the existing development in the surrounding area should also be a consideration as it should not be assumed that the existing developments with lower plot ratios would be redeveloped up to the maximum permitted PR.

55. Given the above concerns, the Secretary suggested revising the rejection reason in para. 11.1 (a) of the Paper to reflect clearly that the proposed hotel development of PR 13.2 was incompatible with the surrounding residential developments with permitted PR of 8 to 10

in terms of development intensity. Members agreed.

56. Members then went through the reasons for rejecting the application as stated in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper and agreed that they should be suitably amended to reflect Members' views as expressed at the meeting. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reasons were :

- (a) the proposed hotel development, with a plot ratio of 13.2, was considered excessive and incompatible, in terms of development intensity, with the surrounding residential developments with permitted plot ratio of 8 to 10; and
- (b) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar hotel developments, the cumulative effect of which would adversely affect the general amenity in the area.

[The Chairman thanked Ms. April K.Y. Kun, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. K.S. Ng, STP/HK, was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 9**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H11/101            Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction from 5 to 5.379  
in "Residential (Group B)" zone,  
23 Babington Path, Mid-levels West  
(MPC Paper No. A/H11/101)

---

57. The Secretary reported that the application was related to Sun Hung Kai Properties Ltd. (SHK). Mr. Raymond Chan and Mr. Felix Fong who had current business dealings with SHK had declared interests in this item. Ms. Julia Lau who was formerly employed by SHK from November 1994 to November 2008 had also declared an interest in this item. The Committee noted that Mr. Fong and Ms. Lau had tendered apologies for being

unable attend the meeting and agreed that Mr. Chan should leave the meeting temporarily.

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

58. The Secretary reported that a petition letter from Mr. Stephen Chan Chit Kwai, the Vice-chairman of the Central & Western District Council (C&WDC), objecting to the application was received before the meeting and tabled for Members' reference. The reasons of objections were similar to the public comment submitted Mr. Chan which included that the proposed development would aggravate the traffic conditions of Babington Path which was a narrow street, cause noise and fume problems, increase the demand of public facilities and adversely affect visual quality, air ventilation and the residents' health.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

59. Mr. K.S. Ng, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application highlighting that the site was subject to a previous application No. A/H11/98 for minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) restriction from 5 to 5.357 for proposed surrender and dedication of land for road widening, which was approved with conditions by the Committee on 20.5.2011;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio restriction from 5 to 5.379;
- (c) departmental comments –the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) supported the proposals of widening the section of public road to 4.5m wide and providing a 1.2m wide footpath fronting the site together with a corner splay. He advised that the surrender/dedication of land was essential for implementation of the proposed road improvement works. The proposed minor increase of PR would result in an increase in gross floor area (GFA) of 401m<sup>2</sup>, corresponding to an increase of 3 units compared with the building plans approved by the Building Authority (BA) on 29.4.2011. Such minor increase would not have adverse traffic impact to

the local road network. The car parking provision for the proposed development was acceptable. The Commissioner of Police (C of P) advised that the traffic flow at the subject location was not so busy but the road was narrow. Widening the bend section of Babington Path could improve the sightline and safety of the pedestrians. No objection/adverse comment from concerned government departments was received;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, 21 comments objecting to the application were received. Amongst them, 1 was from the Vice-chairman of the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC), two were from the Incorporated Owners (IC)/property management company of nearby buildings and the remaining 18 were from members of the general public. The Vice-chairman of C&WDC commented that the proposed development would result in an increase in population and aggravate the traffic congestion problem in the area, resulting in air and noise pollutions. The existing water supply and public facilities might not be able to cope with the increase in population. Besides, the increase in BH at the application site would result in wall effect, affect air ventilation and the health of the local residents. Other commenters were also concerned about the increase in traffic congestion and demand for mini-bus service, the air and noise nuisances, pedestrian safety and the increasing demand for road maintenance. Stricter parking restriction along Robinson Road should be enforced to ensure public safety; the widening of Babington Path could neither solve the traffic problem nor improve pedestrian safety; the proposed high-rise residential development was incompatible with the surrounding environment; the piling works of the development would have adverse impact on the foundation and structural safety of the buildings in the vicinity; the increase in water pressure in the pipes due to the increase of water demand would further aggravate the problem of water pipe bursts in the area; the PR restriction should be strictly adhered to avoid high-rise developments; the proposed development would create extra burden on local utilities, sewerage and drainage systems, as well as community facilities; there was a lack of technical assessments to substantiate the application; and the application was aiming to maximize

the profit of the developer at the expense of the local residents. The applicant's intention of setting back from the lot boundary was for a better design of the ingress/egress of the carpark and the enhancement of the block layout, instead of improving road safety;

- (e) the District Officer (Central and Western), Home Affairs Department (DO(C&W)), advised that members of the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) had all along been concerned about the development intensity in the Mid-levels area. At the C&WDC meeting held on 15.5.2008 when the draft Mid-levels West OZP No. S/H11/14 was discussed, some members considered it necessary to set limits on development intensity to preserve the ridgelines on Hong Kong Island while others observed the likely adverse impacts of high-density developments on traffic flow, air ventilation and quality, sunlight and slope safety. The C&WDC also passed a motion on 12.1.2004 objecting to any relaxation of PR or building height (BH) restrictions for residential buildings in the Mid-levels area; and
- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – the PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Compared with the approved scheme, the current scheme was very similar in terms of the form, shape and floor uses of the proposed development. According to a detailed land survey carried out by the applicant, the surrender and dedication area was 80.2m<sup>2</sup> instead of 75.6m<sup>2</sup>, and thus an additional bonus GFA of 23m<sup>2</sup> (increasing from 378m<sup>2</sup> to 401m<sup>2</sup> or bonus PR from 0.357 to 0.379) would be claimed. The C for T advised that the surrender and dedication of land was essential for the implementation of the road improvement works and the minor increase in PR would not have adverse traffic impact on the local road network. The C of P also advised that widening the bend section of Babington Path could improve the sightline and safety of the pedestrians. On the BH of the proposed development, the applicant had slightly adjusted the floor-to-floor height of the domestic storeys to keep the maximum BH of the proposed development to the same level at 180mPD, as stipulated on the OZP. The

proposed development was considered compatible with the medium to high-rise residential developments in the surrounding area. The concerns raised in the public comments on the increase in development intensity, possible traffic impact, pedestrian safety, and the visual and BH aspects had been addressed above. With respect to the slope safety and impacts of piling works on the adjacent buildings, the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department explained that the design and construction of the building development should comply with the requirements of the Buildings Ordinance such that the foundation works carried out within the development site would not impair the stability of, or cause damage to any buildings and structures. Besides, the applicant was required to submit geotechnical assessment to demonstrate the proposed construction works were in compliance with the safety requirements in the building plan submission stage and an advisory clause covering this aspect was suggested. As for the water supply issue, the Chief Engineer/Development (2), Water Supplies Department advised that the net increase in water demand arising from the application was minimal and the existing supply network was adequate to cope with the anticipated increase in water demand. The Director of Environmental Protection also advised that in view of the scale of the proposed development, insurmountable environmental impact due to the increase in vehicular traffic was not anticipated. Moreover, any possible environmental nuisances during the construction stage would be subject to the control under the relevant pollution control ordinances.

60. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

61. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 5.8.2015, 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 surrender and dedication of land for the implementation of traffic improvement measures to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (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;
- (c) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (d) the implementation of local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the SIA to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (e) the submission and implementation of a landscaping proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

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

- (a) the approval of the application did not imply that any proposal on building design elements to fulfill the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, and any proposal on bonus plot ratio (PR) and/or gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development would be approved/granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. If the building design elements, bonus PR and GFA concession were not approved/granted by the Building Authority and major changes to the current scheme were required, a fresh planning application to the Board might be required;
- (b) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West & South, Lands Department to verify the application site boundary to ensure the accuracy of the site area and boundary to avoid any encroachment onto

the adjoining private lots;

- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Estate Surveyor/Acquisition, Lands Department that the proposed surrender areas should be free of structure and encumbrance;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department that the surrendered area should be designated and constructed in compliance with the relevant standards of Highways Department at the cost of the lot owner, with levels match with the adjacent footpath, and no structure could be constructed above and below the surrendered area;
- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department that consideration should be given to maximizing the separation distances from adjacent buildings to enhance air and visual permeability, 1 m<sup>2</sup> of open space per resident should be provided in the proposed development, a minimum of 20% greening coverage of the entire site (at least half of which should be provided at grade or on levels easily accessible by residents) should be incorporated into the overall design, and landscape plantings should be provided on podia and flat roofs as far as practical to enhance the landscape quality of the new development;
- (f) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that detailed fire service requirements would be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans and the arrangement of emergency vehicular access should comply with Part VI of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Fire Fighting and Rescue;
- (g) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department that the applicant should upgrade/repair all existing drains and sewers to current standards at his own costs before handing them to Drainage Services Department; and

- (h) to note the comments of the Head, Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department that the design of the building development was required to meet the current geotechnical safety standard, geotechnical assessment together with relevant documents as stipulated in the Buildings Ordinance should be submitted to demonstrate the proposed construction works were in compliance with the safety requirements, and the Determined Bulk Excavation Limit would be issued by the Buildings Department after receipt of the ground investigation report and topographic survey plans.

[The Chairman thanked Mr. K.S. Ng, STP/HK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

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

### **Agenda Item 10**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H11/99                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction from 5 to 5.1  
and Building Height Restriction from 230mPD to 240.15mPD  
in "Residential (Group B)" zone,  
23, 25, 27D, E and F Robinson Road, Mid-levels West  
(MPC Paper No. A/H11/99)

---

63.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by two subsidiaries of Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd. (Henderson). Mr. Raymond Chan who had current business dealings with Henderson had declared an interest in this item. Mr. Clarence Leung who was the director of a non-government organisation which had previously received a private donation from a family member of the Chairman of Henderson had also declared an interest in this item. As the applicant had requested a deferral of consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Mr. Chan and Mr. Leung could stay in the meeting.

64.            The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 21.7.2011

for a deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for the applicant to liaise with Transport Department to identify a mutually acceptable ingress/egress point for the proposed development.

65. 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 for its 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.

[Miss Isabel Y. Yiu, STP/HK, was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 11**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H15/244            Proposed Flat (Government Staff Quarters)  
                          in “Government, Institution or Community” zone,  
                          Ex-Housing Department Staff Quarters site,  
                          Tin Wan Street, Tin Wan, Aberdeen  
                          (MPC Paper No. A/H15/244)

---

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

66. Miss Isabel Y. Yiu, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed flat (government staff quarters);
- (c) departmental comments – no objection/adverse comment from concerned government departments was received;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, two public comments were received from Designing Hong Kong Limited and a member of the public. During the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period on the submitted further information, one public comment was received from Designing Hong Kong Limited which was the same as the one previously received on the application. The member of the public was not against the proposed development but expressed general views mainly on illegal parking, road safety and hygiene issues in the area. Designing Hong Kong Limited objected to the application mainly on the grounds that the traffic generated by the proposed development would further contribute to traffic congestion in the Southern District, and any increase in traffic and demand for additional road capacity would require the extension of Route 4 from Kennedy Town to Aberdeen which might have undesirable environmental impacts. District Officer (Southern) advised that it was noted that the gist of application had been sent to the concerned District Council members and the Southern District North Area Committee for comments as part of the public consultation process. Due consideration should be given to the local sentiments in processing the application; and
  
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed Correctional Services Department's staff quarters was similar in nature to that of the former use of the application site as quarters of the Housing Department. The proposed development was in line with the planning intention of the "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") zone to provide land for uses directly related to or in support of the work of the Government, organizations providing social services to meet community needs, and other institutional establishments. The site was not required for other G/IC uses and the proposed development would not adversely affect the provision of G/IC facilities in the district. The application site was located in an area predominantly occupied by G/IC uses and residential developments and hence the proposed development

was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The current application was for redevelopment of an existing 5-storey staff quarters building into a new 13-storey staff quarters for CSD. The proposed development with a BH of 69.95mPD was within the maximum BH of 70mPD stipulated under the OZP. The proposed building height (BH) and plot ratio (PR) of about 5.53 were considered not incompatible with the buildings in its immediate surroundings with BHs ranging from about 25mPD to 102mPD and PR ranging from about 1.7 to 15. The proposed development is considered acceptable in environmental, traffic and infrastructural terms. Regarding the public comment on possible adverse traffic impact, the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) considered that the traffic impact assessment submitted by the applicant had demonstrated that the proposed development would not have adverse traffic impact. In this regard, the C for T and the Commissioner of Police had no objection to the application. Moreover, it was not appropriate to relate the subject application to the extension of Route 4 as the Transport and Housing Bureau had already confirmed that there was no imminent need to implement it before 2026. For the public comment relating to illegal parking, road safety and hygiene issues, they had been passed to concerned departments which would follow up as appropriate.

67. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

68. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 5.8.2015, 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 firefighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;

- (b) the submission of drainage and sewerage connection plans with supporting hydraulic calculations and the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal with tree preservation plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

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

- (a) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South, Lands Department in paragraph 10.1.1 of the Paper regarding the need for application for the modification/imposition of a new set of Engineering Conditions in the Permanent Government Land Allocation;
- (b) to note the comments of the Commissioner for Transport in paragraph 10.1.2 of the Paper regarding the control of the construction vehicles to avoid queuing on public roads during construction stage;
- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services in paragraph 10.1.6 of the Paper regarding the compliance of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue; and
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department in paragraph 10.1.11 of the Paper regarding the greening and preservation of the existing trees.

**Agenda Item 12**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H17/125            Proposed Minor Relaxation of Site Coverage to 29%  
for Permitted House Development in “Residential (Group C) 5” zone,  
15 South Bay Road, Repulse Bay  
(MPC Paper No. A/H17/125)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

70.            Miss Isabel Y. Yiu, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of site coverage (SC) to 29% for permitted house development;
- (c) departmental comments – no objection/adverse comment from concerned government departments was received;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment from Designing Hong Kong Limited was received. The public comment objected to the application as the proposal had no public gain. District Officer (Southern) 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 made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The site fell within Residential Zone 3. The proposed relaxation of SC from 25% to 29% did not exceed the maximum permissible level under the general guideline adopted by the Board (i.e. 50%). The proposed plot ratio (PR) of about 0.721 and building height of 3 storeys for the domestic block and 2 storeys above 1 storey of basement plant rooms for the recreational block were within the development restrictions stipulated

under the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The proposed minor relaxation of SC was mainly to cater for design flexibility and to allow height variation between the domestic block (31.3mPD) and recreational block (28.65mPD). Moreover, the height of both blocks in terms of mPD level had been reduced when compared with the existing development (32.55mPD and 29.38mPD respectively). The proposed PR of about 0.721 was within the PR restriction of maximum 0.75 for a development of 3 domestic storeys on the OZP. In this regard, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department considered that the overall visual impact of the proposed redevelopment would be reduced as compared to the existing development. The Chief Architect/Advisory and Statutory Compliance, Architectural Services Department had no adverse comment on the application. The application was considered generally in line with the planning criteria as set out in the relevant Board's general guideline for SC relaxation. As regards the public comment made on the ground that the proposal had no public gain, it should be noted that the proposed relaxation of SC was minor in nature and in line with the Board's general guideline.

71. In response to a Member's enquiry, Miss Isabel Y. Yiu, STP/HK, clarified that part of the existing building should not appear on the photomontage showing the proposed development in Drawing A-8.

#### Deliberation Session

72. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 5.8.2015, 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 firefighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (b) the submission and implementation of tree preservation and landscape

proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

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

- (a) the approval of the application did not imply that any proposal on building design elements to fulfill the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, and any proposal on bonus plot ratio (PR) and/or gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development would be approved/granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. If the building design elements, bonus PR and GFA concession were not approved/granted by the Building Authority and major changes to the current scheme were required, a fresh planning application to the Board might be required;
- (b) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South, Lands Department for the lease modification;
- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department in paragraph 9.1.3 of the Paper regarding the requirement of the Drainage Reserve Area and the submission of drainage plans to the Building Authority for approval;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department in paragraph 9.1.4 of the Paper regarding the clarification on whether there was provision for emergency vehicular access appliance to pass the portion of government land at the side of the run-in/out; and
- (e) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services in paragraph 9.1.5 of the Paper regarding the compliance of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue.

[The Chairman thanked Miss Isabel Y. Yiu, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Clarence Leung left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms. Kitty S.T. Lam, STP/HK, was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 13**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H20/176            Shop and Services (Block B, Retail Shop) in “Industrial” zone,  
                         Portion of Workshop 11, G/F, Block B, MP Industrial Centre,  
                         18 Ka Yip Street, Chai Wan  
                         (MPC Paper No. A/H20/176)

---

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

74.            Ms. Kitty S.T. Lam, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the shop and services (retail shop);
- (c) departmental comments – no objection/adverse comment from concerned government departments was received;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period and no local objection was received by the District Officer (Eastern); 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 retail shop was located at the ground floor of an existing industrial

building with the main entrance fronting Ka Yip Street. It was considered not incompatible with the industrial and industrial-related uses in the subject industrial building and ground floor of the surrounding developments where retail shops, trading firms, bank and eating places were found. Similar applications for shop and services (retail shop) use had been approved for another ground floor unit of the subject industrial building and in other industrial buildings in the vicinity. The subject industrial building was subject to a maximum permissible limit of 460m<sup>2</sup> for aggregated commercial floor area on the ground floor. Currently, the aggregate commercial floor area of 'Shop and Services' use approved by the Committee on the G/F of the subject building was 106m<sup>2</sup>. If the application premises (85.31m<sup>2</sup>) was included, the aggregate commercial floor area would be 191.31m<sup>2</sup>, which was within the maximum permissible limit of 460m<sup>2</sup> for the industrial building with sprinkler system. The subject retail shop use generally complied with the relevant considerations set out in TPB PG-No. 25D including the fire safety and traffic aspects. In order not to jeopardize the long-term planning intention for industrial use of the application premises within the "Industrial" zone, it was considered more appropriate to permit the use under application on a temporary basis for a period of three years.

75. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

76. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 5.8.2014, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the provision of fire service installations in the subject premises and provision of means of escape separated from the industrial portion within six months from the date of the approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 5.2.2012; 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.

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

- (a) prior planning permission should have been obtained before commencing the applied use at the application site;
- (b) a temporary approval of three years was given in order to ensure that the long term planning intention of industrial use for the application premises within the “Industrial” zone would not be jeopardized;
- (c) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong East, Lands Department for lease modification or a temporary waiver to permit the applied use at the subject premises;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong East and Heritage Unit, Buildings Department regarding the submission of building plans and provision of access and facilities for persons with a disability required under Building (Planning) Regulation 72; and
- (e) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services regarding the compliance with the Code of Practice for Fire Resisting Construction.

[The Chairman thanked Ms. Kitty S.T. Lam, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

### **Kowloon District**

[Mr. Eric C.K. Yue, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), Ms. Jessica H.F. Chu, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), and Mr. Anthony Lo, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 14**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the  
Approved Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/2  
(MPC Paper No. 12/11)

---

78. With the aid of a powerpoint and a model, Mr. Eric C.K. Yue, DPO/K, and Ms. Jessica H.F. Chu, STP/K, presented the proposed amendments to the approved Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) as detailed in the Paper:

### **Background**

- (a) Planning Department (PlanD) and Civil Engineering Development Department (CEDD) had conducted studies on further enhancements to the urban design for Kai Tak Development arising mainly from the preservation of the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Remnants, the relocation of roads away from the waterfront to improve accessibility and other urban design refinement proposals. During the period from May to July 2011, various stakeholders including the Wong Tai Sin District Council (DC), the Kowloon City DC, the Kwun Tong DC, the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB), the Harbourfront Commission (HC) and the Board had been consulted on the urban design enhancement proposals. Views collected from the consultation had been taken into account where appropriate for amendments to the approved Kai Tak OZP;

### **Proposed Amendments to the OZP**

KAI TAK CITY CENTRE

*Preservation of Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Remnants (Plan 5A and 5B of the Paper)*

- (b) in view of the historical significance of the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Remnants, “in-situ preservation” of the Bridge remnants were recommended. A 30 m wide corridor (Preservation Corridor) with an area of about 9,300m<sup>2</sup> was proposed to be rezoned from “Commercial (3)” (“C(3)”), “Residential (Group B)1” (“R(B)1”), ‘Road’ and ‘Road (Pedestrian Precinct/Street)’ to “Open Space(3)” (“O(3)”) to reflect the planning intention for in-situ preservation of the Bridge remnants for public appreciation;
- (c) a parcel of land (about 1,100m<sup>2</sup>) at the southern entrance of the Preservation Corridor was also rezoned from “R(B)1” to “O(3)” to allow a more open view and better design flexibility and integration with the connecting Station Square which was under the “O” zoning. Another strip of land (about 1,800m<sup>2</sup>) between the Preservation Corridor and Road L7 was rezoned from ‘Road’ to “O(3)” to allow greater flexibility to accommodate interpretive displays and related activities;
- (d) the disposition of the development sites in the vicinity of the Preservation Corridor was adjusted correspondingly to accommodate the 30m wide Preservation Corridor and the realigned Road L7. Three development sites abutting the Preservation Corridor were proposed to be rezoned to three “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) sub-areas, namely “CDA(3)” “CDA(4)” and “CDA(5)” abutting the east, northwest and southwest of the Preservation Corridor respectively;
- (e) the “CDA(3)” site (about 2.0 ha) was rezoned from “C(3)”, R(B)1” and ‘Road’. It would be reserved for commercial use subject to a plot ratio (PR) of 4, 65% site coverage (SC) and maximum building height (BH) of 70mPD and 13mPD on the western part and eastern part respectively. When compared with the existing OZP, BH of the southern part of the site was lowered from 110mPD and 45mPD to 70mPP and 13mPD respectively to allow a better transition between the Preservation Corridor and the Station Square while PR had been reduced from 4.5 to 4 to allow greater design flexibility and building permeability;

- (f) the “CDA(4)” site (about 0.63 ha) was rezoned from “C(3)” and ‘Road (Pedestrian Precinct/Street)’ for commercial use with restrictions of PR 4.5, 65% SC and maximum BH of 70mPD. For “CDA(5)” (about 1.4ha) , it was rezoned from “R(B)1” and ‘Road (Pedestrian Precinct/Street)’ for residential use and subject to restrictions of PR 5, 40% SC and maximum BH of 110mPD. There was no change to the proposed use, PR and BH of these two zones when compared with the existing OZP;
  
- (g) the incorporation of the Preservation Corridor would reduce the area of the adjoining residential sites. To make up for the loss in flat production, the domestic PR of the two “Other Specified Use (OU) (Mixed Use)” sites in the City Centre would be increased while the non-domestic PR would be reduced, with the overall PR of 7.0 remained unchanged. As a result, the proposed domestic/non-domestic PR mix for the “OU(Mixed Use)(2)” zone was revised from 4.0/3.0 to 5.0/2.0 and, for the “OU(Mixed Use)(3)” zone, from 3.0/4.0 to 4.75/2.25. The BH of the two sites would remain unchanged to maintain the height profile;

*Connectivity with Kowloon City and Wong Tai Sin (Plan 5A and 5B of the Paper)*

- (h) a curvilinear landscaped elevated walkway (curvilinear walkway) connecting the three districts, namely, San Po Kong, Kai Tak City Centre and Kowloon City was proposed on the approved OZP. From the views collected in the public engagement (PE) exercise, it was noted that the public preferred a subway with a heritage theme from the Preservation Corridor across Prince Edward Road East (PERE) to link with other heritage resources particularly the Kowloon Walled City Park. Besides, in view of public aspirations for enhancing accessibility and integration, a new subway along the Kai Tak River was also proposed to connect the Wong Tai Sin section and the Kai Tak section across PERE;
  
- (i) however, there was no strong justification to have two subways and the curvilinear walkway within a distance of 300m. Further study by CEDD

also revealed that due to the retention of the existing flyover to Kai Tak, the section of the curvilinear walkway crossing PERE to Kowloon City would have to go up to 5-storey high above ground level which was not conducive to enjoyable walking experience. To rationalise the pedestrian connections in the vicinity, it was proposed to curtail the PERE section of the curvilinear walkway connecting Kowloon City;

*Arts and Performance Related Uses (Plans 5A, 5B and 6 of the Paper)*

- (j) with the curtailment of the PERE section of the curvilinear walkway, the planned “C(5)” site (about 1.2ha) on the southern side of PERE was proposed to be rezoned to “OU(Arts and Performance Related Uses)” to incorporate a large platform merging with the deck of the remaining section of the curvilinear walkway. The provision of arts and performance related uses at the site could complement the cultural and heritage theme in the Kai Tak City Centre. The maximum BH of the site was lowered from 60mPD to 15mPD to allow a more open view from the southern entrance of the Preservation Corridor as well as to make use of the large platform for public viewing and outdoor performance. The site would be subject to a maximum GFA of 11,600m<sup>2</sup>, which implied a reduction of PR from 3.5 to 1, with at least 60% of the GFA (about 6,960m<sup>2</sup>) to be used for arts and performance related uses. The platform would cascade down towards the open space leading to the Preservation Corridor and the Stadium Complex. To pronounce the shape of the curvilinear walkway, a non-building area (NBA) at the northern part of the site would be incorporated;

*Twin-tower Gateway Concept (Plans 6 and 7 of the Paper)*

- (k) on the approved OZP, there were two “CDA” sites to the south of the curvilinear walkway, each on a side of Kai Tak River. The “CDA(1)” on the eastern river bank had two BH sub-zones of 175mPD and 40mPD and the maximum PR of 9.5 and SC of 65%. The “CDA(2)” on the western river bank had a uniform maximum BH restriction of 40mPD and the maximum PR of 4.5 and SC of 65%;

- (l) to accommodate the non-domestic GFA displaced by rezoning the adjacent “C(5)” site to “OU(Arts and Performance Related Uses)”, and to further enhance the gateway image in the area, a twin-tower concept was proposed by evenly distributing the GFA and stipulating the same two BH sub-zones of 175mPD and 40mPD for the two “CDA” sites;
  
- (m) for the “CDA(1)” site, the PR was proposed to be lowered from 9.5 to 8.0 and the 175mPD sub-zone boundary was to be realigned. For the “CDA(2)” site, the PR would be increased from 4.5 to 8.0 and a BH sub-zone of 175mPD and a NBA would be incorporated. The air ventilation assessment had confirmed that such increase would not result in adverse air ventilation impacts. The alignment of the 175mPD sub-zone boundary in both “CDA” sites and the incorporation of NBA in “CDA(2)” site would ensure the twin towers to have a symmetrical disposition along Kai Tak River. The twin towers, together with the curvilinear walkway as a landmark feature and Kai Tak River as a major urban axis, would create a vista linking the existing communities in the hinterland and the Kai Tak Development. The 40mPD sub-zone would accommodate the lower structures of the developments that cascade down along Kai Tak River. All in all, the twin towers together with the curvilinear walkway and Kai Tak River at the central axis would shape a very strong gateway image in the area;

*Underground Shopping Street (USS) (Plan 9 of the Paper)*

- (n) the two proposed Underground Shopping Streets (USSs), one from Kowloon City and the other from San Po Kong and both connected to the proposed Kai Tak Station of Shatin to Central Link (SCL), would be realigned;
  
- (o) a section of the USS from Kowloon City to the Kai Tak was realigned to run outside the planned commercial sites to the adjacent public road (Road L16) or open space. The implementation programme of the USS would

have greater flexibility. Connectivity with the commercial sites would be maintained by reserving openings along the USS while additional connections with the adjoining residential sites, if required, could also be allowed;

- (p) the USS from San Po Kong to Kai Tak was proposed to be realigned to run along the boundaries of a “C(3)” site (proposed to be rezoned to “G/IC” as detailed below), and the BH sub-zone of the “OU(Mixed Use)2” site to allow greater design flexibility to the developments above;
- (q) with the refinement to the alignment of the USS below Road L16 and its adjoining open space, flexibility was introduced to provide retail elements on the ground floor of the residential development in the adjacent “R(B)1” sites facing the commercial belt to achieve synergy effect for the retail development;

*Government Offices Cluster (Plan 11 of the Paper)*

- (r) a “C(3)” site of about 0.88ha abutting Road D1 was proposed to be rezoned to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) as one of the re-provisioning sites for the Wan Chai Government Offices Compound (WCGOC). The “C(3)” site together with its adjoining “G/IC” site, which was also another replacement site for WCGOC, and a “G/IC” site further west reserved for Kai Tak Government Offices development, would form a key government office cluster in the Kai Tak City Centre that would speed up the office node development in Kai Tak;

*Design Enhancement of the Grid Neighbourhood (Plan 10 of the Paper)*

- (s) the planning intention for the Grid Neighbourhood area was to create a distinctive residential neighbourhood with intimately scaled urban street blocks. Under the Notes of the approved OZP, residential buildings along the pedestrian streets should be of 3 storeys to encourage interaction in the neighbourhood and to achieve an integrated community;

- (t) to manifest the planning intention and to enhance community interactions within the neighbourhood and the pedestrian streets, it was proposed to enhance visual permeability by refining the massing and disposition of medium-rise and low blocks within the development sites as well as incorporating a courtyard design approach to project a well-proportioned neighbourhood environment for a comfortable urban intimacy. Under this enhanced concept, residential developments in the Grid Neighbourhood area should comprise medium-rise residential towers (100mPD/110mPD) as well as low blocks (6 storeys or 25mPD whichever is the less) to achieve diversity in building mass/form for a more interesting building height profile in the area;
  
- (u) apart from the above and the NBA to be imposed, a set of detailed control parameters on disposition of building blocks, minimum GFA and site coverage for tower/low blocks and façade length, etc. would be incorporated into the lease for individual sites;

#### SOUTH APRON

##### *Enhancement of Accessibility to the Waterfront (Plans 12, 13A and 13B of the Paper)*

- (v) to enhance public accessibility and enjoyment of the waterfront, Road L10 originally at the waterfront of the South Apron area on the OZP was proposed to be relocated to an area south of the Road T2. As a result, the boundary of the “G/IC” zone adjoining Road T2 would be adjusted correspondingly with the waterfront promenade widened from about 15m to about 20m;
  
- (w) to enhance the connectivity between the South Apron and the Kowloon Bay hinterland, a planned landscaped elevated walkway on the approved OZP from Road L18 to an existing bridge at Wang Tung Street of Kowloon Bay was proposed to be realigned. A proposed subway near International

Trade and Exhibition Centre would be replaced by a landscaped elevated walkway to provide a direct linkage from Wang Chin Street in Kowloon Bay to South Apron and then to the Runway. Two landscaped elevated walkways, one along Road D4 to near Wang Chiu Road and one from Kai Hing Road to Hung Yip Street, would also be added to enhance the connectivity between South Apron and Kowloon Bay;

- (x) the proposed layout of the interchange of Central Kowloon Route (CKR) was refined to minimize the visual intrusion due to above-ground structures. As such, an elevated road originally cutting across several amenity areas would be realigned to run along the northern boundary of the proposed Road T2. This provided the opportunity to amalgamate these amenity areas and areas originally reserved for the road structures and rezoned them to “G/IC” for more efficient and effective use. The specific use of this “G/IC” site would be subject to further study. A maximum BH restriction of 45mPD would be stipulated for this site to be consistent with the BH profile of the “G/IC” sites at the waterfront;
- (y) an “OU(Amenity Area)” (“OU(A)”) site to the south of the existing petrol filling stations was proposed to be rezoned to “G/IC” as a re-provisioning site of the existing animal management centre in Ma Tau Kok. A maximum BH restriction of 15mPD was stipulated for this site;
- (z) an area shown as ‘Road’ near Road D4 was proposed to be rezoned to “G/IC” for accommodating a refuse collection point to serve the developments in South Apron. A maximum BH restriction of 15mPD was stipulated for this site;

## RUNWAY

### *Enhancement of Accessibility to the Waterfront (Plans 14, 15A and 15B)*

- (aa) on the approved Kai Tak OZP, Road D3 was located below a landscaped deck at the northern waterfront of the Runway and was under the “O(2)”

zoning which was intended for the provision of open space at elevated deck level. Road L13 was located next to the southern waterfront promenade. To enhance public enjoyment of the waterfront, it was proposed to relocate both Road D3, together with its landscaped deck, and Road L13 to the Central Boulevard between the residential belt and commercial belt. Due to the existence of at-grade vehicular connection to the Cruise Terminal and the underground infrastructures for the district cooling system, the relocated Road D3 would be designed as an at-grade carriageway with connections to the planned adjoining residential and commercial developments, the Cruise Terminal and the Tourism Node;

- (bb) the Central Boulevard was proposed to be widened, from 32m to 36m, to accommodate the roads and its landscaped deck as well as a planting strip along the residential developments to enhance the pedestrian environment and experience along Road D3 and the landscaped deck. The northern waterfront would be rezoned from “O(2)” to “O” as the open space would be provided at ground level. The Central Boulevard with a landscaped deck above the realigned road would be rezoned from “O” to “O(2)”. The landscaped deck would serve both as noise barrier as well as leisure elevated walkway;
- (cc) subsequent to the above changes, the boundary of the adjoining development sites would need to be readjusted to accommodate the widened Central Boulevard, the extended Road D4 as well as additional local access roads to the development sites. In addition, with the relocation of Road D3 away from a “C(4)” site in the northern promenade, the site would become environmentally acceptable for residential development and hence was proposed to be rezoned to “R(C)”. On the other hand, the relocation of Road L13 could release land for widening of the waterfront promenade as well as enlargement of the commercial sites to maintain the commercial development quantum at the Runway Precinct area;
- (dd) as a result of such changes, the minimum width of the northern promenade

and southern promenade would be about 25m and 35m respectively, which was more or less the same as the total width of the waterfront promenade at the Runway Precinct as previously planned under the approved OZP;

- (ee) with the relocation of Road D3 and its landscaped deck to Central Boulevard, the northwestern boundary of the Tourism Node zoned “OU(Tourism Related Uses to Include Commercial, Hotel and Entertainment)” had been fine-tuned for a more regular configuration;

*Increase in GFA for Tourism Node and Incorporation of Set Back Requirement  
(Plans 16 and 17 of the Paper)*

- (ff) following the Government’s decision in September 2008 to finance the implementation of the Cruise Terminal project, it was also decided to reduce the amount of GFA in the Cruise Terminal Building from 50,000m<sup>2</sup> to 10,600m<sup>2</sup>. To maintain the development quantum in the Runway area and the need for a clustering effect of commercial and entertainment facilities, the remaining 39,400m<sup>2</sup> GFA was proposed to be transferred to the adjoining Tourism Node site. The maximum total GFA of the Tourism Node would be increased from 190,000m<sup>2</sup> to 229,400 m<sup>2</sup>. Technical and environmental assessments including air and visual impact had been conducted and confirmed that the proposed increase in GFA for the Tourism Node would not result in adverse traffic, infrastructural, environmental, air and visual impacts;
- (gg) a 45m wide building setback within the Tourism Node from the Cruise Terminal was also proposed to maintain a continuous vista extending from the Central Boulevard to the Runway Park and further to Lei Yue Mun. Possible Rail-based Environmentally Friendly Transport System (EFTS) and its above ground station as well as minor structure for footbridge connections to the Cruise Terminal or the EFTS station would be permitted in the building setback area;

OTHER REFINEMENTS

*Designation of Non-building Areas (Plans 18A to 18D of the Paper)*

- (hh) to further enhance air ventilation, visual permeability and urban design for Kai Tak, new NBAs were designated in the development sites in Ma Tau Kok, Kai Tak City Centre, Stadium and Runway;

*Ma Tau Kok area (Plan 18A)*

- (ii) two 10m wide NBAs within the “CDA” site, one abutting the “R(A)1” site (the Grand Waterfront) and another in the middle to align with existing road (Ma Tau Kok Road), were designated to enhance air ventilation and visual permeability at the waterfront;

*Kai Tak City Centre (Plans 18B and 18C)*

- (jj) NBAs were proposed in “OU(Arts and Performance Related Uses)” and “CDA(2)” sites to pronounce the curvilinear walkway as well as to align the twin towers. Apart from it, 3m wide NBAs were designated within sites along the boundary abutting 10m wide pedestrian streets that run in southeast-to-northwest direction to further enhance air ventilation of the prevailing wind into the inner area. 5m wide NBAs were designated within sites along the boundary abutting Kai Tak River to maintain a wider vista along the riverside;
- (kk) for the twelve residential sites on both sides of Kai Tak River (Grid Neighbourhood), apart from NBAs designated along pedestrian street and Kai Tak River as mentioned above, additional 3m wide NBAs were designated along the other site boundaries to create building envelopes. The intention was to require the medium-rise blocks and low blocks of the residential development in each site to abut the boundary of the building envelope to facilitate the formation of a courtyard design. Two 20m wide NBAs in northeast-to-southwest direction were proposed as visual corridors to enhance the visual permeability of the development cluster in such direction;

*“OU(Stadium)” (Plan 18C)*

- (ll) a strip of land on the eastern boundary of the zone was designated NBA to complement the view corridor towards the Lion Rock running from Metro Park along the Stadium towards the “OU(Arts and Performance Related Uses)” zone;

*Runway (Plan18D)*

- (mm) in order to provide a wider vista along the landscaped deck of the Central Boulevard as well as a wider building gap for more comfortable walking environment for at-grade pedestrian along Road D3, it was proposed to designate NBAs of about 15m wide on average within the “R(C)” sites and NBAs of about 10m wide on average within the “C(4)” sites from the site boundary abutting Road D3;
- (nn) similarly, 5m wide NBAs were designated within the “R(C)” sites abutting Road D4 and its landscaped deck to provide wider building gaps and more comfortable walking experience along Road D4 which was the main vehicular and pedestrian gateway from South Apron to the Runway. For sites along the boundaries abutting 10m wide pedestrian streets, 3m wide NBAs were also proposed to enhance visual permeability at the waterfront;

*Realignment of Roads/Elevated Walkways/Landscaped Deck (Plans 19A to 19D of the Paper)*

- (oo) the alignments of a number of roads, elevated walkways and landscaped decks were proposed to be revised in accordance with the further detailed engineering studies;
- (pp) the cul-de-sac of Road L9 (Plan 19A) to the north of the Stadium was proposed to move northward to allow continuous open space or walkway connecting the Station Square and the Sung Wong Toi Park;
- (qq) the layout of Road L3 (Plan 19B) was proposed to be revised to provide a more direct vehicular and pedestrian route (Road L3A) from Road L2 to

the two proposed school sites in the “G/IC” zone as well as an additional vehicular access (Road L3B) to a southern site of the linked “C(6)” site for loading/unloading use only;

- (rr) the vehicular access branching from Road L4 and located in between a “G/IC” site and a “R(A)3” site was proposed to be deleted and replaced by a through footpath (Plan 19B);
- (ss) the two landscaped decks of CKR at the southern end of the Stadium site were proposed to be combined together to form a wider landscaped deck (Plan 19C) to facilitate a smooth pedestrian flow on the deck level of the Stadium down to the Metro Park;
- (tt) the existing Cheung Yip Street (Plan 19D) was proposed to be widened with the provision of 10m wide footpath to cater for the traffic flow from Kowloon Bay to the South Apron and the Tourism Hub in Runway. The 10m wide footpath would allow for appropriate roadside planting strips to provide a more comfortable walking environment and to enhance the gateway image of Cheung Yip Street which was at the main entrance for vehicular traffic from Kowloon Bay leading to the Tourism and Leisure Hub at Runway;
- (uu) detailed proposed amendment items to the Plan were stated in section 8 of the Paper;

#### Proposed Amendments to the Notes

- (vv) consequential amendments to the Notes of the OZP had been made to incorporate urban design proposals stated above;
- (ww) in addition, to be consistent with the provisions recently incorporated in various OZPs, the following technical amendments to the Notes were proposed:

- to include the public transport facilities, as required by the Government, in GFA calculation for the “OU(Tourism Related Uses to include Commercial, Hotel and Entertainment)” zone, and in PR and SC calculations for the “CDA(1)” zone;
- to update the Notes of the “OU(Mixed Use)” zone to reflect the latest changes agreed by the Board;
- to incorporate a clause to allow minor relaxation of NBA restriction and setback requirements in relevant zones;
- to replace the original reference to the maximum non-domestic GFA by the maximum total GFA allowable for the uses as permitted under the “OU(Cruise Terminal to include Commercial Development with Landscaped Deck Above)” and “OU(Tourism Related Uses to include Commercial, Hotel and Entertainment)” zones for clarity purpose; and
- to amend the exemption clause on maximum PR/SC in the Notes for “CDA”, “R(A)”, “R(B)”, “R(C)” and “OU(Mixed Use)” to clarify that exemption of caretaker’s quarters was only applicable to domestic building or domestic part of the building;

(xx) detailed amendment items to the Notes of the OZP were stated in Section 9 of the Paper;

#### Revision to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP

(yy) the ES of the OZP was proposed to be revised to take into account the proposed amendments of the OZP. Opportunity had also been taken to update the general information for the various land use zones to reflect the latest status and planning circumstances of the OZP;

#### Public Consultation

- (zz) a two-stage public engagement (PE) exercise on the preservation of the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Remnants was carried out from 2010 to early 2011. Relevant stakeholders including the Wong Tai Sin DC, Kowloon City DC, AAB and HC and the Board have been consulted. Community Envisioning and Consensus Building Workshops were also held in each stage of the PE exercise. The public and the bodies consulted were in general supportive of the establishment of the Preservation Corridor for the Bridge remnants. Views on the width of the Preservation Corridor and the public aspiration for a subway linkage with Kowloon City had been incorporated in the proposed amendments to the OZP;
  
- (aaa) the urban design enhancement proposals in relation to the preservation of the Bridge Remnants and the relocation of the carriageways from the waterfront had been submitted to Wong Tai Sin DC, Kowloon City DC, Kwun Tong DC, AAB, HC and the Board for consideration. The public and the bodies consulted had no adverse comments on the enhancement proposals for the urban design and waterfront accessibility at Kai Tak Development; and
  
- (bbb) the Wong Tai Sin DC, Kowloon City DC and Kwun Tong DC would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition period of the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/2A (to be renumbered to S/K22/3 upon exhibition) for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance.

79. A Member asked why the site levels of the open space around the Sports Hub were raised. Mr. Eric Yue explained that it was because major roads such as the proposed Central Kowloon Route from Yau Ma Tei and the proposed Road D2 from To Kwa Wan Road, both to the Sports Hub area of Kai Tak, had to pass through the area. Road T2 would continue to go southwards, submerging down the sea and then link up with Tseung Kwan O-Lam Tin Tunnel forming Route 6. Mr. Anthony Lo, CEDD, supplemented that the approach of a landscaped deck over the roads had been adopted for the Sports Hub area to link up the two sports stadiums at the deck level in the Sports Hub to separate vehicular and pedestrian traffic. The ingress and egress of vehicular traffic of the stadiums would make use of the road under the landscaped deck while pedestrian could enjoy a vehicle-free and

thus more desirable pedestrian environment on the landscaped deck which would actually link up with the Station Square in the Kai Tak City Centre, Metro Park and the waterfront promenades. The landscaped decks had been specially designed to create an open, comfortable and vehicular free pedestrian environment.

80. In response to another Member's enquiry, Mr. Lo explained that at the section where Road D2 overlapped with the existing Kai Tak Tunnel, Road D2 could not be further suppressed as it would affect the tunnel. As such, a landscaped deck crossing over Road D2 was adopted to provide uninterrupted pedestrian linkage and ensure a better pedestrian environment.

81. A Member asked how the surrounding development could complement the Preservation Corridor of Lung Tsun Stone Bridge remnants. Mr. Yue replied that the Preservation Corridor would be zoned "Open Space (3)" with a specific planning intention for in-situ preservation of the Bridge remnants for public appreciation. Two strips of land adjoining the Preservation Corridor would also be rezoned to "O(3)" to complement the preservation corridor while the southern entrance of the Preservation Corridor would be connected to the Station Square which was also under the "O" zoning. As regards the originally proposed residential and commercial sites along the preservation corridor, they would be rezoned to three "CDA" sites, i.e. "CDA(3)" and "CDA(4)" for commercial development, and "CDA(5)" for residential development. PlanD would prepare planning briefs for these three "CDA" sites with specific design requirements to ensure the disposition and design of these developments would be in harmony with the heritage theme of the Preservation Corridor. The planning briefs would be submitted to the Board for agreement and would also be attached to the land sale documents. Submission of Master Layout Plan was also required for these "CDA" sites so that the Board would have a control on the design of these sites. This Member further asked if the BH of "CDA(3)" and "CDA(4)" could be lowered to better complement the Preservation Corridor. Mr. Yue responded that the BH of 70mPD was not particularly high. This BH would help serve as a screening effect against the noise from PERE for the residential sites to the south. Moreover, a lowered BH could not support a critical mass of gross floor areas to develop the area into an office node. Members could further scrutinise the detailed design of the "CDA" sites at the planning brief formulation stage.

82. In response to the same Member's enquiry, Mr. Yue responded that the BH in the Grid Neighbourhood would be limited to not exceeding 6 storeys or 25mPD for the low-rise buildings to facilitate the enhanced urban design of a combination of low-rise and medium-rise buildings with courtyard design approach. Moreover, the lease would stipulate detailed design parameters such as disposition of building blocks, minimum GFA and site coverage for tower/low blocks and façade length, of each site to help achieve the courtyard design.

83. The same Member asked how the continuity in the design of Kai Tak River could be ensured. Mr. Yue replied that CEDD would consider providing a subway linking up the Kai Tak section of the River with the Wong Tai Sin section of the River near Lee Kau Yan Secondary School. The land use of the area adjacent to the School and along PERE could be further reviewed to complement the design of Kai Tak River as far as possible. The same Member asked if the section of Kai Tak River crossing PERE could be exposed. Mr. Lo replied that it would not be possible as it would affect the operation of PERE. However, water feature could be considered in the proposed pedestrian subway if no safety problem was envisaged. At the section in front of the entrance of the SCL Kai Tak Station, the river channel would likely be decked over in view of the anticipated pedestrian flow. As regards the sections overlapping with Kai Tak Tunnel and Central Kowloon Route, Kai Tak River had to be decked over to maintain the carriageway for vehicular traffic. To take heed of public aspirations for accessibility to the waterfront, CEDD would explore the feasibility of using pedestrian subways and depressed walkways along that section of Kai Tak River to provide linkage to the promenades.

84. A Member asked if there were facilities, such as lift, along Kai Tak River walkway to facilitate access of people with wheelchair or strollers or the seniors. Mr. Lo responded that the walkway along Kai Tak River would adopt an unobstructed and organic design approach to integrate with the surrounding developments and would be easily accessible to the public. As most sections of Kai Tak River would not be covered and would be easily accessible, lift facilities would not be required except for some sections such as at the subway section crossing PERE. In response to the same Member's enquiry, Mr. Lo replied that pedestrian connections of Kai Tak River to the curvilinear walkway and the "OU(Arts and Performance Related Uses)" site would be further studied at the detailed design stage and the public would be consulted.

85. The same Member asked if the twin towers could be seen from the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge remnants site. Mr. Lo responded that as the Bridge remnants were only one to two storeys below ground, the twin towers might not be seen inside the Preservation Corridor. However, the twin towers could be seen at the ground level entrance of the Preservation Corridor connecting with the Station Square. The intention was to integrate Kai Tak River, the Preservation Corridor, the site for arts and performance related uses and the twin towers gateway to create a place for art, performance and cultural activities.

86. Another Member asked how Kowloon Bay was connected to the Kai Tak area. Mr. Lo replied that apart from the existing pedestrian subway across Kai Fuk Road from International Trade and Exhibition Centre (ITEC) to South Apron area, the elevated walkway to Wang Tung Street near Mega Box as shown on the approved OZP would be realigned. In addition, three new elevated walkways were proposed, two of which would cross Kai Fuk Road with one connecting to Wang Chin Street near ITEC and one connecting to Wang Chiu Road while another elevated walkway would cross Hoi Bun Road connecting Kai Hing Road in the South Apron with Hung Yip Street in Kowloon Bay.

87. The Secretary said that the Secretariat would further check the accuracy of the proposed amendments to the OZP, Notes and ES. The above documents, after incorporating the refinements (if any), would be published under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance.

88. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/2 and that the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/2A at Attachment I (to be renumbered to S/K22/3 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment III of the Paper for the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/2A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use

zones on the Plan and be issued under the name of the Board, and the revised ES would be published together with the Plan.

[The Chairman thanked Mr. Eric C.K. Yue, DPO/K, Ms. Jessica H.F. Chu, STP/K, and Mr. Anthony Lo, CEDD, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms. Maggie Chan and Professor C.M. Hui left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Silas K.M. Liu, STP/K, was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 15**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K15/105            Eating Place (Restaurant) in "Village Type Development" zone,  
G/F and 1/F, No. 41 Lei Yue Mun Praya Road, Lei Yue Mun  
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/105)

---

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

89.            Mr. Silas K.M. Liu, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the eating place (restaurant);
- (c) departmental comments – no objection/adverse comment from concerned government departments was received;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, one public comment was received. The commenter objected to the application as there was an absence of adequate municipal sewage/drainage services.

No local objection 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 made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Lei Yue Mun was a place renowned for seafood cuisine. Shop and services or restaurant uses were found in some village houses along Lei Yue Mun Praya Road and the main pedestrian corridor in Lei Yue Mun Village. Although the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” zone was primarily for the provision of land for the retention and expansion of existing villages as well as reservation of land for the reprovisioning of village houses affected by Government projects, commercial uses serving the needs of the villagers and in support of the village development were always permitted on the ground floor of a house. The restaurant was therefore in line with the planning intention. Moreover, it was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land use of village houses with various restaurants and retail uses on the ground floor. Although the location of the application premises was not currently served by public foul sewer, the applicant had confirmed that all waste water had made use of the grease trap and discharged to septic tank. As such, the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) had no comment on the current sewage arrangement. Regarding the public comment on municipal sewage/drainage services, EPD had recently commissioned a Feasibility Study on Review of Provision of Sewerage System in Lei Yue Mun Village in which suitable interim and long-term sewerage schemes would be identified for the area. Findings of the Feasibility Study would help improve the sewerage system of the area.

90. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

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

- (a) the provision of fire service installations in the application premises within six months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 5.2.2012; 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.

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

- (a) prior planning permission should have been obtained before commencing the applied use at the application site;
- (b) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that as the floor area of the application premises exceeded 230 m<sup>2</sup>, provision of modified hose reel system and automatic sprinkler system to the eating place premises were envisaged from licensing point of view;
- (c) to consult the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department on the land matters, including the encroachment upon government land and the built over area of the lot under the lease conditions; and
- (d) to note the comment of the Commissioner for Transport that Lei Yue Mun Praya Road was a restricted road except with permit.

[The Chairman thanked Mr. Silas K.M. Liu, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Vincent T.K. Lai, STP/K, was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 16**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K18/285            Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction  
to allow for One Storey of Basement for Six Car Parking Spaces  
and Ancillary Plant Room use in a Proposed Residential Development  
in “Residential (Group C) 1” zone,  
7 Kent Road, Kowloon Tong  
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/285)

---

93.            Mr. Raymond Chan declared an interest in this item and also item 17 (i.e. planning application No. A/K18/286) as the lot owner of the application site was his friend. The Committee agreed that he should leave the meeting temporarily.

[Mr. Raymond Chan left the meeting temporarily.]

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

94.            With the aid of a powerpoint, 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 to allow for one storey of basement for six car parking spaces and ancillary plant room use in a proposed residential development;
- (c) departmental comments – no objection/adverse comment from concerned government departments was received;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, two public comments were received. The two commenters, including one from the adjacent Kowloon True Light Middle School, objected to or have concerns on the application. Their concerns were mainly related to

potential fire hazard, structural safety, reservation about the need of constructing a basement, noise nuisance during construction, increased traffic flow, ingress/egress arrangement and incompatibility with surrounding school uses. 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 11 of the Paper. The subject application for minor relaxation of building height restriction was to facilitate the construction of one basement floor of 542m<sup>2</sup> in area (about 39% of the total site area) and 3.85m in height for accommodating six car parking spaces and some ancillary plant rooms in four houses. The car parking area was 75m<sup>2</sup> and the area for ancillary plant rooms was 142m<sup>2</sup> while the remaining area of 325m<sup>2</sup> was for driveway/escape stairs. According to the tree preservation proposal, all eight existing trees on site would be retained and would not be affected by the basement. Besides, as shown on the G/F plan, the open-air areas were designated as landscaped garden. It was considered that implementation of the landscape and tree preservation proposal would help enhance the visual and environmental amenity of the locality. Since the proposed car parking and plant room uses were all located in the basement floor, the impacts on the environment, drainage, traffic, visual and the planned infrastructure on the surrounding areas, if any, should be insignificant. There are seven similar applications within “Residential (Group C)1” zone in Kowloon Tong approved by the Board, mainly for the reasons that the proposal would allow more tree planting in the site to enhance the local amenity and would not result in significant impacts on the environment, drainage, traffic, visual and infrastructural aspects. As regards the concerns of the public comments, relevant government departments, including Fire Services Department, Buildings Department, Environmental Protection Department and Transport Department, had no adverse comments on those aspects.

95. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr. Vincent Lai, STP/K, replied that there was no previous s.16 application related to the application site. However, the application site

together with two adjoining lots (i.e. 3 and 5 Kent Road) was the subject of four previous rezoning applications submitted by the same applicant and two adjoining lot owners. The four applications involved mainly rezoning of the site from “Residential (Group C)1” to “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zone or “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Hotel”. All of them were not agreed by the Committee.

### Deliberation Session

96. 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 5.8.2015, 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 supply for firefighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (b) the submission and implementation of a landscape and tree preservation proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

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

- (a) to consult the Lands Department on the lease matters concerning the proposed redevelopment; and
- (b) to note that the approval of the application did not imply that any proposal on building design elements to fulfill the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, and any proposal on bonus plot ratio (PR) and/or gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development would be approved/granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. If the building design elements, bonus PR and GFA concession were not approved/granted by the Building Authority and major changes to the current scheme were required, a fresh planning application

to the Board might be required.

**Agenda Item 17**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K18/286            Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction  
to allow for One Storey of Basement for Six Car Parking Spaces  
and Ancillary Plant Room use in a Proposed Residential Development  
in “Residential (Group C) 1” zone,  
3 Kent Road, Kowloon Tong  
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/286)

---

98.            Mr. Raymond Chan had declared an interest in this item as the lot owner of the application site was his friend. The Committee noted that he had left the meeting temporarily.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

99.            With the aid of a powerpoint, 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 to allow for one storey of basement for six car parking spaces and ancillary plant room use in a proposed residential development;
- (c) departmental comments – no objection/adverse comment from concerned government departments was received;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, four public comments were received. Two of the commenters, including one from the adjacent Kowloon True Light Middle School and a nearby resident, objected to or had concerns on the application. Their concerns

were mainly related to potential fire hazard, structural safety, reservation about the need of constructing a basement, noise nuisance during construction, increased traffic flow, ingress/egress arrangement and incompatibility with surrounding school uses. Another commenter was Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL) who opined that since the application site was located within MTR railway protection boundary, the proposed building works should be carried out in compliance with PNAP APP-24; and suggested that a monitoring proposal of the existing MTR railway structures should be submitted for MTRCL's comments and prior agreement before commencement of work. The remaining commenter had no comment on the application. 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 11 of the Paper. The subject application for minor relaxation of building height restriction was to facilitate the construction of one basement floor of 500m<sup>2</sup> in area (about 36% of the total site area) and 3.85m in height for accommodating six car parking spaces and some ancillary plant rooms in four houses. The car parking area was 75m<sup>2</sup> and the area for ancillary plant rooms was 88m<sup>2</sup> while the remaining area of 337m<sup>2</sup> was for driveway/escape stairs. According to the tree preservation proposal, all six existing trees on site would be retained and would not be affected by the basement. Besides, as shown on the G/F plan, the open-air areas were designated as landscaped garden. It was considered that implementation of the tree preservation and landscape proposal would help enhance the visual and environmental amenity of the locality. Since the proposed car parking and plant room uses were all located in the basement floor, the impacts on the environment, drainage, traffic, visual and the planned infrastructure on the surrounding areas, if any, should be insignificant. There were eight similar applications (including application No. A/K18/285 just approved by the Board) within “Residential (Group C)1” zone in Kowloon Tong approved by the Board, mainly for the reasons that the proposal would allow more tree planting in the site to enhance the local amenity and would not result in significant

impacts on the environment, drainage, traffic, visual and infrastructural aspects. As regards the concerns of the public comments, relevant government departments, including Fire Services Department, Buildings Department, Environmental Protection Department, Transport Department and Highway Department, had no adverse comments on those aspects.

100. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

101. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 5.8.2015, 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 supply for firefighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a landscape and tree preservation proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission of quarterly tree monitoring reports to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB upon the commencement of site works and until the satisfactory implementation of the approved landscape and tree preservation proposal.

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

- (a) to consult the Lands Department on the lease matters concerning the proposed redevelopment;
- (b) to note that the approval of the application did not imply that any proposal on building design elements to fulfill the requirements under the

Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, and any proposal on bonus plot ratio (PR) and/or gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development would be approved/granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. If the building design elements, bonus PR and GFA concession were not approved/granted by the Building Authority and major changes to the current scheme were required, a fresh planning application to the Board might be required;

- (c) to note that in case there were significant changes in the layout or building setback distance causing the residential development to be susceptible to railway noise impact, the applicant should carry out a railway noise assessment to demonstrate that the subject residential development would not be subject to adverse railway noise impact;
- (d) to note the requirements of the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department's Code of Practice on Avoiding Danger from Gas Pipes and to maintain liaison/coordination with the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited in respect of the exact location of existing or planned gas pipes routes/gas installations in the vicinity of the proposed work area and the minimum setback distance away from the gas pipelines during the design and construction stages of development; and
- (e) to note that the application site was located within the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL)'s proposed railway protection boundary, which might require compliance with the requirements as set out in PNAP APP-24 and submission of monitoring proposal of existing MTR railway structures for MTRCL's comments and prior agreement before commencement of work.

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

**Agenda Item 18**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K7/103            Proposed Educational Institution  
                         in “Residential (Group E)” zone,  
                         81 Chung Hau Street, Ho Man Tin  
                         (MPC Paper No. A/K7/103)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

103.            With the aid of a powerpoint, 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 educational institution;
- (c)    departmental comments – no objection/adverse comment from concerned government departments was received;
- (d)    during the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, a total of 23 comments were received including one each from management company of Ellery Terrace and Dragon View respectively, four from residents of Dragon View, 12 from residents of Ellery Terrace, three from residents of Chung Man Court and two from other local residents. 22 commenters were against the proposed development mainly on the grounds of excessive building height, inappropriate E & M facilities on roof top, unusual floor-to-floor height, inadequate open space provision, excessive development intensity, traffic congestion, illegal parking, air, noise and light pollution, blocking air ventilation, severe visual and environmental impacts, affecting flat prices and security problem. The remaining commenter (a resident of Ellery Terrace) supported the application on the grounds that the proposed educational institution would nurture talents and allow more people to receive university education. During the first three

weeks of the statutory public inspection period of the further information submitted by the applicant, a total of nine public comments were received including one from a District Council (DC) member, one each from management company of Ellery Terrace and Dragon View respectively, two from residents of Dragon View, three from residents of Ellery Terrace and one from other local resident. Two commenters (a DC member and a resident of Ellery Terrace) supported the application while the other seven commenters objected to the application mainly on the grounds of excessive building height, inappropriate E & M facilities on roof top, unusual floor-to-floor height, inadequate open space provision, excessive development intensity, traffic congestion, illegal parking, air, noise and light pollution, blocking air ventilation, severe visual and environmental impacts, affecting flat prices and security problem. 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 development parameters of the proposed educational institution were in line with the restrictions of “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) zone. Since the site was subject to road traffic noise, the currently proposed educational institution with noise insulation was considered more appropriate than residential use. The proposed educational institution use on the application site was not incompatible with the residential and government, institution or community neighbourhood. Moreover, the Secretary for Education supported the application and had endorsed that the Open University of Hong Kong (i.e. the applicant) be earmarked as the proposed grantee for the application site for the operation of self-financing degree programme. The proposed development could help enhance the visual and air permeability and connectivity of the locality by various features, including the setbacks from Chung Hau Street, adjoining residential development (Dragon View) and the Hung Hom Police Station of 4.5m, 20m and 1m respectively; the central courtyard at ground level and the void areas on 1/F and 2/F as well as the provision of a free public passageway connecting Chung Hau Street and Princess Margaret Road.

The proposed development would unlikely induce significant noise, air, traffic and visual impacts to the surrounding areas. Regarding the public concerns on building height, floor height and E&M structures on roof top, it was noted that the proposed development would not exceed the maximum building height restriction of 100mPD under the OZP. On the issues of traffic congestion and illegal parking, the traffic impact assessment (TIA) submitted by the applicant had demonstrated that the proposed development would not have adverse traffic impact to the surroundings. The Commissioner for Transport had no comment on the TIA while the Commissioner of Police (C of P) had no comment on the application. As regards the air, noise and light pollution, air ventilation, visual and environmental impacts, the relevant technical assessments had demonstrated that the proposed development would not generate adverse impacts to the surroundings. Relevant government departments had no in-principle objection to or adverse comments on the application. On the security issue, C of P had no comment on the application from public law and order point of view. The concern on flat prices was not of direct relevance to the planning considerations of the application.

104. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

105. Ms. F.F. Ying clarified that the number of coach lay-by should be 2, instead of 1 as stated in para. 1.5 of the Paper.

106. 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 5.8.2015, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting 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 sewerage improvement measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission and implementation of a landscape and tree preservation proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (d) the submission of quarterly tree monitoring reports to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB upon the commencement of site works and until the satisfactory implementation of the approved landscape and tree preservation proposal.

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

- (a) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West, Lands Department that there was an area of about 1000mm from the existing boundary wall of the adjoining Hung Hom Police Station (also with 600mm in width existing underground footing of the boundary wall) within the application site. If the applicant intended to include this strip of land in the private treaty grant, it should be advised that :
  - (i) only stratum level above the footing could be granted subject to policy support, no adverse comment from the concerned departments and such terms and conditions to be imposed by the Government; and
  - (ii) the strip of land could only be a non-building area to facilitate future maintenance and repair works of the boundary wall of Hung Hom Police Station and the grantee should at all times to permit the Government entering the lot for the aforesaid works;
- (b) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department that the proposed development should comply with the

Buildings Ordinance, in particular, PNAP APP-151 on Building Design to Foster a Quality and Sustainable Built Environment and PNAP APP-152 on Sustainable Building Design Guidelines and PNAP APP-2 on Calculation of Gross Floor Area and Non-accountable Gross Floor Area – Building (Planning) Regulation 23(3)(a) and (b);

- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department that the application site was located above the ‘Harbour Area Treatment Scheme Tunnel Protection Area’ that relevant conditions regarding this Area would be included in the land lease; and
- (d) to consider stabilising the three slope features within the application site during the construction stage.

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

**Agenda Item 19**

Any Other Business

108. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:15 p.m..