

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 477th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 9.11.2012**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairman

Professor Eddie C.M. Hui

Ms. Julia M.K. Lau

Mr. Laurence L.J. Li

Mr. Roger K.H. Luk

Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr. Stephen H. B. Yau

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

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department  
Mr. Frankie W. P. Chou

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr. Tang Kin Fai

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

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Mr. Wilson So

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Professor P.P. Ho

Ms. Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr. Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Mr. Clarence W.C. Leung

Mr. H.W. Cheung

**In Attendance**

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

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms. Karen K.W. Chan

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 476th MPC Meeting held on 19.10.2012

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 476th MPC meeting held on 19.10.2012 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**

[Ms. Fannie F.L. Hung, 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/KC/394 Columbarium (within a Religious Institution) in “Green Belt” zone,  
Government land, Golden Hill, Shek Lei, Kwai Chung  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/394)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Ms. Fannie F.L. Hung, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) the columbarium use with a total of 993 niches provided in the two structures (Columbarium No. 1 and No. 2) within the existing Shun Fung Temple;
- (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) a total of 267 public comments were received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period. 258 of the public comments supported the application mainly on the grounds that the niches would only be used by the followers of the temple; the existing number of niches was small; and there would be no adverse environmental and traffic impacts on the surrounding area as the application site was far away from residential areas. The remaining nine public comments objected to the application. One of them was submitted by a Kwai Tsing District Councillor, one was submitted by the Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui MacLehose Centre and seven were submitted by private individuals. They objected to the application mainly on the grounds that the current columbarium policy was not yet in order and the columbarium use might pose adverse psychological impacts on the morning hikers; and there would be adverse environmental and traffic impacts on the surrounding area as the application site was close to residential areas; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Regarding the local concern on the potential psychological impacts posed to the morning hikers, it was noted that the hikers from the adjoining footpath and people from the residential developments nearby could not see the columbarium rooms which were located at the lower ground level of the temple. Relevant government bureaux/departments including the Food and Hygiene Bureau, Commissioner for Transport, Director of Environmental Protection, Director of Leisure and Cultural Services,

Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation and Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD had no objection to or adverse comments on the application.

4. A Member noted that in paragraph 13.2 of the Paper, PlanD recommended to stipulate approval condition restricting the total number of niches on the site to be not more than 993. Given that the site was considered to be suitable for columbarium use, and it was difficult to identify a site for such use in the territory, this Member enquired whether it was necessary to stipulate the maximum number to 993 to allow flexibility for future demand. In response, Ms. Fannie Hung said that under the current application, the applicant applied for planning permission for columbarium use within the two structures in Shun Fung Temple. According to the applicant, there were 993 niches within the two structures. Given that the two structures and niches were already built, there was no space within the two structures to accommodate additional niches. If the applicant would like to provide more than 993 niches, he would have to identify another area outside the two structures for such use and this would involve a fresh s.16 planning application and had to be supported by necessary assessments e.g. a traffic impact assessment (TIA). Ms. Hung added that according to the applicant, the 993 niches were only for the followers of the temple and their family members and only 143 niches were currently occupied at the moment.

#### Deliberation Session

5. The Chairperson said that the temple had been in existence at the application site since 1981. It was noted that concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the columbarium use within the two columbarium rooms. The temple was surrounded by vegetated areas and was far away from the residential developments. The nearest residential developments were On Yam Estate and Shek Lei Estate which were more than 200 metres away. The two columbarium rooms were located at the lower ground level of the site and could not be seen by the pedestrians walking along the adjoining footpath. Hence, the columbarium use within the existing temple was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas. In response to a Member's comment on the stipulation of the number of niches in the approval condition, the Chairperson said that if the application was approved by the Committee, it would be approved on the terms of the application as submitted to the Board, which were 993 niches within the two columbarium rooms. Hence, the number of

niches approved by the Committee would not be more than 993 niches.

6. The Vice-chairman noted that the Transport Department (TD) did not require the applicant to submit a TIA for the subject application. However, in another application for columbarium use of a similar scale, the application was not supported by TD for lacking a TIA to demonstrate no adverse traffic impact. In this regard, the Chairperson pointed out that in two recent similar applications for columbarium development in Cheung Chau and Tai O, TD requested the applicants to submit TIA. The Vice-chairman enquired about the basis adopted by TD in requiring the submission of TIA for columbarium use. In response, Mr. Albert Lee, the Assistant Commissioner for Transport, said that in deciding whether a TIA was required for an application, TD did not refer solely to the scale of the columbarium (i.e. the total number of niches provided at the application site). TD would consider each application on a case-by-case basis taking into account the existing traffic situation of the site, the road and pedestrian network and the availability of public transport in the area. For the subject application, TD considered that the vehicular and pedestrian traffic to be generated was insignificant as the columbarium use was small in scale and the location of the temple was rather remote. The traffic impact generated by the columbarium use was insignificant, hence no TIA was required.

7. The Chairperson noted that the applicant had undertaken not to allow the burning of joss sticks and ritual paper in the columbarium rooms, and such activities would only be carried out at other part of the existing temple. The Chairperson enquired whether it was necessary to impose an approval condition on this aspect if the planning permission was granted. In response, Mr. Tang Kin Fai, the Assistant Director of Environmental Protection Department, said that as the columbarium use was already in operation and the applicant had stated that the scale and the operation of the existing columbarium would be maintained, it would unlikely cause adverse environmental impacts on the surrounding area. Moreover, EPD had not received any environmental complaints on this site over the past years. Hence, he considered that it was not necessary to impose any approval condition to restrict the burning of ritual papers and incense at the application site.

8. Ms. Fannie Hung supplemented that there was no furnace proposed in the current submission. However, if the applicant proposed to build a furnace at the application site, the applicant had to apply for a modification of the Short Term Tenancy from the Lands

Department.

9. A Member enquired whether it would be helpful to ask applicants for columbarium use to provide some basic data such as vehicular and pedestrian traffic to be generated so as to help TD assess whether a TIA would be required. In response, Mr. Albert Lee said that in assessing whether a TIA was required for a proposed columbarium, TD would take into account various factors such as location of the site, number of niches, the proposed layout of the columbarium, availability of public transport to the sites, and their own assessment on the capacity of the existing road and pedestrian network in accommodating the vehicular and pedestrian traffic to be generated by the columbarium. For the subject columbarium, TD had undertaken an internal assessment and considered that a TIA was not required as the traffic impact was expected to be insignificant. Mr. Lee also supplemented that for other applications for columbarium use which were of a larger scale and might have traffic impacts on the area, TD might request the applicant to conduct a traffic study, rather than a comprehensive TIA. TD would assess each case based on its individual merit and advise the applicant whether a TIA or a traffic study would be required.

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

10. Noting that a TIA might not be required for small-scale columbarium use which was similar to the one under application, a Member supported TD's approach in deciding whether a TIA would be needed on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the proposal submitted by the applicant and the existing traffic conditions in the surrounding area.

11. 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 was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the total number of niches within the application site should not be more than 993;
- (b) the submission and implementation of fire service installations within six months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 9.5.2013; and

- (c) if the above planning condition (b) 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.

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

- (a) prior planning permission should have been obtained before commencing the applied use at the application site;
- (b) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Tsuen Wan & Kwai Tsing, Lands Department to seek his approval to amend the short term tenancy. There was no guarantee that the regularization application would be approved by his office. If the regularization was approved by his office, the regularization would be subject to such terms and conditions as considered appropriate by his office in the capacity of the landlord including the charging of appropriate rent and administrative fee;
- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services to submit relevant layout plans incorporated with the proposed fire service installations (FSIs) for his approval. In addition, the applicant should be advised to note that (i) the layout plans should be drawn to scale and depicted with dimensions and nature of occupancy; and (ii) the location of where the proposed FSI to be installed should be clearly marked on the layout plans. Detailed fire safety requirements would be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans. Should the applicant wish to apply for exemption from the provision of FSIs as prescribed by his department, the applicant was required to provide justifications to his department for consideration; and
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department that should planning permission for the proposed regularization of columbarium niches in the two structures be granted, it should not be construed as an acceptance of any unauthorized building

works at the subject site. His Department reserved a right for enforcement action under the provisions of the Buildings Ordinance (Cap. 123). The applicant's attention was drawn to the design requirements for columbarium facilities as stipulated in the Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers & Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-154.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Fannie F.L. Hung, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 4**

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

A/KC/395                      Religious Institution (Canopies, Pantry, Incinerator and Store Room) in "Open Space" zone, Government land, Tai Wo Hau Road, Kwai Chung  
(MPC Paper No.A/KC/395)

---

13.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Kwai Chung Fook Tak Temple Co. Ltd.. Miss Bonnie Chan had declared interest in this item as she had current business dealings with Lawson David & Sung Surveyors Ltd., which was the consultant for the applicant. The Committee noted that Miss Chan had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

14.            The Committee noted that on 17.10.2012, the applicant wrote to the Secretary of the Board and requested the Board to defer making a decision on the application for 2 months in order to allow more time for the applicant to address comments from various government departments.

15.            After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would

be granted unless under very special circumstances.

### **Hong Kong District**

[Miss Isabel Y. Yiu, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Shouson Hill & Repulse Bay

Outline Zoning Plan S/H17/11

(MPC Paper No. 10/12)

---

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

16. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Miss Isabel Y. Yiu, STP/HK, presented the proposed amendments and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

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

- (a) the proposed amendments mainly related to the rezoning of a “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) site at Shouson Hill Road West to “Residential (Group C)3” (“R(C)3”);

##### **The Site and its Surrounding Areas**

- (b) the site (about 0.6 hectare) was a piece of government land located at the junction of Shouson Hill Road West and Wong Chuk Hang Path. It was zoned “G/IC” on the Shouson Hill & Repulse Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). It was currently occupied by the Drainage Services Department (DSD) as a temporary works depot until 2.5.2013. The subject site had not been designated for any Government, Institution or Community (GIC) use. After consideration of the characteristics of the site and the

surrounding areas, it was considered appropriate to rezone it to residential use to meet the demand for housing land;

- (c) it was located to the immediate east of a plant nursery site, which was run by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) under a permanent land allocation. The site was accessible via Shouson Hill Road West. To the further west across the plant nursery was the Aberdeen Tunnel portal and Wong Chuk Hang area. To the south and southwest of the site was the low-rise Shouson Hill West residential neighbourhood which was zoned “R(C)3” on the OZP. To the immediate north and east of the site was mainly vegetated slope zoned “Green Belt” and “Open Space” on the OZP;

#### The Rezoning Proposal

##### *Planning Intention/ Land Use Compatibility*

- (d) according to the planned population in the Shouson Hill & Repulse Bay area, there was no shortfall of GIC provision in the area. Concerned government departments had confirmed that they did not need the site for any GIC uses. The proposed rezoning of the site for residential use would not have adverse impact on the overall GIC provision in the area;
- (e) the majority of the existing developments in Shouson Hill area were low-rise low-density residential developments which were zoned “R(C)3” on the OZP, subject to a maximum building height of 3 storeys in addition to 1 storey of carport. In order to respect the character of Shouson Hill area and be compatible with the high-end residential neighbourhood, it was considered suitable to rezone it for low-rise low-density residential development;
- (f) to ensure that the scale and development intensity of the future development at the site was compatible with the surrounding in the vicinity, it was proposed to rezone the site to “R(C)3” with a maximum building height of 3 storeys in addition to 1 storey carport, a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 0.75 and site coverage (SC) of 25%. It was estimated that the

proposed residential development would have a maximum domestic gross floor area of about 4,500m<sup>2</sup>, which could accommodate 15 houses;

*Visual Impact Assessment/Air Ventilation*

- (g) the site was situated in Shouson Hill characterised by low-rise low-density residential developments. The scale and building height of the proposed residential development were consistent with the character of the neighbourhood. According to the Expert Evaluation on the Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau area conducted by the Chinese University of Hong Kong, the topography of the surrounding area effected a strong channelling of wind in the east-west direction over the Shouson Hill and Wong Chuk Hang areas. The proposed residential development was not expected to have adverse air ventilation impacts on the surrounding area as it was shielded by higher terrain on its immediate eastern and southern sides and was of a relatively small scale;

*Traffic, Environmental and Infrastructural Impacts*

- (h) given the small scale of the proposed residential development and the current local traffic condition, it was considered that the proposed development would unlikely induce adverse traffic impact in the area. The Commissioner for Transport had no comment on the proposed rezoning and considered that a traffic impact assessment was not necessary;
- (i) the proposed residential development would not have significant adverse environmental and infrastructural impacts on the surrounding areas. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) had no in-principle objection to the proposed rezoning of the site. However, as the Aberdeen Tunnel portal was located to the further west of the site with air quality concern, DEP suggested that the proposed residential development should be located towards the eastern boundary of the site. The District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South, Lands Department confirmed that a suitable clause would be incorporated in the land lease document to address the air quality concern;

Proposed Amendment to the OZP

- (j) amendment Item A- rezoning a site at the junction of Shouson Hill Road West and Wong Chuk Hang Path from “G/IC” to “R(C)3”, subject to a maximum building height of 3 storeys (over 1 storey of carport), a PR of 0.75 and SC of 25%;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes and the Explanatory Statement (ES)

- (k) revision to the covering Notes to accord with the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans;
- (l) amendments to the exemption clause on maximum PR in the Remarks of the Notes for “R(B)” and “R(C)” zones to clarify that exemption of caretakers’ quarters and recreational facilities was only applicable to those facilities for the use and benefit of all the owners or occupiers of the domestic building or domestic part of the building; and
- (m) opportunity had also been taken to update the general information in the ES for the various land use zones to reflect the latest status and planning circumstances of the OZP;

Departmental Consultation and Public Consultation

- (n) relevant government bureaux/departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the proposed amendments. The proposed amendments had taken into account the comments of relevant bureaux/departments, where appropriate;
- (o) the District Officer (Southern) advised that the Southern District Council (SDC) and local residents might express strong reservations on the proposed rezoning of the subject site from “G/IC” to “R(C)3” and anticipated that SDC would have much concern over the potential environmental and traffic issues created by the proposed residential development. It was expected that the local community might not welcome the amendment for residential use; and

- (p) upon agreement of the Committee, the proposed amendments to the OZP would be published under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) for public inspection. The SDC would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition period of the draft Shouson Hill & Repulse Bay OZP No. S/H17/11A (to be renumbered to S/H17/12 upon exhibition) under section 5 of the Ordinance.

17. A Member asked why the Labour and Welfare Bureau and the Social Welfare Department were not consulted on the proposed amendments to the OZP in view of the shortage of land for social welfare facilities. In response, Miss Isabel Yiu said that as the proposed amendments did not affect the provision of social welfare facilities, the Labour and Welfare Bureau and Social Welfare Department had not been consulted. Miss Yiu also said that according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, there was no shortfall in the provision of GIC and social welfare facilities in the area.

18. The Chairperson said that prior to the subject rezoning proposal, PlanD had conducted an exercise to examine the feasibility of rezoning the “G/IC” sites with no designated use, including the subject site, for residential use. In that exercise, the PlanD had consulted all relevant government bureaux and departments including the Social Welfare Department, and they had indicated no objection to rezoning the subject “G/IC” site for residential use.

19. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Miss Yiu said that the subject site was allocated to DSD as a works depot since 2002. The temporary allocation was renewed thereafter, currently up to 2.5.2013.

20. In response to another Member’s question, Miss Yiu said that the subject site was not the one that had been reserved for private hospital use.

#### Incorporation of the Adjacent Nursery Site

21. The Chairperson noted that there was a plant nursery site adjacent to the subject site within the same “G/IC” zone. In view of the need to increase housing land supply in the territory, the Chairperson enquired why the plant nursery site was not included in the rezoning proposal for residential use. In response, Miss Yiu said that upon request by the

then Urban Services Department, the site was allocated to LCSD under a permanent land grant in 1990s for plant nursery use. As the plant nursery site was located immediately adjacent to the Aberdeen Tunnel portal, and was subject to noise and air quality problems, it was considered not appropriate to rezone it for residential use.

[Mr. Laurence L.J. Li arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

22. Noting that the location of the plant nursery site which was adjacent to the Aberdeen Tunnel portal and was subject to air quality and noise problems, the Chairperson said that the plant nursery site alone could not be used for residential development unless it was combined with the subject site, as an enlarged site would allow greater flexibility in mitigating the noise and air impacts through layout design. Nevertheless, the Chairperson noted that the plant nursery site had been allocated to LCSD under a permanent land grant. In response, Ms. Doris Chow, the Assistant Director of Lands Department, said that for a site that was granted to a government department under a permanent land allocation, LandsD could take back the site for other purposes if the department concerned had no objection to releasing the site. Ms. Chow added that if the plant nursery site was combined with the subject site for residential development, it was necessary to consider whether the proposed “R(C)3” zoning could be achieved, though having a larger site area, as the future residential development had to be located towards the eastern side of the combined site as suggested by EPD to address the noise and air concerns.

23. In response to the Chairperson’s enquiry, Mr. Tang Kin Fai, the Assistant Director of Environmental Protection Department, said that it would be difficult to use the plant nursery site alone for residential development due to environmental problems. It would be better if the plant nursery site was combined with the subject site but EPD would have to further consider the revised proposals.

24. A Member agreed that the plant nursery site could be reprovisioned at another location so as to allow better utilization of the two sites together.

25. Another Member also considered that the plant nursery site should be combined with the subject site so as to form a larger site which allowed more flexibility in the design of the future residential development to address the noise and air quality problems. Other

Members agreed.

26. Taking into account Members' views on the plant nursery site, the Chairperson suggested requesting PlanD to liaise with concerned government departments including LCSD, LandsD and EPD to explore the possibility of combining the plant nursery site with the subject site for residential use.

#### Proposed Development Restrictions on the Subject Site

27. With reference to Plan A-1 of the Paper, the Chairperson said that there were mainly two residential neighbourhoods in Shouson Hill area, which were zoned "R(C)3" and "R(C)9" respectively on the OZP. According to the Notes of the OZP, a "R(C)9" site was subject to a maximum building height of 14 storeys (over 1 storey of carport), and a maximum PR of 2.1. The Chairperson enquired why the subject site was proposed to be rezoned as "R(C)3" with a maximum building height of 3 storeys (over 1 storey of carport) and a PR of 0.75. With the aid of two aerial photos, Miss Yiu explained that residential development zoned "R(C)3" and "R(C)9" belonged to two different clusters. The subject site was served by Shouson Hill Road West and belonged to the cluster of residential developments mainly of 3 storeys above 1 storey of carport. It was separated from the "R(C)9" cluster by a natural slope. The "R(C)9" sites were only accessible via Deep Water Bay Drive leading from Deep Water Bay Road. The road to the immediate east of the subject site as shown on the OZP was only a road reserve and there was no direct vehicular access linking the subject site and the two "R(C)9" sites to the east of the subject site.

28. A Member enquired about the justifications for rezoning the subject site to "R(C)3" with a low development intensity. Miss Yiu said that the site was situated within the Shouson Hill West residential area, which was characterized by low-rise, low-density residential development zoned under "R(C)3" subject to a maximum building height of 3 storeys in addition to 1 storey of carport. In determining the zoning of the subject site, due regard had been made to the existing character of the low-rise residential neighbourhood of Shouson Hill West and the proposed "R(C)3" zoning of the site was considered compatible with the surrounding area.

29. The same Member said that the need to respect the local character should not be the sole consideration in determining the zoning of a site, particularly when there was a high

demand for flat supply, which should be considered as having a wider public interest. The subject site was located at the fringe of the Shouson Hill West residential neighbourhood and unless there were traffic or other technical constraints, this Member considered that there was insufficient information to support the proposed “R(C)3” zoning for the subject site.

30. A Member had a different view and said that from a macro planning point of view, different areas/districts had their own characteristics and planning intention which should be respected in the planning process. The Shouson Hill West area was intended for low-rise, low-density residential development and that should be respected unless the planning intention was changed. As majority of the residential developments in Shouson Hill West were zoned “R(C)3” on the OZP, this Member did not favour a development of high building height on the subject site.

31. A Member shared the above views and added that TD should critically review whether the capacity of the existing road network could support additional population in the area.

32. A Member referred to the road reserve shown on the OZP which would link up the “R(C)3” developments in Shouson Hill West and the “R(C)9” developments to its east. This Member asked whether this road extension would allow developments with higher intensity in the area and if the Government had any programme to construct this road. In response, Mr. Albert Lee, the Assistant Commissioner for Transport, said that the Government did not have a clear implementation programme for the road, but TD would monitor the traffic situation of the area and would implement the road project when necessary. Nevertheless, the road reserve was planned to serve the low-rise, low-density developments according to the zoning on the OZP. If there was a need to increase the development intensity in the area, improvement to the road network might be necessary.

33. The Chairperson said that the majority of the existing developments in the Shouson Hill area were low-rise, low-density residential developments at a building height of 3 storeys (over 1 storey of carport) and a PR of 0.75. If the subject site was rezoned to a much higher development intensity, it would set a precedent for the other owners of the existing “R(C)3” sites to follow. However, as the existing roads in the Shouson Hill area were narrow and winding, there might not be sufficient road capacity to accommodate the

additional traffic generated as a result of the cumulative increase in development intensity.

34. A Member did not consider that that was a need to preserve the character of the Shouson Hill area as it would go against the intention for urban redevelopment in Hong Kong. This Member opined that if there was constraint on traffic capacity to support higher development intensity, the Government had the responsibility to carry out improvement works, unless it was proved impossible to do so.

35. The Chairperson said that according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, three Residential Density Zones – R1, R2 and R3 had been specified for Hong Kong Island and Kowloon, covering areas of high, medium and low intensities. The R1 zone covered areas suitable for high-density development, with a maximum permissible PR of 8, 9 or 10. The R2 zone covered areas of a medium intensity, with a maximum permissible PR of 5. The R3 zone covered areas of low intensity with a maximum permissible PR of 3. In some R3 zones, special control areas with much lower PR of 0.4, 0.6 and 0.75 had also been designated in order to preserve areas with special character or to reflect the limitation in transport capacity. The Shouson Hill area was identified as one of the special control areas. In this regard, the planning intention had long been established to maintain a low development intensity for the Shouson Hill area. The area had been developed with such intention over the years. It was also stated in the ES of the OZP that the “R(C)” zone, which covered the Shouson Hill area was intended primarily for low-rise, low-density residential development. If the planning intention had to be changed for developments with higher intensity, a comprehensive review had to be undertaken. The capacity of infrastructural provision, in particular the road network and the compatibility with the surrounding area had to be assessed. It should be noted that there were private developments along both sides of Shouson Hill Road, and hence the scope of carrying out road improvement works without affecting the private developments would be limited.

36. Upon the enquiry of the Chairperson, Mr. Albert Lee said that there would be technical difficulties in widening or extending Shouson Hill Road and Shouson Hill Road West noting that most of the residential developments in the area had been built along two sides of the roads up to the roadside. Mr. Lee added that the slopes in the area had also posed technical problems in carrying out improvement works to Shouson Hill Road and Shouson Hill Road West.

Site Coverage Restriction Imposed on the Site

37. A Member noted that the subject site was subject to a maximum building height of 3 storeys, a PR of 0.75 and a SC restriction of 25%. This Member anticipated that with such development restrictions, developer would develop up to the maximum permitted level, which would result in monotonous box-like structures on the site. In this regard, this Member suggested relaxing the SC restriction with the building height and PR restrictions remained unchanged. By so doing, the building bulk of the site would remain unchanged but more flexibility would be allowed for building design. This could help achieve a more interesting built form. For the subject site, consideration might be given to relaxing the SC restriction from 25% to 30% with the PR restriction remained as 0.75.

38. In response, the Chairperson said that in 2000, the Board had undertaken a review of domestic SC restriction for “R(B)” and “R(C)” zones on statutory plans. The Board decided that for R3 areas in the Metro Area and in the New Town Area, the maximum SC could be up to 50% provided that inter alia, the PR and the building height restrictions of the sites would remain unchanged and no clearance of mature trees and natural vegetation would be involved. For sites with lower SC restriction stipulated on the OZP, the owner could apply to the Board for minor relaxation of the SC restriction to suit the circumstances of specific case.

39. The same Member said that if it was considered appropriate to relax the SC restriction for the subject site, it would be more appropriate to set out the appropriate SC restriction on the OZP to obviate the need for SC relaxation in future.

40. In response, the Chairperson said that PlanD proposed to rezone the subject site to “R(C)3” which was the same as the other residential development in the Shouson Hill area. The development restrictions for the subject site would therefore follow the development schedule for the “R(C)3” zone as set out in the OZP. A general relaxation of the SC restriction for the site would apply to all the sites covered by the “R(C)3” zone. In this regard, a review should be undertaken to examine the implications of the relaxation of the SC restriction.

41. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to defer the consideration of the proposed amendments to the approved Shouson Hill & Repulse Bay OZP. The PlanD was

requested to review the possibility of rezoning the plant nursery site for residential use and to provide more justifications on the proposed land use zoning and the associated development parameters. The result of the review should be submitted for the Committee's consideration in due course.

[The Chairperson 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, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 6**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H14/71                      Further Consideration of Proposed Public Utility Installation  
(Telecommunications Radio Base Station) in "Green Belt" zone, Land  
Adjacent to Existing Mount Nicholson Microwave Station,  
The Peak Area  
(MPC Paper No. A/H14/71A)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

42.                      With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, 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- the application, submitted by CSL Limited, sought planning permission for a proposed telecommunication radio base station on a site adjacent to the existing Mount Nicholson Microwave Station. The proposed telecommunication radio base station comprised two equipments, telephone and electrical cabinets resting on a concrete footing of an area of about 38m<sup>2</sup>. During the consideration of the application on 4.5.2012, Members considered that, although the proposed telecommunication radio base station was relatively small in scale, given its

prominent location and the existence of three other telecommunication radio base stations in the close vicinity, there would be potential cumulative visual impacts on the surrounding area. However, there was no information in the submission to demonstrate that the visual impact of the proposed telecommunication radio base station was acceptable. Besides, there was no information from the applicant to address the public concern that the application site had occupied the existing drop-off point for helicopter services in the locality;

- (b) the Committee, after deliberation, decided to defer a decision on the application pending submission of additional information from the applicant. The information should demonstrate that the proposed development would be compatible with the surrounding area, and would not have adverse visual impact on the surrounding environment. The applicant should also identify alternative drop-off point for helicopter services in the locality to address public concern;
- (c) further consideration of the proposed public utility installation (telecommunications radio base station);
- (d) the further information submitted by the applicant was summarized as follows:

*Visual Impacts*

- (i) to address Members' concern on visual impacts of the proposed telecommunication radio base station, the applicant had carried out a visual impact study with photomontages to demonstrate that the proposed development would not generate adverse cumulative visual impact on the surrounding area. Mitigation measures would also be implemented by the applicant by painting the two antenna poles in green (lower part) and grey (upper part) to harmonize with the adjacent development. Besides, tree survey and mitigation measures would be implemented to minimize any impact arising from the loss of greenery;

*Alternative Drop-off point for Helicopter Services*

- (ii) the applicant had proposed an alternative drop-off point with an area of about 9m<sup>2</sup> north of the application site for helicopter services;
- (e) departmental comments – concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the further information submitted by the applicant. Their comments on the further information and the application were detailed in paragraph 3 and F-Appendix I of the Paper;
- (f) one public comment was received during the statutory publication period on the further information submitted by the applicant. The comment was submitted by ATV expressing concern on possible obstruction of their existing microwave antenna reception arising from the proposed telecommunication radio base station. In response, the applicant submitted further information clarifying that the proposed development would not affect the microwave antenna reception. On 22.10.2012, ATV sent an email to the Secretary of the Board indicating no adverse comments on the application; and
- (g) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 5 of the Paper. As regards the public comment on the further information, the applicant had addressed the concern of ATV and clarified that the proposed development would not affect their microwave antenna reception.

43. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms. Kitty Lam, STP/HK, said that in order to further improve the visual quality and soften the impact of the proposed development, an approval condition requiring the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal and a colour scheme for the antenna poles to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning had been recommended in paragraph 6.2 (a) of the Paper. Moreover, it would be the applicant's responsibility to maintain the landscaping condition at the application site.

Deliberation Session

44. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 9.11.2016, 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 submission and implementation of a landscape proposal and a colour scheme for the antenna poles to mitigate the visual impact on the surrounding areas to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (b) the provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

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

- (a) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong East, LandsD for the use of the land concerned to effect the proposal;
- (b) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong East and Heritage, Buildings Department in paragraph 9.1.5 in F-Appendix I of the Paper that any building works to be carried out should in all respects comply with the provisions of the Buildings Ordinance;
- (c) to note the comments of the Director-General of Civil Aviation in paragraph 9.1.6 in F-Appendix I of the Paper that the proposed telecommunications radio base station should not affect the normal operation or cause radio interference to Civil Aviation Department's operating systems/facilities;
- (d) to note the comments of the Director-General of Communications in paragraph 9.1.7 in F-Appendix I of the Paper that the applicant should forward the effective radiation power and radiation pattern of the proposed

telecommunication radio base station to TVB for evaluation of radio interference;

- (e) to note the comments of the Director of Health in paragraph 9.1.8 in F-Appendix I of the Paper that according to the World Health Organization (WHO), it was important to comply with the relevant International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines (1998). With the compliance with the guidelines, exposure to radio frequency electromagnetic fields generated by the mobile telecommunication radio base stations would not pose any significant adverse effects to workers and the public. WHO also encouraged effective and open communication with stakeholders in the planning of new facilities and exploration of low-cost ways of reducing exposures when constructing new facilities. Verification of actual compliance with the ICNIRP guidelines by the project owner was advisable upon the commissioning of the facilities; and
  
- (f) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer (Development) 2, Water Supplies Department in paragraph 9.1.11 in F-Appendix I of the Paper that the works of the proposed development should comply with the “Conditions for Working within Water Gathering Grounds”.

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

## **Kowloon District**

### **Agenda Item 7**

#### **Section 16 Application**

A/K11/210                      Proposed Columbarium in “Government, Institution or Community” zone, Rooms 6-12 & 18 in Level 4, Rooms 1, 13, 15 & 16 in Level 5 at Fat Jong Temple, 175 Shatin Pass Road, Tsz Wan Shan  
(MPC Paper No. A/K11/210)

---

46.                      The Committee noted that on 17.10.2012, the applicant requested the Board to defer making a decision on the application for a period of two months so as to allow sufficient time for the applicant to carry out necessary technical assessments to address comments raised by the Environmental Protection Department and Transport Department.

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

[Ms. S.H. Lam, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 8**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K9/253                      Proposed Hotel with Shop and Services/Eating Place in  
“Residential (Group A) 4” zone, 179 and 181 Bulkeley Street  
Hung Hom  
(MPC Paper No. A/K9/253)

---

48. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Sinociti Ltd.. Ms. Julia M.K. Lau had declared interest in this item as she was the shareholder of Traces Ltd., which was the consultant for the applicant. The Committee agreed that Ms. Lau to leave the meeting temporarily for this item.

[Ms. Julia M.K. Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

49. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Ms. S.H. Lam, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel with shop and services/eating place;
- (c) departmental comments – concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection was received by the District Officer (Kowloon City); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper.

50. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

51. In response to a Member’s enquiry, the Chairperson said that an approval condition requiring the applicant to submit proposals on reduction of the floor-to-floor height of 1/F to 3/F and the façade treatment to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning was

recommended in paragraph 11.2 (a) of the Paper.

52. Noting that the proposed floor-to-floor height of 5.1m for the mechanical floors (i.e. 1/F to 3/F), a Member agreed that the applicant should provide more information to justify the proposed floor-to-floor height for the mechanical floors. This Member also suggested that appropriate landscaping could help enhance the façade of these floors.

53. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 9.11.2016, 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) reduction of the floor-to-floor height of 1/F to 3/F and submission and implementation of facade treatment to 1/F to 3/F to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (b) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

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

- (a) the approval of the application did not imply that the proposed non-domestic plot ratio of the proposed hotel development would be granted by the Building Authority (BA). The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. In addition, if hotel concession for the non-domestic plot ratio of the development was not granted by the BA and major changes to the current scheme were required, a fresh planning application to the TPB might be required;
- (b) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department that:

- (i) application for treating the proposed hotel as a non-domestic building for the purposes of B(P)R 19, 20, 21 and 22 could only be considered on its own merits vis-à-vis the criteria as set out in Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers & Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-40 upon formal submission of building plans;
  - (ii) subject to compliance with the criteria under PNAP APP-40 and no adverse comments from all relevant government departments, the application for hotel concession and gross floor area (GFA) exemption for back-of-house facilities under B(P)R 23A would be considered upon formal submission of building plans;
  - (iii) granting of site coverage and/or GFA concessions for green/amenity features and non-mandatory/non-essential plant rooms and services, etc. were subject to compliance with relevant acceptance criteria, detailed requirements, pre-requisites, overall cap, etc. as set out in PNAP APP-151 and APP-152;
  - (iv) an Authorized Person should be appointed to coordinate all building works in accordance with the Buildings Ordinance; and
  - (v) the proposed operation of the subject premises as a hotel would be subject to licensing requirements under the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance, Cap. 349 (HAGAO);
- (c) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West, Lands Department that the applicant was required to apply to his office for removal of the relevant offensive trade restriction, and that for the requirement of right-of-way over common staircases and landings, there was no guarantee that the schematic design submitted under s.16 application must be approved under lease;
- (d) 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 Building 2011;

- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department that to enhance the landscape and visual amenity of the proposed development and its surrounding pedestrian environment, consideration could be given to providing greening/landscaping on the G/F, the flat roof at 2/F, 3/F, 20/F and the roof level, and vertical greening on the façade of mechanical floors; and
- (f) to note the comments of the Chief Officer/Licensing Authority of Home Affairs Department that the applicant was required to make an application under the HAGAO and the licensing requirements would be formulated after inspections by his Building Safety Unit and Fire Safety Unit upon receipt of an application under the HAGAO.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. S.H. Lam, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

### **Special Duties Section**

[Mr. Timothy Y.M. Lui, Senior Town Planner/Special Duties (STP/SD), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 9**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H4/90                      Proposed Construction of Additional Commercial Floors above Central Piers 4 to 6 and Conversion of the Existing Upper Decks at Central Piers 4 and 6 for Shop and Services (Bank, Fast Food Shop, Money Exchange, Photographic Studio, Place of Recreation, Sports and Culture (Arts Gallery), Retail Shop, Service Trades, Showroom excluding Motor-Vehicle Showroom), Eating Place (Restaurant), Public Convenience; Pier use at Lower Deck (for Piers 4 to 6) and Upper Deck (for Pier 5); and Public Utility Installation (Telecommunications Radio Base Station) at the landside of the rooftop at Central Piers 4 to 6 in “Comprehensive Development Area (2)” zone, Central Piers 4, 5 & 6 and adjacent Inland Area, Man Kwong Street, Central  
(MPC Paper No. A/H4/90A)

---

55.                      The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Transport Department. Mr. Albert Lee, the Assistant Commissioner for Transport, had declared interest in this item. The Committee agreed that Mr. Lee should leave the meeting temporarily for this item.

56.                      The Committee also noted that Professor S.C. Wong and Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam had also declared interests in this item as they had current business dealings with the Transport Department and Jacobs China Ltd., the consultant of the applicant, respectively. As Mr. Lam’s interest was direct, the Committee agreed that Mr. Lam should also leave the meeting temporarily for this item. As Professor Wong was not involved in the proposed development, the Committee agreed that Professor Wong could be allowed to stay at the meeting.

[Messrs. Albert Lee and Dominic K.K. Lam left the meeting at this point.]

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

## Presentation and Question Sessions

57. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr. Timothy Y.M. Lui, STP/SD, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

### Application Site

- (a) the application site fell within an area zoned “Comprehensive Development Area (2)” (“CDA(2)”) on the draft Central District Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H4/13. The site area was about 18,900m<sup>2</sup> and the development site for Central Piers 4 to 6 was about 6,851m<sup>2</sup>. The application site was subject to a maximum gross floor area of 55,740m<sup>2</sup> for retail shop, offices and hotels;
- (b) the application site was situated at a prominent location at the Central Harbourfront. The application site mainly comprised Central Piers 4 to 6 and the adjacent inland area to the north of International Finance Centre (IFC), the public drop-off facilities, part of a temporary bus terminus and some amenity areas;
- (c) Central Piers 4 to 6 served ferry services between five major outlying islands and Central. Ferry operations were on the lower decks of 3 piers (i.e. Pier 4 to 6) and the upper deck of Pier 5. There were small shops/food kiosks at the entrances of the piers. The upper decks of Piers 4 and 6 were vacant;
- (d) development in the CDA site would be implemented by phases. Since the essential infrastructure works were being undertaken in the adjoining inland area, the refurbishment work for the three piers would commence first;

### Background

- (e) in March 2007, PlanD commissioned the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS) at the request of the Town Planning Board (the Board) to refine the existing urban design framework for the new

Central Harbourfront and to prepare planning and design briefs for the eight Key Sites identified in UDS to guide the future developments. The UDS was completed in mid-2011;

- (f) the application site was located in the Key Site 1. Together with the adjoining site to its immediate east (Key Site 2), they would be developed as a distinctive civic node and a mixed use precinct. There would be two low-rise buildings of 25mPD and an iconic block of 60mPD for retail, exhibition and cultural uses; an extensive landscaped deck and one and a half additional commercial floors above Central Piers 4 to 6. The planning and design parameters of Sites 1 and 2 as recommended in the UDS were summarized in para.4.4 of the Paper;
  
- (g) in 2011, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) carried out a two-stage public engagement exercise on the facelift of the Central Piers 4 to 6 with a view to collecting public views on the design of the piers as well as their visions, aspirations and suggestions. The Island District Council, Central and Western District Council, Harbourfront Commission's Taskforce on Harbour Developments on Hong Kong Island (TFHK) and other stakeholders were consulted on the design of the concerned piers. In Stage 2, CEDD's consultants carried out a Retail Feasibility Study (RFS) to ascertain the market positioning and retail trade mix. The RFS recommended refining the design to an enhanced scheme which involved changes to the vertical circulation arrangements and the layout of the retail areas, as well as the provision of public open space (POS) at the rooftop. The RFS also recommended separating the POS from the commercial facilities, providing exclusive outdoor terrace areas for restaurants and relocating the POS to the rooftop. The enhanced scheme was supported by TFHK in May 2012. The enhanced scheme formed the basis of this application;

#### The Proposal

- (h) the construction of one and a half additional commercial floors above Central Piers 4 to 6 and conversion of the existing upper decks at those

three piers for shop and services (bank, fast food shop, money exchange, photographic studio, place of recreation, sports and culture (arts gallery), retail shop, service trades, showroom (excluding motor-vehicle showroom), eating place (restaurant), public convenience; pier use at lower deck (for Piers 4 to 6) and upper deck (for Pier 5); and public utility installation (telecommunications radio base station) at the landside of the rooftop at Central Piers 4 to 6. The major development parameters and the proposed floor uses of Central Piers 4 to 6 were detailed in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 of the Paper;

#### The Justifications from the Applicant

(i) the justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application were detailed in paragraph 2 and Appendices Ia to Ic of the Paper, which were summarized below:

- to enhance the vibrancy of the harbourfront;
- in line with the design concept of Sites 1 and 2 of the UDS;
- supported by the public and stakeholders;
- the generation of more non-fare box revenue for ferry services; and
- relevant technical assessments demonstrated that there would be no adverse impacts arising from the proposal;

#### Government Bureaux/Departmental Comments

(j) concerned government bureaux/departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper;

#### Public Comments

(k) two public comments submitted by the Designing Hong Kong Ltd. and the TFHK were received during the three-week statutory publication period. The public commenters raised objection to the application mainly on the grounds that the proposal failed to provide sufficient space at the G/F of the piers for the storage and handling of goods, luggage and waste related to the ferry and the existing and new pier operations; and

Planning Department (PlanD)'s views

PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 13 of the Paper, which were summarized below:

- (l) the whole "CDA(2)" site and the adjoining area were identified as Sites 1 and 2 under the UDS that was completed in 2011. According to the recommended design concept, they would be developed into a distinctive civic node featuring a mixed-use precinct with low-rise structures and quality POS; together with the construction of the additional commercial floor-space for the Central Piers 4 to 6. The proposed refurbishment work for the three piers was generally in line with the final recommended planning and design proposals of UDS and complied with the planning concept and requirements of the "CDA" in the following aspects:

*Land Use Compatibility*

- (m) under the UDS recommendation, the additional commercial floor space to be built over the Central Piers 4 to 6 were proposed for retail, dining and other waterfront related commercial uses. The proposed shop and services uses, eating place (restaurant), and public convenience uses proposed at the additional commercial floors above the Piers 4 to 6 and the upper decks of Piers 4 and 6 were generally in line with the proposed uses recommended in the UDS, and would help enhance the vibrancy and attractiveness of the harbourfront. Moreover, the proposed uses above the piers would not affect the existing ferry operation for the three piers;

*Building Height*

- (n) the UDS recommended a maximum building height of 25mPD for the additional one and a half storey commercial floor space above Central Piers 4 to 6. Although the enhanced scheme under application had included some refinements of the UDS recommendation (e.g. shifting of the POS (part) to Level 5 rooftop and provision of exclusive outdoor area for restaurants in Level 4 to enhance its commercial viability), the height of the future piers, except the lift overrun structures, at 24.85mPD did not exceed the level of 25mPD. The lift overrun structures of 29.35mPD at Level 5 occupied only less than 1% of the pier footprint. Hence, the exceeded

portion would not cause any adverse visual impact as viewed from the harbour. Concerned government departments had no adverse comments on this aspect;

*Visual Permeability*

- (o) there were several key view corridors identified in the UDS to preserve visual permeability and visual linkages with the harbour, one of which was the view from the IFC podium to the harbour. As there were separations between Central Piers 4 to 6 and the level of the IFC podium at about 30mPD was higher than the majority parts of the three piers at 25mPD, it was envisaged that the visual linkages from IFC podium to the harbour could be maintained;

*Future Integration within the “CDA” site*

- (p) to provide a comprehensive grade separated pedestrian network via an extensive landscaped deck connecting the application site with the surrounding developments, there was a need to ensure the integration between the three piers and the future landscaped deck within the “CDA(2)” zone. Taking into account the UDS recommendation of keeping the height of the proposed landscaped deck at 14mPD, pedestrian connections at Level 3 of the three piers would be provided at the same level to connect with the future elevated landscaped deck;

*Public Open Space*

- (q) the L-shaped viewing platform at the outermost strip of the piers at Level 4 and the entire Level 5 at the rooftop were dedicated as POS to facilitate the public to enjoy unobstructed panoramic view towards the harbour. The POS provided in the three piers complied with the UDS requirement (i.e. not less than 3,000m<sup>2</sup>) and barrier-free public access via lifts and stairs would be provided from ground level to bring the public to the waterfront POS without obstruction. To ensure that the future POS was satisfactorily designed and accessible to the public for enjoyment of the waterfront, it was suggested to impose an approval condition on the design and provision of the POS;

*Landscaping Aspect*

- (r) the overall greening ratio of the POS at each pier would not be less than 30% which complied with the recommendation under the UDS.
  
- (s) as regards the Head of Greening and Landscape Office, Greening, Landscape and Tree Management Section of Development Bureau and the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD's concerns on the insufficient greenery and open space facilities and landscaping details at the viewing platform cum POS on Level 4, according to the Landscape Master Plan (LMP), planter seat wall would be provided at the viewing platform, and POS signage would be provided where appropriate. The LMP could be further improved by imposing an approval condition;

*Telecommunications Radio Base Station*

- (t) the proposed telecommunications radio base station would be located at the landward side of the Central Piers 4 to 6. They would be installed underneath the Level 5 roof below the eaves, with architectural screening treatment. The Director-General of Telecommunications considered that such installation would enhance the mobile phone services in the Central area and should be allowed. Since the installation would be installed below the eaves and covered by screen, no visual impact was envisaged;

*Environmental Aspect*

- (u) in the private open space designated as commercial outdoor area (COA) at Level 4, no outdoor formal dining facilities, including no direct provision of food and beverage services and no formal dining table and chair would be provided. This would discourage prolonged stay and minimize the effect of potential ferry exhausts to visitors. An approval condition was proposed to restrict the direct provision of food and beverage services in COA;

*Transport Arrangement*

- (v) the Traffic Impact Assessment concluded that the proposed developments at the Central Piers 4 to 6 would have insignificant impact to the road and pedestrian networks. To ensure the completion of the proposed improvement to the existing loading/unloading arrangement, including the 20m-extension of the loading and unloading area at the existing lay-by area,

an approval condition was suggested; and

*Public Comments*

(w) as regards the public comments on the request for providing sufficient space at G/F of the piers for the storage and handling of goods, luggage and waste related to the ferry and the existing and new pier operations, the CEDD advised that the G/F of the piers were primarily used as passenger waiting areas with minimum provision of retail shops. To cater for the future additional commercial areas, a limited portion of the space at G/F would be reserved for provision of fire prevention installations and barrier-free facilities. TD would remind ferry operators to maintain proper order and other relevant departments concerned would take necessary actions under their ambits against the unattended belongings so that the promenade users would not be adversely affected.

58. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr. Timothy Lui, STP/SD, said that according to the applicant, the proposal of including retail activities and dining places was one of the measures to enhance the long-term financial viability of the outlying islands ferry services through the generation of more non-fare box revenue. The proposed development would provide an opportunity to improve the existing facilities of the piers. At the request of the Chairperson, Ms. Doris Chow, the Assistant Director of Lands Department, said that according to her knowledge, Government Property Administrator acted as an executor for the tenancy agreements for the piers on behalf of TD, and rental income generated by the retail and dining facilities might be a source of non-fare box revenue to the ferry operators.

59. Two Members enquired about the public comments which raised concern that insufficient space had been provided at G/F of the piers for the storage and handling of goods, luggage and waste and there might be conflicting uses among the retail operators, the ferry users and the public. In response, Mr. Timothy Lui said that TD would remind the ferry operators to maintain proper order and relevant government departments such as Food and Environmental Hygiene Department would take necessary actions under their ambits against the unattended belongings so that the promenade users would not be adversely affected. Moreover, TD would also inform the commercial operators that loading and unloading of goods could only be conducted in specified time periods.

60. A Member said that under the UDS, an extensive landscaped deck would provide direct pedestrian linkage between the Central Piers, the Central Business District and the new harbourfront. The public could gain easy access to the public open space in the piers from the landscaped deck. However, under the current application, the POS would be provided at part of Level 4 and Level 5 of the piers. When compared to the previous proposal, the pedestrian connectivity between the future landscaped deck and the proposed POS at Level 4 and Level 5 under the current application had become more indirect.

61. A Member enquired whether the applicant had submitted any information to illustrate that the proposed commercial uses at the piers were financially viable. Mr. Lui responded that the CEDD had carried out a RFS to ascertain the market positioning and retail trade mix. The RFS recommended refining the design to an enhanced scheme which involved changes to the vertical circulation arrangements and the layout of the retail areas, as well as the provision of POS at the rooftop. The RFS also recommended separating the POS from the commercial facilities, providing exclusive outdoor terrace areas for restaurants and relocating the POS to the rooftop. The enhanced scheme was supported by TFHK in May 2012. The enhanced scheme formed the basis of this application.

### Deliberation Session

62. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr. Timothy Lui referred to Drawings A-6 and A-7 of the Paper and explained that the public could take the lifts or staircases located at the southern part of the piers to reach the POS at Level 4 and Level 5. Alternatively, the public could reach the piers from the future landscaped deck and walk up to the POS at Level 4 and Level 5 via staircases which would be provided along the passageway at the side of the piers.

63. A Member opined that the pedestrian connection between the POS provided at the piers and the future landscaped deck was indirect. As illustrated in the case of Star Ferry Pier, the public would prefer taking lifts, rather than walking up and down the staircases. As such, the proposed POS in the three piers would not be favoured by the public and this would defeat the planning objective of the UDS, i.e. to allow the public to enjoy the waterfront and harbourview. In this regard, this Member considered that the pedestrian connectivity between the future landscaped deck and the POS at Level 4 and Level 5 in the

three piers had to be improved. This Member also suggested that consideration might be given to providing escalator to link up the future landscaped deck and the POS at Level 4 and Level 5 of the three piers. The above views and suggestion were shared by two other Members.

64. Another Member pointed out that it might involve a considerable change to the design of the future landscaped deck in order to provide an easy pedestrian connection between the future landscaped deck and the POS at Level 4 and Level 5 of the three piers. In this regard, the Chairperson pointed out that the provision of the landscaped deck was one of the key design proposals of Sites 1 and 2 recommended under the UDS, which had obtained a wide support from the public. However, the future landscaped deck was outside the boundary of the three piers and its detailed design was not yet available.

65. A Member said that there had been extensive public consultation of the UDS and its recommendations. Under the UDS, POS would be provided in the Central Piers to allow the public to enjoy the harbourview. Further, the public could walk directly to the POS in the Central Piers from IFC and other surrounding buildings via the future landscaped deck. However, under the current application, the proposed POS in the three piers could not be easily accessed through the future landscaped deck, and that was not in line with the objectives and recommendations of the UDS. In view of the above, this Member considered that the current application should not be supported before any improvement to the pedestrian connectivity between the future landscaped deck and the POS at Level 4 and Level 5 of the three piers had been made.

66. In response to Members' concern on the need to improving the connectivity between the landscaped deck and the public open space on top of the piers, the Chairperson said that the Committee might consider granting approval to the current application with an approval condition requiring the applicant to improve pedestrian connectivity to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or the Board. Alternatively, the Committee might consider deferring the consideration of the application and requested the applicant to propose improvement measures on pedestrian connectivity.

67. A Member opined that it would be more appropriate to defer the consideration of the application so as to allow the applicant to provide further information on the connectivity

between the piers and the future landscaped deck.

68. In response to the Chairperson's enquiry, Mr. Timothy Lui said that the pier project would be implemented one pier after the other. An interim berthing arrangement was also required during the construction works at the piers. It was targeted that phase 1 of the construction work for the first pier would commence in the latter half of 2013. Moreover, different stakeholders and District Council members had already expressed their views for an early completion of the construction work of the piers.

69. Noting that the subject site was an important piece of land in the Central waterfront, the Chairperson concluded that Members considered that the pedestrian connection between the future landscaped deck and the POS in the three piers under the current application was indirect and needed to be improved. The Committee would defer the consideration of the application pending further submission from the applicant on the proposed improvement measures to that effect. Members also agreed that the PlanD be requested to liaise with the applicant in addressing the concerns of the Committee.

70. The Vice-chairman said that the applicant might need to be clearly informed whether changes to the design of the future landscaped deck could be made in working out the proposal to improve the pedestrian connectivity between the future landscaped deck and the POS at Level 4 and Level 5 of the three piers. In response, the Chairperson said that the public had been extensively consulted on the future landscaped deck under the UDS. The landscaped deck would not only connect to the Central Piers, but also connected to Site 3 in the new harbourfront and IFC. In this regard, it would not be appropriate to make significant changes to the design of the future landscaped deck. However, it would be acceptable if the change only involved refinement to the design of the landscaped deck by providing better connection between the future landscaped deck and the POS in the piers such as the provision of escalator link.

71. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to defer the application pending the applicant's submission of further information on proposals to improve the pedestrian connectivity between the future landscaped deck and the public open space at the piers.

[The Chairperson thanked Mr. Timothy Y.M. Lui, STP/SD, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 10**

Any Other Business

72. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 11:40 a.m..