

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 450th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 23.9.2011**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung

Chairman

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Vice-chairman

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Professor P.P. Ho

Professor C.M. Hui

Ms. Julia M.K. Lau

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
Mr. David To

Assistant Director(2) (Atg), Home Affairs Department
Mr. Frankie Chou

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

Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang

Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss H.Y. Chu

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms. Polly O.F. Yip

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 449th MPC Meeting held on 2.9.2011

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 449th MPC meeting held on 2.9.2011 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

2. The Secretary reported that there were no matters arising.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

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

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K3/538 Proposed Hotel in “Residential (Group A)” zone,
No. 46-48 Fuk Tsun Street
(Kowloon Inland Lot Nos. 10360 and 10418), Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K3/538)

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. Mr. C.K. Soh, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel;
- (c) departmental comments – concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, three public comments were received. The first commenter considered that adequate parking facilities should be provided within the development and the existing buildings on the site should be preserved. The second commenter was concerned about the traffic impact of the proposed hotel on the surrounding areas. The third commenter considered that the proposed hotel could bring more business and job opportunities to the neighbourhood. However, this commenter also had concerns on the possible effect of higher price level caused by the development; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper which were summarised below :
 - (i) the proposed hotel with a plot ratio of 9 had not exceeded the maximum plot ratio restriction for non-domestic building within the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone. It was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were mainly mixed commercial/residential in nature;
 - (ii) the proposed hotel, with not more than 50 guestrooms, was not expected to have any significant adverse effect on the character of the neighbourhood or the existing infrastructure. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had no objection to the non-provision of car parking or loading/unloading facilities in the development in view of its close proximity to various public

transport services. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application;

- (iii) the proposed hotel, with an overall building height of 68.2mPD, was within the building height restriction (i.e. 80mPD) for the “R(A)” zone. It was also considered not incompatible with the existing buildings in its immediate surroundings with building heights ranging from 23.2mPD to 146.7mPD. The Chief Town Planner/ Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department had no adverse comment on the proposed hotel development from the urban design and landscape planning points of view; and
- (iv) regarding the public comment on the possible adverse traffic impacts of the proposed hotel, C for T had no objection to the application. As for the public comment on the preservation of the existing buildings, the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS) advised that these buildings were neither graded historic buildings nor proposed graded historic buildings, and the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) had no adverse comment on the application. An advisory clause, as suggested by DLCS, was added to require the applicant to inform AMO in case of discovery of antiquities or supposed antiquities in the course of the excavation work.

4. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

5. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 23.9.2015, 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 submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (b) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the SIA in planning condition (a) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (d) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

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

- (a) the approval of the application did not imply that any proposal on building design elements to fulfil the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, and any proposal on bonus plot ratio and/or gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development would be approved/granted by the Building Authority (BA). The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. If the building design elements and the GFA concession were not approved/granted by the BA 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/Kowloon West, Lands Department (LandsD) that the lot owner should check if the proposed development would contravene any lease conditions, for example, the proposed hotel development might contravene the user and building height clauses in the lease. Any application to LandsD to seek compliance with the lease conditions, if required and submitted by the proponent, would be processed by LandsD acting in the capacity as landlord at his discretion. If it was approved, it would be subject to the terms and conditions including, among others, charging of premium and fee, as imposed by

LandsD;

- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection that the applicant should prepare and submit the SIA as early as possible in view of the time required for the implementation of any required sewerage works;
- (d) to note the comments of the Commissioner for Transport that he had the rights to impose, alter or cancel any parking, loading/unloading facilities, and/or no-stopping restrictions, etc. on all public roads to cope with changing traffic conditions and needs. The applicant should not expect such public facilities would be available for use of the subject development;
- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department (BD) that the application for hotel concession including any exemption of back-of-house from GFA calculation under Building (Planning) Regulation 23A would be considered upon formal submission of building plans subject to compliance with the criteria under the Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers APP-40 and favourable comments from concerned departments;
- (f) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that the arrangement of emergency vehicular access should comply with Part VI of the 'Code of Practice for Means of Access for Fire Fighting and Rescue' which was administered by BD;
- (g) to note the comments of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services that :
 - (i) necessary measures to safeguard the graded Hung Shing Temple at the junction of Fuk Tsun Street and Lime Street should be given by the applicant during the course of works; and

- (ii) the Antiquities and Monuments Office should be informed in case of discovery of antiquities or supposed antiquities in the course of excavation works;
- (h) to note the comments of the Chief Officer/Licensing Authority, Home Affairs Department that :
- (i) the applicant should submit a copy of the occupation permit for the proposed hotel when making an application under the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance (HAGAO);
 - (ii) the licensed area should be physically connected;
 - (iii) the fire services installation provisions should comply with paragraph 4.28 of ‘Codes of Practice for Minimum Fire Service Installations and Equipment’; and
 - (iv) the licensing requirements would be formulated after inspections by the Building Safety Unit and Fire Safety Unit upon receipt of a licence application under HAGAO.

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

Kowloon District

[Mr. Silas K.M. Liu, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/655 Proposed Conversion of an Existing Industrial Building to Hotel Use
in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone,
133 Wai Yip Street, Kwun Tong
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/655)

7. The Secretary reported that Raymond Chan Surveyors Ltd. was the consultant of this application. Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan had declared an interest in this item as he was the director of this company. The Committee agreed that Mr. Chan’s interest was direct and he should leave the meeting temporarily.

[Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan and Ms. Olga Lam left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

8. Mr. Silas K.M. Liu, STP/K said that a replacement page for page 12 of the Paper was tabled at the meeting for Members’ information. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr. Silas Liu presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed conversion of an existing industrial building to hotel use;
- (c) departmental comments – concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, which ended on 15.7.2011, three public comments were received. The first commenter supported the application and the second commenter had no objection to the application. The third commenter objected to the application on the

grounds that there were numbers of buildings in the area undergoing redevelopment/conversion and the working population was increasing. The proposed hotel development would generate additional traffic and this would have adverse impact on the local traffic and pose danger to the public. Proper traffic management was required for ensuring public safety. The Board should consider the traffic impact arising from the hotel development. During the three weeks of the statutory publication period for further information, which ended on 26.8.2011, one public comment supporting the application without giving any reason was received; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper which were summarised below :
 - (i) the proposed hotel was in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(Business)”) zone. The proposed hotel was for an in-situ conversion of an existing industrial building with a plot ratio of 11.6 and a building height of 61.304mPD, which did not exceed the restrictions on the Outline Zoning Plan. The Committee had approved 20 applications for hotel developments in the Kwun Tong Business Area, one of which, namely the Newton Place Hotel, was located to the further southeast across Wai Yip Street of the site (as indicated in Plan A-1 of the Paper);
 - (ii) the proposed hotel was in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D for ‘Development within “OU(Business)” zone’ in that it was compatible with the surrounding land uses. It would help improve the existing urban environment and serve as a catalyst in phasing out the current industrial uses within the “OU(Business)” zone;
 - (iii) the applicant had submitted Environmental Assessment, Sewerage Impact Assessment and Traffic Impact Assessments (TIA) to

demonstrate that the proposed hotel development would not have any adverse environmental, sewerage and traffic impacts on the surrounding areas. Concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application; and

- (iv) regarding the public comment on the traffic impact of the development, the applicant had adopted proper traffic arrangement by converting portion of G/F to a loading/unloading area with coach and private car/taxi lay-bys, and providing the ingress and egress at the backlane and Wai Yip Street respectively (as indicated in Drawing A-1 of the Paper). The internal transport facility and traffic arrangement would improve the traffic circulation of the site and reduce the potential danger and inconvenience to the public. Although there would be an increase in coaches serving the hotel guests, the goods vehicles serving the current industrial building would decrease. The Commissioner for Transport had no comment on the TIA.

9. A Member enquired about the location of the site in relation to the Kai Tak area. In response, Mr. Silas K.M. Liu said that the Kai Tak area was located to its further west on the opposite side of Kai Tak River.

10. The same Member asked whether the surveyor firm of the subject application had submitted other similar applications for hotel use in the vicinity of site. Mr. Silas K.M. Liu replied in the affirmative but he supplemented that other than the surveyor firm, there were other applications for hotel use which were submitted by different applicants and represented by other consultancy firms.

11. Mr. Silas K.M. Liu further informed Members that there were 20 approved applications for hotel developments on 15 sites in the subject "OU(Business)" zone. The Newton Place Hotel in the vicinity of the site was completed. Two other sites were under construction and six had not yet been redeveloped or converted. Another six sites for hotel developments were redeveloped for office/commercial uses, including the Landmark East, Millennium City 6, Manulife Tower and C-bons International Centre. The total number of

hotel rooms proposed in the 20 approved applications were about 6,000 but only about 3,000 hotel rooms would be provided.

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

Deliberation Session

12. In response to a previous concern raised by the same Member on the implementation of hotel developments which was approved by the Board, the Secretary said that the Secretariat was, in consultation with relevant parties, compiling the relevant information which would be circulated to Members for information in due course.

13. 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 23.9.2015, 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 design and provision of parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces, lay-bys, vehicular access and internal driveway for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and provision of water supply 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; and
- (d) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the SIA in planning condition (c) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.

14. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant the following :
- (a) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department for lease modification or a temporary/special waiver for the proposed hotel use;
 - (b) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that arrangement on Emergency Vehicular Access should comply with Part VI of the 'Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue' which was administered by the Buildings Department (BD);
 - (c) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, BD that :
 - (i) subject to the compliance with the criteria under the Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers APP-40, the application for hotel concession including exemption of back-of-house facilities from gross floor area (GFA) calculation under Building (Planning) Regulation 23A would be considered upon formal submission of building plans;
 - (ii) according to the Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers APP-47, the Building Authority (BA) had no power to give retrospective approval or consent for any unauthorized building works; and
 - (iii) the existing building was constructed under the old "volume" regulations according to the building plans approved on 14.6.1964. Based on the information provided in the Supplementary Planning Statement, the subject site abutted on Lai Yip Street and Wai Yip Street only and it was not a Class C site under the current Buildings Ordinance. In this regard, the proposed plot ratio and site coverage exceed the permissible limits under the current Building (Planning) Regulations. The proposed accountable and non-accountable

GFA/plot ratio and site coverage should be subject to approval by the BA at the building plan submission stage;

- (d) to consult the Chief Officer/Licensing Authority, Home Affairs Department on the licensing requirements for the proposed hotel; and
- (e) to note the comment of the Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department that the proposed sewer upgrading works should be carried out by the developer at his own cost.

[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. Raymond Y.M. Chan and Ms. Olga Lam returned to join the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Richard Y.L. Siu, STP/K, was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K11/202 Proposed Columbarium
in "Government, Institution or Community" zone,
Block A, Tsz Wan Kok Temple, 150 Tsz Wan Shan Road, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K11/202)

15. The Secretary reported that Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan, in the capacity of a Wong Tai Sin District Council member, had submitted a public comment objecting the application. Members noted that Ms. Chan had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

[Professor P.P. Ho arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

16. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr. Richard Y.L. Siu, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;

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

- (b) the proposed columbarium involved the use of the 3-storey Block A (the application premises) of Tsz Wan Kok Temple (the Temple) to accommodate 30,388 urn spaces. Block A was one of the nine existing building structures within the Temple. The proposed 30,388 urn spaces in Block A were in addition to the existing 49,410 urn spaces in Block B and Block E of the Temple (which were the subject of two previously approved applications No. A/K11/137 and A/K11/147 respectively) (as indicated in Plan A-1 of the Paper);

- (c) departmental comments were detailed in paragraph 9 of the Paper and highlighted below :

- (i) the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had reservation on the proposal to add another 30,388 urn spaces on top of the existing 49,410 urn spaces. It was estimated that there would be another 51,600 grave sweepers and 1,690 vehicles to be generated from the proposed 30,388 urn spaces. The number of grave sweepers and vehicles to be generated from the total number of 79,798 urn spaces might be up to 135,600 and 4,400 respectively. Moreover, it was estimated that there would be about 1,100 to 3,300 taxis at Tsz Wan Shan Road near the Temple during Ching Ming Festival. Since Tsz Wan Shan Road was a single two-way carriageway, the loading and unloading of passengers by taxis and private cars would affect this section of road. The pedestrian and vehicular traffic to be generated from the proposal would put the local traffic network in

jeopardy during Ching Ming Festival. A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) was required to ascertain the feasibility of the proposal;

- (ii) the Commissioner of Police (C of P) commented that the current ingress and egress of the Temple via two narrow staircases were inadequate to cope with large increase in pedestrian flow. Although the applicant proposed to replace the existing staircases, the information provided was limited and he was unable to provide comment. Moreover, the proposed traffic and pedestrian calming measures were inadequate to cope with the large increases in the number of worshippers and traffic anticipated during Ching Ming and Chung Yeung Festivals. The roads in and around Tsz Wan Shan were steep and were inadequate to cope with the rise in usage by private cars, taxi and public transport during the festivals. The pavement and road crossings along Tsz Wan Shan Road were inadequate to cope with the extra usage during the festivals. A TIA must be undertaken to ascertain the validity of the proposal;

- (iii) the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department (CBS/K, BD) objected to the application as the application premises within the Temple were unauthorized building works (UBW) under the Buildings Ordinance (BO). Although the applicant claimed in December 2003 that a building replacement programme would be submitted, so far no realistic programme/timetable for replacement of existing UBW had been submitted to BD. The approval of the application, if given by the Board, should not construed as an acceptance of any existing building works or UBW on site under the BO. For the UBW erected on land held under lease, enforcement action might be taken by the Building Authority (BA) to effect the removal of the UBW in accordance with the policy for control of UBW; and

- (iv) the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) commented that in the past few years, a number of substantiated complaints related to malodour, smoke and ashes from burning of incense paper/joss stick, etc. within the Temple had been received. A site inspection revealed that the existing joss paper furnaces and chimneys were not properly designed. It was noted that the applicant had committed to close down/replace the existing incinerators by new type of incinerators which would not produce smoke and ash to improve the existing situation. The applicant had also committed that no burning of incense paper/joss stick would be allowed for the 30,388 urn spaces under the present application. Provided that the restrictions could be implemented and enforced and there should be no additional air emission for the application, DEP had no in-principle objection to the application from technical viewpoint;

- (d) during the statutory publication period, a total of 413 public comments were received. 384 comments objected to the application while 29 comments supported the application. 273 comments were in the form of standard letters while 140 were individual comments. The comments received were summarised below :
 - (i) of the 384 comments objecting the application, 380 comments were from the owners/residents of Tsz Oi Court. The other four comments were from the Incorporated Owners of Tsz Oi Court Phase III, the operator of the Church of Christian China Kei Tsz Primary School, a Wong Tai Sin District Council member and a member of the public. The commenters objected to the application mainly on the grounds that the nearby sensitive receivers including residents and students would be adversely affected by the air and noise pollution to be generated by the proposed columbarium. The emission of ash and fumes would pose health risk to the receivers and affect the hygiene. The substantial increase in vehicular and pedestrian flows would cause traffic congestion on the local road network and illegal parking problem. The increase in the number

of visitors to the Temple during festival days would lead to social nuisance and there were too many columbarium uses in the vicinity; and

- (ii) the 29 comments supporting the application were from the owners/residents of Tsz Oi Court. The commenters supported the application mainly on the grounds that the proposed columbarium could meet the acute shortage of urn spaces in Hong Kong. The increase in columbarium use would not have a significant environmental impact on the surrounding areas. The proposed columbarium was welcomed provided that effective mitigation measures such as improvement in ventilation system for burning of incense paper/joss stick and provision of public transport facilities to cope with the increase in number of visitors were adopted. The location of the columbarium was also convenient to the local residents; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper which were summarised below :
- (i) the application was not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 16 for ‘Application for Development/ Redevelopment within “Government, Institution or Community” zone for uses other than Government, Institution or Community Uses under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ in that it was not sustainable in terms of the capacities of existing and planned infrastructure. The substantial increase in the number of urn spaces (30,388 urn spaces) would generate additional pedestrian and vehicular traffic and would overtax the existing local road network and car parking facilities;
 - (ii) given the roads in and around Tsz Wan Shan were steep, C for T raised concern on the insufficient capacity of the surrounding road

networks to cope with the large increase in the number of grave sweepers and vehicles that would be generated by the additional 30,388 urn spaces. As there was no ingress/egress point at the Temple for vehicular traffic and Tsz Wan Shan Road was a single two-way carriageway, the loading/unloading of passengers by taxis and private cars would affect this section of Tsz Wan Shan Road. Moreover, the pedestrian and vehicular traffic to be generated from the proposed columbarium would put the local traffic network and road junctions in jeopardy especially during Ching Ming Festival and Chung Yeung Festival. C of P also expressed concern on the enforceability of the proposed crowd control measures. The pavement and road crossings along Tsz Wan Shan Road were inadequate to cope with the large increase in pedestrian flows during festival days. In view of the above, both C for T and C of P were of the view that a TIA should be undertaken by the applicant to ascertain the feasibility of the proposal from traffic point of view and to demonstrate that the proposed columbarium would not cause adverse traffic impact on the local road network, especially during Ching Ming Festival and Chung Yeung Festival, and the proposed traffic arrangement was practicable;

- (iii) CBS/K, BD objected to the application as the application premises within the Temple were UBW. When the previous applications (No. A/K11/137 and A/K11/147) were approved by the Committee in 2001 and 2003 respectively, it was considered that the approval of the application should not be taken to indicate that any other government approval, which might be needed in connection with the development, would be given. As such, the applicant was advised to consult BD on the replacement of the existing unauthorised buildings and to submit a building replacement programme. However, no action had been taken by the applicant since the planning approvals were given. The applicant failed to demonstrate that genuine efforts had been made to address the issue of UBW and that the application premises was suitable for the

proposed columbarium use from the building safety point of view;
and

- (iv) as the applicant committed to close down/replace the existing incinerators by new type of incinerators and to prohibit burning of incense paper/joss stick for the new urn spaces to address the air quality concerns, DEP had no in-principle objection to the application from the environmental point of view. However, DEP commented that complaints related to malodour, smoke and ashes from burning of incense paper/joss stick within the Temple were received in the past few years. A site inspection also revealed that the existing joss paper furnaces and chimneys were not properly designed. It was doubtful whether the applicant would implement the proposed mitigation measures.

17. A Member noted that as proposed by the applicant, the purchasers of the urn spaces were required to sign an agreement that no burning of incense paper/joss stick would be allowed. However, it was also indicated in the applicant's submission that only three existing incinerators in the Temple would be closed down. The remaining two would be replaced by new types of incinerators and allowed to operate. In response, Mr. Richard Y.L. Siu said that according to the applicant's proposal, only purchasers of urn spaces in Block A under the current application would be required to sign the agreement. The two incinerators would be replaced and retained for use of the grave-sweepers of the existing urn spaces. In response to another Member's enquiry, Mr. Richard Y.L. Siu said that the two incinerators were located in Block B and Block E of the Temple. A Member opined that the signing of agreement to prohibit the burning of incense paper and joss stick was impracticable and unenforceable as other than the purchasers who signed the agreement, urn spaces would also be visited by other family members and friends.

18. In response to the same Member's question, Mr. Richard Y.L. Siu said that all the structures in the Temple were UBW. Block B and Block E were the subject of two previously applications (No. A/K11/137 and A/K11/147) which were approved for columbarium use in 2001 and 2003 respectively.

[Mr. Clarence W.C. Leung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

19. The same Member asked whether the Board could grant approval to planning application which involved UBW. In response, the Secretary said that both the current and the two previous applications (No. A/K11/137 and A/K11/147) for columbarium use which were approved by the Committee in 2001 and 2003 involved UBW. In commenting on the two previous applications, BD also raised objections because of the UBW. However, in considering the two applications, the Committee held the view that the UBW issue should be dealt with under the Buildings Ordinance and the Committee should consider the applications from the land use planning point of view. After taking into account various planning considerations, the two applications were approved with conditions by the Committee. An advisory clause was added to each of the planning approvals requiring the applicant to consult BD on the replacement of the existing unauthorized buildings and the submission of a building replacement programme. However, no follow-up action had been taken by the applicant since the planning approvals were given. Subsequently, legal advice regarding UBW had been sought. According to the legal advice, applications involving UBW should not be approved in view of paragraph 2 of the Covering Notes of the Outline Zoning Plan which stated that a use or development permitted must also conform to other relevant legislation, conditions of the lease concerned and other government requirements. Based on the legal advice, the Board had taken the stand that the Board could still approve an application even UBW was involved, provided that BD and concerned government departments did not raise objection to the UBW as it could be rectified. An approval condition/an advisory clause would be stipulated to the approval requiring the applicant to rectify the UBW in consultation with BD. However, the Board would not approve an application involving UBW if the UBW were objected by BD and concerned government departments.

20. The Secretary also drew Members' attention that the current application was different from the two previous applications. The urn spaces of the two previous applications had already existed and in use at the time of submitting the applications. However, the current application involved a proposed extension of the columbarium use.

21. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Secretary said that enforcement against UBW would be undertaken by BD subject to its manpower resource and work priority.

22. A Member concerned that as the application premises, i.e. Block A, had already been built, it might be used for columbarium purpose with urn spaces sold to purchasers even though it involved UBW and without any planning permission. In response, the Secretary said that the Development Bureau had compiled two lists of private columbaria, i.e. List A and List B, and promulgated them in its website for public information. The private columbaria under List A were those which had complied with statutory town planning requirements, the land lease and had not illegally occupied government land. The private columbaria under List B were those made known to the Planning Department and the Lands Department but were not under List A. The public could base on the information provided by the Development Bureau in deciding where to buy urn spaces from private columbaria.

23. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. Members then went through the reasons for rejection as stated in paragraph 12 of the Paper and considered that they were appropriate. The reasons were :

- (a) the proposed columbarium was not in line with the Town Planning Board Guideline No. 16 for 'Application for Development/Redevelopment within "Government, Institution or Community" zone for uses other than Government, Institution or Community Uses under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance' in that it was not sustainable in terms of the capacities of the existing and planned infrastructure. The existing local road network and car parking facilities were inadequate to cope with the increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic. The applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed columbarium would not cause adverse traffic impact on the local road network, especially during Ching Ming Festival and Chung Yeung Festival and the proposed traffic arrangement was practicable; and
- (b) the applicant failed to demonstrate that the application premises was suitable for the proposed columbarium use from building safety point of view.

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the

Draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K13/26

(MPC Paper No. 15/11)

Presentation and Question Sessions

24. With the aid of a powerpoint, Mr. Richard Y.L. Siu, STP/K, presented the background and proposed amendments and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

Status of the Outline Zoning Plan

- (a) on 19.11.2010, the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K13/26, incorporating amendments mainly to impose building height restrictions on various development zones outside Kowloon Bay Business Area, to designate non-building areas and building gaps in various zones, and to rezone a number of sites, was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. A total of 1,313 representations and one comment was received;
- (b) after giving consideration to the representations and comment on 27.5.2011 and 1.6.2011, the Board decided to partially meet some representations in relation to the “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Mass Transit Railway Depot with Commercial and Residential Development Above” and the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone for the Kai Tak Mansion. On 30.6.2011, the proposed amendments were published for further representation. A total of 286 valid further representations were received;
- (c) the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (Representer No. R2) and Oriental Generation Limited (Representer No. R6), on 25.7.2011 and 5.8.2011 respectively, filed a judicial review (JR) against the Board’s

decision of not upholding its representation in respect of the said OZP. The JR applicants also sought an interim stay of the submission of the OZP to Chief Executive in Council pending the final determination of the JR proceedings. On 27.7.2011 and 8.8.2011, the Court granted leave to the respective JRs. On 22.8.2011 and 7.9.2011, the Court granted interim stay order to the respective JRs;

- (d) opportunity was taken to incorporate zoning amendments to reflect as-built conditions and completed developments;

Proposed Amendments to the OZP

Rezoning of three sites along Tai Yip Street and Wai Yip Street shown as 'Road' to "OU" annotated "Business"

- (e) the three sites, with a total site area of about 508.3m², were located along Tai Yip Street and Wai Yip Street. The sites were currently shown as 'Road' on the said OZP. They formed small parts of Lots No. NKIL 5591, NKIL 5594 and NKIL 5595 which accommodated the Fortune Industrial Building, the Yeung Yiu Chung (No. 5) Industrial Building and the Ying Lun Godown. The rezoning of the sites to "OU" annotated "Business" was to reflect the as-built conditions and site boundary of the private lots;

Rezoning of a site along Choi Hei Road from "R(A)" to "Open Space" ("O")

- (f) the site along Choi Hei Road, with an area of about 1,280.6m², formed part of the recently completed Choi Hei Road Park adjoining Choi Ha Estate and Choi Fook Estate. To tally with the as-built conditions and the allocation boundary of the park, part of the Choi Hei Road Park was rezoned from "R(A)" to "O";

Proposed Amendments to the Notes and the Explanatory Statement of the OZP

- (g) there was no change to the Notes of the OZP;
- (h) the Explanatory Statement (ES) had been revised to take into account the proposed amendments;

Departmental Consultation and Public Consultation

- (i) relevant government bureaux/departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the proposed amendments. The proposed amendments had taken into account the comments of relevant bureaux/departments, where appropriate; and
- (j) as the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) had ceased operation on 15.9.2011 due to the upcoming DC Election, KTDC could not be formally consulted. A copy of the proposed amendments would be deposited in the Kwun Tong District Office for public inspection upon gazettal. The proposed amendments to the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay OZP No. S/K13/26A (to be renumbered to S/K13/27 upon exhibition) would be exhibited for public inspection under section 7 of the Ordinance.

25. Members had no question on the proposed amendments.

Deliberation Session

26. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay OZP No. S/K13/26 mentioned in paragraph 4 of the Paper and that the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay OZP No. S/K13/26A at Attachment I of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/K13/27 upon gazetting) and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 7 of the Ordinance; and

- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment III of the Paper as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zones of the OZP, and was suitable for exhibition together with the OZP and its Notes.

[The Chairman thanked Mr. Richard Y.L. Siu, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H8/392 Proposed Office Development with Eating Place, and Shop and Services in "Comprehensive Development Area (1)" zone,
14-30 King Wah Road, North Point
(I.L. 7106 s.B, s.C, RP and Portion of Extension to RP)
(MPC Paper No. A/H8/392)

27. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Glory United Development Ltd., a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd. Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan had declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd. Taking into account Mr. Chan's interest and that the Planning Department (PlanD) did not support the applicant's request for further deferment of consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Mr. Raymond Chan should leave the meeting temporarily. The Secretary continue to point out that Professor S.C. Wong had also declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with Ove Arup and Partners Hong Kong Ltd., one of the consultants of the application. The Committee considered that the interest of Professor Wong was indirect as he was not involved in the subject application and he could be allowed to stay in the meeting.

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

28. The Secretary reported that the subject application was submitted on 19.9.2008. On 24.10.2008, the applicant requested for a deferment of consideration of the application to allow more time for the applicant to address the Transport Department's comment. In view of the fact that development schemes with different uses and intensities had been submitted for the site and there was public concern on the development intensity of the site, the Committee on 7.11.2008 agreed that a planning brief (PB) should be prepared to guide the development of the site. The Committee also agreed to defer a decision on the application pending the endorsement of the PB. The PB was endorsed by the Committee on 4.9.2009. Subsequently, the applicant submitted two further applications No. A/H8/398 (for a residential development) and No. A/H8/400 (for an office development) on 11.9.2009 and 18.12.2009 respectively. On 18.12.2009, the Committee approved Application No. A/H8/398, but the applicant applied for a review of one of the approval conditions. On 27.1.2010, the applicant requested for a further deferment of a decision on the subject application pending the outcome of the two applications. On 4.2.2010, the applicant requested for a deferment of consideration of Application No. A/H8/400 to allow more time for the applicant to address departmental comments. On 12.2.2010, the Committee decided to defer a decision on Application No. A/H8/400. The Committee also agreed to defer a decision on the subject application, and agreed that the subject application would be submitted to the Committee upon consideration of the two applications by the Board/the Committee. The applicant subsequently withdrew the two applications on 5.1.2011 and 13.5.2011 respectively. On 20.5.2011, the Secretariat informed the applicant that the subject application would be submitted to the Committee for consideration in due course.

29. The Secretary said that on 15.9.2011, the applicant's representative requested for a further deferment of a decision on the subject application to allow more time for the applicant to review the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) in view of the successful land sale of the adjacent "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") site at Oil Street and that a revised AVA, if found necessary, would be submitted within two months.

30. The Secretary further said that PlanD did not support the request for further deferment as the subject application had been processed for more than three years. PlanD had first informed the applicant on 3.11.2008 of the inadequacies of the AVA, including the

need to take into account the redevelopment of the “CDA” site at Oil Street. The PB for the “CDA” site at Oil Street, which formed the basis of the land sale, was endorsed by the Committee on 23.1.2009. In response to the further information submitted by the applicant in December 2008, PlanD informed the applicant on 20.3.2009 that the AVA remained inadequate. The applicant had not addressed the AVA issue for more than two years. There was no strong justification to further delay the consideration of the application as ample time had been given for the applicant to resolve the technical issue.

31. A Member asked if the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the application, what would be the time frame for the Committee to consider the application. In response, the Secretary said that it would depend on whether the applicant would submit any further information such as a revised AVA of the application after his review in two months’ time. If the further information submitted by the applicant involved a substantial revision, it would need to be published for public inspection. Should clarifications on the revised AVA be required, it might involve a longer processing time. The Secretary further pointed out that the Eastern District Council and various concerned groups had expressed strong objection to the application and the deferment of a decision of the application.

32. A Member asked whether the applicant could request for a review if the Committee decided not to defer the consideration of the application. The Secretary said that similar to a case in Nam Sang Wai, the applicant, upon receiving the Committee’s decision of not acceding to his deferment request, could submit further information/justifications and requested the Board to further consider his deferment request.

33. In response to the same Member’s question, the Secretary said that if the applicant submitted a fresh application, the application would need to be published for public inspection under the Town Planning Ordinance. Concerned parties including the Eastern District Council would be consulted on the application again.

Deliberation Session

34. A Member opined that the PB for the “CDA” site at Oil Street was endorsed by the Committee in January 2009, which was more than two years ago and the PB had been made available for public information by PlanD. The reason put forth by the applicant to

- (c) departmental comments – concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, two public comments from the residents of the nearby On Fai Building and a member of the public were received. Both commenters objected to the application on the grounds that the proposed development would increase traffic burden in the area and there was insufficient space for parking and drop off activities. The residents of On Fai Building also raised concern that the engineering works at the construction stage would affect the safety of the adjoining buildings. Besides, the District Officer (Southern) advised that the application was discussed at a general Area Committee meeting of the Southern District North Area Committee held on 19.7.2011. A member raised objection against the application on the ground that the proposed development would increase the traffic flow in the area. 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 assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper which were summarised below :
 - (i) the site was the subject of a previous application (No. A/H15/243) for a 24-storey (including 4 levels at the top for plant rooms and water tanks) hotel with a plot ratio (PR) of 11.486, which was approved by the Committee on 20.5.2011. In the current application, the applicant proposed to slightly increase the PR to 11.495. The overall building height (BH) at the top roof level of the proposed development was reduced from 70.3mPD to not exceeding 67.2mPD. The minor increase in PR was considered acceptable. The proposed BH was within the maximum BH of 85mPD of the “Residential (Group A) 3” (“R(A)3”) zone and was considered not incompatible with the buildings in its immediate surroundings. The Chief Architect/Advisory and Statutory Compliance, Architectural Services Department considered that the

proposed reduction in the BH of the hotel development was an improvement as compared to the previous scheme;

- (ii) under the Notes of the “R(A)3” zone, a minimum of 2m-wide setback from the lot boundary above 15m from the mean street level abutting Old Main Street, Aberdeen should be provided to improve the air ventilation of the area. In the current scheme, the applicant proposed a 2m-wide setback from the lot boundary above 12.6mPD, which met the setback requirement as stipulated in the OZP;
- (iii) the proposed development was considered acceptable in environmental, traffic and infrastructural terms and concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application; and
- (iv) regarding the public comments on the possible adverse traffic impact induced by the proposed development, the Commissioner for Transport considered that the additional traffic arising from the proposed development acceptable and C of P had no adverse comments on the application. As for the public concerns on structural safety, the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department had no objection to the application. He advised that under the Buildings Ordinance and the subsidiary regulations, prior approval of plan and consent from the Building Authority were required before building works might be commenced and foundation works should be carried out so as not to affect the safety of any building, structure, land, street or services.

37. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

38. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission

should be valid until 23.9.2015, 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 submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (b) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the SIA in planning condition (a) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (c) the provision of water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission and implementation of temporary traffic arrangement during construction to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Transport or of the TPB; and
- (e) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

39. 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 and/or gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development would be approved/granted by the Building Authority (BA). The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. If the building design elements and the GFA concession were not approved/granted by the BA 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 and South, Lands Department that the site area mentioned in section 6.2 of the supplementary planning statement was 90.696m² (approximately 976.24sq.ft.) which was slightly higher than the lot area of 976sq.ft. under the lease. The applicant was required to clarify and rectify the site area during the stage of submission of building plans;
- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department that the design of the new hotel should be able to accommodate landscape planting, such as vertical greening on façades, balconies with planters on each floor, landscape planting on podium/flat roofs as far as practicable, etc. for enhancing the greenery and landscape value of the local urban environment;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Officer (Licensing Authority), Home Affairs Department that the applicant should submit a copy of the occupation permit for the proposed hotel when making an application under the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance (HAGAO). The proposed licensed area should be physically connected. The siting of the proposal was considered acceptable from licensing point of view. The provision of fire service installations should comply with paragraph 4.28 of 'Codes of Practice for Minimum Fire Service Installations and Equipment'. The licensing requirements would be formulated after inspections by the Building Safety Unit and Fire Safety Team upon receipt of a licence application under the HAGAO; and
- (e) to prepare and submit the SIA as early as possible in view of the time required for the implementation of any required sewerage works.

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

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

Agenda Item 9

[Open Meeting]

Further Consideration of the Draft Planning Brief for Redevelopment of Ming Wah Dai Ha at A Kung Ngam Road in “Comprehensive Development Area” zone on the Approved Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan
(MPC Paper No. 14/11)

40. The Secretary said that the draft planning brief involved the redevelopment of Ming Wah Dai Ha to be undertaken by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS), and the Director of Planning and the Director of Lands, being members of the Supervisory Board of the HKHS, had declared an interest in this item. The Committee noted that Mr. Jimmy Leung and Ms. Olga Lam had left the meeting and the Vice-chairman overtook the chairmanship of the meeting at this point.

[Ms Julia M.K. Lau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

41. With the aid of a powerpoint, Ms. Kitty S.T. Lam, STP/HK, presented the background and the results of consultation with the Eastern District Council (EDC) on the draft planning brief (PB) as detailed in the Paper :

Background

- (a) on 20.5.2011, the Committee considered the draft PB for redevelopment of Ming Wah Dai Ha (MWDH) and agreed that the draft PB was suitable for consultation with the EDC;
- (b) during consideration of the draft PB by the Committee on 20.5.2011, a Member suggested that the Planning Department (PlanD) should consult the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department as to whether some of the existing building blocks

built in the 1960s should be preserved. AMO had advised that MWDH was neither a Declared Monument nor a graded/proposed graded historic building. Nevertheless, AMO would welcome any information about the heritage value of MWDH and any suggestions for its grading assessment for further study;

- (c) the Planning, Works and Housing Committee (PWHC) of the EDC was consulted on 2.6.2011;

EDC's Views on the Draft PB

- (d) the PWHC of EDC, in general, had no adverse comment on the draft PB and their primary concerns were on the rehousing and compensation package to be offered by the HKHS. Their views on the planning aspects of the redevelopment were summarized below :
 - (i) the design and layout of the redevelopment should aim at providing a green environment, ensuring good air ventilation, slope stability and achieving visual permeability;
 - (ii) the proposed redevelopment should cater for the turning movement of vehicles from Chai Wan Road southbound into A Kung Ngam Road. Consideration should also be given to widen A Kung Ngam Road and provide passing bays within the redevelopment;
 - (iii) opportunity should be taken to improve pedestrian connection between the site and surrounding developments;
 - (iv) preservation of local character by providing common areas for residents to meet and interact;
 - (v) with the increase in population upon redevelopment, adequate facilities such as integrated transport facilities, greening features, open space and community facilities should be provided; and

- (vi) requirement for tree assessment should be included in the PB and trees of special values should be preserved;
- (e) the PWHC of EDC passed the following three motions :
- (i) to request the Hong Kong Housing Authority to provide decanting units for affected tenants within public housing estates in the Eastern District;
 - (ii) to request relevant government authorities and the HKHS to take into consideration the aspiration of the affected tenants in the decanting arrangement, including opportunities for rehousing within the same district; and
 - (iii) the building height, development intensity and layout of the future comprehensive development scheme should meet the requirements on air ventilation, landscape, environment and transport aspects;

PlanD's Responses to EDC's Views on the Draft PB

- (f) the draft PB had set out the development parameters as well as planning and design requirements to guide future development on the site. An Air Ventilation Assessment and a Visual Impact Assessment would be submitted by the HKHS as part of the Master Layout Plan (MLP) submission to ensure good air ventilation and visual permeability. The requirement for a Geotechnical Review Report had also been stipulated in the draft PB to assess the potential natural terrain hazards of the steep slope overlooking the site;
- (g) regarding greening of the site, the HKHS was required to submit a Landscape Master Plan at the planning application stage, setting out the greening proposal and also including a tree survey report and a tree preservation proposal. A minimum coverage of greenery of 30% of the

site area had been recommended to create a quality green setting;

- (h) on the traffic aspect, the draft PB had stipulated a requirement of setting back the southeastern corner of the site for possible future improvement to the junction at Chai Wan Road and A Kung Ngam Road. The HKHS was required to submit a Traffic Impact Assessment to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have adverse impact on the traffic flow and to incorporate traffic improvement measures. The HKHS would also need to indicate in the MLP submission the planned pedestrian linkages between the site and the surrounding developments;
- (i) preservation of the local character could be achieved through suitable design of the redevelopment and creation of a focal point. The draft PB had stipulated relevant requirements for provision of community facilities and open space to serve the future residents; and
- (j) as regards EDC's motion that the future comprehensive development scheme should meet the requirements on air ventilation, landscape, environment and transport aspects, the HKHS was required to submit various technical assessments as part of the MLP submission to ensure that relevant requirements were complied with. The other two motions relating to decanting arrangements were outside the purview of the Board. No amendment to the draft PB was considered necessary.

42. The Secretary noted that one of the views of the EDC on the planning aspects of redevelopment of MWDH was the preservation of local character by providing common areas for residents to meet and interact. She asked whether this view had been incorporated in the draft PB. In response, Ms. Kitty S.T. Lam said that similar requirement like 'create a strong sense of place' was included in the Landscape and Tree Preservation section of the draft PB. In this regard, the Secretary suggested incorporating EDC's view under the remarks column of the Urban Design Considerations section of the draft PB. Members agreed.

Deliberation Session

43. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :
- (a) note the views of the PWHC of EDC as summarised in paragraph 3 of the Paper and detailed in Attachment IV of the Paper; and
 - (b) endorse the draft PB at Attachment I of the Paper, subject to the incorporation of the amendments as mentioned in paragraph 42 above. The PB would be passed to the HKHS to provide guidance for the future development and serve as a reference for the submission of planning application for the site.

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

Agenda Item 9

Any Other Business

44. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 10:05 a.m..