

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 512th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 23.5.2014

Present

Director of Planning
Mr K.K. Ling

Chairman

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Vice-chairman

Ms Julia M.K. Lau

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung

Mr Laurence L.J. Li

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

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

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

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

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department
Ms Doris M.Y. Chow

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Professor P.P. Ho

Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr Francis T.K. Ip

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Brenda K.Y. Au

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr K.K. Lee

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 511th MPC Meeting held on 9.5.2014

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 511th MPC meeting held on 9.5.2014 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K11/25

2. The Secretary reported that at the 511th MPC meeting held on 9.5.2014, the Committee considered and agreed to the proposed amendments as shown in the draft Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong OZP No. S/K11/25A, its Notes and the Explanatory Statement (ES). One of the amendments to the ES agreed by the Committee was about the incorporation of the Shatin to Central Link (SCL) authorised by the Chief Executive in Council under the Railways Ordinance (Cap. 519) on 27.3.2012, and deemed approved under the Town Planning Ordinance (Cap. 131), into the OZP for information. However, the railway alignment was inadvertently not shown on the draft OZP No. S/K11/25A.
3. Members were asked to note the railway alignment, stations and structures of the SCL incorporated on the Plan which was tabled at the meeting. The draft Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong OZP No. S/K11/26, incorporating the amendments agreed by the Committee on 9.5.2014 and the railway alignment, would be exhibited for public inspection on 30.5.2014.

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/H9/3 Application for Amendment to the Approved Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H9/16 from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” to “Government, Institution or Community”,
No. 3 A Kung Ngam Village Road, Shau Kei Wan
(MPC Paper No. Y/H9/3)

4. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Hong Kong Sanatorium & Hospital (HKSH) with Townland Consultants Ltd. (Townland), MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Ove Arup) being three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item :

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam – having current business dealings with Townland, MVA and Ove Arup

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau – having current business dealings with MVA and Ove Arup

Professor P.P. Ho – having current business dealings with Townland

Ms Julia M.K. Lau – having current business dealings with MVA

5. Members noted that Professor P.P. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Ms Julia M.K. Lau had no involvement in the application. Mr Lam and Ms Lau had not arrived at the meeting yet. The Committee agreed that Mr Lau could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

6. Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), Ms Irene W.S. Lai, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), and the following representatives of the applicant were invited to the meeting at this point :

Ms Keren Seddon
Dr Joseph Chan
Dr Ben Yu
Dr Wu Po Man
Dr Cheung Kin Yin
Ms Adrienne Li
Ms Anna Lee
Mr Ken Yeung
Ms Esme Lau
Ms Carol Kwok
Ms Wong Lai Kwan, Fanny
Ms Cindy Tsang
Miss Delius Wong
Mr Ip Kar Wai, Kelvin
Miss Ho Wei Ling, Fiona
Miss Vivian Chan
Mr Chapman Lam
Mr Alan Pun

7. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He then invited Ms Irene W.S. Lai, STP/HK, to brief Members on the background of the application. Ms Lai did so with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

The Proposal

- (a) the applicant proposed to amend the approved Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H9/16 by rezoning the application site from

“Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to facilitate the development of the HKSH Eastern District Advanced Medical Centre (AMC), which was a hospital focusing on cancer treatment;

- (b) the site was located within the A Kung Ngam Industrial Area at the eastern part of Shau Kei Wan, and was currently vacant. It was currently zoned “OU(B)” on the Shau Kei Wan OZP subject to a plot ratio (PR) restriction of 12 and a building height (BH) restriction of 80mPD;
- (c) the A Kung Ngam Industrial Area was under transformation, with the areas surrounding the site consisting of a mix of commercial and industrial buildings, government, institutional or community (GIC) uses and open spaces;
- (d) the proposed AMC would be a 23-storey building (including 4 levels of basement) with a PR of not more than 12 and a BH of not more than 80mPD providing a maximum of 100 hospital beds. It would provide 24-hour outpatient services, ambulatory care, primary care, cancer care, diagnostic radiology, specialty clinic, oncology clinic, chemotherapy, radiotherapy, Proton Therapy (PT) (which was the first-of-its-kind cancer treatment in Hong Kong), surgical operating theatres, a pharmacy, a laboratory and other essential clinical support services. Major pieces of the medical equipment, including the PT device, along with the associated electrical and mechanical facilities would be housed at the basement levels (i.e. B4/F to B1/F);
- (e) vehicular access to the proposed AMC would be via a one-way run-in/run-out off Tung Wong Road directly connecting to LG/F, while pedestrian entrance was proposed on UG/F at A Kung Ngam Village Road;
- (f) according to the applicant, only PT system that complied with local and international standards would be used, and the radiation levels of PT were no different from other conventional radiotherapy treatment methods. The

applicant would separately seek the approval of the Radiation Board of Hong Kong (RBHK) and the Radiation Health Unit (RHU) of the Department of Health (DH) in obtaining licences for the possession and use of PT and radiotherapy within the proposed AMC;

- (g) the justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application were detailed in paragraph 2 of the Paper;

Public Comments

- (h) the development proposal was discussed at the joint meeting of the Community Building and Services Committee and the Planning, Works and Housing Committee of the Eastern District Council (EDC) on 10.10.2013. EDC members generally supported HKSH to set up a medical centre at A Kung Ngam Village Road to provide 24-hour outpatient service and advanced medical services, and considered that the proposed medical centre would ease the pressure on the medical services of Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital (PYNEH). However, EDC members raised concerns on affordable pricing, clinical waste, radiological impact and traffic impact; and enquired about the standards of radiological safety, locations of the minibus stops and taxi stand and measures to revitalise the area. EDC members also suggested HKSH to reduce the service charges and strengthen the training of medical staff;
- (i) the application and its further information were published for public comments for four times since 29.11.2013, each time for a statutory publication period of three weeks. A total of 1,719 public comments (including 1,685 comments in the form of 21 standard letters) were received, of which 1,422 supported the application, 284 objected to the application and the remaining 13 expressed views on the application;
- (j) the supporting comments were mainly of the view that the proposed AMC was a comprehensive medical centre providing diagnostic and treatment services to patients, which could shorten the waiting time for diagnostic

services at PYNEH and other public hospitals and provide new opportunities for public-private partnership. The 24-hour outpatient service could benefit residents in the Eastern District and provide additional convenience, especially during night time. As the ageing population in the Eastern District had considerable demand for medical services, the proposed AMC offered an additional choice for patients who were able to afford private hospital treatment and could alleviate the pressure of PYNEH. The proposed AMC could help introduce new cancer treatment of PT to Hong Kong. PT was particularly effective on paediatric cancers, liver and lung cancers, resulting in less side-effects than traditional radiotherapy and reducing the chance of recurrence. With careful site planning and risk management, the radiation risk associated with PT should be highly controllable. Moreover, the proposed development could help revitalise the neighbourhood, provide additional job opportunities, bring customers to small businesses and provide opportunity for surrounding property owners to redevelop their properties. Meanwhile, some commenters expected the applicant to set up more community clinics in other locations;

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

- (k) the objections were mainly related to traffic impact, excessive BH and concerns on radiation exposure, radioactive contamination and disposal of clinical wastes. Some commenters considered that the roads in A Kung Ngam area were narrow with many sharp turns. There were also many pedestrians and heavy traffic in the area. The proposed 24-hour outpatient clinic service would add further burden onto the existing road network. The Government should consider setting up a taxi stand on Tung Hei Road on the northern side of Eastwood Centre and introduce minibus service to ease the loading on A Kung Ngam Village Road. As the site was close to schools, residential and commercial buildings, there were concerns on radiation leakage from the proposed PT and other radiological devices during operation as well as transportation of the radioactive materials and wastes which might contaminate air, water and biomass in the area.

Without protective gears or measures, the working population and students in the vicinity could be at the risk of radiation exposure;

Departmental Comments

- (l) the departmental comments were detailed in paragraph 9 of the Paper and highlighted as follows :
 - (i) the Secretary for Food and Health (SFH) confirmed his policy support to the proposed hospital development, and required the applicant to comply with all applicable statutory and Government requirements, including but not limited to Radiation Ordinance (Cap. 303) and the Hospitals, Nursing Homes and Maternity Homes Registration Ordinance (Cap. 165);
 - (ii) the Director of Health (D of H) had no objection to the proposed rezoning from the regulatory perspective under the Hospitals, Nursing Homes and Maternity Homes Registration Ordinance (Cap. 165). The device and radioactive substances generated incidental to PT were subject to control under the Radiation Ordinance (Cap. 303) and required licence from RBHK. The applicant needed to prove to the satisfaction of RBHK that any radiation exposure to the workers and the public would comply with the prescribed dose limits and were optimised to the levels as low as reasonably achievable, and the radioactive substances so generated would be properly managed, and their safe keeping, storage, packaging, transport and disposal would be in compliance with the Radiation Ordinance (Cap. 303). The proposed housing of the PT device underground was acceptable as soil would contribute to the shielding of high energy radiations and reduce the probability of human occupancy around the facility;
 - (iii) the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) considered that as the proposed development was relatively small in scale, the nearby road

junctions had spare capacity to absorb newly generated traffic flow. The proposed internal transport facilities of one lay-by for taxi and private car and one lay-by for public light bus could cope with the newly generated trips. The site was served by public transport including franchised buses running along Tung Hei Road and A Kung Ngam Village Road. The Shau Kei Wan MTR Station was also within walkable distance from the site. The Transport Department would keep monitoring the traffic conditions and coordinate with the public transport operators to adjust service level if necessary and provide the necessary transportation facilities, such as taxi stand, where appropriate;

- (iv) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L), Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application from visual point of view but had reservation on the application from the landscape planning perspective as there was no landscape proposal/plan provided in the application to demonstrate that a minimum 20% green coverage of the site could be achieved. He considered that more planting opportunities at the roof and street levels and vertical greening on the building façade could be explored;
- (v) the District Officer (Eastern) of Home Affairs Department (DO(E) of HAD) had not received any comments on the application. He advised the applicant to consult the local residents and occupants as they might have concern on the operation of the proposed hospital and the potential environmental and traffic impacts; and
- (vi) other concerned departments had no adverse comments on the application;

PlanD's Views

- (m) PlanD had no objection to the proposed hospital use at the site but

considered it more appropriate to rezone the site from “OU(B)” to “OU(B)1” and incorporate ‘Hospital’ use under Column 2 of the “OU(B)1” zone, instead of rezoning the site to “G/IC”, based on the assessments made in paragraph 11 of the Paper as summarised below :

Planning Intention

- (i) the site fell within the “OU(B)” zone which aimed to allow flexibility in the use of existing industrial and industrial/office buildings as well as in the development of new buildings for both commercial and clean industrial uses. The proposed hospital which was supported by SFH, while not in line with the planning intention of the “OU(B)” zone, could help achieve similar objective as the “OU(B)” zoning in facilitating transformation and upgrading of the A Kung Ngam Industrial Area for non-polluting uses;

Land Use Compatibility

- (ii) the proposed hospital was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses comprising a mix of commercial/industrial buildings with open spaces and GIC uses. While there were some industrial buildings in the inner part of the A Kung Ngam Industrial Area, the surrounding open spaces, GIC facilities and roads could serve as land use buffers. The proposed development with PR of 12 and BH of 80mPD complied with the PR and BH restrictions of the current “OU(B)” zone;

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

Technical Issues

- (iii) the proposed development was acceptable in traffic terms in view of its relatively small scale. As regards radiological safety, the PT system to be installed had to be provided to the satisfaction of

RBHK according to the requirements of the Radiation Ordinance (Cap. 303) and the conditions of licence before it was permitted to be put into operation. RHU of DH had no objection to the proposed rezoning from the regulatory perspective. There were also no adverse comments from other Government departments on the noise, air quality, waste, water quality, sewerage, visual and infrastructure provision aspects;

- (iv) with regard to the concern of CTP/UD&L, PlanD on the green coverage of the proposed development, the applicant would have to comply with the greening requirements under the Sustainable Building Design (SBD) guidelines if gross floor area (GFA) exemption was claimed under the Buildings Ordinance for the proposed development at the implementation stage;

Public Comments

- (v) the EDC members consulted generally supported the proposed AMC as it would ease the pressure on the medical services of PYNEH, but they raised concerns on radiological impact, traffic impact, clinical waste treatment and affordable pricing of the medical services. The public comments received also largely supported the application but there were concerns on the traffic, radiation and BH issues;
- (vi) regarding the traffic concern, TD had no objection to the application, but would monitor the traffic conditions of the area and coordinate with the public transport operators to adjust service level and provide additional transport facilities if necessary. On radiation risks, the proposed PT and other radiotherapy equipment installed and radioactive substances used/generated would be subject to control and licensing under the Radiation Ordinance (Cap. 303) and approval of RBHK. For treatment of clinical wastes, it was controlled under relevant waste disposal legislation. The Environmental Protection Department had no adverse comment on

the environmental assessment submitted by the applicant which also covered the treatment of the potential clinical wastes from the proposed development. As regards the proposed BH of 80mPD, it complied with the BH restriction of the current “OU(B)” zone and both CTP/UD&L, PlanD and the Architectural Services Department had no adverse comment on the application from the visual perspective. The issue of affordable pricing was not a land use consideration of the Committee. However, the applicant had proposed to provide PYNEH patients with discounted rates to use its diagnostic facilities, and a patient assistance programme would be set up to support cancer patients who were qualified for but could not afford the treatment; and

Need for Control through Planning Application

- (vii) having regard to the “OU(B)” zoning of other industrial lots in the A Kung Ngam Industrial Area and given the various assessments conducted for the proposed development were based on a specific hospital scheme at the site, it was considered more appropriate to rezone the site to “OU(B)1” and incorporate ‘Hospital’ use under Column 2 of the “OU(B)1” zone to facilitate better planning control for the proposed development. If the site was rezoned to “G/IC” with ‘Hospital’ being a Column 1 use, the site could be developed into any types of hospital that might have different technical considerations.

8. A Member asked if there was a typo in paragraph 12.2 of the Paper where ‘Column 2’ stated in the phrase ‘... rezoning the site to “OU(B)1” with ‘Hospital’ as a Column 2 use, ...’ should be referring to ‘Column 1’. The Chairman clarified that ‘Column 2’ stated in that paragraph was correct.

9. The same Member then asked the applicant’s representatives to note the recommendation of PlanD in this application, i.e. to rezone the site from “OU(B)” to “OU(B)1” and incorporate ‘Hospital’ use into Column 2 of the Notes for the “OU(B)1” zone

requiring subsequent planning application for the proposed hospital development. If the applicant was keen to have the site rezoned to “G/IC” as applied for or have ‘Hospital’ use put under Column 1 of the future zoning, the presentation from the representatives might focus on these aspects.

10. The Chairman then invited the applicant’s representatives to elaborate on the application. Ms Keren Seddon made the following main points :

- (a) it was contented that the AMC development proposal at the site was supported in principle by PlanD and the Board;
- (b) on the issue of whether ‘Hospital’ use should be put under Column 1 or Column 2 of the future zoning, it should be noted that if ‘Hospital’ use was put under Column 2, it could delay the development programme of the hospital for 1 to 2 years for submission of s.16 application, revision of detailed design and discharge of approval conditions, thereby affecting the hospital’s timely provision of services to the public;
- (c) the site located in the urban area of Shau Kei Wan with readily available infrastructure provision and good accessibility was highly suitable for the proposed AMC development. With the nearest residential zone being some 100m away, the proposed hospital would have little land use impact on the residential zones;
- (d) operationally, the site was located close to the applicant’s main hospital in Happy Valley which allowed for synergy of use. It was also close to PYNEH which was currently operating at its full capacity. The proposed AMC could help meet the pressing medical and healthcare services in the Eastern District. As the site was currently vacant, development of the proposed AMC could commence immediately once relevant approvals were obtained. This would ensure the provision of continuous medical services to patients and the community as well as the first-of-its-kind PT cancer treatment in Hong Kong at the earliest possible opportunity;

- (e) the site was currently zoned “OU(B)” which aimed to cater for the changing needs of the industrial and business sectors and to encourage urban revitalisation through the development of commercial and clean industrial uses. As ‘Hospital’ was not included under either Column 1 or Column 2 of the “OU(B)” zone, it was the applicant’s intention to rezone the site from “OU(B)” to “G/IC” with ‘Hospital’ use in Column 1. This was consistent with the “G/IC” zoning of other private hospitals, including some specialist hospitals, in Hong Kong with ‘Hospital’ use in Column 1. The proposed AMC likewise was for specialist cancer treatment and there was no need to create a new zoning for it;

- (f) the planning intention of the “OU(B)” zone was primarily for general business uses such as information technology and telecommunications industries, non-polluting industrial, office and other commercial uses. Whilst the proposed AMC did achieve similar objectives in facilitating the transformation and upgrading of the industrial area for non-polluting uses, the “OU(B)” zoning did not fully reflect the proposed AMC use which was instead a GIC use under the Board’s definition of terms similar to other hospitals in Hong Kong;

- (g) hospitals and medical equipment were regulated on an on-going basis through licensing by the relevant authorities, including DH under the Hospital Nursing Homes and Maternity Homes Registration Ordinance (Cap. 165), RHU of DH and RBHK. Whilst the Board had a duty to ensure that no potential adverse impacts might result from the proposed AMC, this had already been assessed through the relevant submissions and materials made for the subject s.12A application, including the Government departmental consultations that ensued, and through a series of comment-response supplementary submissions made by the applicant. There was no need for another layer of planning control under s.16 as hospitals were already well regulated, from the planning to the implementation stages and throughout on-going operations, by the relevant authorities;

- (h) if the extra Column 2 control proposed by PlanD was not directly related to the proposed AMC use but to the specific matters such as landscaping, that could be regulated through the Government lease as the proposed hospital use would go through the lease modification process and the new lease could entail the stringent landscape conditions;
- (i) there were still many licensing, buildings and lands control procedures for the applicant to get through after the rezoning. Considering it was the normal practice for putting 'Hospital' as Column 1 use in "G/IC" zone and the pressing need for the introduction of the first-of-its-kind PT cancer treatment in Hong Kong, the Board was requested to save the applicant from the unnecessary requirement for a subsequent s.16 application in order to expedite the whole development programme for 1 to 2 years; and
- (j) all the relevant Government departments consulted had no adverse comment on or no objection to the application. The applicant had also received SFH's strong policy support to the proposed AMC and overwhelming support from the medical industry. Moreover, 83% out of the 1,719 public comments received were in support of the rezoning application, with only 16% objecting and the remaining 1% being neutral.

11. Dr Joseph Chan, Deputy Medical Superintendent of HKSH, then made the following main points :

- (a) the applicant, i.e. HKSH, had been serving the community for over 90 years. It had put many resources on professional education, training and research, which aimed to introduce premier technology and facilities for providing the best medical treatment to patients. In recent years, HKSH gradually expanded its service footprint to the wider community to cater for the community's needs for private medical services;
- (b) HKSH had close collaboration with PYNEH and was aware that there was a strong demand for primary care services in the Eastern District, particularly on recovery and emergency beds. During the planning of the

proposed AMC, HKSH had engaged in over 30 activities to understand the needs of the stakeholders and noted that there was pressing need for 24-hour outpatient service. The proposed AMC would serve as a one-stop medical centre and help relieve demand for diagnostic services in the public sector. It would bring in more advanced technology in cancer diagnosis and treatment, including the first-of-its-kind PT cancer treatment in Hong Kong;

- (c) with rising number of cancer patients in Hong Kong, the introduction of PT, which was a type of radiotherapy, could improve the survival rate of cancer cases and quality of life; and
- (d) HKSH was committed to complying with the planning requirements and licensing regulations. Its priority was to set up the AMC within the shortest period of time to meet the needs of the Eastern District and Hong Kong and the cancer patients. If the subject application for rezoning the site to “G/IC” was approved, the proposed AMC could be set up by end 2018, otherwise more time would be needed.

12. A Member recalled that a proton machine was proposed to be housed in HKSH’s development in Happy Valley and wondered whether the current proposal was a replacement of that proposal. Dr Joseph Chan replied that HKSH had a plan to develop two PT treatment centres in Hong Kong, with one in its main hospital in Happy Valley and the other in the proposed AMC at the subject site. As different PT systems were designed with different functions, the provision of only one PT system would not be able to meet the demand of Hong Kong as a whole. Ms Keren Seddon went on to say that paragraph 1.9 of the Paper had already given a summary of HKSH’s position in which the PT system at the AMC under the current application in Shau Kei Wan would supplement the services through a network-based approach to reach the wider population; and due to unforeseeable delays with respect to the development of the PT system in their hospital in Happy Valley, the PT system within the proposed AMC would be made available to the patients at the earliest time.

13. A Member noted that the reason why PlanD recommended the site to be rezoned to “OU(B)1” with ‘Hospital’ use put under Column 2 was that the nature of the proposed

hospital could be changed, which might have different technical considerations as compared with the current specific hospital scheme. This Member asked if the applicant had any suggestion to ease the concern of PlanD about the possible change of the development scheme afterwards. In response, Dr Joseph Chan said that HKSH was a reputable hospital and it had numerous dialogues with the various stakeholders including PYNEH to decide the types of services and facilities to be provided at the proposed AMC, which were those as presented to the Board. The procurement of the PT system also required close communications with the manufacturer and the commitment could hardly be changed. From the hospital's planning and operation points of view, there would not be much difference if the site was zoned "G/IC" or "OU(B)1". However, any saving in the development time would allow earlier provision of medical treatment to the patients in need.

14. The same Member also noted that the roads surrounding the site were rather narrow and that many patients of the hospital might come to the hospital by private cars, causing traffic congestion and on-street parking, as experienced in their main hospital in Happy Valley. This Member asked if the applicant could suggest any measures to alleviate the possible adverse traffic impact of the hospital. In response, Dr Joseph Chan said that the services to be provided in the proposed AMC, including cancer diagnosis and treatment, would not generate much traffic on a daily basis as most of the patients would visit the AMC with prior appointment. The traffic impact assessment conducted also demonstrated that the relatively small scale of the proposed AMC would not result in adverse traffic impact on the surrounding area. Moreover, the applicant would provide shuttle bus service to its staff to save the need for private transport.

15. A Member asked the applicant the implication on the completion time of the proposed AMC if the site was rezoned to "OU(B)1" with 'Hospital' use put under Column 2 as recommended by PlanD and whether the submission of a s.16 application for the development, which would need to be processed within 2 months, was on the critical path of the development programme.

[Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

16. In response, Ms Keren Seddon explained with a timechart that, on the basis of what would happen in practice, if representations on the zoning amendment were received

during the gazettal of the draft OZP, the submitted s.16 application in respect of the site would not be decided by the Board until the Board had considered the representation and the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) had made a decision on the zoning amendments and the representation, which would normally take 9 months after the 2-month exhibition period of the draft OZP. Compared with the indicative development scheme in a s.12A application, the scheme in a s.16 application was more detailed and it would take several months' time for the planning team to refine the development scheme for submission. In about one month's time after the submission of the s.16 application, comments from the Government departments and from the public would be received, which the planning team also needed time to address. In many cases, consideration of the s.16 application needed to be deferred in order to allow time to address the departmental comments. The reiterative comment-response procedures would last until green light was eventually given by all relevant departments. The related building and land approvals would only be considered by the relevant authorities after planning approval had been obtained.

17. In response to the question on how to address the issue of possible change of the hospital proposal after approval, Ms Keren Seddon said that a "G/IC" zoning should be appropriate for the site since the planning intention of the "G/IC" zone had already been clearly defined in the Notes of the OZP and 'Hospital' was also accurately defined under the Board's definition of terms to match with the "G/IC" zoning; and Dr Joseph Chan had assured Members that HKSH was determined to pursue the hospital scheme as currently presented to the Committee. From the regulatory perspective, a hospital also had a definition as one registered under the Hospitals, Nursing Homes and Maternity Homes Registration Ordinance (Cap. 165) which would be strictly monitored by the relevant authority. As for Members' concern on traffic impact, Ms Seddon said that C for T had no adverse comment from the traffic engineering point of view.

18. The Member who earlier enquired on the development programme of the proposed AMC said that Ms Seddon's previous response only showed a scenario on the time required for obtaining a s.16 approval but did not show the implication on the development programme under the "G/IC" and "OU(B)1" zonings. This Member asked the applicant to elaborate on the possible delay caused by the "OU(B)1" zoning with a development programme. In response, Dr Joseph Chan said that accordingly to their discussion with the planning consultant, the whole development process could be shortened for 1 to 2 years if the

site was rezoned to “G/IC” and the proposed AMC could be completed by end 2018. After obtaining the planning approval, the applicant would still need to engage the architects to work on the building scheme and obtain approval of the licensing authority on the equipment to be used.

19. Mr Ip Kar Wai, Kelvin supplemented with two timecharts that the proposed AMC could be completed by end 2018 if the site was under “G/IC” zoning and that it would be completed in mid 2020 if planning permission was required under the recommended “OU(B)1” zoning. The main reason for the delay was that the s.16 application could only be considered after the CE in C had approved the draft OZP, and the submission of general building plans could only be made after planning permission had been obtained and part of the approval conditions discharged.

20. The Vice-chairman asked the following questions: (i) where were the radiotherapy facilities located in other public hospitals; (ii) whether the site was a piece of reclaimed land; (iii) whether assessment had been carried out on the geology and water table of the site; (iv) how the applicant could guarantee the structural quality of the underground concrete shield for the PT system; (v) whether there were any remedial measures in case of radiation leakage; and (vi) what would be the lifetime of the PT system and how the system could be reinstalled.

21. In response, Ms Keren Seddon said that the Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department had no comment on the geotechnical aspect of the application, which could be considered in more detail when the building plan submission was made to the Buildings Department. On the issue of radiation safety, Dr Ben Yu said that PT would not employ any external radioactive substance in its operation. Similar to the case of X-ray, PT would only generate radiation when there was electricity current passing through the equipment. If the electricity supply was turned off, the radiation would stop. On the issue of radiation shielding, Dr Ben Yu said that some overseas cases had been studied and it was decided to build thick concrete walls on all 6 sides of the PT system, which would be placed in the basement of the proposed AMC to shield any radiation to the outside. Such a protective design, including the installation of the PT system below ground, was common and similar to those of other radiotherapy systems in Hong Kong and overseas. Radiotherapy had been practised by medical practitioners for some decades and

was not a new technology, and PT itself was a kind of radiotherapy. Many public hospitals in Hong Kong, including PYNEH, were equipped with radiotherapy systems. On the issue of reclamation, Ms Anna Lee said that the site was not a piece of reclaimed land.

22. Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang, DPO/HK, then explained to the Committee why “OU(B)1” zoning was recommended for the site despite the applicant had applied for rezoning the site to “G/IC”. In general, “G/IC” zoning would be designated for a site if there was an existing GIC use on the site or there was an intention to reserve the site for future GIC use. In the Eastern District, there was no current need for reserving a new site for future GIC use. As the developments around the application site were mainly used for business purpose, an “OU(B)” zoning would provide flexibility for the site to revert to business use in case the subject AMC proposal of HKSH fell through. As regards whether ‘Hospital’ use should be put under Column 1 or Column 2, it would depend on whether there was a need for the Board to consider the applicant’s development scheme in a s.16 application. The development scheme presented by the applicant in the current s.12A application was a specialised hospital focusing on cancer treatment and PT, and the technical assessments conducted for this application were based on such a development scheme. If there were changes to the applicant’s development scheme in future such that a hospital of different nature was proposed, the technical considerations could be different. As such, there was a need to require a subsequent s.16 application from the applicant to ensure that the potential impacts of the development scheme could be properly addressed no matter the site was designated a “G/IC” or “OU(B)” zoning.

23. A Member asked what changes to the current development scheme PlanD would expect, which would warrant a further s.16 application from the applicant, and if there were other cases where medical facilities were designated with “OU(B)” zoning requiring s.16 application. In response, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that PlanD’s concern was mainly on the possible changes in impacts arising from a change in the applicant’s scheme since the development impacts currently assessed and considered in the s.12A application were specific to the subject AMC proposal. If the applicant’s development scheme was changed, its development impacts, for instance the traffic impact, could be different and should be re-assessed. As regards the zoning issue, since the proposed AMC was a private project on private land and there was no requirement for GIC use on the site, the site was proposed to be designated as “OU(B)1” to allow flexibility for business use in case the proposed private

hospital project was not pursued.

24. Ms Keren Seddon said that the applicant was determined to pursue the proposed AMC at the site and implement the project as soon as possible. As such, the site should be rezoned to “G/IC”. In the very remote possibility that the proposed AMC was not pursued, the site could still be reverted to “OU(B)” zoning through the rezoning process. As regards PlanD’s concern on the possible change in traffic impact due to a change of the scheme, it should be noted that TD had already indicated that the proposed AMC was relatively small in scale and would have insignificant traffic impact. As the scale of site as well as the development on it was fixed, there should not be significant change in traffic impact even though there might be change in the scheme but it would still be for hospital use. Planning tools should not be used to cause 1 to 2 years’ delay for the proposed AMC.

25. Dr Joseph Chan said that it was the mission and vision of HKSH to develop a hospital at the site to provide medical services to the community, and it had no intention to pursue any development other than a hospital. Whether the site was zoned “G/IC” or “OU(B)1” would not affect the determination of HKSH to operate a hospital at the site.

26. As the applicant’s representatives had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairman informed them that the hearing procedure for the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Committee’s decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the applicant’s representatives and PlanD’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

27. A Member supported rezoning the site to “OU(B)1”. On the issue of whether ‘Hospital’ use should be put under Column 1 or Column 2, this Member said that the consideration was mainly on whether the applicant would change their proposal to a different hospital scheme at the site. Although only a broad development scheme was presented in the application, noting that the applicant had already placed an order in 2013 to purchase a PT system for installation at the proposed AMC, the possibility for the applicant to change to a different scheme should be low. From the development programme shown by the

applicant, the applicant might have reserved about 10 months for PlanD to prepare the proposed amendments to the OZP and another 10 months to process the s.16 application. There should be scope for the applicant to shorten the development programme.

28. A Member supported the provision of more medical facilities in Hong Kong and considered that the applicant had a genuine intention to develop the proposed AMC at the site. This Member said that zoning the site for “G/IC” was appropriate as it would add certainty for the applicant to implement the hospital scheme. As the site was small in size, the development on the site was not anticipated to generate significant traffic impact. If the Committee agreed to the hospital proposal of the applicant, a further s.16 application was considered not necessary.

29. A Member said that while the concerns of PlanD for not rezoning the site to “G/IC” with ‘Hospital’ being a Column 1 use were noted, it would be beneficial to the community if the proposed AMC could be completed as early as possible. If there were mechanisms to ensure the provision of the outpatient and cancer treatment services in the future development as proposed by the applicant in the current application, a further s.16 application would not be necessary.

30. The Vice-chairman said that as the proposed AMC would install a PT system in the basement of the development, he had concern on the possible leakage of radioactive substances to the underground water, which could also contaminate the sea as the site was located close to the shore. It was therefore worthwhile to require a s.16 application for the development in order to allow the Committee to consider the possible impacts of the proposal more thoroughly. A Member remarked that there were relevant Government departments to look after such technical aspect.

31. A Member said that whether to put ‘Hospital’ use under Column 1 or Column 2 would depend on whether there was a need for the Committee to further consider the impacts of a development proposal, and traffic impact should not be a major consideration in this case. This Member considered that underground structures were common in Hong Kong and the shielding ability of the basement in the proposed AMC should not be an issue as it would be designed by professional engineers and monitored by the Buildings Department on its construction. As clarified by the applicant, no radioactive substance would be used in the

PT process and radiation would only be generated when electricity was supplied to the equipment. The problem of leakage of radioactive substances through the basement was hence not anticipated. In view of the strong demand for medical services in Hong Kong, the initiative of a reputable organisation to provide medical services to the community was supported. Although the requirement for submission of a s.16 application would unlikely cause a delay of 1 to 2 years in the completion of the proposed AMC as claimed by the applicant, time was critical for patients, particularly the cancer patients.

32. A Member supported a “G/IC” zoning for the site to facilitate the proposed AMC development as Hong Kong was lacking in medical facilities severely. This Member also considered that the monitoring of radiation safety was not under the purview of the Committee.

33. A Member did not support putting ‘Hospital’ use under Column 1 as the identity of the applicant or landowner should not be a planning consideration to determine the zoning. Flexibility in land use should be allowed to cater for possible change in land ownership. If the proposed hospital was a compatible land use at the site and there were other mechanisms to regulate hospital development and operation, “G/IC” zoning with ‘Hospital’ use put under Column 1 could be considered. Otherwise, the recommendation of PlanD for an “OU(B)1” zoning with ‘Hospital’ use put under Column 2 should be adopted as it would allow the impacts of that particular hospital scheme be considered. The current proposal of developing a hospital within an industrial/business area was uncommon. It was also not certain if DH would consider issues such as traffic impact as the Board during the development of the proposed hospital.

34. The Secretary said that the consideration of this application could be from two aspects, namely the appropriate zoning for the site and whether ‘Hospital’ use should be put under Column 1 or Column 2. If Members were of the view that the site was suitable for general GIC use, a “G/IC” zoning could be considered. Noting that this area of A Kung Ngam was still mainly an industrial area, it might not be appropriate to plan a general hospital at the site which was surrounded by industrial buildings. The current proposal from the applicant was unique as it was a specialised hospital focusing on cancer treatment and radiotherapy. While PlanD had no objection to such hospital development, PlanD considered that it would be better to allow flexibility in land use in case the specific hospital

scheme was not pursued by the applicant. While the proposed “OU(B)1” zoning would allow general business uses at the site which were compatible with the surrounding uses, the site might not be suitable for some types of GIC uses that were generally permitted under “G/IC” zoning, such as elderly home.

35. The Secretary went on to say that on the proposal of putting ‘Hospital’ use under Column 2 of the “OU(B)1” zone which required a further s.16 application from the applicant, the delay to the development programme for 1 to 2 years as claimed by the applicant might be exaggerated as some of the tasks, such as the preparation of the application submission, could be done much earlier rather than after the OZP approval. Besides, most of the technical assessments conducted for this s.12A application, which had been accepted by the relevant departments, could be made use of in the subsequent s.16 application if there was not any major change to the development scheme. It should be noted that s.16 application was scheme-specific and the scheme approved would be used as the basis for controlling the actual development on site. If the site was rezoned to “G/IC” with ‘Hospital’ being a Column 1 use, the site could be developed into any other types of hospital which might be different from the currently proposed specialised hospital focusing on cancer treatment. In case the site was developed into a general hospital like the applicant’s main hospital in Happy Valley, it could be expected that the traffic generation would be much higher and the traffic impact assessment should be different.

36. The Chairman noted that Members were in general in support of the proposed specialised hospital. He pointed out that the A Kung Ngam area, currently covered by “OU(B)” zoning, was in a transitional stage from industrial to non-industrial use and the transformation process was on-going. As there were still existing industrial uses in the vicinity, the site was not suitable for general GIC uses which could include elderly home, child care centre and social welfare facility, etc., and a “G/IC” zoning might not be appropriate. On the other hand, an “OU(B)1” zoning for the site could allow land use flexibility in case the hospital scheme fell through and the permitted business uses were compatible with the surrounding land uses. As regards whether ‘Hospital’ should be a Column 1 or Column 2 use, if it was a Column 1 use, the applicant might develop any types of hospital at the site, such as a general hospital, and it could have different impacts on the area. If the proposed specialised hospital was considered more suitable at the site, putting ‘Hospital’ use under Column 2 to require a s.16 application could ensure that the specific

hospital scheme would be developed as proposed. On the development programme, it should be noted that various tasks could be carried out in parallel and the additional time involved should not be that long as claimed by the applicant's consultants. Members generally expressed their support for putting 'Hospital' use under Column 2 of the "OU(B)1" zoning as recommended by PlanD.

37. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to partially agree to the application by rezoning the application site from "OU(B)" to "OU(B)1" with 'Hospital' as a Column 2 use so that appropriate control could be imposed through the planning application mechanism to facilitate better planning control of the proposed development. The proposed amendments to the approved Shau Kei Wan OZP No. S/H9/16 in respect of the "OU(B)1" zone would be submitted to the Committee for agreement prior to gazetting under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance after reference back of the OZP for amendment by CE in C.

[The meeting was adjourned for a break of 5 minutes.]

[Mr Frankie W.P. Chou left the meeting at this point.]

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

[Mr Wilson W.S. Chan, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon, and Ms Fannie F.L. Hung and Ms M. L. Leung, Senior Town Planners/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STPs/TWK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Draft Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/KC/27

(MPC Paper No. 11/14)

38. The Secretary reported that this item involved proposed amendments to the Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for proposed public rental housing (PRH) developments at

two sites by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests in this item:

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| Mr K.K. Ling
(the Chairman)
as the Director of Planning | – | being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Building Committee of HKHA |
| Mr Frankie W.P. Chou | – | being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA |
| Ms Doris M.Y. Chow | – | being an alternate member for the Director of Lands who was a member of HKHA |
| Ms Julia M.K. Lau | – | being a member of HKHA and its Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | – | having current business dealings with HKHA |

39. The Secretary said that according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Board, as the proposed HKHA projects were only the subjects of amendments to the OZP proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of the Chairman, Mr Frankie W.P. Chou, Ms Doris M.Y. Chow, Ms Julia M.K. Lau and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam on this item only needed to be recorded and they could be allowed to stay at the meeting.

40. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Fannie F.L. Hung, STP/TWK, presented the proposed amendments to the draft Kwai Chung OZP No. S/KC/27 as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

Current Status of the Kwai Chung OZP

- (a) on 20.4.2012, the draft Kwai Chung OZP No. S/KC/26 incorporating amendments mainly to impose building height (BH) restrictions for various

development zones, to designate non-building areas and building gaps as well as to rezone a number of sites to reflect their existing uses and planning intentions, was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of 13 representations and 1,925 comments were received;

- (b) on 12.10.2012, the Board decided not to uphold seven of the representations. On 26.10.2012, the Board considered the remaining six representations which were related to the BH restrictions imposed on the Kwai Chung Container Terminals under the “OU” annotated “Container Terminal” zoning. The Board decided to defer consideration of the representations and requested PlanD to liaise with the representers regarding their expansion proposals and to carry out further studies to assess the cumulative impact of their proposals. Further consideration of the representations was tentatively scheduled for mid-2014;
- (c) on 11.1.2013, a judicial review (JR) was lodged against the Board’s decision of not upholding a representation in respect of the BH restriction imposed on a “Comprehensive Development Area” site. It sought an interim stay of the submission of the OZP to the Chief Executive in Council for approval pending the final determination of the JR proceedings. The date of hearing of the JR had yet to be fixed;
- (d) on 9.5.2014, the draft Kwai Chung OZP No. S/KC/27, mainly to rezone a site at Tai Lin Pai Road for commercial use and two sites at Tsing Tsuen Road and Wing Lap Street for columbarium developments, was exhibited for public inspection under section 7 of the Ordinance;

Background

- (e) it was stated in the 2013 Policy Address that the Government would adopt a multi-pronged approach to build up land reserve with a view to meeting housing and other development needs. “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) sites with no designated use would be reviewed for

housing purpose. The development intensity of Government's unallocated residential sites would also be increased as far as allowable in planning terms;

- (f) it was reaffirmed in the 2014 Policy Address that the Government would continue to review various land uses and rezone sites as appropriate for residential use, as well as to increase the maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) by around 20% at appropriate locations;
- (g) the proposed amendments to the OZP were related to the rezoning of three sites at Tai Wo Hau Road, Kwai Shing Circuit and Lai Kong Street respectively for housing purposes. In general, the maximum PR for Kwai Chung fell within Density Zone R2 (i.e. PR of 5). To maximise the development potential of housing land, a PR of 6 was proposed for the three housing sites identified, which was equivalent to the maximum of Density Zone R2 (i.e. PR 5) with a 20% increase;
- (h) to ascertain the technical feasibility of the proposed housing sites and the related increase in PR, various technical assessments on traffic, sewerage, drainage, water supply and environmental impacts had been undertaken. It was confirmed that the proposed amendments would not cause insurmountable problems on traffic and other infrastructural capacity as well as on the environmental aspects;

Proposed PRH Development at Tai Wo Hau Road and Kwai Shing Circuit (Amendment Items A1, A2, B1 and B2)

- (i) a site at Tai Wo Hau Road (about 0.32 ha) was proposed to be rezoned from "Open Space" ("O") and "Residential (Group A)" ("R(A)") to "R(A)2" subject to a domestic/non-domestic PR restriction of 6/9.5 and a BH restriction of 160mPD (Amendment Items A1 and A2);
- (j) another site at Kwai Shing Circuit (about 0.31 ha) was proposed to be rezoned from "G/IC" and "O" to "R(A)2" subject to a

domestic/non-domestic PR restriction of 6/9.5 and a BH restriction of 190mPD (Amendment Items B1 and B2);

- (k) the site at Tai Wo Hau Road was currently vacant and vegetated with natural terrain and several platforms. The Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) did not have implementation programme for the “O” portion forming the majority of the site and had no objection to the rezoning proposal;
- (l) the site at Kwai Shing Circuit was currently used as the Kwai Shing Driving Test Centre (DTC). The DTC would be relocated to a vacant site at Wing Kei Road, Kwai Chung to vacate the site for the proposed PRH development. LCSD did not have implementation programme for the concerned “O” zone and had no objection to the rezoning proposal;
- (m) the two sites, which were about 30m apart at two different levels, formed a PRH development scheme to be developed by HD. It was proposed to develop one residential block providing about 400 PRH flats on each site. A neighbourhood elderly centre and a multi-purpose venue would be built at the Tai Wo Hau Road site. A footbridge would be provided to link up the two sites with Kwai Chung Estate;
- (n) the two sites were located within a breezeway. The design of the proposed PRH development had taken into account the said breezeway and served to convert the said breezeway into two breezeways with minimum widths of 50m and 20m to facilitate the penetration of annual prevailing easterly winds. With the two breezeways, the quantitative air ventilation assessment (AVA) conducted by HD concluded that the air ventilation performance with and without the proposed PRH development was largely the same. The provision of breezeways would be included in the Explanatory Statement (ES) and planning brief to guide the future development on the two sites;
- (o) the proposed PRH development would not pose major visual, traffic and environmental impacts on the surrounding areas. The Kowloon Motor

Bus Co. Ltd. suggested adjusting the services in Kwai Chung area by adopting an “Area Approach” to meet passenger demand and utilise resources more efficiently and the Transport Department would closely monitor the provision of public transport services. The provision of appropriate mitigation measures such as fixed windows or noise barriers would be included in the planning brief to minimise the impact due to traffic noise;

- (p) for the existing trees and vegetation at the two sites, tree preservation and compensatory planting proposals would be provided for the proposed PRH development in accordance to the Development Bureau (DEVB)’s Technical Circular (Works) No. 10/2013 on tree preservation in Government projects. Tree preservation and at-grade amenity treatment would be included in the planning brief;

[Mr Patrick H.T. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

Proposed Private Residential Development at Lai Kong Street (Amendment Item C)

- (q) a site at Lai Kong Street (about 0.38 ha) was proposed to be rezoned from “G/IC” to “R(A)2” subject to a domestic/non-domestic PR restriction of 6/9.5 and BH restrictions of 240mPD for the northern and southern portions and 163mPD for the middle portion of the site for providing a building gap, together with the requirement for providing a public transport terminus (PTT) at the site (Amendment Item C);
- (r) the site at Lai Kong Street was a piece of vacant Government land. While it was currently zoned “G/IC”, it had no designated Government use;
- (s) in response to the locals’ request, a PTT would be provided within the site to accommodate the green minibus (GMB) terminus currently located at Lai Kong Street;

- (t) it was estimated that about 410 flats could be provided at the site;
- (u) according to the AVA Expert Evaluation for Lai Kong Street conducted by PlanD, with a long lot frontage of about 140m in north-south direction and a maximum BH restriction of 240mPD, the proposed development would have no significant effect on the surrounding sites when prevailing winds came from the southwest and south. However, when prevailing wind came from the northeast, east and southeast, the proposed development might create some wake areas on the leeward sides which would affect the air ventilation of Highland Park and the pedestrian level of Lai Kong Street. To facilitate the penetration of the easterly winds into the west of the proposed development and channel the easterly wind down to the ground due to downwash effects, a 30m wide building gap at 10m above ground level (i.e. 163mPD) needed to be provided. The proposed PTT at ground level should also be carefully designed to increase the permeability of the podium structure facing the easterly winds to alleviate the air ventilation impact on the street level. These design requirements would be incorporated into the Plan, Notes and ES to guide the future development of the site;
- (v) the proposed residential development at Lai Kong Street would not create significant visual, landscape, traffic, environmental and infrastructural impacts;

Consultation

- (w) relevant departments consulted had no adverse comment on the proposed amendments to the OZP;
- (x) on 3.12.2013, HD consulted the Housing Affairs Committee (HAC) of the Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC) on the proposed PRH development at Tai Wo Hau Road and Kwai Shing Circuit. HAC of K&TDC had no in-principle objection to the proposed PRH development;

- (y) on 13.3.2014, PlanD consulted K&TDC on the proposed amendments to the OZP. Two motions, among others, were passed objecting to (i) the proposals of rezoning the sites at Tai Wo Hau Road and Kwai Shing Circuit for residential use without improving the existing traffic conditions within the district; and (ii) the proposed residential development at Lai Kong Street;
- (z) on 8.5.2014, DEVB and PlanD consulted K&TDC again on the proposed amendments. Three motions, among others, were passed objecting to (i) the rezoning of sites for residential purpose in Kwai Tsing without support from K&TDC and without a comprehensive planning for the whole district on the improvement in community and transport services; (ii) the rezoning of the sites at Tai Wo Hau Road and Kwai Shing Circuit for residential use without improving the existing traffic conditions within the district and implementing the proposed hillside elevator systems in Kwai Chung; and (iii) the proposed residential development at Lai Kong Street; and
- (aa) the responses of PlanD and the relevant Government departments to the concerns of K&TDC were: (i) the traffic impact brought by the three housing sites was insignificant and TD would review and strengthen the public transport services; (ii) the proposed PTT at Lai Kong Street would improve the future traffic condition in the area; (iii) the existing provision of government, institution or community (GIC) facilities and open space in Kwai Chung could generally meet the demand of the existing population and the new population of about 3,300 persons from the three proposed housing sites; and (iv) the Highways Department would brief K&TDC on the progress of the lift tower projects in Kwai Chung on 28.5.2014.

41. The Vice-chairman asked why the site at Lai Kong Street was not proposed for public housing but private residential development in view of its proximity to other public housing developments and Government quarters. In response, Mr Wilson W.S. Chan, DPO/TWK, said that there was no request from other Government departments for using the site for their quarters. As regards the proposed housing type on the site, it should be noted that there was already a very high proportion of about 75% of public housing in Kwai Tsing

district. It would be appropriate to have a more balanced housing mix for the district, which was in line with the policy agenda of the Long Term Housing Strategy Steering Committee that called for a public-private housing mix of 6:4.

42. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree that the proposed amendments to the draft Kwai Chung OZP No. S/KC/27 as shown on the draft OZP No. S/KC/27A (to be renumbered as S/KC/28 upon exhibition) and its Notes were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 7 of the Ordinance;
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement for the draft Kwai Chung OZP No. S/KC/27A (to be renumbered as S/KC/28 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zones on the Plan; and
- (c) agree that the revised Explanatory Statement was suitable for exhibition together with the draft Kwai Chung OZP No. S/KC/27A (to be renumbered as S/KC/28 upon exhibition).

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TY/24

(MPC Paper No. 12/14)

43. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms M.L. Leung, STP/TWK, presented the proposed amendments to the approved Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TY/24 as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

Background

- (a) on 8.11.2011, the Chief Executive in Council referred the approved Tsing

Yi OZP No. S/TY/24 to the Board for amendments under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance;

- (b) it was stated in the 2013 Policy Address that the Government would adopt a multi-pronged approach to build up land reserve with a view to meeting housing and other development needs. For this purpose, the Government would increase the supply of land in the short, medium and long terms through optimal use of developed land and identifying new land for development at the same time;
- (c) it was reaffirmed in the 2014 Policy Address that the Government would continue to review various land uses and rezone sites as appropriate for residential use, as well as to increase the maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) by around 20% at appropriate locations;
- (d) the Government had taken steps to review the Green Belt (“GB”) sites. The review of “GB” sites excluded sites within Country Parks or Special Areas, areas with steep topography, areas of high scenic, landscape or ecological value, water gathering ground, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, firing range, ‘village environs’, burial ground, areas under active cultivation as well as areas under planning and/or engineering studies. It was undertaken in two stages. The Stage 1 review mainly focused on the “GB” sites which had been devegetated, deserted or formed and did not require extensive tree felling or slope cutting. The Stage 2 review covered the remaining “GB” sites. The following site selection criteria were adopted :
 - (i) sites with a minimum area of 0.5 ha and with an overall slope gradient not steeper than 20 degrees;
 - (ii) sites within or near the fringes of new towns/planned New Development Areas or in close proximity to existing settlements;
and

- (iii) sites near or accessible to existing roads (say within 100m from primary/secondary roads);
- (e) based on the site selection criteria, two “GB” sites near Cheung Wang Estate and Mayfair Gardens in Tsing Yi were identified as suitable for housing development. In general, the maximum PR for Tsing Yi fell within Density Zone R2 (i.e. PR of 5). To maximise the development potential of housing land, a PR of 6 was proposed for the two housing sites identified, which was equivalent to the maximum of Density Zone R2 (i.e. PR 5) with a 20% increase;
- (f) to ascertain the technical feasibility of the proposed housing sites and the related increase in PR, various technical assessments on traffic, sewerage, drainage, water supply and environmental impacts had been undertaken. It was confirmed that the proposed amendments would not cause insurmountable problems on traffic and other infrastructural capacity as well as on the environmental aspects;

Proposed Private Residential Development at a Site near Cheung Wang Estate (Amendment Items A1 and A2)

- (g) a site to the north of Cheung Wang Estate (about 0.14 ha) was proposed to be rezoned from “GB” and “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) to “R(A)3” subject to a domestic/non-domestic PR restriction of 6/9.5 and a building height (BH) restriction of 200mPD, together with the requirement for providing a public transport terminus (PTT) at the site (Amendment Items A1 and A2);
- (h) the majority of the site was formed and paved, and was currently occupied by a green minibus (GMB) terminus for two GMB routes under a Government Land Allocation (GLA). The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) advised that a permanent re-provisioning of the affected GMB terminus within the site was necessary;

- (i) it was estimated that about 153 flats could be provided at the site;
- (j) the site did not lie within any major air path. The proposed residential development at the site would not create significant visual, landscape, air ventilation, traffic, environmental and infrastructural impacts;

Proposed Private Residential Development at a Site near Mayfair Gardens (Amendment Item B)

- (k) a site to the west of Mayfair Gardens and north of the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (Tsing Yi Campus) (about 0.62 ha) was proposed to be rezoned from “GB” to “R(A)4” subject to a domestic/non-domestic PR restriction of 6/9.5 and a BH restriction of 140mPD (Amendment Item B);
- (l) the site was a vegetated gentle slope at the toe of a hill accessible via Sai Shan Road. There was a small natural stream traversing the middle of the site. Amidst the vegetation was a number of hiking facilities including a pavilion, a rain shelter and some footpaths, all managed by the District Officer (Kwai Tsing) (DO(K&T)) under GLA;
- (m) it was estimated that about 740 flats could be provided at the site;
- (n) the site did not lie within any major air path. The proposed residential development at the site would not create significant visual, air ventilation, traffic, environmental and infrastructural impacts;
- (o) while the site was well-wooded with ornamental trees, fruit trees, native and exotic tree species and significant tree removal was anticipated for development on the site, the tree species seemed to be woodland tree species commonly found at hillside slopes. The Lands Department (LandsD) would conduct a pre-land sale tree survey to take care of the tree preservation aspect. Considering the urban fringe context in the surroundings, and if tree removal could be regulated and adequately

compensated at the later stage, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of the Planning Department (PlanD) and the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation had no strong view on the rezoning proposal from the landscape planning and nature conservation perspectives. DO(K&T) and other relevant Government departments would explore sites nearby to re-provision the affected hiking facilities on the site;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (p) the Notes of the OZP would also be amended mainly to add the uses of ‘Eating Place (not elsewhere specified)’, ‘Institutional Use (not elsewhere specified)’, ‘Public Clinic’ and ‘Training Centre’, in wholesale conversion of an existing building only, in Column 2 of the user schedule for the “Industrial” zone and to incorporate minor relaxation clauses for gross floor area/PR/BH restrictions in the Remarks of the Notes for the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Container Related Uses” and “Recreation and Tourism Related Uses” zones;

Consultation

- (q) relevant departments consulted had no adverse comment on the proposed amendments to the OZP;
- (r) on 13.3.2014, PlanD consulted the Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC) on the proposed amendments to the OZP. Two motions, among others, were passed objecting to (i) the piecemeal development of 170 private flats at the site to the north of Cheung Wang Estate; and (ii) the proposed amendments to the Tsing Yi OZP, including the amendments in relation to the site adjacent to Cheung Wang Estate and Mayfair Gardens;
- (s) on 8.5.2014, the Development Bureau and PlanD consulted K&TDC again on the proposed amendments. Three motions, among others, were passed objecting to (i) the rezoning of sites for residential purpose in Kwai Tsing without support from K&TDC and without a comprehensive planning for the whole district on the improvement in community and transport services;

- (ii) the proposed housing development at the site to the north of Cheung Wang Estate should be shelved permanently unless the issues on transport capacity and provision of community facilities were addressed; and (iii) the proposed rezoning of the site to the west of Mayfair Gardens from “GB” to residential;
- (t) K&TDC was also concerned about the inadequate provision of transport facilities and services to support the proposed housing developments particularly when the bus routes and services would be re-arranged by the bus company; the traffic impacts of proposed developments particularly those arising from the relocation and re-provisioning of the GMB terminus near Cheung Wang Estate; the provision of adequate government, institution or community (GIC) facilities and open space to cope with the increase in population; the possible noise and glare impacts from Container Terminal 9 on the proposed housing development adjacent to Mayfair Gardens; and the significant impacts on landscape and the natural environment due to the felling of about 300 trees for development at the site adjacent to Mayfair Gardens; and
- (u) the responses of PlanD and the relevant Government departments to the concerns of K&TDC were: (i) C for T would keep monitoring the traffic demand and adjust the level of services provided by the bus company as appropriate to cope with demand changes; (ii) the existing GMB terminus would be re-provisioned within the site to the north of Cheung Wang Estate upon development; (iii) the provision of existing and planned GIC facilities in Kwai Tsing district would be sufficient to meet the needs of the local community as well as proposed housing developments at the two sites. The relevant Government departments indicated that no additional GIC facilities would be required to cater for the anticipated increase in population; and (iv) the future lease document for the site adjacent to Mayfair Gardens would include conditions requiring carrying out of noise impact assessment, tree preservation and landscaping.

44. A Member said that there was apparent difference in the physical conditions of

the two proposed housing sites for the site near Cheung Wang Estate was formed and paved but the site adjacent to Mayfair Gardens was overgrown with trees. In view of the well-vegetated condition of the latter site, this Member asked if more compensatory greening measures, such as rooftop and vertical greenings, could be required in the future development of the site. In response, Mr Wilson W.S. Chan, DPO/TWK, said that the future developer of the concerned site would be required under lease to submit a tree preservation proposal to LandsD stating clearly the number of trees that would be felled, transplanted and preserved. It was a general requirement under the relevant land administration guidelines for a minimum of 1:1 compensatory tree planting for the felled trees. Moreover, there was another requirement for a minimum of 20% greenery site coverage for development site under the relevant sustainable building design guidelines promulgated by the Buildings Department. As the site was currently covered by a considerable number of trees, it was anticipated that there would be more than 20% greenery coverage in the future residential development at the site taking into account the amount of compensatory tree planting required.

45. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree that the proposed amendments to the approved Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/24 as shown on the draft OZP No. S/TY/24A (to be renumbered as S/TY/25 upon exhibition) and its Notes were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance;
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement for the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/24A (to be renumbered as S/TY/25 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zones on the Plan; and
- (c) agree that the revised Explanatory Statement was suitable for exhibition together with the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/24A (to be renumbered as S/TY/25 upon exhibition).

[The Chairman thanked Mr Wilson W.S. Chan, DPO/TWK, and Ms Fannie F.L. Hung and Ms M.L. Leung, STPs/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Mr Chan, Ms Hung and Ms Leung left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K1/242 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction
for Permitted Shop and Services/Eating Place and Hotel uses
in “Commercial” Zone, Nos. 38, 38A, 40 and 40A Hillwood Road,
Tsim Sha Tsui
(MPC Paper No. A/K1/242C)

46. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by three subsidiaries of Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd. (Henderson) with Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTA) and LLA Consultancy Ltd. (LLA) being two of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests in this item :

- Mr Clarence W.C. Leung – owning a flat in Tsim Sha Tsui, and being a director of a Non-Government Organisation (NGO) that recently received a private donation from a family member of the chairman of Henderson

- Mr Roger K.H. Luk – being a member of the Council of the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) which received a donation from a family member of the chairman of Henderson

- Professor P.P. Ho – being an employee of CUHK which received a donation from a family member of the chairman of Henderson

- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok – being an employee of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) which received a donation from a family member of the chairman of Henderson

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam – having current business dealings with Henderson,
and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau KTA and LLA

Ms Julia M.K. Lau – having current business dealings with LLA

47. Members noted that Professor P.P. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had already left the meeting and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok had not arrived at the meeting yet. As the applicants had requested for deferment of consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Mr Clarence W.C. Leung, Mr Roger K.H. Luk, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Ms Julia M.K. Lau could stay in the meeting but Mr Dominic K.K. Lam should refrain from participating in the discussion.

48. The Committee noted that the applicants requested on 21.5.2014 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for undertaking a study to review the floor-to-floor heights adopted in similar types of hotels in Tsim Sha Tsui and other major tourist areas in Hong Kong and revisit the proposed building height in support of the application. This was the applicants' fourth request for deferment. Following the approval of the third deferment, the applicants had reduced the proposed building height and submitted further justifications with plans, drawings and illustrations on 11.4.2014 and 7.5.2014 taking into account the departmental comments. The Hong Kong Observatory and the Antiquities and Monuments Office had provided comments on the submissions but still had reservation on the application.

49. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicants pending the submission of further information from the applicants. 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 applicants. If the further information submitted by the applicants was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants that two more months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and since a total period of seven months had been allowed, this was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted.

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K1/244 Proposed Flat and Shop and Services/Eating Place Uses
in “Commercial” Zone, No. 68, 68A, 70, 70A, 72, 72A, 72B and 72C
Kimberley Road, Tsim Sha Tsui
(MPC Paper No. A/K1/244A)

50. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd. (Henderson) with Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTA), Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Ltd. (Mott MacDonald) and CKM Asia Ltd. (CKM) being three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item :

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung – owning a flat in Tsim Sha Tsui, and being a director of a Non-Government Organisation (NGO) that recently received a private donation from a family member of the chairman of Henderson

Mr Roger K.H. Luk – being a member of the Council of the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) which received a donation from a family member of the chairman of Henderson

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok – being an employee of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) which received a donation from a family member of the chairman of Henderson

Professor P.P. Ho – being an employee of CUHK which received a donation from a family member of the chairman of Henderson, and having current business dealings with CKM

- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam – having current business dealings with Henderson, KTA and Mott MacDonald
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau – having current business dealings with Henderson and KTA

51. Members noted that Professor P.P. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had already left the meeting and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok had not arrived at the meeting yet. As the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Mr Clarence W.C. Leung, Mr Roger K.H. Luk and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam could stay in the meeting but Mr Dominic K.K. Lam should refrain from participating in the discussion.

52. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 8.5.2014 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for collecting relevant background information to supplement the drainage and sewerage impact assessments to address the comments of the Drainage Services Department (DSD). This was the applicant's second request for deferment. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted revised impact assessments, including environmental noise impact assessment, environmental air quality impact assessment and drainage and sewerage impact assessments, to address the comments of the Environmental Protection Department and DSD, and submitted traffic forecast and traffic data for the Transport Department's comment.

53. 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. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two more months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and since a total period of four months had been allowed, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K20/121

Proposed Minor Relaxation of Gross Floor Area and Building Height Restrictions in “Open Space”, “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Arts, Cultural, Entertainment and Commercial Uses”, “OU” annotated “Mixed Uses”, “OU” annotated “Electricity Substation”, “OU” annotated “Airport Railway Ventilation and Traction Substation Building” and “OU” annotated “Western Harbour Crossing Ventilation Building” Zones,
West Kowloon Cultural District
(MPC Paper No. A/K20/121)

54. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in this item :

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam – having current business dealings with Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Ltd., one of the consultants of the applicant

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau – having current business dealings with Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Ltd., another consultant of the applicant

55. Members noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had already left the meeting. As the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had no involvement in this application, the Committee agreed that Mr Lam could stay in the meeting.

56. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 21.5.2014 for deferment of the consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. This was the applicant’s first request for deferment.

57. 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. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K3/560 Proposed Hotel in "Residential (Group A)" Zone,
Nos. 93-95 Lai Chi Kok Road, Mong Kok
(MPC Paper No. A/K3/560)

Presentation and Question Sessions

58. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel – wholesale conversion of an existing 15-storey commercial building for hotel use providing 66 guestrooms;

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok arrived to join the meeting and Mr Clarence W.C. Leung left the meeting at this point.]

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments were received from one of the owners of the adjoining building at No. 97 Lai Chi Kok Road and Designing Hong Kong Limited, objecting to the application for reasons that the current application had not addressed the concerns raised under the previous Application No. A/K3/546 on the possible traffic, noise, air pollution and sewage impacts arising from the proposed hotel; the large-scale mechanical equipment, including fire services water tank, centralised air conditioning system and pump room, of the proposed hotel might increase the structural loading to the existing building and affect the structural stability of the adjoining buildings, including No. 97 Lai Chi Kok Road; and the proposed development would reduce the housing supply in Hong Kong. No local objection/view 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 assessments as detailed in paragraph 10 of the Paper. As regards the public comments on the possible adverse traffic impacts on the surrounding areas, the Commissioner for Transport had no objection to the application and to the nil provision of car parking and loading/unloading spaces having taken into account the scale of the development, the location of the site and the availability of public transportation means in the vicinity, and also had no adverse comment on the traffic impact assessment submitted. As for the concerns on noise, air quality, building safety as well as drainage and sewerage capacity, the concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Approval conditions requiring the submission of a sewerage impact assessment and implementation of the necessary local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works were suggested. Regarding the structural safety of the proposed hotel and the adjoining buildings, the applicant was required to comply with the Buildings Ordinance and

building regulations.

59. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

60. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 23.5.2018, 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 landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the SIA in planning condition (b) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (d) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board.”

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

- “(a) the approval of the application does not imply that any proposal on gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development will be approved/granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department direct to obtain the necessary approval.

If the GFA concession is not approved/granted by the Building Authority and major changes to the current scheme are required, a fresh planning application to the Board may be required;

- (b) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West, Lands Department (LandsD) that the applicant should check if the proposed hotel would contravene any lease conditions. Any application to LandsD to seek compliance with the lease conditions, if required and submitted by the proponent, will be processed by LandsD acting in the capacity as landlord at their discretion. If it is approved, it will be subject to the terms and conditions including, among others, charging of premium and fee, as imposed by LandsD;

- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department that the applicant should submit plans to demonstrate compliance with the Buildings Ordinance and Building Regulations, in particular, the provision of prescribed windows under Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)Rs) 30 and 31 and access and facilities for persons with a disability in accordance with B(P)R 72 at the subject premises. The application for hotel concessions including any exemption of back-of-house areas from GFA calculation under B(P)R 23A will be considered upon formal submission of building plans subject to compliance with the criteria under Practice Note for Authorised Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-40 and favourable comments from concerned departments. For quality and sustainable built environment requirements and building separation, the applicant should make reference to PNAPs APP-151 and APP-152 respectively. A 3m wide service lane should be provided at the rear or side of proposed hotel development under B(P)R 28 and such lane should not be included in the site area under B(P)R 23(2)(a). No part of any domestic building shall be erected within 1.5m of the rear boundary of the site under B(P)R 25(2);

- (d) to note the comments of the Commissioner for Transport that he has the rights to impose, alter or cancel any car parking, loading/unloading facilities and/or any no-stopping restrictions, on all local roads to cope with the changing traffic conditions and needs. The frontage road space would not be reserved for any exclusive uses of the subject development;
- (e) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection that the applicant/Authorised Persons should select a proper location for fresh-air intake of the centralised air-conditioning system during the detailed design stage to avoid exposing future occupants under unacceptable environmental nuisances/impact. The applicant should also 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;
- (f) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that detailed fire services requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans. The applicant is reminded that the arrangement of emergency vehicular access shall comply with the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Building which is administered by the Buildings Department;
- (g) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department that the applicant should maximise the greening opportunities on the provision of vertical greening and landscape planting at the roof of 4/F in addition to those on G/F and roof floor; and
- (h) to note the comments of the Chief Officer/Licensing Authority, Home Affairs Department (HAD) that:
 - (i) documentary evidence showing that the Building Authority has granted prior approval for the proposed change in use should be submitted when making an application under the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance (HAGAO);
 - (ii) the proposed licensed area must be physically connected;

- (iii) the fire service installation provisions should comply with paragraph 4.28 of the Codes of Practice for Minimum Fire Services Installations and Equipment; and
- (iv) the licensing requirements will be formulated after inspections by the Building Safety Unit and Fire Safety Team of HAD upon receipt of a licence application under HAGAO.”

[The Chairman thanked Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Ms Yuen left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/753 Proposed Hotel (Conversion of Existing Building)
in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (1)” Zone,
42A Wing Hong Street, Cheung Sha Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/753)

62. The Secretary reported that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with Raymond Chan Surveyors Ltd., the consultant of the applicant. As the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had no involvement in this application, the Committee agreed that Mr Lam could stay in the meeting.

63. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 15.5.2014 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of a traffic impact assessment as required by the Transport Department. This was the applicant's first request for deferment.

64. 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. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H12/28 House (Proposed Vehicular Access) in "Green Belt" Zone,
Government Land to the North of 17 Bowen Road, Mid-levels East
(MPC Paper No. A/H12/28B)

65. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in this item :

Mr Laurence L.J. Li – his spouse owning a flat at Kennedy Road

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau – having current business dealings with Lanbase Surveyors Ltd., the consultant of the applicant

66. Members noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had already left the meeting. As the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Mr Laurence L.J. Li could stay in the meeting.

67. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 7.5.2014 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of an environmental assessment report as advised by the Environmental Protection Department

and providing further responses to address departmental comments. This was the applicant's third request for deferment. Following the approval of the second deferment, the applicant submitted further information on 4.4.2014 to address the departmental concerns on environmental, geotechnical, local traffic and vehicular access, drainage and land matters as well as landscape and tree preservation with the inclusion of a revised tree survey report. Upon circulation of the further information for departmental comment, there were outstanding issues in relation to environmental impacts and landscape and tree matters that more time would be required by the applicant to prepare further information, including the environmental assessment, to address the departmental comments.

68. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicants pending the submission of further information from the applicants. 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 applicants. If the further information submitted by the applicants was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants that two more months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and since a total period of six months had been allowed, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

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

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H15/260 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restrictions
for Ocean Park (Water Park) Development
in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Ocean Park" Zone,
Ocean Park, Tai Shue Wan, Aberdeen
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/260)

69. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in this item :

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam – having current business dealings with Ocean Park Corporation, the applicant, and seven of its consultants including Buro Happold, Jacobs China Ltd., Meinhardt (HK) Ltd., Urbis Ltd., MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA), Shen Milsom & Wilke and Food Service Consultants Ltd.

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau – having current business dealings with Lanbase Surveyors Ltd. and MVA, two of the consultants of the applicant

Ms Julia M.K. Lau – having current business dealings with MVA

70. Members noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had already left the meeting. As Ms Julia M.K. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that Ms Lau could stay in the meeting. The Committee considered that the interest of Mr Dominic K.K. Lam was direct and he should leave the meeting temporarily for this item.

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

71. Miss Isabel Y. Yiu, STP/HK, drew Members attention that three replacement pages no. 11, 12 and 17 of the Paper had been sent to Members.

72. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Isabel Yiu presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

(a) background to the application;

- (b) the proposed minor relaxation of building height (BH) restrictions for Ocean Park (water park) development – the proposed water park development straddled two different BH restriction zones of 1 storey and 2 storeys (both excluding basement and amusement rides). The application was for minor relaxation of BH restrictions from 1 storey to 2 to 3 storeys and from 2 storeys to 3 storeys for the main building complex of the proposed water park;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no 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/view 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 as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper. In terms of absolute BH, the maximum BH of the proposed water park development (i.e. 46.5mPD) was similar to the previous facilities (i.e. maximum BH of 23.6mPD for Middle Kingdom and 44mPD for Bird Paradise) at the application site. The proposed water park building adopted a “terraced profile” with different floor-to-floor heights and tailor-made design of the floors to accommodate the different facilities of the water park. Out of the total roofed-over area of about 25,634m² (i.e. about 39.8% of the application site), about 61% was 1 storey high, 25% was 2 storeys, and 14% was 3 storeys. The area subject to relaxation by 1 storey was 5,650m² and by 2 storeys was 794m² (i.e. 8.8% and 1.2% of the whole site or 22% for 1 storey relaxation and 9.5% for 2 storeys relaxation respectively). The remaining area (i.e. about 60.2% of the application site) would be used for recreation, landscaping and circulation purposes. The extent of relaxation sought was minor.

73. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

74. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 23.5.2018, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the design and provision of the car parking facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission of traffic impact assessment to address the traffic impact during construction stage prior to commencement of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the provision of water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) the submission and implementation of a revised Drainage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (e) the submission and implementation of quarterly tree monitoring reports, and tree preservation and landscape proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board.

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

- “(a) the approval of the application does not imply that the proposed building design elements could fulfill the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines and the relevant requirements under the lease, and that the proposed gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed

development will be approved/granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department and the Lands Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. If the building design elements and the GFA concession are not approved/granted by the Building Authority and the Lands Authority and major changes to the current scheme are required, a fresh planning application to the Board may be required;

- (b) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West & South, Lands Department in paragraph 9.1.1(e) of the Paper that all the proposed whips to be planted should be confined within the private lot boundary and in paragraph 9.1.1(f) of the Paper that all proposed work, including any slope works if so required by the Government upon completion of the natural terrain hazard study, must be confined within the private lot boundary;
- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services in paragraph 9.1.6(b) of the Paper that the arrangement of emergency vehicular access shall comply with the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 administered by the Buildings Department; and
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department in paragraph 9.1.7(b) of the Paper that barrier free facilities should be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Design Manual: Barrier Free Access 2008.”

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

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

[Ms W.H. Ho, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H3/421 Proposed Eating Place in “Open Space” Zone,
G/F, 1-7 Tak Sing Lane, Sai Ying Pun
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/421)

76. The Secretary reported that Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan had declared an interest in this item as she had current business dealings with Lawson David & Sung Surveyors Ltd., one of the consultants of the applicants.

77. Members noted that Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

78. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms W.H. Ho, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application – the subject seven 3-storey residential buildings at 1-7 Tak Sing Lane were completed in 1952 and 1953 before the site was zoned “Open Space” (“O”) on the first Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) which was gazetted in 1970. The implementation of the open space was subject to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department’s program. A review of the “O” zones in the Sai Ying Pun and Sheung Wan area was carried out in 2006 in relation to the proposed amendments to the approved OZP No. S/H3/20. It was recommended that the “O” zone at 1-7 Tak Sing Lane should be retained;
- (b) the proposed eating place;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, 17 public comments were received including 10 objections and 7 providing comments on the application. The commenters were concerned that the proposed eating place use was not in line with the planning intention of the “O” zone and not compatible with the surrounding environment; the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent; the site should be reserved for open space development; the proposed eating place located amidst the residential area would pose adverse environmental nuisances on the surrounding residential area and the nearby elderly centre and cause fire safety and security problems; the application premises was not accessible by traffic and would cause loading/unloading problems; and there were already enough eating places in the vicinity. No local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Central and West) (DO(C&W)). Nevertheless, DO(C&W) advised that members of the Central and Western District Council and residents in the vicinity might raise concern on the additional pedestrian flow and other nuisances (hygiene, noise, security, etc.) arising from the proposed eating place; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper. As regards the public comments on the possible adverse traffic and environmental impacts of the proposed eating place, the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Environmental Protection had no adverse comment on the application from the traffic and environmental points of view. Environmental issues such as air, noise and water pollution were controlled under the relevant pollution control ordinances and an advisory clause for such an aspect would be incorporated. The applicant also stated that there would be no outdoor seating accommodation and the proposed eating place would be operated from 11:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. daily. Regarding the provision of public open space, the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services had no programme for open space development at the site and advised that the land resumption matters would need to be resolved before the open space development could proceed. As for the concerns on fire safety, the Director of Fire Services had no objection to the application

and an approval condition on the provision of fire service installations would be recommended.

79. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

80. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 23.5.2018, 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) no outdoor seating accommodation should be provided and the operation hours should be restricted from 11:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. daily, as proposed by the applicant, during the operation of the eating place;
- (b) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the SIA to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) the provision of fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (e) if the above planning condition (a) is not complied with during the operation of eating place, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice.”

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

- “(a) to note that non-compliance of approval condition will lead to revocation of the planning permission;
- (b) the approval of the application does not imply any compliance with the Buildings Ordinance and Regulations. The applicant should appoint an Authorised Person and Registered Structural Engineer to submit building plans to the Buildings Department for approval in accordance with the requirements of the Buildings Ordinance;
- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene that a licence should be obtained to conduct any food business in the premises;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department that the applicant may wish to review whether the width of the corridor leading to the yard and the width of male lavatory in Nos. 3, 4 and 5, Tak Sing Lane are appropriate;
- (e) to note the comments of the Commissioner of Police that specific designs and measures should be provided: (i) for the loading/unloading of goods for the future restaurants; and (ii) to prevent nuisances (e.g. noise, hygiene) being caused to the neighbourhood by the future restaurants;
- (f) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection on strict compliance with all requirements under all relevant pollution control ordinances, and to follow the recommendations of EPD’s guidelines on “Control of Oily Fume and Cooking Odour from Restaurants and Food Business”;
- (g) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West & South, Lands Department that application for licence/technical modification is required to remove the offensive trade clause of the subject lots for the proposed eating place; and

- (h) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department on implementation of the sewerage improvement measures identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment at the applicant's own cost."

[The Chairman thanked Ms W.H. Ho, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Ms Ho left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H6/71 Proposed Hotel in "Residential (Group A)1" Zone,
53-58 Sun Chun Street, Tai Hang
(MPC Paper No. A/H6/71)

82. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in this item :

- | | |
|---|---|
| Mr Roger K.H. Luk | – his spouse owning a flat at Illumination Terrace in Tai Hang |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | – having current business dealings with Kenneth To & Associates Ltd., one of the consultants of the applicant |

83. Members noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had already left the meeting. As the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that Mr Roger K.H. Luk and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam could stay in the meeting.

84. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 2.5.2014 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 of the relevant Government departments on the application and to substantiate the case. This was the applicant's first request for deferment.

85. 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. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. 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.

Kowloon District

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

Agenda Item 15

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/699 Shop and Services (Local Convenience Store)
 in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone,
 Workshop A on Ground Floor, Hing Win Factory Building,
 No. 110 How Ming Street, Kwun Tong
 (MPC Paper No. A/K14/699)

Presentation and Question Sessions

86. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, 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 shop and services (local convenience store);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments were received. The Chairman of Kwun Tong Central Area Committee supported the application. A member of the public also supported the application and reminded the applicant to pay attention to pedestrian safety as the application premises was next to the ingress/egress of the building's car park. No local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Kwun Tong); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

87. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the submission and implementation of the proposal for fire safety measures, including the provision of a means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion and fire service installations and equipment, in the application premises within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 23.11.2014; and

- (b) if the above planning condition (a) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

- “(a) prior planning permission should have been obtained before commencing the applied use at the application premises;
- (b) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department for lease modification or waiver for the proposed ‘Shop and Services (Local Convenience Store)’ use at the application premises;
- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services on compliance with the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 administrated by the Buildings Department, and to observe the Guidance Note on Compliance with Planning Condition on Provision of Fire Safety Measures for Commercial Uses in Industrial Premises; and
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department (BD) that the applicant should engage an Authorised Person to ensure that any building works/alterations and additions works/change of use are in compliance with the Buildings Ordinance (BO), in particular the provision of adequate means of escape in accordance with Building (Planning) Regulation (B(P)R) 41(1) and the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 (FS Code), the application premises should be separated from the remaining portion of the building by fire barriers of adequate fire resistance rating pursuant to Building (Construction) Regulation 90 and the FS Code, and the provision of access and facilities for persons with a disability in accordance with B(P)R 72 and Design Manual: Barrier Free Access 2008. For unauthorised building works (UBW) erected on leased land, enforcement action may be taken by the Building Authority to effect their removal in accordance with BD’s enforcement policy against UBW as and when necessary, and that the

granting of planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of any UBW on the application site under the BO. Detailed comments under the BO can only be formulated at the building plan submission stage.”

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

Agenda Item 16

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K15/113 Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development
in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone,
5 and 8 Tung Yuen Street, Yau Tong
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/113)

90. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by two subsidiaries of Cheung Kong (Holdings) Ltd. (Cheung Kong). Professor P.P. Ho, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Francis T.K. Ip had declared interests in this item as they had current business dealings with Cheung Kong.

91. Members noted that Professor P.P. Ho and Mr Francis T.K. Ip had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had already left the meeting.

92. The Committee noted that the applicants requested on 9.5.2014 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for revising their technical assessments to address the comments of various Government departments. This was the applicants’ first request for deferment.

93. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicants pending the submission of further information from the applicants. 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

applicants. If the further information submitted by the applicants was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants 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 17

Any Other Business

94. The Chairman said that this meeting was the last Metro Planning Committee meeting attended by the Secretary prior to her retirement. The Chairman proposed and Members extended a vote of thanks to Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong for her contribution to the work of the Town Planning Board (the Board) in the past years.

95. The Chairman said that the Administration proposed to appoint Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong as a special advisor to the Town Planning Board Secretariat to assist and represent the Board in handling judicial review cases. Members agreed to the proposal.

96. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:20 p.m.

(Chairman)

Metro Planning Committee