

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 513th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 13.6.2014

Present

Director of Planning
Mr K.K. Ling

Chairman

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Vice-chairman

Mr Laurence L.J. Li

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr Francis T.K. Ip

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

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr K.F. Tang

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

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Professor P.P. Ho

Ms Julia M.K. Lau

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung

Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Louis K.H. Kau

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss Anny P.K. Tang

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 512th MPC Meeting held on 23.5.2014

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 512th MPC meeting held on 23.5.2014 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

Amendment to Confirmed Minutes of the 511th MPC Meeting held on 9.5.2014

[Open Meeting]

2. The Secretary reported that on 9.5.2014, the Committee rejected a section 12A application No. Y/H9/2 for rezoning a site in Shau Kei Wan from “Residential (Group A)” to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”). The minutes were confirmed at the meeting on 23.5.2014 and sent to the applicant on the same date. On 29.5.2014, the Town Planning Board Secretariat received an email, which was tabled at the meeting, from the applicant proposing amendments to the confirmed minutes of the MPC. The speaking notes of two of the applicant’s representatives were also attached in the e-mail. The proposed amendments were mainly to provide details of and elaborations on the main points raised by the applicant’s representatives which, the applicant claimed, had not been incorporated in the confirmed minutes. The Secretary said that the minutes were not intended to be a verbatim record but to reflect the main points of discussion. However, it was proposed to revise paragraph 11(f) of the minutes to make it clear that it should be 5,000 elderlies on the waiting list of residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) who died each year. The revised minutes were tabled at the meeting for Members' reference and were shown as follows :

“(f) there were over 30,000 persons on the waiting list for subsidised RCHE places in Hong Kong. However, about 5,000 elderlies *on the waiting list* died each year. The number of subsidised RCHE places provided in the Eastern District was only 896. The proposed RCHE in Sai Wan Ho would provide only 100 places which were insufficient to meet the growing

demand. The site, if developed for elderly facilities, would partially address the shortage. It was not understood why the Social Welfare Department (SWD) always claimed that there was no site available for the development of RCHE.”

3. After deliberation, Members agreed not to amend the minutes as proposed by the applicant, except to revise paragraph 11(f) as above. Members also agreed that the Secretariat would advise the applicant the rectification of the minutes.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/K9/10 Application for Amendment to the Approved Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/24, To rezone the application site from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” to “Residential (Group E)”, 13 Hok Yuen Street, Hung Hom
(MPC Paper No. Y/K9/10)

4. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Global Coin Limited, which was a subsidiary of Cheung Kong (Holdings) Ltd. (Cheung Kong) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Ove Arup) and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Ltd. (Mott MacDonald) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item :

Professor P.P. Ho - having current business dealings with Cheung Kong

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having current business dealings with Ove Arup and Mott MacDonald

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with Cheung Kong and Ove Arup

Mr Francis T.K. Ip - having a close relative served on the Board of Directors for Cheung Kong

5. Members noted that Professor P.P. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Mr Francis T.K. Ip had not yet arrived at the meeting. Members also noted that PlanD had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. As Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had no involvement in the subject application, Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

6. The Secretary reported that the site fell within the Hung Hom Business Area, which was one of the industrial/business areas covered by the Area Assessments of Industrial Land in the Territory completed in 2009. According to the 2009 Area Assessments, the site was proposed to be retained as “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone. Another round of Area Assessments was being conducted by the Planning Department (PlanD) and was expected to be completed in late 2014. Consideration of the subject application at this stage was premature as it would prejudice the recommendation of the Area Assessments and might jeopardize the overall land use planning for the area. In the circumstances, PlanD requested that a decision on the application be deferred until the completion of the Area Assessments which was expected to be in late 2014. On 6.6.2014, the applicant wrote to the Secretary of the Town Planning Board indicating that he had no objection to defer consideration of the application.

7. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by PlanD. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration after the completion of the Area Assessments which was expected to be in late 2014.

Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 4

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/TW/8

Application for Amendment to the Approved Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/31, To rezone the application site from “Green Belt” to “Government, Institution or Community (10)”, Lots No. 613 RP (Part), 614 and 1229 in D.D. 453 and adjoining Government Land, Lo Wai, Tsuen Wan
(MPC Paper No. Y/TW/8)

8. The Secretary reported that CKM Asia Ltd. (CKM) and BMT Asia Pacific Ltd. (BMT) were two of the consultants of the applicant. Professor P.P. Ho, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had declared interests in this item as Professor Ho had current business dealings with CKM while Mr Lam and Mr Lau had current business dealings with BMT. Members noted that Professor Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members also noted that the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Lam and Mr Lau had no involvement in this application. Members agreed that Mr Lam and Mr Lau could stay in the meeting.

9. The Secretary reported that on 21.5.2014, the applicant had requested for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address the comments of relevant government departments. This was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment.

10. In response to a Member’s question on the proposed use of the site, the Secretary said that the application was to amend the approved Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/31 by rezoning the site from “Green Belt” to a new “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) subzone, i.e. “G/IC(10)”, to facilitate regularization of the existing columbarium on the site.

11. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as

requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. 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.

[Mr Philip Y.L. Chum, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/754 Proposed Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated
“Business 1” Zone, Workshop No. 3 (Portion), G/F, Charm Centre,
700 Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/754)

Presentation and Question Sessions

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Philip Y.L. Chum, DPO/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed shop and services;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no

objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment was received and no local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Sham Shui Po); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The development complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Development within “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone (TPB PG-No. 22D).

13. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

14. 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 13.6.2016, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

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

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

- “ (a) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West, Lands Department for application of a temporary waiver or lease modification;
- (b) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department to appoint an Authorized Person to submit building plans for the change in use to demonstrate compliance with the Buildings Ordinance, in particular :
- (i) adequate means of escape should be provided to the premises and the remaining portion of the premises in accordance with the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) 41(1) and the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 (FS Code);
 - (ii) the dead-end travel distance of the remaining portion of the premises at the back and side of the premises should be reassessed in compliance with the FS Code;
 - (iii) access and facilities for persons with a disability should be provided in accordance with B(P)R 72 and Design Manual: Barrier Free Access 2008;
 - (iv) the premises should be separated from the remaining portion of the building by fire barriers of adequate fire resistance rating pursuant to the Building (Construction) Regulations 90 and the FS Code; and
 - (v) adequate provision of sanitary fitments and fittings should be provided in accordance with Building (Standards of Sanitary Fitments, Plumbing, Drainage Works and Latrines) Regulations.”

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

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H24/22 Proposed Eating Place [Sites A and B] in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pier and Associated Facilities” Zone, Public Viewing Area and Public Shared Area next to Watermark on Public Viewing Deck Level (2/F) [Site A], Public Viewing Area and Public Shared Area next to Café & Bar on Roof Viewing Deck (3/F) [Site B] of Central Pier No. 7 and Roof Platforms [Site C] at the Clock Terminal Building at Central Star Ferry Terminal, Central
(MPC Paper No. A/H24/22B)

16. The Secretary reported that one of the applicants was The ‘Star Ferry’ Company Ltd., which was a subsidiary of Wharf (Holdings) Ltd.. The following Members had declared interests in this item :

Mr Roger K.H. Luk - having current business dealings with Wharf (Holdings) Ltd., as well as being a member of the Board of Directors of Wharf T&T Ltd. and a former member of the Board of Directors of Wheelock Properties Ltd. (Wheelock) (resigned in 2010), both of which were companies related to Wharf (Holdings) Ltd.

Professor P.P. Ho - having current business dealings with Wharf (Holdings) Ltd. and Wheelock had financially sponsored the School of Architecture of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, of which Professor Ho was the Director of the MSc in Architectural

Conservation and Design Programme

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having current business dealings with Wharf (Holdings) Ltd., Wharf (China) Ltd. and Wheelock

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with Wharf (Holdings) Ltd. and Wheelock

17. Mr Roger K.H. Luk said that the company he had involved was privatised more than three years ago. Members noted that for past business dealings with the applicant which were not related to the application site, only the past dealings within three years had to be declared and agreed that Mr Luk could stay at the meeting. Members also noted that Professor P.P. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members considered that the interests of Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau were direct, they should leave the meeting temporarily for this item.

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau left the meeting temporarily and Mr Francis T.K. Ip and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

18. 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 highlighting that the entire public viewing deck level (2/F), including Watermark restaurant and the public viewing area at Site A, were previously intended for public enjoyment. The Watermark restaurant was the subject of Application No. A/H24/7 approved by the Committee on 13.9.2002. According to the approved scheme, the restaurant on public viewing deck level was proposed to be surrounded by a public area on three sides (i.e. Site A). In approving the application, whilst the public area was scaled down as a compromise, the Committee noted that the proposal would increase the vibrancy of the pier and generate revenue to subsidize the ferry operation and the applicants

claim that the public would be provided with the access to the best viewing areas on the public viewing deck level;

- (b) the current application was to use the public viewing areas and “public shared areas” at Sites A and B for restaurant use; and the unused roof platforms at Site C for the proposed public viewing platforms (which was always permitted) to compensate for the loss in public viewing areas at Sites A and B;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper, which were summarised as follows :
 - (i) the Chief Transport Officer/Planning/Ferry, Transport Department (CTO/P/F, TD) raised that since TD was responsible for the cost of the electricity consumption for the public areas while other works departments were responsible for the repair and maintenance for the installations and facilities within the pier premises, resource implications would be caused to all the relevant government departments;
 - (ii) the Lands Unit, Development Bureau (DEVB) advised that the “shared areas” as mentioned by the applicants were in fact public areas with no commercial concession approval granted before and the approval of the application would result in a total loss of public area by 37m². The applicants should justify how the proposal could achieve planning gain with the overall loss in public area within the pier and to elaborate on how public enjoyment of public area in the pier would not be compromised;
 - (iii) the Harbour Unit (HU), DEVB stated that it was inconclusive for the HU, DEVB to offer support to the proposal or otherwise, and that the application should only be considered when further details were available and subject to the proponent’s further consultation with stakeholders. HU, DEVB also commented that the public would be

required to climb a few flights of stairs to reach the public viewing platforms at rooftop level which might adversely affect patronage to the platforms and public enjoyment of the harbour view would also be subject to weather conditions. Harbourfront Commission's Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (HKTF) discussed the proposal at its meeting on 18.2.2014 and Members had diverse views on the proposal. One of the Members who was also a member of the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) expressed reservation on the proposal at the meeting. HU, DEVB advised the applicants to more actively engage C&WDC to seek local community's views. The District Officer/Central and Western (DO/C&W) also advised the applicants to submit a paper to C&WDC for discussion;

- (iv) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had some reservations on the application from the landscape point of view, as there was insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed public viewing platforms could be easily accessible to pedestrians by an unrestricted barrier free access with adequate provision of facilities for public uses;
 - (v) the Central District Commander/Central District Police Headquarter commented that a large crowd was expected to congregate at the public viewing platforms in Site C when there was large-scale public event held in the Victoria Harbour or vicinities. In view of public safety, the platforms should be closed during the large-scale event;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, nine public comments from the general public were received. All of the commenters supported the proposed arrangement as the proposed public viewing deck would provide a better view and would better utilise the public and private spaces. The additional revenue generated from the expanded operation of the restaurants could also subsidize the Star Ferry operation;

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper, which were summarized below :
- (i) the public viewing platforms at Site C were at the expense of the loss of public viewing areas (-519m²) and public areas (-283m²) together with an expansion of private dining areas (+802m²) at Sites A and B. The area of the proposed public viewing platforms at Site C (765m²) was actually smaller than the total loss of public area (802m²) by 37m², which had yet to be fully justified from the viewpoint of public enjoyment of the harbour;
 - (ii) whether the roof platforms at Site C would eventually provide a quality open space and achieve a gain for the public actually depended on the design and provision of facilities on the proposed public viewing deck at Site C and its public accessibility. CTP/UD&L, PlanD commented that there was insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed public viewing platforms could function properly as a quality public open space and the provision of barrier-free access was unsatisfactory. HU, DevB also advised that climbing a few flights of stairs to reach the public viewing platforms at rooftop level might adversely affect patronage to the platforms. Given the accessibility and design issues, there was insufficient planning merit to justify the loss of public areas/public viewing areas at Sites A and B; and
 - (iii) there was a lack of a detailed management proposal demonstrating how the public viewing platforms were to be managed and maintained for public access and enjoyment, particularly how to facilitate members of the public to use the proposed public viewing platforms at Site C in normal days, and how to restrict/prohibit public access in case of large scale public events held in the harbourfront area to ensure public safety. CTO/P/F, TD also raised that resource implications would be caused to all the relevant

government departments; and

- (iv) while Members of HKTF had diverse views on the proposal and one of the HKTF Members who was also a C&WDC Member expressed strong reservation on the application at the HKTF meeting, both HU, DEVB and DO/C&W advised the applicants to more actively engage C&WDC to seek local community's views.

19. In response to the Vice-chairman's question on the meaning of "public shared areas", Ms W.H. Ho, STP/HK, referred to a slide showing the floor plans of public viewing floor and explained that the areas included access corridor and washroom that were currently shared between the customers of Watermark and the general public visiting the public viewing area. The applicants proposed to use the "shared areas" for extension and exclusive use of the existing restaurants.

20. In response to two Members' question on pedestrian flow in the public area, Ms W.H. Ho said that according to the information provided by the applicants, there were very few visitors to the public viewing deck, i.e. about 10 people per day. The applicants considered that as the public viewing area failed to meet the original planning intention for public enjoyment of the harbourfront area, the area should be rationalized and Site C would be a better alternative with prime waterfront viewing and more convenient location for public enjoyment.

21. A Member asked whether it would be allowed to carry out superstructure and major modification works to improve the accessibility in the Clock Tower. A Member also asked whether it was possible to construct a lift shaft inside the Clock Tower. Referring to a slide showing the elevation and layout plans of the Clock Tower, Ms W.H. Ho said that retractable awnings would be provided at Site C. However, erection of superstructures might have visual implications and be visually incompatible with the built form of the Clock Tower. Notwithstanding, the applicants had yet to provide sufficient information concerning the actual design of the proposed facilities. As for improving the accessibility of Site C, the applicants had once considered installing a lift, however, some Members of HKTF did not support the proposal from visual point of view. For the construction of a lift shaft inside the Clock Tower, Ms Ho said that a detailed technical assessment from the applicants would be required to ascertain its feasibility.

22. In response to a Member's question on whether it was suitable to use Sites A, B and C as public viewing areas, Ms W.H. Ho said that the entire 2/F was originally designed as a public viewing deck and intended for public enjoyment. In approving the application for restaurant use on 2/F at Pier 7, the three sides along the perimeter of the pier were retained as a public area for public enjoyment. Site B was originally designed as roof viewing deck and circulation area before a planning application for restaurant use for part of the site was approved by the Committee. For Site C, its original design was not for access by the public.

23. A Member noted that according to the applicants, the additional revenue generated from the expanded restaurants could subsidize the Star Ferry operation. This Member asked if the arrangement had been agreed by the Government. Mr W.B. Lee, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), TD, said that there was no specific arrangement yet. However, they had no in-principle objection to use the revenue generated for subsidizing the ferry operation.

Deliberation Session

24. Members generally agreed with PlanD's assessments and considered that the application could not be supported at this stage. Some Members considered that the existing public viewing arrangements at Sites A and B were not ideal, thus the public viewing deck on 2/F was underutilized. However, the proposed design and accessibility of Site C were also considered unsatisfactory. A Member said that the Clock Tower was an icon and Site C was not intended for public use. Another Member said that the current unsatisfactory arrangement at Sites A and B should not be the reason for extension of the restaurants. A Member concurred with this view. Some Members also considered that the applicants should consider rearranging the layout of the restaurants and the public viewing deck so as to bring an overall improvement to the pier as a tourist attraction point.

25. Two Members considered that the intention of the proposal was good. A Member said that should Site C be opened to the public in future, it would provide another quality public viewing platforms for public enjoyment. However, there were issues that would need to be resolved and the applicants should be encouraged to revise the scheme and consult the C&WDC. A Member considered that there were alternative means for the

applicants to revise the arrangement in both Sites A and B. Another Member also considered that C&WDC should be consulted. The Chairman summed up that the applicants should consult C&WDC on details of its revised proposal including the possible visual impact of the proposed structures on the Clock Tower and the provision of better signage and arrangement for access to the public areas in Sites A and B.

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

- “ (a) there is insufficient justification for the loss of public areas/public viewing areas at Sites A and B for restaurant use from the viewpoint of public enjoyment of the harbour;
- (b) there are insufficient planning merits to justify the proposed conversion of Sites A and B for restaurant use;
- (c) the applicants fail to demonstrate that the proposed public viewing platforms at Site C would create a quality open space for public enjoyment; and
- (d) there is insufficient information on the management of the proposed public viewing platform at Site C including the accessibility arrangement, opening hours and safety.”

[The Chairman thanked Ms W.H. Ho, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

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

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H10/85 House (Temporary Uses of Leisure Pool, Pantry and Sitting-out Area) for a Period of 5 Years in “Green Belt” Zone, Government Land adjoining House B3, Villa Cecil, South of No.200 Victoria Road, Pok Fu Lam

(MPC Paper No. A/H10/85B)

27. The Secretary reported that Mr Roger K.H. Luk and Mr Francis T.K. Ip had declared interests in this item as they had current business dealings with the owner of the site. Members considered that the interests of Mr Luk and Dr Fok were direct, they should leave the meeting temporarily for this item.

[Mr Roger K.H. Luk and Mr Francis T.K. Ip left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

28. A replacement page (page 5) to the Paper was tabled at the meeting for Members’ information. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the house (temporary uses of leisure pool, pantry and sitting-out area) for a period of 5 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) objected to the application from landscape planning perspective and commented that according to the aerial photos, vegetation clearance had been carried out on site in 2010 and the leisure pool was built in 2011. All the existing

trees of significant sizes inside and adjacent to the site were removed. The proposed uses were considered not compatible with the surrounding natural environment of the green belt and had caused noticeable disturbances and changes to the existing natural landscape character and resources. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent to encourage similar incompatible uses sprawling onto the green belt that would further deteriorate the landscape quality of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone. It was also noted that area to the south of the site within the green belt had already formed into stepped terraces with existing vegetation removed which caused cumulative adverse landscape impacts on the natural environment. CTP/UD&L, PlanD also commented that the proposed use was not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone and the applicant had not provided a strong justification for a departure from the planning intention;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection periods of the application and further information, a total of 65 public comments were received. There were 49 public comments supporting the application mainly on grounds that the proposed uses were small in scale and did not have a significant impact on the surrounding green belt or local community. Moreover, the applicant would help to look after and clean up the inaccessible area and the slope. There were 10 public comments objecting to the application mainly on grounds that the occupation of public land for private use was not reasonable and against public interest, which would set an undesirable precedent to others. There were also four general comments without indicating support or objection but expressed the view that the site should be appropriately used for the public interest; and two nil comments;
- (e) PlanD’s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper, which were summarized below :
 - (i) the application was not in line with the planning intention of the

“GB” zone, which was primarily for the conservation of the existing natural environment at the urban fringe and to safeguard it from encroachment by urban type development, and to provide additional outlets for passive recreational activities for public purpose. There was a general presumption against development within this zone. According to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10, development within “GB” zone would only be considered in exceptional circumstances and must be justified with very strong planning grounds. However, there was no strong planning justification to utilize this piece of Government land for leisure pool, pantry and sitting-out area purpose for private enjoyment only;

- (ii) the site had been converted to leisure pool, pantry and sitting-out area uses after the site was zoned “GB” on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) without the Town Planning Board (the Board)’s approval. The District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West & South, Lands Department (LandsD) confirmed that the subject piece of Government land was occupied without authorization and would take appropriate action against the unauthorized occupation of Government land and the unlawful structures on the unleased land; and
- (iii) the uses had already resulted in removal of all the trees on site, affecting the natural landscape and visual amenity. Besides, other similar application in Villa Cecil was rejected by the Committee. The approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “GB” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the natural environment.

29. In response to a Member’s question on when the site was used as a leisure swimming pool, pantry and sitting-out area, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, STP/HK, said that the site had been converted to these uses since 2009 when the site was zoned “GB”. According to the Notes of the OZP, these uses required planning permission from the Board. However, no

planning approval had been granted within the subject “GB” zone. LandsD also confirmed that appropriate actions against the unauthorized occupation of the Government land and the unlawful structures on the unleased land would be taken.

30. A Member noted that there were two approved Short Term Tenancies (STTs) near the site, and enquired on the nature of the STTs and if the uses were approved by the Board. Referring to a slide showing a site plan of the area, Mr Derek P.K. Tse said that the two approved STTs to the northwest of the site were for recreational uses. According to aerial photo taken in 1985, the two sites had already been formed, which was prior to the first gazettal of the OZP in February 1986. In response to a Member’s question, Mr Tse also clarified that the nullah which fell within the site was covered by a platform built by the applicant.

31. In response to a Member’s question on whether there were similar circumstances in other residential developments situated within the “GB” zone, Mr Derek P.K. Tse said that there was one similar application (No. A/H10/84), at House B1 of Villa Cecil, for the private garden and swimming pool uses, which was rejected by the Committee in May 2013. It was understood that LandsD was taking appropriate actions against the unauthorized occupation of the Government land.

Deliberation Session

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

- “ (a) the leisure pool, pantry and sitting-out area development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone which is primarily for conservation of the existing natural environment amid the built-up areas/at the urban fringe, to safeguard it from encroachment by urban type development, and to provide additional outlets for passive recreational activities. There is a general presumption against development in “GB” zone. There is no strong justification for a departure from the planning intention;

- (b) the residential development does not meet the Town Planning Board Guidelines No.10 for ‘Application for Development within “GB” Zone’ in that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the application and there are adverse landscape and visual impacts; and
- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications within the “GB” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such proposals will result in a general degradation of the environment in the area.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr Derek P.K. Tse, STP/HK, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting and Mr Roger K.H. Luk and Mr Francis T.K. Ip returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K11/217

Proposed Columbarium (within a Religious Institution or Extension of Existing Columbarium only) in “Government, Institution or Community” and “Green Belt” Zones, Block A and Footbridges (including Lift Tower, Staircase and Services House) at Tsz Wan Kok Temple, 150 Tsz Wan Shan Road, Tsz Wan Shan
(MPC Paper No. A/K11/217)

33. The Secretary reported that Lawson David & Sung Surveyors Ltd. (Lawson David) and CKM Asia Ltd. (CKM) were the consultants of the applicant. Professor P.P. Ho and Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan had declared interests in this item as Professor Ho had current business dealings with CKM while Ms Chan had current business dealings with Lawson David.

Members noted that Professor Ho and Ms Chan had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

34. The Secretary reported that on 23.5.2014, the applicant had requested for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to respond to the comments from government departments. This was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment.

35. 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.

[Mr Richard Y.L. Siu, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K13/290 Shop and Services in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business"
Zone, Unit 3, G/F, Kingsford Industrial Centre, 13 Wang Hoi Road,
Kowloon Bay
(MPC Paper No. A/K13/290A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

36. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Richard Y.L. Siu, STP/K, presented

the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the shop and services under application;

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

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment was received and 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 set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The development complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Development within “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone (TPB PG-No. 22D).

37. With reference to paragraph 6.2 of the Paper, a Member noted that some of the applied uses in previous applications were accountable for maximum permissible limit of 230m²/460m² for aggregate commercial floor area on G/F of an industrial building while others were not. This Member asked PlanD to elaborate on the criteria used. In response, Mr Richard Y.L. Siu, STP/K, explained that the criteria were based on the TPB PG-No. 22D. For uses which were ancillary to or for the purposes of supporting the industrial activities and the routine activities of the workers in the industrial building, their floor area would not be accountable for aggregate commercial floor area. For the fast food shops stated in paragraph 6.2 of the Paper, only those fast food shops without seating accommodation were not accountable, while those fast food cum retail shops were accountable.

Deliberation Session

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

- “ (a) the submission and implementation of the proposal for fire safety measures, including the provision of means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion and fire service installations and equipment in the application premises within six months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 13.12.2014; and
- (b) if the above planning condition is not complied with by the specific date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

39. 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 temporary waiver for the shop and services use at the application premises;
- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services on the compliance with the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings administered by the Buildings Department (BD) and to refer to 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, BD to appoint an Authorized Person to submit alterations and additions proposal

to the Building Authority (BA) to demonstrate compliance with the Buildings Ordinance (BO), in particular:

- (i) the provision of adequate means of escape for the application premises in accordance with the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) 41(1) and the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 (FS Code);
- (ii) 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;
- (iii) the application premises should be separated from the remaining portion of the building by fire barriers of adequate fire resistance rating pursuant to the Building (Construction) Regulations 90 and the FS Code;
- (iv) for unauthorized building works (UBW) erected on leased land/private buildings, enforcement action may be taken by BA to effect their removal in accordance with BD's enforcement policy against UBW as and when necessary. The granting of any planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of any existing building works or UBW on the application premises under the BO; and
- (v) detailed comments under the BO can only be formulated at the building plan submission stage."

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

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

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/700 Proposed Hotel in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone,
28A Hung To Road, Kwun Tong
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/700)

40. The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTA) and MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) were two of the consultants of the applicant. Ms Julia M.K. Lau, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had declared interests in this item as they had current business dealings with MVA while Mr Lam and Mr Lau also had current business dealings with KTA. Members noted that Ms Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Mr Lau had left the meeting already. As Mr Lam had no involvement in this application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

41. 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 proposed hotel;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Tourism supported the application as the proposed development would increase the number of hotel rooms, broaden the range of accommodation for visitors and support the rapid development of convention and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) commented that the proposed provision of one parking space for tour bus and one loading/unloading (L/UL) bay for goods vehicle, though not entirely in

accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), could be tolerated. C for T also considered that with the proposed setback areas for footpath widening, the pedestrian environment, including safety, would be significantly improved;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four public comments were received. Two comments were submitted by the Chairman of Kwun Tong Central Area Committee and a Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) Member supporting the application without giving reason. The remaining two comments submitted by another KTDC Member and Designing Hong Kong Limited objected to the application mainly on the grounds that the traffic generated from the proposed use would aggravate the traffic congestion in the Kwun Tong Business Area (KTBA), and sufficient office space should be provided in the business area;
- (e) No local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Kwun Tong); and
- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Regarding the public comments against the application on traffic grounds, C for T and Commissioner of Police had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the view that more office use should be provided in the area, the proposed hotel use was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone, and office use, which was always permitted in the “OU(B)” zone, could be provided in other “OU(B)” zone in the KTBA.

42. The Vice-chairman asked the Transport Department (TD) to explain why the proposed parking and L/UL provision could be tolerated even though it did not meet the HKPSG parking requirements. Mr W.B. Lee, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), TD, said that given the small size and the specific location of the site, the proposed development would not pose major traffic impact on the surrounding areas. Besides, the

proposed setbacks for footpath widening could be considered as a planning merit as it would significantly improve the pedestrian environment.

43. Another Member was also concerned about the non-provision of car parking space and taxi/private car lay-by and suggested TD to consider providing a lay-by at How Ming Street for L/UL activities for the proposed development. In response, Mr W.B. Lee said that TD would continue to monitor the traffic condition of How Ming Street and Hung To Road and would carry out the appropriate traffic management measures if required.

Deliberation Session

44. A Member had no objection to the application but had concern on the precedent effect of approving the application, as the Committee had all along been very cautious about the traffic impacts of new hotel developments in the Kwun Tong area, in view of its poor traffic condition.

45. The Vice-chairman said that although the applicant proposed to dedicate the setbacks for footpath widening, some public area would be used for on-street L/UL activities of the proposed hotel for which bonus plot ratio/gross floor area could be claimed. Hence, it was doubtful if the dedication was really for the public benefit. The issue should be examined carefully in the building plans submission stage.

46. In response to Members' concerns, Mr W.B. Lee said that after assessing the traffic condition of the area, it was considered that the on-street L/UL activities would be acceptable. TD would impose necessary traffic management measures to regulate traffic in the area if required.

47. A Member asked if the proposed hotel would be covered by the Government's policy measures to revitalise industrial buildings or whether the policy no longer existed. Ms Doris M.Y. Chow, Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department, said that she had no such information at hand. The Chairman suggested that the information would be provided for Members' information after the meeting.

[Post-meeting Note : The revitalisation measures had been implemented since 1 April 2010

and the deadline for submission of applications was 31 March 2016. Refined measures were implemented in 2012. In 2013 Policy Address, the Chief Executive announced that the Government would further refine the existing measures to better facilitate revitalisation of industrial buildings in appropriate land use zonings into non-industrial uses. For redevelopment of industrial buildings, the proposed uses must always be permitted in the respective zones or planning permission had been obtained from the Town Planning Board before submitting applications to the Lands Department for consideration.]

48. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 13.6.2018, 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 provision of parking facilities, loading/unloading spaces, lay-bys, vehicular access and internal driveway for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB; and
- (b) the provision of full height setbacks along How Ming Street, Hung To Road and the back lane of the site for public passageway 24 hours daily, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the provision of water supplies for fire-fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (e) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (f) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection

works identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment in planning condition (e) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

49. 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 fulfil 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 and bonus plot ratio (PR) for footpath widening 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, the GFA concession and bonus PR 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 TPB may be required;
- (b) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department for lease modification to effect the proposal;
- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that arrangement on emergency vehicular access shall comply with the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 which is administered by the Buildings Department;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department that the applicant should appoint an Authorized Person to submit building plans to demonstrate full compliance with the Buildings Ordinance (BO); detailed comments under the BO can only be provided at the building plan submission stage; the granting of hotel concession can only be considered upon formal submission of building plans and subject to the compliance under Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered

Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-40; the operation of the hotel will be subject to the licensing requirements under the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance; PNAP APP-151 and 152 on sustainable built environment or building design are applicable; 50% GFA concession may be granted for above-ground private car park in accordance with PNAP APP-2; lighting/ventilation and fire safety requirements should be complied with; application for bonus PR and site coverage (SC) in respect of dedication of area to the public for street widening will be considered in accordance with requirements of the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) 22 and will be considered at the building plan submission stage; and areas of existing streets or service lanes should be deducted from site area for the purpose of PR and SC calculations under B(P)R 23(2)(a);

- (e) to consult the Chief Officer (Licensing Authority), Home Affairs Department on the licensing requirements for the proposed hotel; and
- (f) to prepare and submit the revised Sewerage Impact Assessment as early as possible in view of the time required for the implementation of any required sewerage works.”

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

[Mr Tom C.K. Yip, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), Mr Barry Y.S. Yan and Ms Emily P.W. Tong, Town Planners/Kowloon (TPs/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K7/109 Proposed Shop and Services (Bank) in “Residential (Group E)” Zone,
Room E0022, G/F, The Open University of Hong Kong – Jubilee
College, 81 Chung Hau Street, Ho Man Tin
(MPC Paper No. A/K7/109)

50. The Secretary reported that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Ltd., the consultant of the applicant. Members noted that Mr Lau had left the meeting already.

Presentation and Question Sessions

51. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Barry Y.S. Yan, TP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed shop and services (bank);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment was received from the Chairman of the Incorporated Owners of Chun Man Court supporting the application provided that the bank opened for public use. No local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Kowloon City); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper.

52. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

53. 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 13.6.2018, 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 condition :

“ the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

“ to apply to the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West, Lands Department for a temporary waiver or lease modification for the proposed shop and services (bank) use.”

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K8/46 Proposed Flat (Government Staff Quarters) and Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction (from 11 storeys to 15 storeys) in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, 20 Heng Lam Street, Lok Fu
(MPC Paper No. A/K8/46)

55. The Secretary reported that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with ADI Ltd., one of the consultants of the applicant. As Mr Lam had no involvement in this application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

56. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Emily P.W. Tong, TP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed flat (government staff quarters) and minor relaxation of building height restriction from 11 storeys to 15 storeys;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Secretary for Security (S for S) supported the application and commented that it had not been easy to search for land suitable for development of new Disciplined Services Quarters due to limited supply of residential land in the territory. The application was also in line with the 2013 and 2014 Policy Addresses. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application from urban design/visual impact perspectives and commented that the proposed increase of 4 storeys was unlikely to create significant visual impacts on the surroundings. The Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department considered that the proposed minor relaxation not incompatible with the adjacent residential developments;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment was received and no local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Kowloon City); and
- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was considered not in conflict with the planning intention for the site. All concerned departments had no adverse comment or no objection to the application.

57. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

58. 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 13.6.2018, 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 vehicular access arrangement, parking facilities and loading/unloading spaces to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the provision of fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission and implementation of a landscape and tree preservation proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (e) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the Sewerage Impact Assessment as mentioned in (d) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

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

- “ (a) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that the emergency vehicular access arrangement shall comply with the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings administered by the Buildings Department. Detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal

submission of general building plans;

- (b) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Development(2), Water Supplies Department that fresh water from Government mains shall not be used for watering plant nurseries or landscape features purpose except with the written consent of the Water Authority;
- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Highways Engineer/Kowloon, Highways Department that the proposed access road connecting Heng Lam Street and the site shall be designed, constructed and maintained by the applicant. Any road improvement works due to the site shall also be designed and constructed under the development; and
- (d) to consult the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department on her detailed comments at the detailed design stage.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, Mr Barry Y.S. Yan and Ms Emily P.W. Tong, TPs/K, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 13

Any Other Business

60. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 10:50 a.m..