

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 488<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 3.5.2013**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr. K. K. Ling

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. Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr. Stephen H. B. Yau

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

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

Acting Assistant Director (Hong Kong), Lands Department  
Mr. Simon Wang

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

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

Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam

**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 487<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 19.4.2013**

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 487<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 19.4.2013 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

**Matters Arising**

[Open Meeting]

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

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

[Mr. Wilson Chan, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK) and Mr. Tom C.K. Yip, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Draft Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K3/29  
(MPC Paper No. 9/13 )

---

3. The Committee noted that two replacement pages of pages 8 and 9 of the revised Notes in Attachment II of the Paper were tabled at the meeting.

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

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

4. With the aid of a powerpoint, Mr. Tom C.K. Yip, STP/TWK, presented the

proposed amendments to the draft Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K3/29 as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

Background

- (a) the Chief Executive announced in 2013 Policy Address a number of measures to increase the housing land supply. One of the measures was to convert the use of “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) sites and other Government sites, which were considered suitable for residential use after review by the Planning Department (PlanD), to meet the demand for housing land. Among these sites, two were within the Mong Kok area, i.e. one at the junction of Soy Street and Shanghai Street (Soy Street site) with an area of about 625m<sup>2</sup>, and one at Nos. 322-324 Reclamation Street/Nos. 445-447 Shanghai Street (Reclamation Street site) with an area of 283m<sup>2</sup>. The Soy Street site was currently a temporary open-air public car park while the Reclamation Street site was currently vacant;
- (b) falling within a predominant residential neighbourhood with low to medium-rise residential buildings and taking into account the surrounding land uses and the absence of designated GIC use, it was considered appropriate to rezone these two sites from “G/IC” to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”);

Proposed Amendments to the Plan

Soy Street Site (Amendment Item A)

- (c) the District Officer (Yau Tsim Mong) (DO(YTM)) had advised that there was an acute demand for community hall (CH) in the Mong Kok area and a large number of neighbourhood and local organizations in Mong Kok had a high demand for venues for holding activities and meetings. To meet the local demand, DO(YTM) proposed to incorporate a CH with a GFA of not less than 937m<sup>2</sup> in the future residential development at the site;

- (d) therefore, the Soy Street site with an area of about 625m<sup>2</sup> was proposed to be rezoned from “G/IC” to “R(A)4”, with a requirement of the provision of a CH with GFA not less than 937m<sup>2</sup>. It would be subject to a maximum plot ratio of 7.5 for a domestic building and a maximum plot ratio of 9 for a composite building, and the two-tier BH restrictions, i.e. 80mPD for sites with an area of below 400m<sup>2</sup> and 100mPD for sites with an area of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more. In other words, the Soy Street site would be subject to a maximum BH of 100mPD;

Reclamation Street Site (Amendment item B)

- (e) the Reclamation Street Site with an area of about 283m<sup>2</sup> was proposed to be rezoned from “G/IC” to “R(A)”. It would be subject to a maximum plot ratio of 7.5 for a domestic building and a maximum plot ratio of 9 for a composite building, and the two-tier BH restrictions, i.e., 80mPD for sites with an area of below 400m<sup>2</sup> and 100mPD for sites with an area of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more. In other words, the Reclamation Street site would be subject to a maximum BH of 80mPD;

[Mr. Patrick Lau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Departmental Comments

- (f) relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed rezoning of the above two sites for residential use. The rezoning would not have significant adverse traffic, environmental and infrastructural impacts on the surroundings;
- (g) apart from the CH in the Soy Street site, concerned government departments had not requested to provide other G/IC facilities and open space at the two sites;

- (h) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) considered that the proposed developments at the two sites were not incompatible with the surrounding visual context, and could blend in well with the height profile in the vicinity. As regards air ventilation, the two sites did not fall within the problem areas or major breezeway/air paths identified in the Air Ventilation Assessment by Expert Evaluation for the Mong Kong OZP conducted in August 2010. No major adverse impact on the air ventilation in the area was envisaged;

Comments from Yau Tsim Mong District Council (YTMDC)

- (i) YTMDC was consulted on the proposed amendments on 25.4.2013 and expressed general support to the proposed amendments and particularly welcomed the inclusion of a CH at the Soy Street site. It considered that the proposed amendments could achieve a win-win situation of providing the much needed community facility on the one hand, and increasing the housing land supply and achieving better utilization of land resources on the other hand. However, there was concern on the proposed BH for the sites which might adversely affect the air ventilation in the area;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES)

- (j) a remark stipulating the provision of a CH with GFA not less than 937m<sup>2</sup> on land designated as “R(A)4” zone would be added under the Notes of “R(A)” zone;
- (k) opportunity had been taken to propose technical amendments to the Notes for the relevant zones as detailed in paragraph 5.1 of the Paper to better reflect the planning intention and intended control of the concerned zones; and
- (l) opportunity had also been taken to revise the ES to take into account the proposed amendments as mentioned and to update the general information

for the various land use zones to reflect the latest status and planning circumstances of the OZP.

5. A Member asked if the proposed PR and BH restrictions for the Soy Street site could accommodate the required CH. Mr. Wilson Chan, DPO/TWK, replied that the required CH of 937m<sup>2</sup> would be counted as non-domestic GFA. With a maximum PR restriction of 7.5 for a domestic building, a PR of 9 for a composite building and a BH of 100mPD, the Soy Street site would be able to accommodate the required CH.

6. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Secretary reported that the current Mong Kok OZP involved two judicial reviews (JRs). One was submitted by Lindenford Limited and one was submitted by Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDA). For the Lindenford Limited case, the Court of First Instance (CFI) had dismissed the JR and Lindenford Limited had lodged an appeal against the CFI judgment and the hearing date of the appeal was yet to be fixed. For the REDA case, the hearing of the JR had been completed pending the judgment from the Court. Though the Court had ordered a stay of the submission of the draft Mong Kok OZP to the Chief Executive in Council for approval, it would not affect the publication of the current proposed amendments to the draft OZP.

7. In response to the same Member's enquiry, Mr. Wilson Chan replied that according to the Transport Department's advice, the proposed CH would not generate adverse traffic impact on the surroundings.

8. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr. Tom Yip, STP/TWK replied that according to the Buildings Department's advice, the service lane within the Reclamation Street site should be retained upon redevelopment and should not be built upon. Therefore, the service lane would divide the site into two portions, with the portion closer to Shanghai Street having an area of 144m<sup>2</sup>, and the portion near Reclamation Street having an area of 109m<sup>2</sup>. The future development on the site would likely be in the form of two separate towers.

9. Another Member asked whether consideration could be given to swap the nearby open space with the Reclamation Street site as the service lane within the Reclamation Street site would be a constraint to the future residential development. On the contrary, the open

space could be more flexibly designed to accommodate the service lane. Mr. Wilson Chan responded that LCSD did not have any plan to develop the Reclamation Street site for open space use. The Reclamation Street site, if swapped with the current open space, could only be developed into two small pieces of open space separated by the service lane. Mr. Yip supplemented that the swapping arrangement, which would involve rezoning and re-provisioning work, would affect the local enjoyment of the existing open space in the interim. LCSD might not be interested in pursuing the swapping proposal.

10. Another Member opined that the Reclamation Street site could form a quality open space providing linkage and enhancing permeability between Reclamation Street and Shanghai Street. It would be a better location for open space development than the existing open space fronting Reclamation Street. From the planning perspective, it would be more desirable for the Reclamation Street site to be developed into an open space while pursuing the residential development proposal on the existing open space. The Chairman said that unless the surrounding buildings were comprehensively redeveloped, the service lane within the Reclamation Street site, which was part of the service lane of the entire street block, had to be retained even the site was developed into an open space. Moreover, the proposal would affect the existing open space which was being frequently used by locals and the swapping arrangement might not be welcomed by the local community. Mr. Wilson Chan added that the YTMDC was supportive to the proposed rezoning of the Reclamation Street site for housing development as it might act as a catalyst to facilitate redevelopment of the adjacent old buildings. There might be a possibility that the Reclamation Street site would be amalgamated with the adjacent old buildings to form a larger site for comprehensive redevelopment.

11. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr. Wilson Chan responded that the proposed CH to be accommodated in the Soy Street site would be served by a separate access and would not share the same access with the residential development on the same site. Such requirement would be stipulated in the lease conditions.

12. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the draft Mong Kok OZP No. S/K3/29 and that the draft Mong Kok OZP No. S/K3/29A at Attachment I

of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/K3/30 upon gazetting) and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 7 of the Ordinance; and

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

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

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

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Draft Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/29

(MPC Paper No. 10/13 )

---

13. Mr. K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, presented the proposed amendments to the draft Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/29 as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

#### **Background**

- (a) TWTL 393 (the Site) (about 1.5 ha) was located at the junction of Yeung Uk Road and Ma Tau Pa Road. It was originally zoned "Commercial" ("C") and subject to a maximum plot ratio of 9.5 on the Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/19. On 24.2.2012, the Site was rezoned from "C" to "Undetermined" ("U") on the draft Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/29 pending review of its land use and development parameters. A comprehensive review of the proposed land uses and development parameters of the Site (the land use review) and the surrounding area had been undertaken by the Planning

Department (PlanD). In order to help meeting the demand for both housing and commercial floor spaces, the Site was recommended for comprehensive residential cum commercial development subject to an overall plot ratio restriction of 7.556, a 2-tier building height restriction of 100mPD and 130mPD, and designation of a 20m-wide NBA. The adjoining “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) site was also proposed to be rezoned “Open Space” (“O”) to address the Tsuen Wan District Council (TWDC)’s requests for more recreational and open space;

- (b) on 26.3.2013, the TWDC was consulted on the recommendations of the land use review. There was no objection against rezoning the Site to “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) for residential cum commercial uses. However, it considered that the proposed development intensity with an overall plot ratio of 7.556 was too high and there was concern on the air ventilation impact of the future development. Moreover, it did not support the proposed rezoning of the adjoining “G/IC” site to “O” but requested the provision of not less than 13,000 ft<sup>2</sup> (about 1,208m<sup>2</sup>) public open space (POS) within the Site;

### Proposed Amendments to the Plan

#### Amendment Item A

- (c) taking into account the views of the TWDC, it was proposed to rezone the Site (about 1.5 ha) from “U” to “CDA(7)” with the following revised development restrictions :
- a domestic gross floor area (GFA) of not less than 39,365m<sup>2</sup> and a non-domestic GFA of not less than 59,755m<sup>2</sup> with a total GFA of 99,120m<sup>2</sup>. Based on such development intensity restriction, the overall plot ratio of the Site would be 7;
  - designation of a 38m-wide non-building area (NBA) aligned with Chung On Street to direct wind flow from the Tsuen Wan waterfront

via Chung On Street to the Tsuen Wan Town Centre, which tallied with the Recommended Option under the study on air ventilation assessment for the Site (PlanD's AVA Study) in 2008;

- a 2-tier building height restriction of 100mPD (at the western side of the 38m-wide NBA) and 150mPD (at the eastern side of the 38m-wide NBA) be specified on the OZP; and
  - the provision of a POS of not less than 1,300m<sup>2</sup> in the commercial portion of the development to address the TWDC's request;
- (d) the proposed 2-tier building height restriction of 100mPD and 150mPD for the Site was considered in line with the building height profile for the area. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) considered that the proposed building height restrictions (100mPD/150mPD) for the Site would not be incompatible with the surroundings from the urban design and visual perspectives;
- (e) as compared with the Recommended Option under the PlanD's AVA Study with a plot ratio of 7.6 and a maximum building height of 180mPD, the subject rezoning proposal had a lower development intensity (overall plot ratio of 7) and building heights (100mPD/150mPD) while maintaining the 38m-wide NBA aligned with Chung On Street;
- (f) this rezoning proposal was considered acceptable to all the concerned bureaux/departments. No major supporting infrastructure would be needed to support development of the Site;
- (g) a planning brief (PB) for the proposed "CDA(7)" site would be prepared to guide the developments. Requirements to submit Master Layout Plan coupled with relevant technical assessments, including environmental assessment, traffic impact assessment, drainage and sewerage assessments, air ventilation assessment, visual impact assessment, urban design and landscape proposals etc. would be incorporated into the PB;

Amendment Item B

- (h) two pieces of land at Sheung Kwai Chung Village (total area of about 0.11 ha) which were located at the northern periphery of the existing “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone at Sheung Kwai Chung, Tsuen Wan were proposed to be rezoned from “O” to “V”. They mainly involved five private building lots (Lot Nos. 1244 S.A, 1244 R.P., 1290, 1393 and 1408, all in D.D. 451) occupied by existing NTEHs and an open carpark situated on unleased Government land at Sheung Kwai Chung Village (the Village), which was a recognized village. They also fell within the village ‘environs’ of the Village. The subject sites were designated as “V” on the adopted Tsuen Wan Central Outline Development Plan No. D/TWC/2A covering the concerned sites. The proposed amendments were to reflect the planning intention for the sites and their as-built situation;
- (i) there were adequate provision of open space in Tsuen Wan, the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services had no objection to the proposed rezoning;

Departmental Comments

- (j) concerned government departments did not object to the proposed amendments which would not have significant adverse traffic, environmental and infrastructural impacts on the surroundings;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES)

- (k) a new set of Notes for the proposed “CDA(7)” sub-zone with minor relaxation clause was proposed to be incorporated into the Notes; and
- (l) opportunity had also been taken to revise the ES to take into account the proposed amendments as mentioned and to update the general information for the various land use zones to reflect the latest status and planning circumstances of the OZP.

14. A Member asked about the status of the car park at Sheung Kwai Chung Village, whether village house could be built on the car parking site after the proposed rezoning to “V” and whether the “V” zone extension would have knock-on effect on the extension of the village ‘environs’. Mr. Wilson Chan, DPO/TWK, replied that the current proposed “V” zone extension involved five building lots and one open car park on government land. After the rezoning, Small House development was permitted as of right on any land within the “V” zone and indigenous villagers of Sheung Kwai Chung Village could apply to Lands Department for Small House development. The current village ‘environs’ of Sheung Kwai Chung Village was larger than the “V” zone, including sloping areas which might not be suitable for Small House development. The proposed “V” zone extension only reflected the as-built situation of the existing village houses and the open car park which was currently used by the villagers. In response to the question of the Chairman, Mr. Chan explained that under the existing “O” zoning, there was no provision for application of redevelopment of the existing village houses.

15. Noting that a 38m wide NBA and a POS with 1,300m<sup>2</sup> had to be provided within the proposed “CDA” site, another Member asked whether the NBA would be counted towards open space provision. Mr. Wilson Chan responded that the domestic portion of the “CDA” site would be on the west of the NBA while the commercial portion would be on the east. The POS was required to be incorporated in the commercial portion of the “CDA” site and the 38m NBA could not be counted towards the POS requirement. These requirements would be clearly stipulated in the planning brief to be prepared later.

16. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the draft Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/29 and that the draft Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/29A at Attachment I of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/TW/30 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 7 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment III of the Paper for the draft Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/29A as an expression of the planning intentions and

objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP, and agree that the revised ES was suitable for exhibition together with the OZP and its Notes.

[The Chairman thanked Mr. Wilson Chan, DPO/TWK and Mr. K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

### **Special Duties Section**

[Ms. Carol Yuen, Deputy Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development, Commerce and Economic Development Bureau (CEDB), Ms. Elsa Cheuk, Chief Town Planner/Special Duties (CTP/SD), Ms. Polly Yip, Senior Town Planner/Special Duties (STP/SD) and Mr. Louis Kau, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK) were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Wan Chai North Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H25/2 (MPC Paper No. 11/13 )

---

17. The Secretary reported that one of the amendment items related to Exhibition Station site of the Shatin to Central Link (SCL) to be operated by the Mass Transit Railway Corporation Ltd. (MTRCL). The following Members had declared interests in this item:

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Mr. Albert Lee<br>as the Assistant<br>Commissioner for<br>Transport (Urban) | - | being an assistant to the Commissioner for Transport who was a Non-executive Director of MTRCL |
| Mr. Dominic Lam   | - | having current business dealings with MTRCL  |

- Mr. Patrick Lau - having current business dealings with MTRCL
- Prof. S.C. Wong - being the Director of the Institute of Transport Studies of the University of Hong Kong and MTRCL had sponsored some activities of the Institute.

18. The Committee noted that Mr. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee considered that Professor Wong's interest was indirect and agreed that he could stay in the meeting. For Mr. Lee and Mr. Lau, the Committee considered that their interests were direct and they should leave the meeting temporarily.

[Mr. Albert Lee and Mr. Patrick Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

19. Ms Polly Yip, STP/SD, presented the proposed amendments to the draft Wan Chai North Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H25/2 as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

Background

- (a) the Exhibition (EXH) Station site of the Shatin to Central Link (SCL) with an area of about 1.65 ha was mainly zoned "Government, Institution or Community (1)" ("G/IC(1)") and partly zoned "Other Specified use (OU) (Railway Station Facilities)", "OU (Railway Ventilation Building)", "OU(Amenity Area)", "OU (Landscaped Elevated Walkway)" and areas shown as 'Road' on the current OZP. Developments within the "G/IC(1)" zone was subject to a maximum building height (BH) restriction of 50mPD. While the BH restriction for the "OU (Railway Station Facilities)" and "OU (Railway Ventilation Building)" zones were subject to a BH restriction of 25mPD;
- (b) the site was at a strategic location in the waterfront and was a potential

major transport hub well served by public transport. Being in close proximity to the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC) (HKCEC) and the HKCEC Extension, it was considered that a topside development at the EXH Station primarily for convention and meeting facilities and other commercial related uses would optimize the land resources and meet the economic need of Hong Kong. A Working Group on Convention and Exhibition Industries and Tourism had been set up under the Chief Executive's Economic Development Commission to consider, among others, issues related to the development of convention and exhibition industries in Hong Kong. It had just started work and had not made any specific recommendations yet. The proposed rezoning as a forward planning initiative would preserve the flexibility for future topside development at the EXH Station;

- (c) an architectural feasibility study had therefore been commissioned in August 2012 to explore the feasibility of a topside development at the EXH station. The study had ascertained the feasibility of a development not exceeding 50mPD in height mainly for convention and meeting facilities. The ground level would be mainly used to accommodate the station entrances and facilities, a covered public transport interchange (PTI), a public open space, the entrance to the topside development, drop-off and loading/unloading area;

### Proposed Amendments to the Plan

#### Amendment Item A

- (d) to preserve the flexibility for allowing the future topside development at the EXH Station, it was proposed to rezone an area bounded by Road P2, Fleming Road, Tonnochy Road and Great Eagle Centre/Harbour Centre, i.e. the EXH Station site, from "G/IC(1)", "OU(Railway Station Facilities)", "OU(Railway Ventilation Building)", "OU(Amenity Area)", "OU(Landscaped Elevated Walkway)" and areas shown as 'Road' to "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") to facilitate comprehensive

development at the site. The planning intention of the proposed “CDA” zone was for comprehensive development, which was primarily for convention and meeting facilities and other commercial related uses, together with railway station facilities, a PTI and other supporting facilities;

- (e) the existing maximum BH restriction of 50mPD of the site would be retained for the proposed “CDA” zone. This was to ensure compatibility of the proposed topside development with the waterfront setting and surrounding developments, and to be in line with the stepped height profile descending towards the waterfront;
- (f) the proposed BH restriction of 50mPD for the topside development at the EXH Station site would be visually compatible with the nearby HKCEC Extension (70mPD) and the proposed re-provisioned the Harbour Road Sports Centre and the Wan Chai Swimming Pool (31mPD), and maintained a stepped height profile descending from high-rise buildings in the hinterland, including Great Eagle Centre/Harbour Centre (143mPD), China Resources Building (175mPD) and Sun Hung Kai Centre (202mPD), towards the waterfront;
- (g) given that the site was shielded by high-rise, dense built up area to the south and opened to the Victoria Harbour to the north, air ventilation impact arising from the proposed development with a BH restriction of 50mPD was not expected to be significant;
- (h) as regards traffic impact, the District Officer (Wan Chai) (DO/WC) had advised that Wan Chai District Council (WCDC) might express concerns about the additional traffic generated by the topside development. However, it should be noted that the future topside development was intended primarily for convention and meeting facilities and no exhibition use was proposed. With the opening of the SCL, the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) and the completion of the road improvement works associated with the Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) project, the traffic condition in the area would be improved. The proposed development would not

generate significant traffic impact on the nearby road network. The Transport Department (TD) had no comment on the proposed rezoning provided that the applicant would submit a traffic impact assessment (TIA) report as part of the Master Layout Plan submission for the approval of the Board at the planning application stage;

#### Amendment Item B

- (i) the Atrium Link Extension, located between HKCEC and HKCEC Extension with an area of 13,111m<sup>2</sup>, was currently occupied by a 3-storey elevated structure with exhibition halls and supporting facilities. It was the subject of a planning application (No. A/H25/5) for exhibition hall use approved by the Committee on 26.8.2005 to cater for the expansion of the HKCEC. The Atrium Link Extension had now been completed and all the approval conditions of the planning permission had been complied with. To reflect the completed development, the Atrium Link Extension was proposed to be rezoned from “OU (Pedestrian Walkway with Ancillary Exhibition Facilities)”, “OU (Amenity Area)” and areas shown as ‘Road’ to “OU (Exhibition Centre)”;

#### Amendment Item C

- (j) the Harbour View International House at 4 Harbour Road, with an area of about 1,115m<sup>2</sup>, was now occupied by a 24-storey hostel. In 2010, the owner of the site submitted a section 12A planning application (No. Y/H25/1) for rezoning of the site from “G/IC” to “G/IC” sub-zone and to include ‘Hotel’ and ‘Eating Place’ in Column 1 of the Notes for the “G/IC” sub-zone and to transfer ‘School (other than in free-standing purpose-design school building only)’ from Column 2 to Column 1 of the Notes of the “G/IC” zone. Whilst the Committee rejected the application on 7.5.2010, it agreed to designate the site as a specific “G/IC” sub-zone with the inclusion of ‘Hotel’ and ‘Residential Institution’ under Column 2 of the Notes. In the light of the Committee’s decision, the Harbour View International House was proposed to be rezoned from “G/IC” to “G/IC(5)” with the inclusion of ‘Hotel’ and

'Residential Institution' under Column 2 of the Notes for this "G/IC" sub-zone;

Amendment Item D

- (k) minor adjustments to rezone a narrow strip of land from an area shown as 'Road' to "G/IC(1)" zone according to the gazetted road alignments of Tonnochy Road and to align with the eastern boundary of the proposed "CDA" zone were proposed;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES)

- (l) a new set of Notes for the proposed "CDA" zone with remarks in particular stipulating a maximum BH restriction of 50mPD for development within the "CDA" zone was added;
- (m) in connection with Amendment Item C, the schedule of uses for the "G/IC" zone was amended by adding 'Hotel (for "G/IC(5)" only)' and 'Residential Institution (for "G/IC(5)" only)' under Column 2 of the Notes for the "G/IC" zone;
- (n) opportunity had been taken to incorporate the technical amendments to the Notes in accordance with the revised Master Schedule of Notes;
- (o) the ES had been revised to take into account the proposed amendments as mentioned and to update the general information for the various land use zones to reflect the latest status and planning circumstances of the OZP;

Departmental Comments

- (p) concerned government departments had no objection or adverse comment on the proposed amendments. Departmental comments had been taken into account where appropriate; and

Public Consultation

- (q) should the Board agree the proposed amendments to the OZP, both the WCDC and Hong Kong Taskforce of Harbourfront Commission would be consulted on the proposed amendments as the EXH Station site was located at the Wan Chai waterfront.

20. In response to a Member's question on the traffic impacts of and supporting transport arrangement including parking facility for the proposed topside development at the EXH Station site, Ms. Elsa Cheuk, CTP/SD, said that the future topside development was primarily for convention and meeting facilities and other commercial related uses and no exhibition use was proposed. The proposed convention and meeting facilities would generate less traffic and pedestrian flow than those of exhibition use. Moreover, the topside development would only be constructed after the completion of the Exhibition Station, i.e. after 2020. According to TD's information, the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) and the other road improvement works in the area would also be completed before 2020. Therefore, TD considered that the proposed development would not cause significant traffic impacts on the surroundings. Moreover, TD would require the future project proponent to submit a TIA report as part of the MLP submission for approval of the Board at the planning application stage. In future, with the completion of the Exhibition Station, railway would be the main transport mode for people visiting the proposed convention and meeting facilities. In addition, the site was well served by public transport and would be connected to Wan Chai MTR Station and surrounding areas by elevated pedestrian walkways which would help improve and divert pedestrian flow. As regards parking facilities, there were ample parking facilities in the vicinity of the site.

21. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Wan Chai North OZP No. S/H25/2 and that the draft Wan Chai North OZP No. S/H25/2A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/H25/3 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and

- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Wan Chai North OZP No. S/H25/2A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and agree that the revised ES would be published together with the OZP and its Notes.

[The Chairman thanked Ms. Carol Yuen, Deputy Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development, CEDB, Ms. Elsa Cheuk, CTP/SD, Ms. Polly Yip, STP/SD, and Mr. Louis Kau, STP/HK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Albert Lee returned to join the meeting at this point.]

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

## **Agenda Item 6**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Further Consideration of Application No. A/H4/90

Proposed Construction of one and a half 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 and 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/H4/90B)

---

22. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Transport

Department (TD) with Jacobs China Ltd. (JC), and Leigh & Orange Ltd. (L&O) as consultants. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

- Mr. Albert W.B. Lee - being the Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban) of TD
- Prof. S.C. Wong - having current business dealings with TD
- Mr. Dominic Lam - being the Managing Director and Shareholder of L&O and having current business dealings with JC

23. The Committee noted that Mr. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. For Mr. Lee and Professor Wong, the Committee considered their interests were direct and they should leave the meeting temporarily.

[Mr. Albert Lee and Professor S.C. Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

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

##### Background

- (a) on 9.11.2012, the Committee considered the application and Members considered that the pedestrian connection between the future landscaped deck at 14mPD (i.e. same level of L3) and the public open space (POS) at L4 and L5 in the three piers was indirect and needed to be improved. The Committee decided to defer a decision on the application and requested the applicant to submit further information on proposals to improve the pedestrian connectivity between the future landscaped deck and the POS in the three piers;

The Revised Design

- (b) subsequently, the applicant had submitted a refined design to provide a direct access to the L4 and L5 POS from the landscaped deck level at L3 and to enhance the connectivity between different floors of the three piers. Under the refined design, the major planning parameters including commercial gross floor area (GFA), building height and minimum provision of POS would remain unchanged. The key features of the refined design included:
- the provision of a new escalator link connecting L3 to L5 in the southern end of the three piers. In future, public entering the piers from the future landscaped deck could use the escalator at L3 in the south to reach the POS at L4 and L5;
  - apart from the new escalator link, public could still use the outdoor stairs and outdoor corridor at the western part of the piers to reach the POS at L4 and L5;
  - a new escalator lobby would be provided at L4. Public reaching L4 from the escalator and the firemen lift could have direct access to the POS via the outdoor corridor without passing through the commercial area at L4;
- (c) the size of the POS at L4 and L5 for each pier would be reduced by about 210m<sup>2</sup> to provide a landing area for the new escalators in L5 and to convert some areas for circulation. The total revised area of the POS as 3,550m<sup>2</sup> still exceeded the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS)'s recommendation of 3,000m<sup>2</sup>;

Departmental Comments

- (d) departmental comments – concerned government departments had no adverse comments on the revised design and their previous comments on

the application were still valid;

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

*Views of Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (TFHK), Harbourfront Commission*

- (e) a TFHK member raised concerns on the handling of supplies and refuse related to pier operations and passengers' cargo and luggage. This member suggested that cargo handling operations could be handled at the Western District Public Cargo Working Area (PCWA), or the ferry operators should allocate necessary storage space in the piers;
- (f) another member opined that the piers could be re-designed with more space (e.g. an additional storey) so that building volume, open decks and voids would have a more ideal overall composition;
- (g) the Task Force Chair raised concern on the reduction of space for commercial use due to the incorporation of additional escalators. He suggested that an independent view from consultants on the commercial viability of the project should be sought;

*Planning Department (PlanD)'s views*

- (h) PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 5 of the Paper. Overall speaking, the revised scheme had responded to the concerns raised by the Committee and was considered as an improvement to the original proposal, particularly on the pedestrian connectivity between the future landscaped deck and the POS at L4 and L5 of the piers;
- (i) the planning considerations and assessment in paragraph 12 of MPC Paper No. A/H4/90A were still relevant. In brief, 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 “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone, in terms of the land use compatibility, building height, future integration with the “CDA” site and provision of the POS. As regards the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD’s previous concerns on the insufficient greenery at the viewing platform cum POS on L4, the primary intention of the viewing platform was to facilitate the public to enjoy the spectacular view of harbourfront. The Landscape Master Plan could still be further enhanced through the imposition of the approval condition;

- (j) as regards a TFHK member’s view on handling of goods, refuse and luggage, the transport services of daily necessities and groceries were essential to the outlying islands residents and the volume was small. A significant portion of the limited available space on the ground floor had to be taken out for provision of fire prevention installations and barrier-free facilities. Allocating further space for storing goods might undermine the piers’ capacity to handle passengers during peak hours. It was not feasible to transfer the existing services to the Western District PCWA due to significantly higher costs and adverse impact on the livelihood of the outlying islands residents;
- (k) on the TFHK’s suggestion of providing an extra floor, it would present significant difficulties in meeting the means of escape requirements for the pier buildings and such addition would also deviate from the UDS recommendations, which had undergone extensive public consultation, in respect of the building height and GFA requirements; and
- (l) as regards TFHK’s concern on commercial viability, a retail rental estimation based on the refined design conducted by a professional property consultant revealed that the revised scheme would not have significant effect to the commercial viability of the project, as compared with the original one.

25. A Member agreed that there was improvement in the revised scheme as compared with the original scheme under application, but that was only on the technical aspect in enhancing the pedestrian connectivity between the future landscaped deck and the POS at the piers. The Member asked how the revised scheme had helped ensure the planning objective of the UDS, i.e. to allow the public to enjoy the waterfront and harbour view, could be achieved noting that the objective was an important element in the consultation of the UDS. This Member asked PlanD to explain the differences between the subject revised scheme and the original proposal as recommended in the UDS in achieving the above planning objective. Mr. Timothy Lui responded that under the recommended planning and design proposals of the UDS, Sites 1 (where the application site was located) and 2 would form a distinctive civic node featuring a mixed-use precinct with low-rise structures for retail, restaurant, exhibition and gallery uses and quality POS for public enjoyment. There would be an extensive landscaped deck connecting the Central Business District to the new harbourfront primarily be used as a major POS. In addition, one and a half floors for commercial uses would be added onto Central Piers 4 to 6 for retail, dining and other waterfront related uses with a minimum provision of 3,000m<sup>2</sup> POS on the top decks of the piers. The revised scheme in the subject application was in line with the recommended planning and design proposals of UDS and achieved the objective of providing direct and uninterrupted pedestrian connection from inland towards the new harbourfront. He further advised that as compared with the recommendation of the UDS to provide the POS at L4, the scheme under this application had provided an additional POS at the rooftop of L5 for public enjoyment of the harbour view. This was considered as a planning merit for the subject application.

26. The same Member opined that the plan shown in the UDS had included an inviting and extensive landscaped deck which brought people directly from the inland to the waterfront on the same level. However, in the subject scheme, people had to walk along corridors and escalators at several levels before they could reach the waterfront. Mr. Lui explained that under the UDS, the landscaped deck was at a level of about 14mPD, which was the same level as the commercial floor at L3 and people had to walk up to L4 to reach the POS (viewing platform) of the Piers. In response to the same Member's further enquiry, Mr. Lui clarified that the refined scheme under the current application had followed the recommendations of the UDS, among others, to provide an additional one and a half commercial floors above the piers.

[Mr. Patrick Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

27. In response to another Member's enquiry, Mr. Lui explained that under the revised scheme, the public could access the POS at the Piers from the landscaped deck at L3 using lifts or escalators to get up to L4 and L5 or they could use the outdoor stairs and corridors to get access from L3 to L4 and L5. This was an improvement to the previous scheme in terms of pedestrian connectivity..

### Deliberation Session

28. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the Master Layout Plan (MLP) and the application, under sections 4A and 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 3.5.2017, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the submission of a revised MLP, taking into account the approval conditions (b), (c) and (d) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a revised Landscape Master Plan for Central Piers 4 to 6 to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the design and provision of the public open space to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (d) the design and implementation of the proposed improvements to the existing loading/unloading arrangement to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (e) the implementation of the sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works

identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;

- (f) the provision of fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (g) no direct provision of food and beverage services and facilities should be allowed in the private open space (Commercial Outdoor Area) at Level 4 of Central Piers 4 to 6.

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

- (a) the approved MLP, together with the set of approval conditions, would be certified by the Chairman of the TPB and deposited in the Land Registry in accordance with section 4A(3) of the Town Planning Ordinance. Efforts should be made to incorporate the relevant approval conditions into the revised MLP for deposition in the Land Registry as soon as possible;
- (b) the design of the proposed piers should integrate with the overall planning and design concept of Sites 1 and 2 as recommended in the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront;
- (c) to note the comment of the Government Property Administrator that the tenants should have the written consent of the Transport Department for granting any commercial concessions for the proposed uses under the tenancy agreement;
- (d) to obtain Temporary Places of Public Entertainment Licence from the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH) if public entertainment activities were involved, and food licences/permits from the DFEH if food business activities were involved at the Central Piers 4 to 6;
- (e) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection that it was the duty of the applicant to ensure air quality concerns would be addressed through proper design and implementation of the control

measures ;

- (f) to note the comments of the Commissioner for Transport that the future tenants should carry out loading/unloading activities outside peak hours to optimize the use of the loading/unloading facilities outside the piers;
- (g) 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” and detailed fire services requirements would be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general buildings plans;
- (h) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Development (2), Water Supplies Department (WSD) that all necessary precautions should be taken to protect WSD’s water mains within and in the vicinity of the application site; and
- (i) to note the comments of the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services that there were several existing underground town gas transmission pipes located in the vicinity of the application site and to comply with the requirements of the “Code of Practice on Avoiding Danger from Gas Pipes”.

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

[The meeting had a short break for ten minutes. During the break, the Chairman left the meeting and the Vice-chairman chaired the meeting after the break.]

### **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 7**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K1/237            Proposed Hotel (Guesthouse) in "Residential (Group A)" zone, G/F  
(Portion), 1/F and 2/F, Nos. 52, 54 and 56 Kwun Chung Street, Jordan  
(MPC Paper No. A/K1/237)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

30.            With the aid of a powerpoint, Mr. Tom 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 (guesthouse);
- (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 and broaden the range of accommodations for visitors. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comment 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 had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 10 of the Paper.

31.            Members had no question on the application.

### **Deliberation Session**

32. 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 3.5.2017, 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 security measures to ensure that the lift serving the residential floors was not accessible to the hotel floors except in case of emergency and the installation of panic bolt with alarm at 1/F and 2/F staircase exits as proposed by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning 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;
- (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.

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

- (a) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West, Lands Department that for the proposed restaurant on G/F outside the Premises, the owner should apply for a licence or lease modification to remove the relevant trades from the offensive trade clause which, if approved by Lands Department in the capacity as the Landlord at its discretion, would be subject to such fees and other terms and conditions as might be considered appropriate;
- (b) the approval of the application did not imply that any proposal on gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development would be

approved/granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department (BD) direct to obtain the necessary approval. If the GFA concession was 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;

- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection 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 Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, BD's comments that:
  - (i) all building works/ change in use were subject to the compliance with the Buildings Ordinance (BO).
  - (ii) the applicant was required to appoint an Authorized Person (AP) to submit building (alterations and additions) plans to demonstrate compliance with the BO for the proposed change in use, including (but not limited to):
    - a. compliance with Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) 20, 21 and 25 in respect of the proposed change in use from non-domestic to domestic use. Granting of hotel concession under B(P)R 23A could only be considered at building plan submission stage subject to the compliance with the requirements as stated in Practice Note for APs, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers APP-40;
    - b. provision of access and facilities for persons with a disability, including the provision of initial access for wheelchair on G/F, accessible lift and manoeuvring space for wheelchair at the corridor, etc., in accordance with B(P)R 72;

- c. provision of means of escape in accordance with B(P)R 41 and the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Building 2011;
  - d. provision of fire resisting construction in accordance with Building (Construction) Regulation 90 and the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011;
  - e. provision of fireman's lift in accordance with B(P)R 41B and the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011;
  - f. provision of natural lighting and ventilation to the guestrooms and lavatories in accordance with B(P)Rs 30, 31, 32 and 36;
  - g. provision of sanitary fitments in compliance with Building (Standards of Sanitary Fitments, Plumbing, Drainage Works and Latrines) Regulations; and
  - h. justification on the structural adequacy of the existing structures for any additional loadings arising from the change in use.
- (e) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that the arrangement of emergency vehicular access should comply with the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Building which was administered by the BD; and
- (f) to note the comments of the Chief Officer/Licensing Authority, Home Affairs Department that:
- (i) the applicant should submit documentary evidence showing that the Building Authority had granted prior approval for the proposed

change in use when making an application under the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance (HAGAO);

- (ii) the proposed license area should be physically connected;
- (iii) the siting of the proposal was considered acceptable from licensing point of view. The fire service installation provisions should comply with the Codes of Practice for Minimum Fire Services Installations and Equipment; and
- (iv) the licensing requirements would be formulated after inspections by his Building Safety Unit and Fire Safety Unit upon receipt of a licence application under HAGAO.

### **Agenda Item 8**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K2/207                      Proposed Composite Residential, Hotel and Retail Development in "Commercial" zone, No. 348 Nathan Road, Jordan  
(MPC Paper No. A/K2/207A)

---

34.            The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KT) and CKM Asia Ltd. (CKM) were the consultants of the applicant. Mr. Patrick Lau and Mr. Dominic Lam who had current business dealings with KT and Professor P.P. Ho who had current business dealings with CKM had declared interests in this item. Professor S.C. Wong had also declared an interest in this item as he was the Director of the Institute of Transport Studies of the University of Hong Kong and CKM had sponsored some activities of the Institute.

35.            The Committee noted that Mr. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As PlanD had requested a deferral of consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Mr. Lau, Professor Ho and Professor Wong could stay in the meeting.

36.            The Secretary reported that as claimed by the applicants, the proposed composite development at the site had a total plot ratio of 12, comprising a domestic plot ratio (PR) of 6

and a non-domestic plot of 6. The “Commercial” (“C”) zone was subject to a maximum PR of 12 under the OZP and was generally intended for commercial developments. The PR calculation adopted by the applicants for the proposed composite development in a “C” zone had a wide planning implication for other similar cases, and more time was required for the Planning Department (PlanD) to seek clarification/comments from concerned government departments on the PR calculation issue. In view of the above, PlanD requested to defer the consideration of the application by the Committee for two months pending the clarification/comments of concerned departments on the PR calculation issue.

37. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by PlanD. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration upon receipt of clarification/comments of concerned departments on the PR calculation issue in two months’ time. The Committee also agreed that no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

## **Agenda Item 9**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K3/547                      Proposed Hotel (Guesthouse) in "Residential (Group A)" zone, 2nd Floor, Block A, Wah May Building, Nos. 36A -36B Shantung Street, Mong Kok  
(MPC Paper No. A/K3/547)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

38. With aid of a powerpoint, Mr. Tom 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 (guesthouse);

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Tourism supported the proposed guesthouse development in Mong Kok as the proposed development would broaden the range of accommodations for visitors. Concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, one public comment from the Owners' Corporation of Wah May Building Block A (the subject building) was received. The commenter expressed no objection to the application because the subject hotel had maintained a good relationship with the residents of the building over the years and had positive effect on the hygiene, appearance, fire safety and security of the building. 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 assessments as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The subject application was for proposed hotel use at the 2/F of the non-domestic podium of a commercial/residential building. As an established practice of the Board in considering applications for hotel use within an existing commercial/residential building, there was a need to ensure that separate means of access for the hotel portion of the building was provided to avoid causing nuisances to the residents of the domestic portion of the building. For the subject application, the building was only served by a lift, a common entrance on G/F facing Shantung Street and two staircases. It was considered undesirable for the residents and hotel guests to share the use of the G/F entrance and the only lift. As no separate entrance and lift had been provided for the exclusive use of the proposed hotel on 2/F, the operation of the proposed hotel might cause nuisances and inconvenience to the residents of the same building. The applicant had proposed some security measures to address the above concern including setting aside the front staircase mainly for the customers of commercial premises on the lower floors, including the proposed hotel, and reserving

the lift mainly for the residents, installation of a metal gate at the lift lobby to restrict the use by customers of commercial premises at night, the installation of security cameras at public areas, alarm system for the exits of staircases on 2/F and clear signage. However, these measures were considered not effective in that there was no restriction on the use of the lift by the hotel guests during day time, it might not be practical to require the hotel guests who carried large luggage to use the front staircase, instead of lift, to access the Premise at 2/F, and the lift was accessible to the hotel guests on 2/F. Apart from the access arrangement, the internal layout of the proposed development was also considered unacceptable in that the two guestrooms in the middle of the Premises were not provided with windows. This was against the requirement in the Building (Planning) Regulations that every room used for habitation should be provided with natural lighting and ventilation.

39. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

40. After 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) the application involved partial conversion of an existing commercial/residential building for hotel use. As there was no separate access to exclusively serve the proposed hotel, its operation would create nuisances to the residents on the upper floors of the same building. The security measures proposed in the application were considered not effective to avoid the shared use of the common entrance and lift of the building by the hotel guests and residents;
- (b) the internal design and layout of the proposed hotel development were not acceptable as some of the guestrooms were not provided with windows; and

- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar application for partial conversion of an existing commercial/residential building for hotel use without separate access.

## **Agenda Item 10**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K3/548                      Proposed Hotel and Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction in "Residential (Group A)" zone, Nos. 5-7 Ki Lung Street, Mong Kok (MPC Paper No. A/K3/548)

---

41.            The Secretary reported that MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) was the consultant of the applicant. Mr. Patrick Lau, Mr. Dominic Lam and Ms. Julia Lau who had current business dealings with MVA had declared interests in this item. The Committee noted that Mr. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr. Lau and Ms. Lau had no direct involvement in the subject application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

42.            With the aid of a powerpoint, Mr. Tom 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 restriction;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Tourism supported the proposed guesthouse development in Mong Kok as the proposed development would increase the number of hotel rooms, broaden the range of accommodations for visitors, and support the rapid development of

conversion and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) advised that although the proposed hotel was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land use and the proposed building height of 71.55m was within the maximum building height restriction for the site, the applicant had not provided any information to demonstrate the design merits for the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR). As such, he was unable to lend support to the application from urban design point of view. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comment on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, two public comments were received. The first one expressed concerns on the possible traffic, noise and air pollution impacts arising from the proposed development, whereas the second one objected to the application on grounds of limited traffic capacity of Prince Edward Road and adverse impacts on pedestrian safety. No local objection was received by the District Officer (Yau TsimMong); and

[Mr. Laurence Li left the meeting at this point.]

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The application site was located within a predominant residential neighbourhood. It was surrounded by residential buildings on four sides. In addition, the three street blocks around the site (i.e. sites bounded by Lai Chi Kok Road, Cedar Street, Prince Edward Road West, Portland Street and Yu Chau Street) were predominantly occupied by residential buildings under “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone. Given the current shortfall in housing supply, residential sites should be developed for its zoned use unless the site was very conducive for hotel development, or development for hotel would meet a specified planning objective. Also, the site was zoned “R(A)”, which was intended primarily for high-density residential development. The proposed hotel development would result in reduction

of sites available for residential developments, which would affect the supply of housing land in meeting the pressing housing demand over the territory. The site was subject to a maximum PR of 9 for a non-domestic building under the “R(A)” zone. The proposed relaxation of the PR restriction from 9 to 12 (+33.3%) could not be considered as minor. Although the Commissioner for Transport and other concerned government departments had no adverse comments on the proposal from traffic and infrastructure viewpoints, the applicants had not provided any planning and design merits to justify the proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction. In this regard, CTP/UD&L, PlanD advised that the application could not be supported from urban design viewpoint. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for minor relaxation of the PR restriction with no planning and design merits, the cumulative effect of approving such applications would jeopardize the intended plot ratio control for the “R(A)” zone.

43. Noting that there were many similar applications for proposed hotel developments on residential zoning, a Member asked whether the impact on housing land supply was a relevant consideration in assessing such kind of applications. Mr. Tom Yip responded that it was important from the planning point of view to respond to the changing circumstances and needs of the society. Given that there was an overall shortage of housing land and the subject application site was within a predominantly residential neighbourhood, the potential for redevelopment of the subject site to residential use was high. Although hotel development might not be regarded as incompatible with residential use, there were other areas more suitable for hotel development such as areas along Nathan Road, or close to commercial development. In any event, each case should be considered based on its own circumstances.

44. In response to another Member’s enquiry, Mr. Yip replied that the two existing pre-war buildings within the application site were built in 1941 but were not included in the list of 1,444 historic buildings assessed by the Antiquities and Monuments Office.

Deliberation Session

45. The Secretary said that in a recent meeting of the Committee, Members had a thorough discussion on the implications of approving an application for hotel development on a site zoned “R(A)” noting that there was a general shortage of housing land. That application was not similar to the subject application as the application site of that case was adjacent to industrial building and hence the approval of the hotel development might act as a catalyst to accelerate redevelopment of the area so as to resolve the industrial/residential interface problem. Since the announcement in 2013 Policy Address that the Government would undertake different measures to increase housing land supply, the implication on housing land supply had become an important consideration in assessing planning applications. PlanD would have to take the implication on housing land supply into consideration in the assessment of all relevant planning applications.

46. 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) the application site was located in a predominant residential neighbourhood. Given the current shortfall in housing supply, the site should be developed for its zoned use. The proposed hotel development would result in reduction of sites for residential developments, which would affect the supply of housing land in meeting the pressing housing demand over the territory;
- (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 planning and design merits would jeopardize the intended control on plot ratio in the “R(A)” zone.

[The Vice-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 11**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/732                      Proposed Shop and Services in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business(1)" zone, Shops D1 and D2 (formerly known as C1 & C2 ), G/F, Garment Centre, Nos. 576-586 Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/732)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

47.            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 shop and services;
- (c)    departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. All concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comment 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 (Sham Shui Po); and
- (e)    the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

48.            Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

49. 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 3.5.2015, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the submission and implementation of fire safety measures, including the provision of a means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion and fire service installations in the subject premises before operation of the use to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (b) if the above planning condition was not complied with before operation of the use, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the same date be revoked without further notice.

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

- (a) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services with respect to fire resisting construction for the Premises on:
  - (i) the requirements as stipulated in Code of Practice for Fire Resisting Construction which was administered by Buildings Department; and
  - (ii) to observe the Guidance Note on Compliance with Planning Condition on Provision of Fire Safety Measures for Commercial Uses in Industrial Premises if the application was approved;
- (b) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department to appoint an Authorized Person to submit

building plans for the change in use to demonstrate compliance with the Buildings Ordinance, in particular:

- (i) the provision of adequate means of escape to the Premises and remaining portion of G/F in accordance with the Building (Planning) Regulation 41(1) and the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011;
  - (ii) the Premises should be separated from the remaining portion of the building including the workshop on 1/F above by fire barriers of adequate fire resistance rating pursuant to Building (Construction) Regulation 90 and the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011; and
  - (iii) the provision of access and facilities for persons with a disability under Building (Planning) Regulation 72 and Design Manual: Barrier Free Access 2008; and
- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene for obtaining appropriate licence/permit from the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department.

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

**Agenda Item 12**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/447

Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions to the Approved Scheme for Comprehensive Residential Development (New Home Ownership Scheme Development with Social Welfare Facility (Day Care Centre for the Elderly)) in "Comprehensive Development Area (2)" zone, Ex-Tai Wo Hau Factory Estate, Sha Tsui Road, Tsuen Wan  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/447)

---

51. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) with Atkins China Ltd. (Atkins) as consultant. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

- Mr. K.K. Ling - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA
- Mr. Frankie Chou - being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA
- Mr. Simon Wang - being an alternate member for the Director of Lands who was a member of HKHA
- Mr. Dominic Lam - having current business dealings with HKHA and Atkins
- Ms. Julia Lau - being a member of HKHA and Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA

52. The Committee noted that Mr. Chou and Mr. Lam had tendered apologies for

being unable to attend the meeting and the Chairman had left the meeting already. As the applicant had requested for a deferral of consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Mr. Wang and Ms. Lau could stay in the meeting.

53. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 29.4.2013 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for further review of plot ratio and building height for optimising the development potential of the site.

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

### **Agenda Items 13, 14 and 15**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TW/446                      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) (Vacant Vehicle Parking Spaces Only) under Application No. A/TW/411 for a Period of 3 Years in "Residential (Group A)" zone, Lei Muk Shue Estate, Tsuen Wan (MPC Paper No. A/TW/446)

---

A/TWK/8                      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Public Vehicle Parks (excluding Container Vehicle) (Vacant Vehicle Parking Spaces Only) under Application No. A/TWK/6 for a Period of 3 Years in "Residential (Group A)" zone, Kwai Shing West Estate, Lai King Estate, Lai Yiu Estate in Kwai Chung and Cheung Ching Estate in Tsing Yi  
(MPC Paper No. A/TWK/8)

---

A/KC/398                      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) (Vacant Vehicle Parking Spaces Only) under Application No. A/KC/353 for a Period of 3 Years in "Residential (Group A)" zone, Kwai Chung Estate, Kwai Chung  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/398)

---

55.            Noting that the three s.16 applications were similar in nature and were all submitted by Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), Members agreed that the three applications should be considered together.

56.            The Secretary reported that the applications were submitted by HKHA. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

- Mr. K.K. Ling            -    being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA
  
- Mr. Frankie Chou       -    being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA
  
- Mr. Simon Wang        -    being an alternate member for the Director of Lands who was a member of HKHA
  
- Mr. Dominic Lam        -    having current business dealings with HKHA

Ms. Julia Lau - being a member of HKHA and Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA

57. The Committee noted that Mr. Chou and Mr. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and the Chairman had left the meeting already. As the interests of Mr. Wang and Ms. Lau were considered direct, the Committee agreed that they should leave the meeting temporarily.

[Mr. Simon Wang and Ms. Julia Lau left the meeting at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

58. With the aid of a powerpoint, Ms. Fannie Hung, STP/TWK, presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Papers:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approvals for temporary public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) (vacant vehicle parking spaces only) under application No. A/TW/411, application No. A/TWK/6 and application No. A/KC/353 for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the each Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comment on the applications;
- (d) no local objection was received by the District Officer (Tsuen Wan) for application No. A/TW/446 and the District Officer (Kwai Tsing) for application No. A/TWK/8 and application No. A/KC/398;
- (e) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period of application No. A/TW/446, two public comments were received. The first comment from a District Council member objected to the application due to the changes in the number of car parking spaces in some areas. The other

comment from Designing Hong Kong Limited appreciated the benefits of utilising vacant parking spaces. However, letting out of parking spaces to non-residents should only be allowed when the demand of residents was fully satisfied at affordable parking fees. The applicant should seek permanent land use approval as the subject use under continuously renewal application was no longer in temporary status;

- (f) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period of application No. A/TWK/8, two public comments were received. The first comment considered that more space should be allocated for residential purpose as Hong Kong was lacking space for public housing. The second comment submitted by Designing Hong Kong, was similar to the one received under application No. A/TW/446 submitted by the same commenter;
- (g) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period for application No. A/KC/398, no public comment was received;
- (h) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of each Paper. With regard to the public comment under application No. A/TW/446 expressing concern on the changes in number of car parking spaces in some areas, the applicant indicated that the application involved only the vacant car parking spaces that would not affect meeting the resident's parking demand. Regarding the comments from Designing Hong Kong under application No. A/TW/446 and application No. A/TWK/8, the proposed continued letting of vacant monthly parking spaces would not compromise the rights of the residents because HKHA would continue to offer the highest priority to residents in renting out the parking spaces. The monthly charges for both residents and non-residents would also be the same. Conditions requiring the applicant to accord priority to the residents of the concerned estate in the letting of the vacant monthly vehicle parking spaces and to seek the Commissioner for Transport's agreement on the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents could address

the commenter's concern. The number of public car parking spaces to be let to non-residents would need to be monitored in order to meet the demand of residents from time to time. In this regard, a temporary planning approval could allow the applicant to review the demand and the vacant monthly car parking spaces for letting. Permanent approval was therefore considered inappropriate. As regards the public comment on more spaces should be allocated for residential purpose under application No. A/TWK/8, the spaces under the application were within the setting of existing car parks and thus not suitable for dwelling purpose.

59. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms. Fannie Hung, STP/TWK, responded that the use applied under the current applications was 'public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle)' and no container vehicle would be allowed. With reference to the site photos shown on Plans A-4 and A-5 of the Paper for application No. A/TW/446, the same Member said that there were container vehicles parked in the public vehicle park and asked whether the applied surplus car parking spaces for non-residents would allow the parking of container vehicle. Mr. K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, replied that the vacant car parking spaces under application No. A/TW/446 were mainly parking spaces for private cars and light goods vehicle. The Secretary suggested that the applicant should be reminded that the planning permission given was for public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) and the parking of container vehicle was not allowed.

60. In response to another Member's enquiry, Mr. K.T. Ng replied that for application No. A/TW/446, the parking facilities included both covered and open-air parking spaces. The covered parking spaces were within three one-storey car parks provided under the podium of residential blocks and one multi-storey car park above the bus terminus.

#### Deliberation Session

61. While having no objection to these applications as they could better utilise the public resources, a Member considered that more greening should be provided in open-air car park to help improve the environment and reduce urban heat island effect.

62. Another Member had concern on the parking of container vehicle in the housing

estate which might cause danger to residents, in particular children. In response to the Vice-chairman's enquiry, Ms. Fannie Hung responded that the parking spaces within the housing estates included parking spaces for light goods vehicle. The same Member referred to the site photo in Plan A-5 of the Paper for application No. A/TW/446 and asked whether the vehicles shown in the photo were light goods vehicles. Mr. Albert Lee clarified that the vehicles were light goods vehicles and he agreed that the applicant should be reminded not to allow the parking of container vehicles in the public vehicle park.

63. The Vice-chairman concluded that the applicant should be advised to incorporate more greening in open-air car park to improve the environment and to strengthen its management against the parking of container vehicle in the public vehicle park.

64. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve application No. A/TW/446 on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 26.5.2013 to 25.5.2016, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition:

Priority should be accorded to the residents of Lei Muk Shue Estate in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.

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

- (a) to review and keep a record of the conditions of the use of parking spaces regularly so as to ensure well management in utilizing the public resources and avoid exploiting the right of letting of monthly vehicle parking spaces in the car park by the residents;
- (b) consideration might be given to letting the vacant vehicle parking spaces to non-governmental organizations for other uses so as to fully utilize the vacant vehicle parking spaces in the subject housing estate;

- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection that the Recommended Pollution Control Clauses for Construction Contracts should be followed;
- (d) more greening should be provided in the open-air car park to improve the environment; and
- (e) appropriate management measures should be taken to ensure that no parking of container vehicle was allowed in the public vehicle park.

66. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve application No. A/TWK/8 on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 26.5.2013 to 25.5.2016, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition:

Priority should be accorded to the residents of Kwai Shing West Estate, Lai King Estate and Lai Yiu Estate in Kwai Chung, and Cheung Ching Estate in Tsing Yi in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.

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

- (a) to review and keep a record of the conditions of the use of parking spaces regularly so as to ensure well management in utilizing the public resources and avoid exploiting the right of letting of monthly vehicle parking spaces in the car parks by the residents;
- (b) consideration might be given to letting the vacant vehicle parking spaces to non-governmental organizations for other uses so as to fully utilize the vacant vehicle parking spaces in the subject housing estates;
- (c) to note the comments of the Independent Checking Unit, Housing Department that the total plot ratio (PR) of the estate including the additional gross floor area of the proposed public car park should comply

with the permitted PR under Building (Planning) Regulation 21;

- (d) more greening should be provided in the open-air car parks to improve the environment; and
- (e) appropriate management measures should be taken to ensure that no parking of container vehicle was allowed in the public vehicle parks.

68. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve application No. A/KC/398 on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 26.5.2013 to 25.5.2016, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition:

Priority should be accorded to the residents of Kwai Chung Estate in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.

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

- (a) to review and keep a record of the conditions of the use of parking spaces regularly so as to ensure well management in utilizing the public resources and avoid exploiting the right of letting of monthly vehicle parking spaces in the car park by the residents;
- (b) consideration might be given to letting the vacant vehicle parking spaces to non-governmental organizations for other uses so as to fully utilize the vacant vehicle parking spaces in the subject housing estate;
- (c) to note the comments of the Independent Checking Unit, Housing Department that the total plot ratio (PR) of the estate including the additional gross floor area of the proposed public car park should comply with the permitted PR under Building (Planning) Regulation 21; and
- (d) appropriate management measures should be taken to ensure that no

parking of container vehicle was allowed in the public vehicle park.

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

**Agenda Item 16**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TY/121                      Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) (Vacant Car Parking Spaces Only) and Minor Relaxation of Non-Domestic Plot Ratio (from 0.05 to 0.2) for the Proposed Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) in "Residential (Group A)" zone, Easeful Court, Tsing King Road, Tsing Yi  
(MPC Paper No. A/TY/121)

---

70.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr. K.K. Ling                -    being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA

Mr. Frankie Chou         -    being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA

Mr. Simon Wang            -    being an alternate member for the Director of Lands who was a member of HKHA

Mr. Dominic Lam          -    having current business dealings with HKHA

Ms. Julia Lau              -    being a member of HKHA and Commercial

Properties Committee and Tender Committee of  
HKHA

71. The Committee noted that Mr. Chou and Mr. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, the Chairman had left the meeting already and Mr. Wang and Ms. Lau had left the meeting temporarily.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) (vacant car parking spaces only) and minor relaxation of non-domestic plot ratio (PR) (from 0.05 to 0.2) for the proposed public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comment 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 (Kwai Tsing); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to partially approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. According to the applicant's information, the vacancy rate of the monthly parking spaces fluctuated over time ranging from 19% for the year 2012/2013 to 56% for the year 2009/2010. There was insufficient information to justify the actual parking demand of both residents and non-residents. In view of the fluctuation of the vacancy rate, it was considered not appropriate to permit a permanent relaxation of

non-domestic PR for the Court as it might set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments and might deprive the right of the residents in case the actual demand of the residents rose in the future. Therefore, similar to previous applications, the current application should be approved on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years so that the applicant could let parking spaces flexibly while the parking demand of the residents could be reviewed after three years.

73. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

74. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 3.5.2016, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition:

Priority should be accorded to the residents of Easeful Court in Tsing Yi in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.

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

- (a) to review and keep a record of the conditions of the use of parking spaces regularly so as to ensure well management in utilizing the public resources and avoid exploiting the right of letting of monthly vehicle parking spaces in the car park by the residents;
- (b) consideration might be given to letting the vacant vehicle parking spaces to non-governmental organizations for other uses so as to fully utilize the vacant vehicle parking spaces in the subject housing estate;
- (c) to note the comments of the Independent Checking Unit, Housing Department that the total plot ratio (PR) of the estate including the

additional gross floor area of the proposed public car park should comply with the permitted PR under Building (Planning) Regulation 21;

- (d) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing, Lands Department that the owners of the concerned premises were required to apply to his Office for a temporary waiver of the relevant lease conditions; and
- (e) appropriate management measures should be taken to ensure that no parking of container vehicle was allowed in the public vehicle park.

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

### **Agenda Item 17**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TY/122

Proposed Residential Institution (Redevelopment of Fok Ying Tung Hall of Residence) in "Government, Institution or Community" zone, Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (Tsing Yi), Nos. 20, 20A and 22 Tsing Yi Road, Tsing Yi (Tsing Yi Town Lot 123)  
(MPC Paper No. A/TY/122)

---

76. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Vocational Training Council (VTC) with Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd (Ove Arup) as one of the applicant's consultants. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr. Dominic Lam - having current business dealings with VTC and Ove Arup

Mr. Patrick Lau - having current business dealings with VTC and Ove

Arup

Prof. S.C. Wong - being the traffic consultant of Ove Arup and being the Director of the Institute of Transport Studies of the University of Hong Kong and Ove Arup had sponsored some activities of the Institute

77. The Committee noted that Mr. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the applicant had requested a deferral of consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Mr. Lau and Professor Wong could stay in the meeting.

78. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 30.4.2013 for deferment of the consideration of the application to the next meeting on 24.5.2013 in order to allow more time for preparation of supplementary information to address the comments from government departments and to provide justifications for the proposed scheme.

79. 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 three weeks 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 18**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H15/255                      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) (Vacant Vehicle Parking Spaces Only) under Application No. A/H15/239 for a Period of 3 Years in "Residential (Group A)" zone, Shek Pai Wan Estate, Aberdeen (MPC Paper No. A/H15/255)

---

80.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr. K.K. Ling                -    being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA

Mr. Frankie Chou         -    being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA

Mr. Simon Wang            -    being an alternate member for the Director of Lands who was a member of HKHA

Mr. Dominic Lam          -    having current business dealings with HKHA

Ms. Julia Lau                -    being a member of HKHA and Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA

81.            The Committee noted that Mr. Chou and Mr. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, the Chairman had left the meeting already and Mr. Wang and Ms. Lau had left the meeting temporarily.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) (vacant vehicle parking spaces only) under application No. A/H15/239 for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment from Designing Hong Kong Limited was received. The commenter appreciated the benefits of utilizing vacant parking spaces but pointed out that letting parking to non-residents should only be allowed when the demand of residents was fully satisfied at an affordable fee, to avoid residents being forced to park on unauthorized pavements and other areas in the vicinity. In addition, the continuous approval of such renewal application would in fact turn the use to permanent and the temporary status was no longer appropriate. The applicant should seek for permanent land use approval. No local objection was received by the District Officer (Southern); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Regarding the public comment on sufficient car parking spaces should be reserved for the residents of the subject estate, the applicant confirmed that only vacant parking spaces would be let to non-residents. An approval condition was recommended in this regard. As to the comment that permanent land use approval should be sought, the proposed tenure of 3 years of the planning permission under application was considered reasonable so

that the vacant parking spaces could be let to non-residents flexibly while parking demand of the residents could be further reviewed.

83. In response to a Member's enquiry on the planning condition recommended, Ms. Isabel Yiu replied that TD would review the parking demand of the residents in Shek Pai Wan Estate in determining the number of vacant parking spaces that could be let to non-residents. It was intended to give priority to residents in Shek Pai Wan Estate for renting car parking spaces and only vacant car parking spaces would be let to non-residents.

### Deliberation Session

84. The same Member opined that letting out of vacant car parking spaces of public housing estates to non-residents would increase the supply of car parking spaces in the surrounding area which might in turn encourage car ownership. In view of the large number of vacant car parking spaces in public housing estates, this Member asked whether the standard of car parking provision in public housing estates would be reviewed. Ms. Yiu replied that the letting out of vacant car parking spaces in public housing estates to non-residents was intended to better utilise public resources. TD would review the relevant car parking standard as stipulated in Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines at an opportune time.

85. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms. Yiu responded that the total number of monthly car parking spaces had reduced from 314 to 178 as compared with the previously approved application as some car parking spaces had been converted for social welfare facilities use. In the current application, the private car and motor cycle parking spaces to be rented out to non-residents would be 22 (12%) and 6 (6%) respectively.

86. The same Member suggested that similar to other cases, the applicant should be reminded not to allow parking of container vehicle in the public vehicle park. Other Members agreed.

87. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 26.5.2013 to 25.5.2016, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following

condition :

Priority should be accorded to the residents of Shek Pai Wan Estate in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.

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

- (a) to review and keep a record of the conditions of the use of parking spaces regularly so as to ensure well management in utilizing the public resources and avoid exploiting the right of letting of monthly vehicle parking spaces by the residents;
- (b) consideration might be given to letting the vacant vehicle parking spaces to non-governmental organizations for other uses so as to fully utilize the vacant vehicle parking spaces in Shek Pai Wan Estate; and
- (c) appropriate management measures should be taken to ensure that no parking of container vehicle was allowed in the public vehicle park.

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

[Mr. Simon Wang and Ms. Julia Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. K.S. Ng, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 19**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H1/95                      Proposed Hotel in "Residential (Group A)" zone, No. 10-12 Yat Fu Lane, Shek Tong Tsui  
(MPC Paper No. A/H1/95A)

---

89.            The Committee noted that a petition letter from Legislative Council Member the Honourable Sin Chung Kai and Mr. Yeung Sui Yin objecting to the application was submitted to the Board before the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

90.            With the aid of a powerpoint, Mr. K.S. Ng, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a)    background to the application;
- (b)    the proposed hotel;

[Professor C.M. Hui left the meeting at this point.]

- (c)    departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Tourism supported the application as the proposed development would increase the number of hotel rooms, broaden the range of accommodations for visitors and support the rapid development of convention and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries. The Commissioner of Police (C of P) had concern on large vehicles (mainly coaches and goods vehicles related to the operations of hotel) entering and leaving Yat Fu Lane as Yat Fu Lane was a narrow street at which vehicles were difficult to make a ‘U’ turn in the limited area. The C of P had no authority to prevent coach or minibus from entering the private land portion of Yat Fu Lane. The construction of the proposed hotel

would invariably increase both the pedestrian and traffic flows in the vicinity. In particular, as there was no pavement between Yat Fu Lane and Queen's Road West, the increase in pedestrian and traffic flows would have safety concern. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comment on the application;

- (d) the District Officer (Central & Western) advised that the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) discussed a paper on 8.7.2010 objecting to the previous application for hotel use (No. A/H1/92) at the application site, which was rejected by the Committee on 5.6.2010. It was expected that some DC members would raise concern on the current application given its similar nature with the previous application. In particular, it was noted that some DC members had raised strong concerns on possible impact of the proposed hotel on traffic, environment and air ventilation. These concerns were also shared by some local groups. Due consideration should be given to these concerns. A District Minor Work project was proposed to improve the condition of the private road of Yat Fu Lane in 2009. However, no improvement works could be done as the owners of the private road could not be contacted. Subject to Transport Department (TD)'s advice, the condition of the private road might not be suitable for accommodating the possible traffic flow arising from the proposed hotel development; and
- (e) during the first three weeks of the three statutory public inspection periods of the application and further information, a total of 304 public comments raising objection to the application from Legislative Council member, C&WDC members, owners' corporations (OCs) of the nearby buildings, the Designing Hong Kong Limited, a nursing centre and the general public were received. The major views were summarized as follows:
  - (i) Yat Fu Lane was a narrow road with high pedestrian flow and more pedestrians would be anticipated after the commencement of the West Island Line (WIL). The increase in traffic flow and loading/unloading activities outside the hotel would aggravate the traffic problem,

resulting in a traffic bottleneck in the portion of the road next to the proposed hotel, and block the traffic going through South Lane to Queen's Road West. There were road accidents due to difficulty in making 'U' turn in the narrow road. Besides, the existing width of Yat Fu Lane could not meet the requirement of emergency vehicular access. The proposed hotel development would bring adverse traffic impacts to the area, affect the operation of emergency vehicles and fire trucks and endanger the health of local residents. The traffic induced by hotel operation would affect the business of the shops at the street;

- (ii) the traffic impact assessment (TIA) submitted by the applicant was not comprehensive and could not reflect the real situation. The provision of a vehicle lay-by on G/F and the undertaking letter of no coach operation could not address the traffic problem generated by the proposed hotel. Transport Department's proposal to restrict vehicles from entering Yat Fu Lane was supported. The traffic survey submitted by the applicant should be conducted in different periods of time, as well as after the commencement of the WIL to assess the additional traffic flow in the area;
- (iii) the private land ownership of Yat Fu Lane made it difficult for traffic management, implementation of road improvement scheme and enforcement against illegal parking;
- (iv) the proposed hotel development would cause security, hygiene, fire safety, view blocking, glare pollution, drainage and sewerage problems, and air and noise nuisances to local residents. It would adversely affect the sunlight penetration and air ventilation of the area. The tranquil environment would be destroyed. The health of the local residents and also the property value of the nearby building would be affected;
- (v) the proposed hotel would increase the development density of the

district and adversely affect the living environment. It was incompatible with the surrounding residential developments. More land resources should be allocated to meet the high demand of residential flats; and

- (vi) the site was not suitable for hotel development due to small area and triangular shape. The small lobby and room size of the proposed hotel and the lack of reasonable hotel services could not attract high-ended tourists and had limited contribution to the tourism industry. There was no planning merit to approve the planning application;
- (f) the petition letter submitted before the meeting raised similar concerns as those in the public comments and mainly related to adverse impact on traffic and pedestrian safety; the building height of the hotel development would cause adverse impact on visual, air ventilation and natural lighting; and the site was too small and not suitable for hotel development; and
- (g) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The application site was located in a predominant residential neighbourhood. While the proposed hotel development was not incompatible with the land uses in the vicinity, the cumulative effect of changing residential land for non-residential uses might result in a reduction of sites for residential developments. Given the current shortfall in housing supply, residential sites should be developed for its zoned use unless the site was very conducive for hotel development, or development for hotel would meet a specified planning objective. Given the site was intended for high-density residential development and in view of the current acute shortage of housing land, there was no strong justification to redevelop a site planned for residential use for hotel development. The application site was relatively small in size (with an area of 171.3m<sup>2</sup> and a net site area of 140.782m<sup>2</sup> only) when compared with other sites within the planning scheme area with similar hotel applications approved (ranging from 310m<sup>2</sup> to 1,661m<sup>2</sup> except application No. A/H1/86). The small site

area and its triangular configuration made the site not conducive to a decent hotel development. In the previous scheme (No. A/H1/93), the Committee had concerns on the site area and its configuration, and the application was rejected for the reasons that the application site was not conducive to hotel development given its small site area and triangular configuration, and there was no planning merit to justify the proposed hotel development. The current application was similar to the previously rejected scheme in terms of small site area, triangular configuration and lack of hotel amenities. The C of P had concerns on large vehicles entering and leaving Yat Fu Lane since it was difficult to make a 'U' turn in the narrow street. The proposed hotel would increase both pedestrian and traffic flows in the vicinity which would cause safety concern.

91. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr. K.S. Ng replied that the hatched area at the northern boundary of the application site as indicated in Drawing A-1 of the Paper, which was a proposed non-building area, formed part of a service lane with a width of 3m. According to an Agreement to Surrender dated 15.3.1977, the registered owners agreed to surrender a portion of the lot (about 12.63m<sup>2</sup>), i.e. about half of the hatched area, along the northern boundary of the application site for road improvement works when required by the Government.

#### Deliberation Session

92. Noting that one of the rejection reasons of the previous application was related to pedestrian safety, the Vice-chairman asked whether the same reason should be included for the subject application. Mr. Ng responded that the C for T had no objection to the application as the applicant had proposed a vehicle lay-by for loading/unloading purpose and a footpath on the ground floor in the current application. As TD had no objection to the application, pedestrian safety was not included as a rejection reason. In response to the Secretary's enquiry, Mr. Albert Lee said that TD was the authority on pedestrian safety while the Police was the enforcement agent. He confirmed that TD had no objection to the application from traffic viewpoint.

93. With reference to paragraph 4.2 of the Paper and noting that TD had no objection

to the current scheme, a Member asked whether there would be any implication on the previous application No. A/H1/93 which was rejected on traffic ground and the applicant had applied for an appeal of the decision of the Board. Another Member shared this Member's view and asked whether it was possible for the applicant to revise the scheme under appeal to tally with the current scheme of which TD had no objection. The Secretary explained that each application should be considered on its terms as submitted to the Board and on its individual merits. Hence, Members should consider the current application based on the scheme as submitted in the application. The appeal of the previous scheme would be considered separately by the Town Planning Appeal Board (TPAB). It would be up to TPAB to decide whether the TPAB would allow the applicant to make amendments to the previous scheme to tally with the current scheme under application.

94. 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) the application site was located in a predominant residential neighbourhood. Given the current shortfall in housing supply, the site should be developed for its zoned use. The proposed hotel development would result in reduction of sites for residential developments, which would affect the supply of housing land in meeting the pressing housing demand over the territory;
- (b) the application site was not conducive to hotel development given its small site area and triangular configuration; and
- (c) there were no planning merits to justify the proposed hotel development.

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

**Agenda Item 20**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H10/83                      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Flat (Government Quarters for Lease) under Application No. A/H10/77 for a Period of 3 Months and 3 Days in "Government, Institution or Community" zone, 122 Pok Fu Lam Road, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H10/83)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

95.                      With the aid of a powerpoint, Mr. K.S. Ng, STP/HK, 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 'flat' use (government quarters for lease) under Application No. A/H10/77 from 28.6.2013 to 30.9.2013, i.e. a period of 3 months and 3 days;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. All concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comment 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 (Southern); 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.

96.                      Members had no question on the application.

## Deliberation Session

97. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 months and 3 days from 28.6.2013 to 30.9.2013, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition:

The provision of fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

[The Vice-chairman thanked Mr. K.S. Ng, STP/HK, 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.]

## **Agenda Item 21**

### Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H4/91 Proposed Temporary Installation of Telecommunications Radio Base Station for a Period of 5 Years in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Pier" zone, Portions of Top Roof, Roof Floor, Western Berth of 1/F and G/F of Central Pier No. 2, Central  
(MPC Paper No. A/H4/91)

---

98. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (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. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Mr. Lau and Ms. Lau were considered direct, the Committee agreed that they should leave the meeting temporarily.

[Mr. Patrick Lau left the meeting and Ms. Julia Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

### Presentation and Question Sessions

99. With the aid of a powerpoint, Ms. April K.Y. Kun, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary installation of telecommunications radio base station for a period of 5 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. The Director-General of Communications, Office of the Communications Authority supported the application as the proposed telecommunications radio station would enhance the mobile service in the vicinity of Central Pier. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comment 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 (Central and Western); 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.

100. Noting that the proposed radio base facilities would be installed within the ventilation structure, a Member asked whether further application would be required for any changes to the current scheme in future. Ms. April Kun replied that planning application would be required if there would be any changes to the current scheme.

### Deliberation Session

101. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 3.5.2018, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition:

The provision of fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

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

- (a) to note the comment of the Government Property Administrator on the need to apply for commercial concession areas for the proposed uses under the tenancy agreement; and
- (b) to note the comments of the Director of Marine that the proposed installations should not interfere any maritime band radio equipment that were currently used by the Marine Department.

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

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 22**

##### **Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting]

Y/K11/4                      Application for Amendment to the Approved Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill & San Po Kong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K11/25, to Rezone the Application Site from "Government, Institution or Community" to "Residential (Group C)", No.99 Shatin Pass Road, Wong Tai Sin  
(MPC Paper No. Y/K11/4)

---

103. The Secretary reported that MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) was one of the

consultants of the applicant. Mr. Patrick Lau, Mr. Dominic Lam and Ms. Julia Lau who had current business dealings with MVA had declared interests in this item. The Committee noted that Mr. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, Mr. Lau had left the meeting and Ms. Lau had not returned to join the meeting yet.

104. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 26.4.2013 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments.

105. 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 three 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. Bonnie Chan left the meeting at this point.]

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

### **Agenda Items 23, 24 and 25**

#### **Section 16 Applications**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K/12                      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Public Vehicle Parks (excluding Container Vehicle) (Vacant Vehicle Parking Spaces only) under Application No. A/K/9 for a Period of 3 Years in "Residential (Group A)" zone, (a) Ma Tau Wai Estate, Kowloon City and (b) Sheung Lok Estate, Ho Man Tin  
(MPC Paper No. A/K/12)

---

A/K/13                      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Public Vehicle Parks (excluding Container Vehicle) (Vacant Vehicle Parking Spaces only) under Application No. A/K/10 for a Period of 3 Years in "Residential (Group A)" and "Open Space" zones, (a) Wan Hon Estate and (b) Wo Lok Estate, Kwun Tong  
(MPC Paper No. A/K/13)

---

A/K15/109                  Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) (Vacant Vehicle Parking Spaces only) under Application No. A/K15/95 for a Period of 3 Years in "Residential (Group A)" zone, Yau Chui Court, Yau Tong  
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/109)

---

106.            Noting that the three s.16 applications were similar in nature and were all submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), Members agreed that these applications should be considered together.

107.            The Secretary reported that the applications were submitted by the HKHA. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr. K.K. Ling            -    being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA

Mr. Frankie Chou      -    being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA

Mr. Simon Wang        -    being an alternate member for the Director of Lands who was a member of HKHA

Mr. Dominic Lam        -    having current business dealings with HKHA

Ms. Julia Lau            -    being a member of HKHA and Commercial

Properties Committee and Tender Committee of  
HKHA

108. The Committee noted that Mr. Chou and Mr. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, the Chairman had left the meeting already and Ms. Lau had left the meeting temporarily. As the interest of Mr. Wang was considered direct, the Committee agreed that he should leave the meeting temporarily.

[Mr. Simon Wang left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approvals for temporary public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) (vacant vehicle parking spaces only) under application No. A/K/9, application No. A/K/10 and application No. A/K15/95 for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Papers. Concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comment on the application;
- (d) no local objection was received by the District Officer (Kowloon City) for application No. A/K/12 and the District Officer (Kwun Tong) for application No. A/K/13 and application No. A/K15/109;
- (e) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period of application No. A/K/12, one public comment from Designing Hong Kong Limited was received. The commenter raised concern that letting parking spaces to non-residents should only be allowed when the demand of residents was fully satisfied at affordable parking fees to avoid residents

being forced to park on pavements or other unauthorized areas. He also suggested the applicant to seek permanent land use approval as the use was in fact permanent with the continuous renewal of the application.; and

- (f) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period of application No. A/K/13, three public comments were received. Two comments, one from a member of Kwun Tong District Council and another from the Chairman of Kwun Tong Area Committee, supported the application without giving any reasons. The remaining comment from the Designing Hong Kong Limited was similar to the public comment submitted under application No. A/K/12;
- (g) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period of application No. A/K15/109, no public comment was received;
- (h) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of each Paper. Regarding the public comments from Designing Hong Kong Limited that the parking demand of the residents should be fully satisfied in first priority, an approval condition requiring the applicant to accord priority to the residents of the subject estates in letting of the vacant parking spaces, as in the previous approvals, was recommended. Regarding whether application for permanent land use was more appropriate, temporary planning approval could allow flexibility for the letting of vacant parking spaces to non-residents while the parking demand of the residents could be further reviewed regularly.

110. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

111. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve application No. A/K/12 on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 12.6.2013 to 11.6.2016, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following

condition :

Priority should be accorded to the residents of Ma Tau Wai Estate and Sheung Lok Estate in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.

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

- (a) to review and keep a record of the conditions of the use of parking spaces regularly so as to ensure well management in utilizing the public resources and avoid exploiting the right of letting of monthly vehicle parking spaces in the vehicle parks by the residents;
- (b) to ensure compliance of the lease conditions of Ma Tau Wai Estate and the Vesting Order of Sheung Lok Estate. The applicant might apply to Lands Department to seek compliance of lease conditions of Ma Tau Wai Estate;
- (c) consideration might be given to letting the vacant vehicle parking spaces to non-governmental organizations for other uses so as to fully utilize the vacant vehicle parking spaces in the subject housing estates;
- (d) more greening should be provided in the open-air car parks to improve the environment; and
- (e) appropriate management measures should be taken to ensure that no parking of container vehicle was allowed in the public vehicle parks.

113. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve application No. A/K/13 on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 29.5.2013 to 28.5.2016, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition :

Priority should be accorded to the residents of Wan Hon Estate and Wo Lok

Estate in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.

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

- (a) to review and keep a record of the conditions of the use of parking spaces regularly so as to ensure well management in utilizing the public resources and avoid exploiting the right of letting of monthly vehicle parking spaces in the vehicle parks by the residents;
- (b) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department for a temporary waiver to effect the use at Wo Lok Estate;
- (c) consideration might be given to letting the vacant vehicle parking spaces to non-governmental organizations for other uses so as to fully utilize the vacant vehicle parking spaces in the subject housing estates;
- (d) more greening should be provided in the open-air car parks to improve the environment; and
- (e) appropriate management measures should be taken to ensure that no parking of container vehicle was allowed in the public vehicle parks.

115. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve application No. A/K15/109 on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 26.5.2013 to 25.5.2016, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition:

Priority should be accorded to the residents of Yau Tong Estate, Yau Chui Court and Yau Lai Estate in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.

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

- (a) to review and keep a record of the conditions of the use of parking spaces regularly so as to ensure well management in utilizing the public resources and avoid exploiting the right of letting of monthly vehicle parking spaces by the residents;
- (b) consideration might be given to letting the vacant vehicle parking spaces to non-governmental organizations for other uses so as to fully utilize the vacant vehicle parking spaces in the subject housing estates/courts; and
- (c) appropriate management measures should be taken to ensure that no parking of container vehicle was allowed in the public vehicle park.

**Agenda Item 26**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K15/110                      Temporary Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) (Vacant Vehicle Parking Spaces only) for a Period of 5 Years in "Residential (Group A)" Zone, Lei Yue Mun Estate, Yau Tong  
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/110)

---

117.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr. K.K. Ling                -    being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA

Mr. Frankie Chou           -    being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA

- Mr. Simon Wang - being an alternate member for the Director of Lands who was a member of HKHA
- Mr. Dominic Lam - having current business dealings with HKHA
- Ms. Julia Lau - being a member of HKHA and Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA

118. The Committee noted that Mr. Chou and Mr. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, the Chairman had left the meeting already and Mr. Wang and Ms. Lau had left the meeting temporarily.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

119. 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 temporary public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) (vacant vehicle parking spaces only) for a period of 5 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comment 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 (Kwun Tong); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to partially approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The subject vehicle park was previously approved for the same temporary use

for 3 years by the Committee three times with the latest approved application (No. A/K/10) valid up to 28.5.2013. In the current application, the applicant applied for fresh application for the same temporary use for a period of 5 years. Similar applications for the same temporary use in other Public Rental Housing estates / Home Ownership Scheme courts were approved by the Committee on a temporary basis for 3 years. The applicant had not provided any justification for proposing a longer period in the current application. It was considered that should the Committee approve the application, the same period of 3-years tenure as in the previous and other similar applications was recommended so that the vacant parking spaces could be let to non-residents flexibly while the parking demand of the residents could be further reviewed more regularly, in particular, after completion of the Lei Yue Mun Phase 3 development in 2015.

#### Deliberation Session

120. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 3.5.2016, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition:

Priority should be accorded to the residents of Lei Yue Mun Estate in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.

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

- (a) to review and keep a record of the conditions of the use of parking spaces regularly so as to ensure well management in utilizing the public resources and avoid exploiting the right of letting of monthly vehicle parking spaces by the residents;
- (b) consideration might be given to letting the vacant vehicle parking spaces to

non-governmental organizations for other uses so as to fully utilize the vacant vehicle parking spaces in the subject housing estate;

- (c) more greening should be provided in the open-air car park to improve the environment; and
- (d) appropriate management measures should be taken to ensure that no parking of container vehicle was allowed in the public vehicle park.

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

[Mr. Simon Wan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

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

### **Agenda Item 27**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K18/300                      Proposed School (Kindergarten) in "Residential (Group C) 1" zone, 41  
Cumberland Road, Kowloon Tong  
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/300)

---

122.            The Secretary reported that MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr. Patrick Lau, Mr. Dominic Lam and Ms. Julia Lau who had current business dealings with MVA had declared interests in this item. The Committee noted that Mr. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, Mr. Lau and Ms. Lau had left the meeting.

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

123.            With the aid of a visualiser, 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 school (kindergarten);
- (c) departmental comments –departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) did not support the application. Cumberland Road was very congested with pick-up/drop-off activities of students by private cars/school bus during school peak hours because there were many schools along Cumberland Road. The traffic impact assessment (TIA) had over-estimated the usable kerbside length at Cumberland Road and hence underestimated the kerbside utilization. Transport Department (TD) had grave concern that traffic flows at Cumberland Road including its junction with Essex Crescent would be severely affected due to the influx of pick-up/drop-off activities associated with the proposed school. According to the forecasted junction capacities in the TIA, the reserved capacity of key junctions would be reduced to unacceptable level in year 2017. Further reduction of junction capacity by the proposed school was undesirable from traffic point of view. The applicant proposed to modify junction at Waterloo Road and Hereford Road to increase reserved junction capacity. However, there was no guarantee that the modification scheme could be implementable. The TIA failed to convince that the proposed school hours could avoid traffic jam. While it was proposed to restrict all pick-up/set-down within campus, there were insufficient internal circulation spaces for such internal pick-up/set-down arrangement. Also, the proposed parking layout and swept path of car/taxi/school bus were undesirable. The proposed run-in/out of the proposed school would be close to the junction of Essex Crescent and Cumberland Road. Queuing up of vehicles at Cumberland Road might cause tailing back of vehicles to Essex Crescent, Stafford Road and even Waterloo Road. Pick-up/drop-off of students by private cars/taxi would inevitably be taken place fronting the proposed school and occupy the roadside of Cumberland Road. The actual number of students joining

school bus service might be over-estimated and consequently would cause additional influx of pick-up/drop-off activities of private cars at Cumberland Road up to an intolerable level. The Commissioner of Police (C of P) objected to the application as the kindergartens/schools in the proximity of the subject location had already created an undesirable traffic situation on a daily basis. Addition of another school in the area would further aggravate the problem. The traffic condition of Cumberland Road was very congested during school peak hours due to the pick-up/drop-off activities by school buses and private cars. Additional influx of pick-up/drop-off activities at Cumberland Road would bring the congestion up to an intolerable level. Other concerned government departments had no objection or adverse comment on the application;

- (d) the District Officer (Kowloon City) advised that both the local residents and the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) members had all along been concerned about the traffic congestion problem in the Kowloon Tong area. They were worried that the proposed school development would further worsen the current traffic situation. Their views/comments gathered in the consultation exercise should be seriously considered;
- (e) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a total of 255 public comments were received. 5 comments raised objection to/made adverse comments on the application, while 250 comments supported the application. The major views were summarized as follows:

Objecting reasons

- (i) the proposed development would affect the unique character of the residential neighbourhood in the vicinity; .
- (ii) the Town Planning Board (TPB) did not have a limit on school applications. However, if the planning approval was granted, whether these schools would fulfil the approval conditions was in doubt;

- (iii) the traffic in Kowloon Tong was over-saturated. During school peak hours, dozens of parents drive their private cars to pick-up and drop-off their children. These parents completely ignored the traffic regulations and order. In addition, school buses parked on the streets outside the school also constituted traffic congestion;
- (iv) the proposed development would aggravate the already grave traffic situation, posing potential risk/danger to the safety of the pedestrians;
- (v) the proposed development would give rise to air and noise pollution from the vehicles, construction dust and noise of school premises, which would harm the health and quality of life of the students and residents in the vicinity;
- (vi) there were already too many schools including kindergartens in Kowloon Tong. Presence of too many schools in the area would lead to competition amongst schools, and might lead to vicious cycle of schools running out of business, which was not fair to other existing school operators;

Supporting reasons

- (vii) the proposed development would provide a nicer and better education facilities and a more comfortable, safe and healthy learning environment to the students;
- (viii) the proposed school could help meet the increasing demand for school places. With the proposed expansion, more students could be benefited from the school philosophy, vision and teaching methods;
- (ix) the provision of “School Bus Only Campus” would ease off traffic congestion. Traffic/pedestrian issues should not be a major concern; and

- (x) the proposed development provided an opportunity to revitalise this old and historic hotel building and provide better school facilities to the students;
  
- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper. As there were schools, religious institutions, elderly homes and GIC uses in the vicinity, the proposed kindergarten was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Nevertheless, cumulative effect of converting or redeveloping residential land for non-residential uses might adversely affect housing land supply. Both C for T and C of P objected to the application on traffic ground as detailed in paragraph 123 (c) above. As the traffic mitigation measures proposed in the TIA could not satisfactorily mitigate the traffic congestion problem, the application did not comply with Town Planning Board (TPB) Guidelines No. 23A. Approval of the current application, which was not in compliance with the TPB Guidelines No. 23A, would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for kindergarten/child care centre in the area.

124. A Member supported that priority should be given to resolving the pressing housing need.

#### Deliberation Session

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

- (a) the proposed development was not in compliance with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 23A in that possible adverse traffic impacts on local roads were anticipated and proposed traffic mitigation measures were considered not effective to tackle the problem; and
  
- (b) the traffic congestion problem in the area was already serious. The

approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would aggravate the traffic congestion of the Kowloon Tong Garden Estate.

**Agenda Item 28**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K18/301            Proposed School (Primary School Activity Rooms) in "Residential (Group C) 1" zone, 15 Kent Road, Kowloon Tong  
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/301)

---

126.            The Secretary reported that Ms. Julia Lau had declared an interest in this item as she had discussed the subject application with the applicant. The Committee noted that Ms. Lau had already withdrawn from the meeting temporarily.

127.            The Committee noted that a letter dated 30.4.2013 submitted by the applicant was tabled at the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

128.            With the aid of a visualiser, 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 supporting activity rooms for extension of a primary school (regarded as 'school' use);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) did not support the subject application. He opined that Kent Road was a district

distributor linking Cornwall Street and local roads in Kowloon Tong Area. Since Kent Road was close to Kowloon Tong MTR Station and was a popular place for people to interchange between MTR and vehicular transport, there were already high volumes of loading/unloading activities of vehicles and passengers waiting for coaches during peak hours. Adding school sites at Kent Road would worsen the traffic situation thereat. There was concern on the potential transfer of student intake capacity to the existing campuses. In other words, the existing campuses would transfer the supporting facilities to the subject site, and recruit more students. The existing Yew Chung International School (YCIS) (Primary Section) located at Kent Road and Somerset Road were already very congested with pick-up/drop-off activities of students by private cars during school peak hours. Additional student intake at these schools would further aggravate traffic congestion. There was no control/monitoring mechanism on whether the application site would be genuinely used for the supporting activity, nor any revocation clause in planning approval condition if the applicant violated the traffic mitigation measures in the planning statement. Monitoring of student intake and operational use of the application site and existing schools was very difficult. Additional school at these critical road links would be an undesirable precedent to future application at Kent Road and other interconnecting roads. The cumulative effect of approving this application would further aggravate the traffic congestion problem at Kent Road and other interconnecting roads. The Commissioner of Police (C of P) had no objection to the application provided that other campuses of YCIS (Primary Section) in Kowloon Tong would not increase the number of students intake each year and that there would be no student intake at 15 Kent Road. Yet, he was concerned about whether other campuses of YCIS (Primary Section) in Kowloon Tong would increase the number of student intake as such increase would have adverse impact on traffic. The Secretary for Education (SED) gave in-principle support to the subject application as it would enable the school to have extra space for student activities and enhance the quality of education for the benefits of students. SED highlighted that there would be a shortage of over 4,000 international primary school places by 2016/17. SED considered that the concern on the impact on traffic might be more

appropriately dealt with by implementing traffic mitigation measures rather than by suppressing the number of students;

- (d) the letter dated 30.4.2013 submitted by the applicant mainly stated that the applicant would not transfer their existing registered student intake capacity to the application site, Education Bureau could monitor the number of student intake and operation use of the application site and existing school campuses, and the applicant would ensure all future additional student intake utilizing the current school bus services;
- (e) the District Officer (Kowloon City) advised that Planning Department (PlanD) had consulted the interested Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) members, the Lung Tong Area Committee as well as the Owners' Committees, Mutual Aid Committees, management committees and residents of buildings near the site directly regarding this planning application. Their comments, if any, should be considered;
- (f) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, 6 public comments were received from nearby residents and kindergartens' principals objecting to the application. The major views were summarized as follows:
  - (i) the Kowloon Tong Garden Estate (KTGE) was planned for residential and there were already too many schools including kindergartens in the area. The proposed extension was not to meet the local need. There was no need in public interest to change the site to school use. The proposed use was contrary to the planning intention of the area and had affected the tranquillity of the residential area;
  - (ii) the traffic along Kent Road was already very congested and heavily blocked up during school hours which affected also Waterloo Road. The proposed development would aggravate the traffic situation posing danger to the safety of pedestrians and creating noise problem.

No traffic impact assessment had been submitted. Kent Road was a pick-up point of cross-border coaches and was the route towards the Kowloon Tong MTR Station. There was no imminent need for the whole society for the proposed extension;

- (iii) international schools usually had generous space for students and should not require supporting classrooms, unless there was over-enrolment or the schools wanted to enrol more students. It was difficult to monitor if students would in fact be enrolled at the application site;
  - (iv) currently, there should be some activity rooms at the other campuses. If these rooms were relocated to the application site, there were concerns about whether YCIS would use the vacated rooms as additional classrooms and how many new students could be admitted; and
  - (v) approval of the application would directly or indirectly result in additional students to be admitted to Yew Chung Schools, appropriate impact assessments should be conducted to assess the impacts arising from such increase.
- (g) the PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper which were summarised below:
- (i) noting that there were schools, religious institutions, elderly homes and GIC uses in the vicinity, the application for use of the existing building for activity rooms of a primary school was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Nevertheless, cumulative effect of converting or redeveloping residential land for non-residential uses might adversely affect housing land supply;
  - (ii) the C for T did not support the application as he was not convinced

that the proposed use under application would not create adverse traffic impact as detailed in paragraph 128 (c) above;

- (iii) the C of P had concern on whether the other 3 campuses of YCIS (Primary Section) in Kowloon Tong would increase the number of student intake as such increase would have adverse traffic impact;
- (iv) according to SED, the total number of pupils permitted for the 3 campuses of the YCIS (Primary Section) in Kowloon Tong was 1043 based on about 30 students per class. The average planned class size of YCIS was around 26 students for 2012/13 school year resulting in a total no. of places of 720 with 28 operating classes. The total no. of pupils admitted in 2012/13 was 648. Hence, with an average planned class size of 26 students, YCIS could admit 72 more students over the total number admitted in 2012/13 school year. If YCIS increased the student intake to its permitted capacity, i.e., 1043, the student intake would be even higher. There was no means to control YCIS to maintain its future student number to the existing level; and
- (v) there was an application (No. A/K18/294) for kindergarten/child care centre, at 7 Kent Road nearby which was rejected by the Board on review on 26.10.2012 for the reasons that adverse traffic impacts were anticipated and no effective traffic mitigation measures were proposed to mitigate the impacts, and that approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications. Though that application was not for primary school use, there was similar concern on the adverse traffic impact created by the pick-up/drop-off activities of students. The traffic condition in the area was very congested in particular during school peak hours. Approval of this application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for primary school use in the area. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would aggravate the traffic congestion of the KTGE.

129. In response to a Member's enquiry on the information in paragraphs 11.4 and 11.5 of the Paper, Ms. S.H. Lam explained that SED had advised that the total number of students permitted for the 3 campuses of the YCIS (Primary Section) in Kowloon Tong was 1043 based on about 30 students per class. According to YCIS, the average planned class size was around 26 students per class for the 2012/13 school year, resulting in a total number of about 720 students with 28 operating classes. However, the actual student intake in 2012/13 was only 648. When compared to the planned student intake, YCIS still had 72 student places in 2012/13 school year. If some activity rooms were relocated to the application site, the surplus classrooms in the existing YCIS campuses might allow more student intake, although the total number of students might not reach the maximum limit of 1043. The same Member considered that school activities should be confined within the campus and doubted whether SED had previously considered that the school had sufficient space to permit a maximum student intake of 30 per class. It appeared that this application suggested that there was currently not sufficient space for the students. Ms. S.H. Lam responded that 30 students per class was a maximum limit. Normally, international school would not admit the full capacity of 30 per class.

130. In response to another Member's enquiry, Ms. Lam said that she had no information in hand on the ratio of local students and foreign students in YCIS.

#### Deliberation Session

131. In response to the Vice-chairman's enquiry, Ms. Lam clarified that SED supported the subject application as there would be a shortage of international primary school places by 2016/17. SED could only provide the maximum number of students permitted and the actual student intake of the school. Whilst the applicant had mentioned that SED could assist in monitoring the number of students admitted, SED said that they had no mechanism to require YCIS to maintain its number of students to the existing level. SED said that YCIS could admit students up to the maximum number of 1043. Paragraphs 11.4 and 11.5 in the Paper intended to bring out the concern that there was potential for YCIS to admit more students when some classrooms were vacated in the existing YCIS campuses, and that might have adverse traffic impact on the surroundings.

132. A Member said that if the application was approved, the applicant could increase

the number of student intake as some existing classrooms were vacated after the relocation of some activity rooms to the application site. In view of the traffic concern arising from the potential increase of students, this Member considered that the application should be rejected.

133. A Member considered that a school should be self-contained within a campus. With reference to Drawing A-4 of the Paper showing the student movement between proposed development and other campus, the students might need to walk from the three existing campuses to the subject site. It would be undesirable for primary school students to walk outside the campus in between classes. Approval of the subject application might become a precedent case for other similar applications, encouraging the development of a school at different campuses. Moreover, the maximum permitted student intake of 30 per class had already been allowed by SED and it might not help the future shortage of 4,000 international primary school places as mentioned by SED in support of this application. Therefore, this Member did not support the application.

134. Another Member opined that the applicant had a clear intention to increase student intake as shown in the letter tabled at the meeting and there was a large buffer between the permitted number of students and the existing number of students. There was a potential for the number of students to increase. As the traffic congestion problem was already serious with the existing number of students, the continuous increase in the number of students would further worsen the traffic condition of the area. Moreover, it was undesirable for primary school students to walk around the busy Kent and Somerset Road.

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

- (a) the proposed development was located near the junction of Kent Road and Somerset Road and Kowloon Tong MTR Station with busy traffic. The applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not induce additional student intake for the three campuses of Yew Chung International School (Primary Section) in Kowloon Tong as a result of the provision of activity rooms at the application site to serve the three

campuses. Any increase in number of students in the vicinity and the related increase in the loading/unloading activities of vehicles and passengers would aggravate the traffic congestion in the area; and

- (b) the traffic congestion problem in the area was already serious. The approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would aggravate the traffic congestion problem of the area.

## **Agenda Item 29**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K18/302                      Proposed Temporary School (Kindergarten cum Child Care Centre) for a Period of 5 Years in "Residential (Group C) 1" zone, 2 and 4 Dorset Crescent, Kowloon Tong  
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/302)

---

136.            The Secretary reported that CKM Asia Ltd. (CKM) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Professor P.P. Ho who had current business dealings with CKM had declared an interest in this item. Professor S.C. Wong had also declared an interest in this item as he was the Director of the Institute of Transport Studies of the University of Hong Kong and CKM had sponsored some activities of the Institute. As the applicant had requested a deferral of consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Professor Ho and Professor Wong could stay in the meeting.

137.            The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 16.4.2013 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments.

138.            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.

### **Agenda Item 30**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K9/257                      Proposed Hotel in "Residential (Group A) 4" zone, 8 Ma Tau Wai  
Road and 7 Station Lane, Hung Hom  
(MPC Paper No. A/K9/257)

---

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

139.            With the aid of a visualiser, 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;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had reservation about the non-provision of carparking and loading/unloading facilities as there were already significant kerbside activities in the area especially during the busy hours. Moreover, there was no guarantee or control on the arrival time of visitors and type of transportation used. As stated in the traffic impact assessment (TIA), the proposed preliminary improvement scheme suggested conversion/relocation of an existing zebra crossing to signalised junction which might have impact on the existing traffic at Gillies Avenue South, and might not alleviate the current situation. The Commissioner of Police (C of P) did not support the application from

the traffic policing point of view. Since parking and loading/unloading facility was not provided within the proposed development, he was concerned that the construction and operation of the hotel would have impact upon the already badly congested Station Lane or the busy Ma Tau Wai Road. The Commissioner for Tourism supported the proposed development as it would increase the number of hotel rooms, broaden the range of accommodations for visitors, and support the rapid development of convention and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comment on the application;

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

- (d) the District Officer (Kowloon City) noted that Planning Department (PlanD) had consulted the interested Kowloon City District Council members, Hunghom Area Committee as well as the Owners' Committees, Mutual Aid Committees, management committees and residents of buildings near the site concerned direct regarding this planning application. PlanD and the Board should take into account all the comments gathered in the consultation exercise in the decision-making process. Should the application be eventually approved, the applicant should take appropriate measures to address the residents' concerns;
- (e) during the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period, five public comments were received. All of them either raised objection or had concerns on the application. The major views were summarized as follows:
  - (i) the proposed hotel development was not in line with the planning intention of the Hung Hom area and would have adverse impacts on the living environment. The infrastructure and supporting facilities such as water, electricity, sewerage, transport, road and security could not support the proposed hotel development. There was concern about the proposed intensity of the development, and the cumulative development pressure in the area;

- (ii) the height of the hotel development was too high and taller than the adjoining Hip Fai Building by at least 20m. The residents of Hip Fai Building would suffer most. The hotel would block air ventilation, natural lighting and view. Moreover, smoke emitted from the restaurant, laundry and plant rooms of the hotel would bring about disturbance to them as well as nearby residents;
- (iii) the increase in traffic from taxis, coaches and service vehicles arising from the hotel development would put further strain on the existing busy and narrow transport network, especially Ma Tau Wai Road and Station Lane. There was concern on the limited traffic capacity of Ma Tau Wai Road. The proposed relocation of mini-bus station at Station Lane would be objected by mini-bus operators;
- (iv) as the proposed hotel was located near the busiest junction of the district, there was concern on the impact on the safety of children and elderly pedestrians;
- (v) the air conditioners, hot water heater and advertisement signage on the roof top of the hotel would bring air, noise and light pollution respectively to nearby residents;
- (vi) the shops or entertainment facilities of the hotel would attract outsiders to the area and it would pose security impact on local residents;
- (vii) there was no buffer area at the entrance of the hotel. The proposed hotel would overload the pavement outside the hotel which was already very congested. The gathering of visitors outside the hotel would affect pedestrian movements and bring inconvenience to the local residents;
- (viii) the construction of the hotel would have adverse noise, air and

sewerage impacts on the surroundings; and

- (ix) approving the application was in conflict of the Board's objectives to ensure the health and well being of the community;
  
- (f) the PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The application site was located in a predominant residential neighbourhood. While the proposed hotel development was not incompatible with the land uses in the vicinity, the cumulative effect of changing residential land for non-residential uses might result in a reduction in housing land supply. Given the site was intended for high-density residential development and in view of the current acute shortage of housing land, there was no strong justification to redevelop a site planned for residential use for hotel development. Due to non-provision of car parking and loading/unloading facilities within the site, C of P did not support the application as the proposed hotel would have adverse impact on the already congested Station Lane or the busy Ma Tau Wai Road. C for T also had reservation as there were already significant kerbside activities in the area during busy hours. Besides, the proposed conversion/relocation of an existing zebra crossing to signalized junction by the applicant might not alleviate the current traffic condition.

140. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

141. After 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) given the current acute shortage of housing land, there was no strong justification to use the application site which was intended for high-density residential development for hotel development;

- (b) the non-provision of internal parking and loading/unloading facilities for the proposed hotel development would have adverse traffic impact on Ma Tau Wai Road and Station Lane and was considered unacceptable; and
  
- (c) approval of the application which would have adverse traffic impact on Man Tau Wai Road and Station Lane would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area. The cumulative effect of approving such applications without required internal parking and loading/unloading facilities would aggravate the already heavy traffic of the surrounding roads.

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

**Agenda Item 31**

Any Other Business

142. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 1:10 p.m..