

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 474th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 21.9.2012**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Professor P.P. Ho

Professor Eddie C.M. Hui

Ms. Julia M.K. Lau

Mr. Clarence W.C. Leung

Mr. Laurence L.J. Li

Mr. Roger K.H. Luk

Ms. Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr. H.W. Cheung

Mr. Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr. Stephen H. B. Yau

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),
Transport Department
Mr. W.B. Lee

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

Assistant Director (Hong Kong), Lands Department
Ms. Doris Chow

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Assistant Director(2), Home Affairs Department
Mr. Eric Hui

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms. Christine K.C. Tse

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr. Edward W. M. Lo

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

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 473rd MPC Meeting held on 07.09.2012

[Open Meeting]

1. Ms. Doris Chow proposed that the last part of the last sentence in paragraph 36 of the draft minutes of the 473rd MPC meeting held on 07.09.2012 should be amended to read:

“However, there was no guarantee that a replacement site for fee-paying public car park could be provided.”

Members had no objection to the proposed amendment and agreed that the minutes should be confirmed subject to the incorporation of the proposed amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

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

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K2/205

Section 16 Application No. A/K2/205

Proposed Hotel and Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio in “Residential (Group A)” zone, K.K. Centre, Nos. 46-54 Temple Street, Yau Ma Tei (MPC Paper No. A/K2/205)

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. With the aid of a powerpoint, Mr. Tom C.K. Yip, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel and minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Tourism supported the proposed development as it would increase the number of hotel/guesthouse rooms, broaden the range of accommodations for the visitors, and support the rapid development of convention and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) commented that internal transport facilities should be provided in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). Should there be practical difficulties to provide such facilities, the applicant should provide justifications for any deviation from the HKPSG requirements. The applicant should note that there were hawker stalls at Temple Street in front of the proposed development in the evening each day. The applicant should take into account the street condition in designing the vehicular run-in/out and internal transport facilities including the parking and loading/unloading (L/UL) facilities. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application;
- (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 (Yau Tsim Mong); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper. From land use compatibility viewpoint, the proposed hotel was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were predominantly

mixed commercial/residential in nature. There were also some existing hotel developments and approved planning applications for hotel/guesthouse developments in the vicinity. Despite the above, the proposed hotel had to comply with other technical requirements of concerned government departments and demonstrate that it would not have adverse impacts on the traffic and infrastructure of the surrounding areas. In this regard, C for T advised that internal transport facilities should be provided in accordance with the requirement under HKPSG. Yet, the proposed hotel had no provision of internal transport facilities, including parking, L/UL and lay-by facilities. The applicant had not undertaken any traffic impact assessment (TIA) or provided any justifications for the nil provision of internal transport facilities and to explain why some of its floor space could not be converted into car parking spaces and L/UL facilities to meet the HKPSG requirements. The existing PR would be reduced as parking and L/UL facilities were exempted from GFA calculations. There were no planning and design merits provided to justify the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications with no planning and design merits and no internal parking facilities. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would jeopardize the intended PR control for the “R(A)” zone.

4. Noting that the subject application involved wholesale conversion of an existing building with an existing PR of 10.936, a Member asked how the development could comply with the outline zoning plan’s restrictions of a maximum non-domestic plot ratio (PR) of 9. Mr. Tom Yip replied that the proposed hotel use was subject to a maximum non-domestic PR of 9 under the subject “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone. The Kowloon Density Study completed in 1993 concluded that non-domestic PR of “R(A)” zone should be subject to a maximum PR of 9 in view of the constraints in road and infrastructure capacities. For redevelopment exceeding a PR of 9 in the “R(A)” zone, an application could be submitted to the Board for minor relaxation of PR restriction.

5. The Chairman asked how the in-situ conversion of the existing building with a PR of 10.936 could comply with the stipulated non-domestic PR restriction of 9. Mr. Yip

responded that the non-domestic PR restriction of 9 applied to both redevelopment and in-situ conversion of existing building. The Secretary supplemented that the applicant could turn some of the existing floorspace into carparking spaces or L/UL facilities as those facilities were normally exempted from the calculation of gross floor areas (GFA). That would reduce the total PR of the converted building. If the PR of the development still exceeded 9 after discounting the above facilities, the applicant could apply to the Board for minor relaxation of PR restriction.

6. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Mr. Tom Yip confirmed that there was no vehicular access and carparking spaces within the existing building.

Deliberation Session

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

7. The Chairman said that currently the existing building for office use at the subject site had no carparking spaces and vehicular access. Noting that the entrance at Temple Street would be occupied by hawker stalls from 3 pm onwards to midnight, he asked TD to comment on the feasibility of providing parking spaces and vehicular access at the subject site. Mr. W.B. Lee, TD, responded that apart from Temple Street, the application site had another frontage along Arthur Street. Vehicular access to the subject site could be provided at Arthur Street. For the subject application, TD considered that the carparking provision should follow the requirement as laid down in the HKPSG. The applicant had not conducted traffic impact assessment (TIA) and no information had been provided to justify that the traffic impact generated by the proposed development was acceptable without the provision of carparking space and L/UL bays. As the applicant had not submitted any further information to address TD's concerns, TD could not support the subject application at this stage.

8. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr. W. B. Lee said that TD's comments were conveyed to the applicant through PlanD. So far, the applicant had not contacted TD and no further information to address TD's concerns was received from the applicant. Mr. Tom Yip supplemented that TD's comments had been conveyed to the applicant by PlanD. Noting TD's recent practice that hotel with less than 100 rooms might be exempted from the provision of carparking spaces, he had asked the applicant if the number of rooms of the hotel

under application could be reduced to less than 100 and whether the applicant could provide any information on site constraints to justify the nil provision of carparking and L/UL spaces. The applicant however had not provided any responses despite repeated requests from PlanD.

9. Noting that it was possible for the proposed hotel to provide vehicular access at Arthur Street and the applicant had not provided any justifications for the nil provision of parking and L/UL facilities, a Member considered that the subject application should be rejected.

[Ms. Bonnie Chan arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

10. The Vice-chairman agreed to reject the application. However, he noted that under the remarks (a) of “R(A)” zone, a redevelopment could be allowed to attain the PR of the existing building. As the subject case involved wholesale conversion of an existing building with no increase in the existing PR, he asked whether it was appropriate to reject the application for the reason that the PR restriction on the OZP was exceeded. Mr. Tom Yip replied that according to the Notes of “R(A)” zone, the PR of a new development or redevelopment should not exceed a PR of 7.5 for a domestic building or 9.0 for a building that was partly domestic and partly non-domestic, or the PR of the existing building, whichever was the greater. For a non-domestic building, the maximum PR of a new development or redevelopment should not exceed 9.0, except where the PR was permitted to be exceeded by the Board under minor relaxation of the PR restriction or under the circumstances as set out in Building (Planning) Regulation (B(P)R) 22(1) and 22(2) (related to the granting of bonus PR arising from surrendering site area for road widening). As the hotel under application was regarded as a non-domestic building, the claiming of existing PR was not permitted under the Notes. In 2006, the Board had rejected an application in Hung Hom which involved wholesale conversion of an existing building to hotel use with a PR of 12 under “R(A)” zone (with PR restriction of 9 for a non-domestic building). As there was no minor relaxation clause under the Notes of that OZP, the Board rejected the application as the proposed hotel had exceeded the OZP restriction. That decision was confirmed by the Town Planning Appeal Board and it was clear that the claim of the PR of the existing building was not permissible.

[Mr. Dominic Lam arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

11. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Mr. Tom Yip replied that the proposed PR of 10.516, which was less than the PR of 10.936 of the existing building, had already excluded the back-of-house (BOH) facilities as shown in the table under paragraph 1.2 of the Paper. As the Building Authority would normally exempt 5% of the total GFA for BOH facilities for hotel development, the scope to further reduce the PR by increasing the BOH facilities was limited. The applicant might consider converting some existing GFA for carparking use which was exempted from GFA calculation so as to reduce the overall PR of the proposed hotel development.

12. In response to the Chairman's further question, Mr. Tom Yip explained that there were five hotels in the vicinity of which only one had more than 100 hotel rooms, i.e. 279 rooms. This hotel had provided carparking spaces and L/UL facilities. For the remaining four hotels with less than 100 hotel rooms, no carparking spaces and L/UL facilities were provided.

13. A Member said that for the wholesale conversion of an existing building into hotel development, the applicant should endeavour to comply with the technical requirements of hotel development including the provision of parking and L/UL facilities. If the applicant had made effort to comply with all the technical requirements but could still not meet the PR restriction, then the Board might consider whether minor relaxation of PR restriction would be permitted. In the subject application, as the applicant had not provided sufficient justifications to demonstrate why the technical requirements for hotel development could not be complied with, the application should be rejected.

14. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. Members then went through the reasons for rejection as stated in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper and considered that they were appropriate. The reasons were :

- (a) no strong justifications had been provided nor traffic impact assessment undertaken to support the non-provision of internal parking facilities for the proposed hotel development with a total of 117 rooms, which was considered unacceptable;

- (b) there were no planning and design merits to justify the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio restriction for the proposed hotel development; and
- (c) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area. The cumulative effect of approving such applications with no justifications or planning and design merits would jeopardize the intended control on plot ratio in the “R(A)” zone.

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

[Mr. Philip Y.L. Chum, 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/K5/718 Proposed Hotel (Guesthouse) (Wholesale Conversion) in “Residential (Group A) 6” zone, Nos. 21 and 23 Nam Cheong Street, Sham Shui Po
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/718)

Presentation and Question Sessions

15. Mr. Philip Y.L. Chum, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel (guesthouse);
- (c) departmental comments – the Commissioner for Tourism supported the application as the proposed development would increase the number of hotel/guesthouse rooms and broaden the range of accommodations for

visitors. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 8 of the Paper;

- (d) during the first three weeks of statutory publication periods of the application and the further information, a total of 13 public comments (four in support, seven raised objection and two provided suggestions) were received. Common amongst the supporting comments was the view that the proposed development would bring people and activities into the area and would benefit the local community and economy. As for those objecting to the application, the main concerns were on traffic impacts, displacement of the existing residents and appropriateness of the site for hotel development due to traffic condition and the presence of street-sleepers and methadone patients in the area. One public commenter reported the unlawful removal of the notice concerning the s.16 application from the subject building. Upon receipt of the comment, the PlanD had immediately posted a replacement notice. One commenter suggested that attention should be given to keep the impact on the environment, noise and traffic to the minimum during construction of the development. No local objection was received by the District Officer (Sham Shui Po); and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Regarding the commenters' concern on adverse traffic impacts, Transport Department had no adverse comment on the traffic impact assessment report and no objection to the application. With regard to the view that the area was not desirable for tourist as it was frequented by street-sleepers and methadone patients and there was often congestion on the road and pavement caused by unloading activities, the matters were mainly related to street management. The commenters' concerns had been referred to the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene and the Commissioner of Police for follow-up action. On tenant displacement, this issue would arise in any event upon redevelopment.

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

16. Noting the small room size of the proposed hotel, a Member raised concern on the standard of the hotel which might have difficulty in helping to promote tourism in Hong Kong in view of the current policy of revitalizing existing industrial building to hotel and other uses. This Member asked whether the Board should focus on planning consideration of the proposed hotel, leaving the detailed building design and safety aspects such as means of escape, provision of prescribed window, be taken care of at the building plan submission stage. Mr. Philip Chum replied that the applicant would need to submit building plans to the Buildings Department for approval and apply to Home Affairs Department for a hotel licence after the planning permission was obtained. The applicant had to provide all the necessary detailed information to comply with all relevant ordinances/regulations and government requirements relating to hotel development. The Chairman added that the Buildings Department would scrutinize the detailed design of the hotel to ensure that it would comply with the Buildings Ordinance, including the requirements on fire safety and prescribed window etc.

17. With reference to the site photo on Plan A-4 of the Paper showing an advertisement of service apartment on the existing building at the application site, a Member asked whether the applicant could on the one hand apply to the Board for hotel development and on the other hand use it as service apartment. The Secretary explained that in the early days, the Board had regarded service apartment as hotel use. Noting that there was a trend for developer to apply for service apartment to enjoy a higher plot ratio, but were in effect 'flats' in disguise, and that there was a change in Government policy not allowing the strata-title of service apartment development, the Board had decided in 2000 to delete the use term of service apartment from the Notes of all statutory plans. Since then, if a proposed service apartment units were developed as part of and/or operated within a hotel establishment, it would be considered as 'hotel'. All other service apartment development would be regarded as a kind of residential development and subject to the provision of 'flat' use under the Notes of the relevant statutory plans.

Deliberation Session

18. A Member suggested imposing relevant approval conditions on the health and

safety aspects of the proposed hotel development to the satisfaction of Buildings Department. The Secretary explained that the applicant had to comply the requirements in the Buildings Ordinance, including safety and hygienic standards upon the building plans submission stage. In this regard, it was not necessary to impose an approval condition on this aspect, and a relevant advisory clause (e) relating to the compliance with the requirements of Buildings Ordinance had already been proposed.

19. 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 21.9.2016, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB ;
- (b) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the SIA in planning condition (b) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.

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

- (a) the approval of the application did not imply that 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 bonus PR and/or 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 TPB might be required;

- (b) to note the comment of the Director of Fire Services that the arrangement of emergency vehicular access should comply with Part VI of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 which was administrated by the Buildings Department;
- (c) to prepare and submit the Sewerage Impact Assessment as early as possible in view of the time required for the implementation of any required sewerage works;
- (d) to note the comment of the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West, Lands Department about submission of application to his office for removing the relevant offensive trades restriction by way of a licence or modification letter to allow for the café operation on G/F of the proposed hotel(guesthouse);
- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department on appointment of an Authorised Person and a Registered Structural Engineer to prepare and submit building and structural (alterations and additions) plans/structural calculations to demonstrate the structural viability and compliance with all relevant requirements and applicable codes/manuals under the Buildings Ordinance for approval and consent prior to commencement of the proposed works;
- (f) to note the comment of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene that the applicant must obtain relevant food licence or permit should the premises be intended for conducting food business or other trade or business requiring a licence from the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department; and
- (g) to note the comment of the Chief Officer (Licensing Authority)'s, Home Affairs Department regarding the licensing requirements under the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance.

[Ms. Bonnie Chan left the meeting temporarily while Mr. Lawrence Li left the meeting at this

point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/724 Proposed Hotel (Guesthouse) in “Residential (Group A) 6” zone, No. 164
 Hai Tan Street, Sham Shui Po
 (MPC Paper No. A/K5/724)

Presentation and Question Sessions

21. With the aid of a visualiser, Mr. Philip Y.L. Chum, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel (guesthouse);
- (c) departmental comments – the Commissioner for Tourism supported the application as the proposed development would increase the number of hotel/guesthouse rooms and broaden the range of accommodations for visitors. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods of the application and the further information, a total of four public comments were received. Three of them supported the application for reasons of improving fire safety, promoting tourism and speeding up the pace of urban renewal in the Sham Shui Po area. The remaining public comment opined that attention should be given to avoid adverse environmental and traffic impacts during construction stage. No local objection was received by the District Officer (Sham Shui Po); and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper. For the public comments, it should be noted that the Director of Environmental Protection and the Commissioner for Transport had no objection to the application.

22. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

23. 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 21.9.2016, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of the landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment 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 Sewerage Impact Assessment in planning condition (c) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.

24. 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 fulfil the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, and any proposal on bonus plot ratio and/or 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 and the 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 TPB might be required;

- (b) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that the arrangement of emergency vehicular access should comply with Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 which was administrated by the Buildings Department;
- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Drainage Services to prepare and submit the Sewerage Impact Assessment 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 District Lands Officer/Kowloon West, Lands Department about submission of application to his office for removal of the relevant offensive trades restriction by way of a licence or modification letter to allow for the café operation on G/F of the proposed hotel(guesthouse);
- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department on back-of-house areas exemption, site area for site coverage and plot ratio calculations, GFA concessions for green/amenity features and plant rooms and services, appointment of an Authorised Person to prepare and submit building plans under the Buildings Ordinance for approval and consent prior to commencement of the proposed development;
- (f) to note the comments of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene that the applicant must obtain relevant food licence or permit should the premises be intended for conducting food business or other trade or

business requiring a licence from the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department; and

- (g) to note the comments of the Chief Officer (Licensing Authority), Home Affairs Department regarding the licensing requirements under the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance.

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

[Ms. Bonnie Chan returned 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 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TWW/104 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary “Minor Relaxation of Maximum Non-domestic GFA Restriction for Permitted School (Tutorial Service) Use” for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group A) 3” zone, Level 5 (Part), Bellagio Mall, Bellagio, 33 Castle Peak Road, Sham Tseng, Tsuen Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/TWW/104)

Presentation and Question Sessions

25. With the aid of a visualizer, 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 renewal of planning approval for temporary “minor relaxation of

maximum non-domestic gross floor area restriction for permitted school (tutorial service) use” for a period of 3 years;

[Ms. Bonnie Chan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (c) departmental comments – the District Lands Officer/Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (DLO/TW&KT) commented that as required under lease, loading and unloading (L/UL) space should be provided at the rate of not less than one space for every 1,000m² non-industrial (other than private residential) use. The increase in non-industrial GFA led to non-compliance of this requirement. However, the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) advised that the lease provision of one loading bay for every 1,000 m² non-industrial area presumably was intended for supporting general commercial related uses such as retailing and offices. Given the specified use for tutorial services in this application, and that there was no provision in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) for loading bay for such land use, he had no objection to waive this requirement for the 670 m² area under the application. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, 54 public comments were received. 52 of them supported the application on various grounds including the huge demand for tutorial school in the area, the tutorial service provided at the premises serving and benefiting the local district, the strong desire for continuing enjoying the tutorial service provided by Calibre Education Centre at the premises and the provision of spacious environment for hobby courses by Queen’s Music & Art Centre at the premises. The remaining 2 public comments were illegible. No local objection was received by the District Officer (Tsuen Wan); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment as detailed in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Although DLO/TW&KT considered that the current application

would lead to non-compliance of the requirement under lease regarding L/UL space, C for T had no objection to waive this requirement intended for supporting general commercial related uses while HKPSG had no standard for provision of L/UL space for tutorial service use.

26. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

27. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a further period of 3 years from 21.11.2012 to 20.11.2015 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 for fire-fighting at the application premises within 9 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.8.2013; 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.

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

- (a) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department that his “no objection in principle” should not be construed as condoning to any unauthorized building works, if any, existed or carried out in the premises. The applicant should be reminded to notify the Buildings Department of any material change in use and make a formal building submission, if any non-exempted building works were involved;
- (b) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that detailed fire services requirements would be formulated upon receipt of formal

submission of general building plans; and

- (c) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing that the temporary waiver on the kindergarten area for the purpose of a school for tutorial service would expire on 20.11.2012 and the renewal of the planning approval was required before the temporary waiver could be renewed.

[The Chairman thanked Mr. K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He 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.]

[Ms. Bonnie Chan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 7

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Draft Revised Planning Brief for the Urban Renewal Authority Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Development Scheme

(MPC Paper No. 8/12)

28. The Secretary reported that the subject development would be carried out by Urban Renewal Authority (URA). The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr. Jimmy Leung - being a non-executive director of URA
as the Director of Planning

- Ms. Doris Chow - being a representative of the Director of
as the Assistant Director of Lands Department Lands who was a non-executive director
Lands Department of URA

- Mr. Eric Hui - being a representative of the Director of
as the Assistant Director of Home Affairs who was a non-executive
Home Affairs Department director of URA

- Mr. H.W. Cheung - being a co-opted member of the
Planning, Development and
Conservation Committee of URA

- Prof. C. M. Hui - being a co-opted member of the Finance
Committee of URA

- Mr. Stephen Yau - being a member of the Wan chai District
Advisory Committee of URA

- Prof. P. P. Ho and Mr. Patrick - having current business dealings with
Lau URA

- Mr. Maurice Lee - being a former non-executive director of
URA (the term of office ended on
30.11.2008)

29. The Committee noted that Mr. Hui had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr. Lee was yet to arrive to join the meeting. As the interests of the other Members were direct, the Committee agreed that they should leave the meeting temporarily. Since the Chairman had declared an interest and needed to leave the meeting, the Committee agreed that the Vice-chairman should take over and chair the meeting for this item. The Vice-chairman chaired the meeting at this point.

[The Chairman, Ms. Doris Chow, Mr. H.W. Cheung, Prof. C.M. Hui, Mr. Stephen Yau, Prof.

P.P. Ho, Mr. Patrick Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

30. With the aid of a powerpoint, Ms. April Kun, STP/HK, presented the draft planning brief (PB) for the URA Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Development Scheme as detailed in the Paper and summarised below:

Background

- (a) the PB for the URA Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) was endorsed by the Board on 23.11.2007. According to the latest URA's application No. A/H3/387, the tenement buildings at Wing Lee Street (Site A) were historically valuable and deserved conservation. Therefore, URA also proposed to excise Site A from the DSP and rezoning it to an appropriate conservation/preservation zoning while Sites B and C would remain in the DSP;
- (b) on 19.3.2010, the Committee agreed that the preservation of all the tenement buildings at Wing Lee Street (Site A) was the right direction, and the development parameters and layout for Sites B and C (i.e. a 13-storey and a 20-storey residential block with lower floors accommodating commercial/retail uses with an overall PR of 4.76) were acceptable;
- (c) on 8.7.2011, the draft URA Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street DSP No. S/H3/URA1/3, incorporating amendments mainly related to the excision of the Wing Lee Street area and the Bridges Street Market site (Site A) from the DSP, was exhibited under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. On 17.1.2012, the Board decided not to propose any amendment to the DSP to meet the 28 representations received. On 8.5.2012, the draft DSP was approved by the Chief Executive in Council and renumbered as S/H3/URA1/4, while the zoning of the site (i.e. "CDA") remained unchanged;

Major Changes to the Endorsed PB

- (d) as a result of the exclusion of Site A, and the URA's revised scheme for Sites B and C, the endorsed PB had to be reviewed. Subsequent to excising Site A, the gross site area (GFA) and net site area were revised to 1,997m² and 1,285m² respectively. The requirement reference to Site A, such as reprovisioning of refuse collection point and public market, vehicular ingress/egress at Staunton Street/Bridge Street, preservation of Shing Wong Street and heritage study relevant to Site A, would be deleted. The required public open space (POS) was revised from 625m² to 474m² due to the exclusion of Site A;
- (e) according to the schemes in Sites B and C acceptable to MPC, the maximum GFA was revised to 6,117m². The maximum building height was reduced from 150mPD to 120mPD;
- (f) to strengthen the heritage preservation, tenement buildings at 88-90 Staunton Street should be preserved. Developments in Site B along Shing Wong Street should align with other existing buildings fronting Shing Wong Street for the enhancement of visual appreciation of the building architectures along the street, to encourage a vibrant street frontage and to preserve the existing character. Besides, towers abutting Shing Wong Street should be arranged in a stepped BH profile; and
- (g) to strengthen urban design, the relevant requirements in Sustainable Building Design (SBD) Guidelines would be incorporated. A minimum 20% green coverage as required under the SBD Guidelines was included. Moreover, setback along Staunton Street and Aberdeen Street were proposed to improve compatibility of the site with its surroundings. Due regard should be paid to heritage features/historic sites. The requirements for Air Ventilation Assessment and Visual Impact Assessment were clearly set out in accordance with the relevant guidelines.

31. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms. April Kun explained that Plan 1 in

Annex III of the Paper was the site plan enclosed in the previous PB and hence Site A was included. She further confirmed that Site A had been excised from the scheme by making reference to Plan 1 in Annex I of the Paper.

32. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms. April Kun said that in the MLP submitted to the Board in 2009, URA had conducted heritage assessment and recommended to preserve the two buildings at No. 88-90 Staunton Street in the Development Scheme with a view to preserving the special character of Staunton Street. Those two buildings were not historic buildings included in the list of 1,444 historic buildings being considered by the Antiquities Advisory Board .

Deliberation Session

33. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) endorse the draft revised planning brief (PB) for the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Development Scheme (H19); and
- (b) agree that the draft PB was suitable for consultation with the Central and Western District Council. The views collected together with the revised PB incorporating the relevant comments, where appropriate, would be submitted to the Committee for further consideration and endorsement.

[The Chairman, Ms. Doris Chow, Mr. H.W. Cheung, Prof. C.M. Hui, Mr. Stephen Yau, Prof. P.P. Ho, Mr. Patrick Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 8

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Sai Ying Pun and Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan
No. S/H3/27

(MPC Paper No. 9/12)

34. The Secretary reported that the item involved proposed amendments to the Sai

Ying Pun & Sheung Wan area. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Prof. P. P. Ho | - | spouse owned a flat at Third Street and a flat at Kui Yan Lane |
| Mr. Clarence Leung | - | his mother owned a flat at Sai Ying Pun |
| Mr. Roger Luk | - | being a council member of St. Paul's College from 1992 |
| Ms. Doris Chow | - | Co-owned with spouse a flat at Bonham Road and a flat at Queen's Road |

35. As the properties of Mr. Leung's mother and Ms. Chow were some distance away from the proposed amendments, and Mr. Luk's interest was remote, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. For Prof. Ho, his property was closer to one of the proposed amendments at First Street and Second Street, but as the proposed amendments were mainly to reflect the existing development, the Committee agreed that Prof. Ho could stay in the meeting.

36. One of the amendment items were related to Urban Renewal Authority (URA) and the following Members had declared interests in this item:

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| Mr. Jimmy Leung as the Director of Planning | - | being a non-executive director of URA |
| Ms. Doris Chow as the Assistant Director of Lands Department | - | being a representative of the Director of Lands who was a non-executive director of URA |
| Mr. Eric Hui as the Assistant Director of Home Affairs Department | - | being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a non-executive director of URA |

- Mr. H.W. Cheung - being a co-opted member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of URA
- Prof. C. M. Hui - being a co-opted member of the Finance Committee of URA
- Mr. Stephen Yau - being a member of the Wan chai District Advisory Committee of URA
- Prof. P. P. Ho and Mr. Patrick Lau - having current business dealings with URA
- Mr. Maurice Lee - being a former non-executive director of URA (the term of office ended on 30.11.2008)

37. The Committee noted that Mr. Eric Hui had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the proposed amendments were mainly to reflect the completed development of the URA site and was related to plan-making, the Committee agreed that the other Members could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

38. With the aid of a powerpoint, Ms. April Kun, STP/HK presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and summarised below:

Amendment Item A: Amendments to the U Lam Terrace, Rozario Street and Ladder Street

- (a) on 23.3.2012, the Board considered the findings of the “Review of the Stepped Street Sites on Hong Kong Island” (the Review). The Board noted that with enhanced fire safety measures, fire fighting was no longer a concern in the area. The Board agreed to the Review’s recommendations

that the current development restrictions, i.e. maximum plot ratio (PR) of 5 and maximum 12 storeys, should be maintained for all the stepped street sites. The planning intention of the concerned “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) zones should be suitably revised to set out the latest planning considerations relevant to the redevelopment. To avoid out-of-scale developments, the “relaxation” clause should be revised to a “minor relaxation” clause. To prevent the major stepped streets and terraces from being built over, the concerned areas would be excised from the “R(C)” zones and shown as ‘Road’ on relevant Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs);

- (b) in this regard, the terraces and the stepped streets including U Lam Terrace, Rozario Street and Ladder Street were proposed to be rezoned from “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”), “R(A)8”, “R(C)” and “Government, Institution or Community” to area shown as ‘Road’ to prevent them from being built over. The area shown as ‘Road’ formed a pedestrian network providing connection between Canie Road and Queen’s Road Central via Ladder Street;
- (c) the planning intention of the “R(C)” zone was proposed to be revised to reflect the latest circumstances;
- (d) the “relaxation” clause had also been revised to a “minor relaxation” clause;

Amendment Item B : Rezoning of the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Scheme at First Street/Second Street

- (e) the URA scheme at First Street/Second Street was currently zoned “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) on the approved Land Development Corporation (LDC) First Street/Second Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/H3/LDC5/2. The latest approved scheme was for two towers with a maximum domestic gross floor area (GFA) of 34,954m² and a non-domestic GFA of 4,000m² for commercial and residential care home for the elderly (RCHE). A public open space (POS) of 700m² was

also proposed;

- (f) to reflect the approved scheme which had been developed on the site, namely Island Crest, and to maintain effective planning control, it was proposed to rezone the site from “CDA” on the DSP to “R(A)22” on the OZP subject to a building height restriction (BHR) of 120mPD or the height of the existing building, whichever was the greater; a maximum domestic GFA of 34,954m²; a maximum non-domestic GFA of 4,000m², of which not less than 2,197m² should be provided for GIC facilities; and the provision of a POS of not less than 700m² at the Second Street level. The POS was part and parcel of the development and hence it should be subsumed under the proposed “R(A)22” zoning to reflect its integrated relationship with the development, and
- (g) the BHR for the OZP had adopted a BH profile gradually increasing uphill. Having regard to the overall stepped height concept for the Area, the site fell within the height band of about 120mPD. Although the existing buildings at the site with a BH of about 164mPD exceeded the height band of 120mPD, as a general principle, existing developments that had already exceeded the relevant BHR would not be affected.

39. Noting that U Lam Terrace, Rozario Street and Ladder Street were proposed to be rezoned to area shown as ‘road’ so as to prevent them from being built over, a Member asked whether the terraces and the stepped streets could be designated as non-building areas (NBA) in order to have a more effective control on the preservation of the area. This member said that by rezoning the terraces and streets as road, buildings on two sides of the road could be built taller. Ms. April Kun replied that it was the general practice of the Board to designate an area as ‘Road’ to reflect its actual function. The proposed amendments to show U Lam Terrace, Rozario Street and Ladder Street as ‘Road’ were mainly to reflect their function as roads. In general, area within development site would be designated as NBA to avoid built-over. Moreover, the Covering Notes of the OZP had specified that in any areas shown as ‘Road’, all uses or developments except those specified in the Covering Notes would require planning permission from the Board. In response to the Chairman’s enquiry, Ms. Kun replied that the areas involved were government land.

40. Another Member asked whether other terraces in the Central and Western District would be designated as 'Road' such as the Ladder Street Terrace. Ms. April Kun replied that the Ladder Street Terrace had already been amended to be shown as 'Road' in the previous Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/26. Apart from the terraces under the subject proposed amendments, all terraces in the district had already been shown as 'Road'.

41. A Member asked whether showing the terraces as 'Road' was the most effective way to preserve the areas. Ms. April Kun reiterated that designating the terraces as 'Road' was mainly to reflect their road function. According to the Notes of the subject OZP, any development other than those uses permitted under the Covering Notes of the OZP would need planning permission from the Board. In fact, this practice was adopted in all OZPs.

42. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms. April Kun responded that the BH restriction of the URA Scheme at First Street/Second Street was 120mPD or the height of the existing building, whichever was the greater. As 'existing building' referred to the building physically existing at the site, redevelopment at this site in future would be allowed up to the BH of the existing building, i.e. Island Crest (about 164mPD).

43. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/27 and that the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/27A at Attachment II-A of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/H3/28 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment II-B of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised explanatory statement (ES) at Attachment II-C of the Paper for the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/27A as an expression of the Board's planning intentions and objectives for the various land use zones on the Plan and the revised ES would be published together with the Plan and issued under the name of the Board.

[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. Ken Wong and Mr. Patrick Lau left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms. Kitty S.T. Lam, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H9/69 Proposed Comprehensive Redevelopment of Ming Wah Dai Ha
(including flats, shop and services and social welfare facilities) in
"Comprehensive Development Area" zone, Ming Wah Dai Ha, 1-25 A
Kung Ngam Road, Shau Kei Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/H9/69A)

44. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) with AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM), BMT Asia Pacific Ltd. (BMT) and LLA Consultancy Ltd. (LLA) as the consultants. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| Mr. Jimmy Leung as the Director of Planning | - | being an Ex-officio member of HKHS Supervisory Board |
| Ms. Doris Chow as the Assistant Director of Lands Department | - | being an assistant to the Director of Lands who was an Ex-officio member of HKHS Supervisory Board |
| Mr. H.W. Cheung | - | being a member of the Task Force on Construction of HKHS |
| Mr. Dominic Lam | - | having current business dealings with |

HKHS, AECOM, BMT and LLA

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Mr. Patrick Lau | - | having current business dealings with AECOM, BMT and LLA |
| Prof. S.C. Wong and Ms. Julia Lau | - | having current business dealings with AECOM |

45. As Prof. S.C. Wong, Mr. Patrick Lau and Ms. Julia Lau had no direct involvement in the subject application, the Committee noted that Mr. Lau had already left the meeting and agreed that Prof. Wong and Ms. Lau could stay in the meeting.

46. As the interests of the Chairman, Ms. Doris Chow, Mr. H.W. Cheung and Mr. Dominic Lam were considered direct, the Committee agreed that they should leave the meeting temporarily. As the Chairman had declared an interest and needed to leave the meeting, the Committee agreed that the Vice-chairman should take over and chair the meeting for this item. The Vice-chairman chaired the meeting at this point.

[Ms. Doris Chow, Mr. H.W. Cheung and Mr. Dominic Lam left the meeting temporarily while the Chairman left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

47. With the aid of a powerpoint, 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 highlighting that a planning brief (PB) for setting out the development parameters as well as planning and design requirements to guide future development on the site was endorsed by the Committee on 23.9.2011;
- (b) the comprehensive redevelopment of Ming Wah Dai Ha (MWDH) for public housing and elderly housing (including flats, shop and services and

social welfare facilities);

- (c) departmental comments – concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods of the application and the further information, a total of 9 public comments were received from local residents/general public, Eastern District Council (EDC) Members, the Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRC Ltd.) and the HK and China Gas Co. Ltd.. They were concerned with the adverse impacts on developments nearby including wall effect and natural lighting; more tree plantings needed to improve the environment; noise and air pollution and falling objects from above during the demolition and construction periods; provision on government, institution or community (GIC) and transport facilities in the area; provision of shuttle bus running between MWDH and Shau Kei Wan; adoption of energy saving and sustainable development measures (e.g. the use of solar panels); preservation of the existing Block M as heritage; adverse visual impact including in breach of ridgelines and view to the historic site of Lei Yue Mun Holiday Village; pedestrian connectivity between the site and the Shau Kei Wan Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Station; stability and condition of a slope fronting Wang Wa Street; and interface with two existing Island Line tunnels running underneath the site and underground gas pipeline running along Chai Wan Road etc.. 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 as detailed in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Regarding the public concerns on wall effect, natural lighting and visual aspects, three visual corridors and building gaps ranging from 15m to 36m had been incorporated to allow vistas to the greenery of Lei Yue Mun Park and enhance visual permeability. As regards the public concerns on air and noise pollution, the Director of Environmental Protection had

advised that potential environmental pollution problems were under the control of various pollution control ordinances. On the concerns of safety aspects during demolition/construction period, the Buildings Department had advised that the Authorized Person and the registered contractor responsible for the works had to ensure that the works were carried out in compliance with the requirements of the Buildings Ordinance. On slope stability/maintenance, the Geotechnical Engineering Office (GEO) had advised that the GEO would exercise geotechnical control through the statutory authority of the Buildings Department under the provisions of the Buildings Ordinance. Regarding the preservation of Block M, Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) had advised that MWDH was neither a Declared Monument nor a graded/proposed graded historic building. In addition, the existing buildings were not included in the list of 1,444 historic buildings being considered by the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB). Regarding MTRC Ltd.'s comment on the existing railway tunnels underneath the site, the proposed scheme had incorporated an air/visual corridor at the northern part of the site generally aligning with the MTR reserve in accordance with the PB and no buildings were proposed within the reserve area. In respect of HKCG Co. Ltd.'s comment, the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services had advised that the applicant should seek HKCG Co. Ltd.'s views on specific safety requirements and the minimum set back distance from the gas pipelines during the design and construction stages. In respect of the suggested shuttle bus services, the applicant had commented that the site was in close proximity to the town centre and there was a lift tower at Kam Wa Street providing connection between MWDH and the town centre area. The necessity to provide shuttle bus services would be further considered upon completion of the development. The applicant would also explore the provision of additional pedestrian access points to further improve the pedestrian connectivity between Phase 3 with the Shan Kei Wan town centre area. Regarding the incorporation of sustainable and energy-efficient building design, the applicant has indicated that sustainable building design features would be incorporated during detailed design stage.

Preservation of Block M

48. A Member asked whether Block M could be preserved for adaptive reuse as it was a typical block of the first generation of housing estates built by HKHS and was creative in architectural design. This suggestion was indeed raised when the draft planning brief of the subject site was considered but had not been included into the planning brief as a requirement. Ms. Kitty Lam responded that AMO had been consulted in this regard. AMO pointed out that MWDH was neither a Declared Monument nor a graded/proposed graded historic building. In addition, the existing buildings were not included in the list of 1,444 historic buildings being considered by the AAB. Ms. Lam said that Member's view on preservation of Block M had indeed been conveyed to HKHS for consideration. However, HKHS decided to retain its original layout design as the proposed retention of Block M would have significant impact on the overall design and layout of the residential development.

49. Another Member said that although Block M was not a monument, its historical significance would showcase the role and contribution of this type of building in the history of Hong Kong to the people of Hong Kong, particularly the younger generations. In view of the large size of the development site, there should be ample opportunity for retention of Block M allowing an integration of old and new buildings. This would provide an attraction for people living outside to visit the housing estate, thus creating a more vibrant community. This view was shared by another Member.

Parking Provision

50. Noting the large scale of the development and the limited provision of parking spaces, a Member asked whether the traffic impact assessment (TIA) of the development was robust enough and whether there would be sufficient parking spaces to cater for the need of the development given its inconvenient location and the inclusion of elderly housing. Ms. Kitty Lam responded that sufficient parking spaces had been proposed in the development taking into account the estimated trip generation of the proposed development as an integrated public housing and elderly housing development. To meet the need of the elderly, sufficient parking and loading/unloading spaces (including ambulance) had been incorporated in the development. The same Member further enquired about the standard parking ratio for public housing development. By referring to page 14 of the TIA, Ms. Kitty Lam replied that

sufficient parking spaces would be provided for different phases of the development in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). For Phase 2 development where the two blocks of elderly housing were located, 47 private car parking spaces and 2 ambulance parking spaces would be provided. Transport Department had considered the parking provision acceptable. With reference to Appendix F in the TIA, the Secretary supplemented that the parking spaces were provided in accordance with the requirements of HKPSG. The parking provision was calculated based on the global parking standard which was one carparking space per 6 to 9 flats and discounted by relevant factors such as the type of housing (i.e. subsidized housing) and distance from the rail station.

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

Serving the Need of the Elderly

51. A Member asked about the access to the elderly housing in view of the inconvenient uphill location of the subject site. Ms. Kitty Lam replied that three lifts were provided in the development providing connection between MWDH and Kam Wa Street which was close to the Shau Kei Wan MTR entrance. Ramps and barrier-free access would also be provided for the ease of access of the elderly. There were also bus stops in the vicinity of the site. Moreover, in accordance with the request of the Social Welfare Department, picking up/dropping off point close to the day care centre for the elderly would also be provided.

52. Ms. Kitty Lam explained that the proposed elderly services provided within the development would not only serve the two elderly housing blocks within the development but also the elderly people in the district. In view of that, a Member asked whether the pedestrian and road networks would be convenient enough for the elderly to visit the facilities at the development. In response, Ms. Lam said that the lifts connecting the proposed development with Kam Wa Street which was close to the Shau Kei Wan MTR Station would be a convenient and easily accessible pedestrian link for the elderly. She also pointed out that, as requested by TD, the applicant would explore various options for the provision of additional pedestrian access to further improve the pedestrian network connection between the Phase 3 development with the Shau Kei Wan MTR Station, including enhancing staircase connection, provision of ramps and lift as the present access through the staircase near Eastway Towers

was not convenient particularly for elderly people.

Others

53. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms. Kitty Lam replied that a total GFA of 500m² for commercial uses such as convenience store, small shops were proposed within the development. The exact types of commercial uses could not be confirmed at this stage.

54. In response to another Member's enquiry, Ms. Kitty Lam replied that she had no information at hand about the eligibility criteria for the elderly housing of HKHS. She said that any application for public rental housing and elderly housing would have to meet the respective eligibility criteria of HKHS.

Deliberation Session

Preservation of Block M

55. In the absence of a shopping centre which could attract people coming to visit the large housing estate, a Member opined that the development should be developed in a more innovative way by retaining an original building block with architectural merits for adaptive reuse so as to become an attraction for people living outside the estate.

56. In response to the Vice-chairman's enquiry, Ms. Kitty Lam replied that the suggestion to preserve Block M had been relayed to HKHS for consideration. In drawing up the layout of the development, HKHS had to take into account many factors including the need for in-situ rehousing of the affected residents and the need to provide flats to meet the housing demand. The proposed retention of Block M would significantly affect the design and layout of the development. Instead of preserving Block M, HKHS had adopted another design approach to facilitate better integration of the estate with the community by providing a large amount and well-designed quality open space, serving as a focal point for the local community. While appreciating HKHS's effort in providing extensive greening in the development, the same member was of the view that the retention of Block M for adaptive reuse to create a more innovative and a mixed environment of old and new buildings would be more effective in attracting people from other districts. It could then facilitate a more

dynamic interaction between the residents of the future development at MWDH and people in the wider community.

57. Another Member opined that comparing with Mei Ho House in Sham Shui Po which had been preserved, the special architectural design of the building blocks at MWDH could not be found in Mei Ho House and would warrant preservation on grounds of heritage preservation. There were two light wells between blocks with kitchens facing the light well, which had acted as social space for the residents there. The design was modelled on the early design of low-rise public housing in Britain. The British design concept was translated to become a high-rise development in MWDH which was innovative at that time. Block M could be retained for GIC uses and should not have much impact on the total gross floor areas that could be provided in the development. Moreover, Block M was located near Chai Wan Road and hence could serve as a noise barrier for the development. The member considered that Block M could be retained by slightly modifying the layout of the development, given the large area of the development site of MWDH.

58. Another Member agreed with this Member and considered that there should be space to manoeuvre in the layout to retain Block M and that would not affect the flat production of the future development. Moreover, from the environmental perspective, Block M could serve as the site office at the construction stage and then turn into a GIC building after the completion of the redevelopment.

Provision of Elderly Housing

59. Noting that the subject development was a pioneering example of HKHS's new integrated redevelopment model of public housing and elderly housing as mentioned in section 2 of the Paper, a Member raised concerns on providing proper care of the elderly if they were all concentrated on the two high-rise elderly housing blocks. Consideration should be given to allocate housing units at the lower floors of each housing block of the proposed development to the elderly so as to ensure better care-taking and to facilitate better integration of the elderly with the community.

60. The same Member said that HKHS should plan for the elderly housing in a comprehensive manner taking into account the special needs of the elderly people both at the

present day and in future. HKHS should not only ensure adequate provision of elderly facilities within the development, but should ensure that they were properly managed. Another Member considered that many elderly people had no problem in taking care of themselves. The provision of two elderly housing blocks was considered acceptable as that would be a more cost-effective provision of service and facilities. Ms. Kitty Lam clarified that some of the elderly facilities within the development were provided at the request of SWD and would likely be operated by suitable social welfare organisations. They would not only serve the elderly within the development but also those in the wider district.

61. The Secretary said that HKHS had good experience in the development and management of elderly housing. They had good knowledge in providing special design and tailor-made facilities to cater for the needs of the elderly. Examples included wider corridor with handrails, railing in lift, provision of seats along railing and special lock in the unit etc. It could be more effective to provide suitable facilities in a specially designed elderly housing block. At the lower floors of the elderly housing block, elderly facilities such as day care centre, residential care home for elderly, clinic, neighbourhood elderly centre etc. would normally be provided, providing the needed facilities for the convenience of the elderly. The subject development was modelled on the two successful HKHS elderly housing schemes, i.e. Jolly Place in Tseung Kwan O and Cheerful Court in Ngau Tau Kok, which were well supported by the community.

Conclusion

62. The Vice-chairman said that HKHS had good experience in developing elderly housing and as explained by the Secretary, there were reasons that elderly housing units were concentrated in two blocks. However, Members' suggestions and views on the design and provision of elderly housing and facilities within the development could be conveyed to HKHS.

63. On the proposed retention of Block M for adaptive reuse, as suggested by some Members, Ms. Kitty Lam said that the northern part of the existing development of MWDH was recently renovated and hence was scheduled for a later phase in the redevelopment. Block M was however scheduled for phase 1 of the redevelopment. The proposed retention of Block M might not only affect the design and layout of the proposed redevelopment, but the

implementation programme as well. The Vice-chairman said that Block M was only quoted as an example of the original housing block within the development, and HKHS could consider preserving another suitable block within the development. Another Member agreed.

64. Noting Members' view on the preservation of the existing Block M or another suitable block for adaptive reuse, the Vice-chairman asked Members to consider if the Master Layout Plan (MLP) should be approved and Members' views be conveyed to HKHS, or the application be deferred and HKHS be requested to further consider the feasibility of preserving a building block within the development.

65. The Secretary said that as the application involved the consideration and approval of the MLP by the Committee and the proposal to retain Block M or another suitable block would affect the design and layout of the proposed redevelopment, a conditional approval of the application requiring HKHS to retain Block M or another suitable block would not be appropriate. If Members had a strong view on the preservation of a building block, it would be prudent to defer the consideration of the application so as to give HKHS an opportunity to respond to the views of Members, particularly, the constraints and difficulties encountered in retaining a building block, before making a decision.

66. After discussion, Members agreed that the application should be deferred pending further information be provided by HKHS on the feasibility to preserve the existing Block M or another suitable block in the redevelopment proposal. Members also agreed that HKHS should be requested to provide information on the building design, facilities to be provided and management of the two elderly housing blocks within the development.

67. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application pending the submission of further information from the applicant.

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

[Ms. Doris Chow, Mr. H.W. Cheung and Mr. Dominic Lam returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

[Ms. Karen F.Y. Wong, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/678 Proposed Hotel (Wholesale Conversion of an Existing Industrial Building) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone, 101 Wai Yip Street, Kwun Tong
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/678)

68. The Secretary reported that the application was related to Sun Hung Kai Properties Ltd. (SHK). Mr. Patrick Lau, Mr. Dominic Lam and Ms. Julia Lau who had current business dealings with SHK had declared interests in this item. The Committee noted that Mr. Lau had already left the meeting and agreed that Mr. Lam and Ms. Lau should leave the meeting temporarily.

[Mr. Dominic Lam and Ms. Julia Lau left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

69. With the aid of a powerpoint, Ms. Karen F.Y. Wong, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel (wholesale conversion of an existing industrial building)

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

- (c) departmental comments – the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) commented that the dimension of one loading/unloading (L/UL) space of

the proposed development was smaller than the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)'s requirement. The applicant should prove that they had made the best use of all existing spaces in the industrial building originally designated for car parking and L/UL facilities. Should the Board approve the application, it was suggested to impose a condition requiring that the design and provision of parking facilities, L/UL spaces, lay-bys, vehicular access and internal driveway for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the C for T. The Commissioner for Tourism (C for Tourism) supported the application as it was the Government's policy to enhance the appeal of Hong Kong as an international convention, exhibition and tourism capital and hence there was a need to ensure adequate hotel facilities. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments supporting the application were received. While one of the commenter did not provide any reason, the other one suggested that the Government should improve the transport facilities in the area so to enhance accessibility for the locals. 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 as detailed in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Regarding C for T's concerns that the L/UL space of the proposed development was below the HKPSG's requirement, an approval condition (a) was recommended to address his concerns. For the public comment on the need to improve the transport facilities in the area, the comment was not related to the application and had been relayed to C for T for consideration.

70. Members had no question on the application.

71. 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 21.9.2016, 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 provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire-fighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

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

- (a) the approval of the application did not imply that any proposal on bonus plot ratio (PR) and/or 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 bonus PR and/or 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 TPB might be required;
- (b) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department for lease modification, waiver or special waiver;
- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection that hotel developments were normally provided with central air conditioning system

and the applicant/authorized persons should be able to select a proper location for fresh air-intake during design stage to avoid exposing future occupants under unacceptable environmental nuisance/impact;

- (d) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that arrangement on Emergency Vehicular Access should comply with Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Building 2011 which was administered by the Buildings Department;
- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department that:
 - (i) to appoint an Authorized Person to submit building plans for the proposed change of use/ alternation works to demonstrate full compliance with the current provisions of the Buildings Ordinance;
 - (ii) the granting of hotel concession under Building (Planning) Regulation 23A would be considered upon formal submission of building plans subject to compliance with the criteria under the Practice Notes for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-40; and
 - (iii) the applicant's attention should be drawn to the PNAP APP-47 that the Building Authority had no power to give retrospective approval or consent for any unauthorized building works; and
- (f) to note the comments of the Chief Officer (Licensing Authority), Office of the Licensing Authority, Home Affairs Department to submit documentary evidence showing that the Building Authority had granted prior approval for the proposed use when making an application under the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance (HAGAO). The proposed license area should be physically connected. The fire service installations provisions should comply with paragraph 4.28 of the Code 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 an application under HAGAO.

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

Agenda Item 11

Any Other Business

72. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 11:25 a.m..