

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 518th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 22.8.2014

Present

Director of Planning
Mr K. K. Ling

Chairman

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Vice-chairman

Professor P.P. Ho

Mr Laurence L.J. Li

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Ms Julia M.K. Lau

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

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

Assistant Director/Regional 1, Lands Department
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Stephen H. B. Yau

In Attendance

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

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

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

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 517th MPC Meeting held on 8.8.20014

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 517th MPC meeting held on 8.8.2014 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/K15/3

Application for Amendment to the Draft Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K15/20, to rezone the application site from “Open Space” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Public Open Space and Hotel”, Lot Nos. 859SA, 859RP and 860 in Survey District No. 3 and Adjoining Government Land, Wing Fook Street, Cha Kwo Ling

(MPC Paper No. Y/K15/3)

3. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Ove Arup), Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ) and LLA Consultancy Ltd. (LLA) were the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item :

| | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - | having current business dealings with Ove Arup and LLA |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - | having current business dealings with Ove Arup, Environ and LLA |
| Ms Julia M.K. Lau | - | having current business dealings with Environ |

4. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Ms Julia M.K. Lau had not yet arrived to join the meeting. Since the applicant had requested for a deferral of consideration of the application and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had no direct involvement in the subject application, Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

5. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 14.8.2014 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 from government departments, in particular Transport Department (TD) and Highways Department (HyD). The Secretary reported that

this was the third time that the applicant had requested for deferment. Since the last deferment on 9.5.2014, the applicant had made submissions to the Board including the revised drawings for the improvement works at the roads and road junctions near the proposed development to address comments from the concerned departments. TD and HyD had further comments on the technical aspects of the proposed road/junction improvement works. The applicant requested more time for preparation of further information to address their concerns.

[Messrs Francis T.K. Ip, Laurence L.J. Li and Simon S.W. Wang arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

6. 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 since a total of six months had been allowed, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Mr Frankie W.P. Chou arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/K7/10 Application for Amendment to the Approved Ho Man Tin
Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K7/22, To rezone the application site from
"Open Space" to "Government, Institution or Community", Junction of
Sheung Shing Street and Fat Kwong Street, Ho Man Tin
(MPC Paper No. Y/K7/10)

7. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Ove Arup) and URS Hong Kong Ltd. (URS) were the consultants of the applicant. Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, who had current business dealings with Ove Arup, had declared an interest in this item. Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, who had current business dealings with Ove Arup and URS, had also declared an interest in this item. Members noted that Mr Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr Lam had no direct involvement in the subject application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

8. The following representatives from Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr Tom Yip - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)
Ms S.H. Lam - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)

9. The following applicant's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mrs Cybill Lam
Mr Stephen Ng
Ms Theresa Yeung
Mr Barton Leung
Mr Plato Tso
Mr Alex Wong
Mr Ben Yiu

Mr David Lau
Mr Rodney Ip
Ms Jace Iong
Mr Aloysius Wong
Dr Emma Leung

10. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the hearing. He then invited Ms S.H. Lam, STP/K to brief Members on the background of the application.

Presentation and Question Sessions

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint, Ms S. H. Lam , STP/K, presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

The Proposal

- (a) the application was for rezoning the application site from “Open Space” (“O”) (about 2,180m²) to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to facilitate the proposed Open University of Hong Kong (OUHK) campus development. The proposed development, comprising one block, had a total gross floor area (GFA) of 18,680m² (i.e. a plot ratio of 8.57) and a building height (BH) of 85.25mPD (14 storeys);
- (b) the new campus would provide additional facilities for the existing students and would accommodate academic facilities (lecture halls, classrooms, canteen, office and visiting scholars centre, etc) to relieve congestion of the existing campus. No additional student intake in the new campus was proposed. According to OUHK, the GFA per student would be increased from 7m² to 10m². The G/F of the new campus would be designed as an open plaza for public use. Sky garden and roof garden would be incorporated in the building for visual enjoyment and as green features. The applicant also proposed to reinstate the existing footbridge across Sheung Shing Street to connect with the existing bus terminus. A total of 14 car parking spaces would be provided;

Departmental Comments

- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper and summarised as follows:
- (i) the Secretary for Education (SED) supported the proposed development in-principle to improve the academic environment for OUHK's students. The GFA per student of the UGC-funded institutions ranged from 12m² to 17m². The current ratio of 7m² per student of OUHK was comparatively compact;
 - (ii) the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had no objection to the application as there would be no increase in the number of student and staff. The traffic pattern was nearly the same as the existing condition and no significant traffic impact was anticipated;
 - (iii) the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS) had no objection in-principle to the application on the understanding that there was no shortfall of open space in Ho Man Tin area and Kowloon City District. He also advised that there was no implementation programme to develop the planned open space at the application site;
 - (iv) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) advised that the proposed development of 85.25mPD would bring some visual impacts, but vertical greening would be provided by the applicant to break the monotony of the high-rise residential building backdrop. The height of the proposed development was considered not unacceptable should there be surplus on "O" site and very strong justifications. From the landscape point of view, she also had no in-principle objection to the application if there was sufficient open space within the district. There was also no adverse comment on

the air ventilation aspect;

- (v) other concerned government departments have no objection to/adverse comments on the application;

Local Comments

- (d) the District Officer (Kowloon City) advised that Members of the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) expressed objection against the application;
- (e) on 6.3.2014, KCDC Housing and Infrastructure Committee (HIC) passed a motion on 'requesting the Board to reject the application No. Y/K7/10'. The KCDC members' concerns were mainly on traffic congestion, pedestrian safety and loss of open space arising from the proposed OUHK development. Moreover, as Jubilee College of OUHK had been completed which could cope with its growth in the coming 10 years, some KCDC members queried the imminent need of OUHK for expansion;

Public Comments

- (f) during the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection periods of the application and the further information, a total of 333 public comments were received. Among them, 311 (about 93.4%) supported/were in favour of the application and 18 (about 5.4%) objected to/had adverse comments on the application. The remaining four comments (about 1.2%) provided views on the application which included that land resources should be better utilised to improve townscape and living quality; pedestrian crossing network should be improved; pedestrian walkway connecting Sheung Shing Street Park and the Ho Man Tin bus terminus should be provided; and sufficient re-provisioning open space compensating the affected open space area should be provided;
- (g) the major supporting comments included the following:

- (i) the proposed development would ease the over crowdedness within the existing OUHK main campus;
 - (ii) close proximity to the existing OUHK main campus would facilitate distribution of OUHK's resources;
 - (iii) the proposed development would offer more greening and open space to students and local residents;
 - (iv) the playground at the application site could not perform the function of an open space due to limited space. The site was not suitable for open space use as it was located at the busy road junctions and was not easily accessible;
 - (v) converting the application site for academic use was a better use of land resource and would benefit the society in the long term;
 - (vi) the applicant would improve the pedestrian crossing in nearby area and reinstate the connection to the adjoining Sheung Shing Street Park; and
 - (vii) the proposed 14-storey academic building would have no adverse impacts on the community;
- (h) the major opposing comments included the following:
- (i) the increase in vehicular and pedestrian flows from commuting between the proposed development and the existing campus would add pressure on the existing roads;
 - (ii) the proposed campus development and other residential developments in the vicinity would have adverse visual impact. The existing infrastructure could not cope with the needs from the increased population;

- (iii) as more high-rise residential buildings would be completed in the nearby area, the population would increase and it was necessary to provide more open space;
- (iv) even though the OUHK would allow the public to use the open space on G/F, it would create management problem;
- (v) the proposal would lead to loss of open space provision in the area. The proposed open plaza at G/F could not fully compensate the loss of uncovered open space. The quantity and location of the proposed landscaping and compensatory tree planning at G/F was far less satisfactory than an intact open space. There was a lack of evidence that the existing open space site was under-utilised;
- (vi) the proposed OUHK building would block air ventilation;
- (vii) the new OUHK campus at Chung Hau Street, i.e. Jubilee College, was just established in the nearby area. University education became a profit-making industry and it was not fair to the population nearby. It was not clear whether there was remaining space in the existing campuses for further development to accommodate additional required physical facilities and whether the application site was the only suitable site in Hong Kong for OUHK development; and
- (viii) the site should be reserved for open space/recreational space, public housing or car parking uses to cater for the local needs;

Planning Department (PlanD)'s views

- (i) PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper which were summarised below:

- (i) the site was surrounded by a mixture of uses including GIC and residential buildings. The proposed development was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. It was close to the OUHK main campus just across Fat Kwong Street. Locating the new campus at the site would have synergy effect for students using the facilities in the two campuses. The applicant had been working with EDB since 2002 to identify suitable site for the proposed campus development and 23 sites/premises were considered in the territory. However, none of them fulfilled the operational requirements of OUHK;
- (ii) in the urban design context, CTP/UD&L, PlanD considered that the height of the proposed development (85.25mPD) was not unacceptable given that the building height restriction of the “Residential (Group A)” zone to its immediate east was already 100mPD. The OUHK main campus across Fat Kwong Street was 88mPD. The OUHK Jubilee College nearby was 98mPD. There were also high-rise residential developments in the vicinity, e.g. King Man House of 149mPD to the north-east and Ellery Terrace at 165mPD to the south. The proposed development was not incompatible with the existing landscape character;
- (iii) the site was located in the south-eastern part of a large “O” zone planned for district open space (DO). Taking into account the latest estimated planned population of the Ho Man Tin area upon full development and assuming that the Site was to be rezoned from “O” to “G/IC”, there would still be a surplus of planned “O” land of 4.37ha with surplus LO of about 3.83ha and surplus DO of about 0.54ha. LCSD had no programme to develop the subject “O” site, and had no objection to the application. To compensate the loss of the existing playground of about 500m² within the site, the applicant had proposed to develop part of the G/F (about 500m²) as open space for public use. Besides, the greening ratio would be at least 20% to 25%;

- (iv) DEP had no objection to the application from the environmental planning perspective. As no additional students were planned for the proposed OUHK campus, C for T had no objection to the application. The proposed development at the site would unlikely induce significant drainage, water supplies, highway and geotechnical impacts. Relevant government departments had no adverse comment on/no objection to the application; and
- (v) the proposed “G/IC” zoning for educational institution use with a plot ratio of 8.57 and BH of 85.25mPD were generally acceptable. The proposed plot ratio was in line with the plot ratios of developments in the vicinity which mainly ranged from 5 to 9. Should the Committee agreed to the application, it was suggested that the development parameters, i.e. GFA, BH and an area of open space for public use, should be stipulated in the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP).

12. Upon the invitation of the Chairman to make a presentation, Mr Stephen Ng made the following main points:

- (a) OUHK was a self-financed university established by the Government in 1989. It believed that higher education should be available to all those aspiring to it, regardless of previous qualification, gender or race. Originally, OUHK only organised distance learning courses which were quite successful. With the continuous change of the society, from 2001, OUHK introduced full-time courses in response to the Government’s call for more full-time courses in university. There was also a recent trend of organising e-learning courses on the internet. OUHK provided opportunity for people in the work force to continue study in various fields;
- (b) up till now, there were about 80,000 graduates from OUHK. This year, OUHK had 12,000 distance-learning students and 7,000 full-time students. There was insufficient space in the campus for teaching, learning and

student activity. As a self-financed university and in the absence of any Government subvention, OUHK hoped to find sites nearby with good linkage to the main campus for further development. Therefore, this application was submitted with a view to better utilising the under-utilised site and also providing more facilities for the local community;

- (c) OUHK had been consulting KCDC and the local people on the proposed development for ten months since last year. Their concerns were mainly on three aspects, namely, traffic impact, safety of pedestrian and loss of open space. On traffic concern, OUHK would liaise with Transport Department (TD) on the provision of bus/mini-bus routes and schedules to minimise the traffic impact. On the concern on pedestrian safety, OUHK intended to construct a new footbridge which would benefit the district and planned to raise fund for the project. For the loss of open space, OUHK would compensate the loss as far as possible by providing open space for public use within the site. Moreover, while survey had been done and had confirmed that there was no special species of tree, trees within the application site would be preserved as far as possible. OUHK would plant some popular tree species within the site; and
- (d) OUHK was not funded by the Government and had to solicit fund by themselves through fund-raising. The existing main campus of OUHK was very crowded with insufficient space for activity. When compared with other universities, the GFA per student ratio in OUHK was on the low side. With the completion of the proposed development, more classrooms and activity space would be provided for the students, which could help achieve the objective of whole person development.

13. The Vice-chairman asked PlanD to elaborate on the support given by SED. In view of the different demand of space for full-time, part-time and distance-learning students, he asked why the applicant proposed to increase the GFA of OUHK but with no increase in the number of student. Mr Tom Yip, DPO/K explained that SED supported in-principle the provision of quality teaching environment for OUHK's students, given that the proposal was to provide more space for teaching, learning, students activities and other facilities.

However, SED would not give financial support to OUHK which was a self-financed university with no subvention from the University Grants Committee (UGC). On the latter question, Mr Stephen Ng responded that OUHK originally provided distance learning courses. From 2001, with the change of the government policy to encourage more universities and more full-time courses, the number of full-time students had been increased from 200 to currently 7,000. With the increase of full-time students, OUHK had to borrow venues from Vocational Training Council or other secondary schools. At present, there was not only a lack of classrooms, activity and interaction space for OUHK's teacher and students was also badly needed. It was hoped that the availability of the subject application site for the expansion of OUHK would help improve the situation and provide opportunity for whole person development. Full-time students used the campus mostly during daytime while other students would use the campus after work at night. Currently, OUHK had only one multi-purpose hall with 70% of time used for conducting examinations. The proposed expansion of OUHK would provide more venues for examinations and other activities. The venues could also be opened for the use of the local residents given that there was a lack of community hall in Ho Man Tin.

[Mr Ken Y.K. Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

14. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Mr Stephen Ng replied that Jubilee College of OUHK began to operate from March 2014. It offered courses mainly on Creative Arts and Cultural Studies, Testing and Certification programmes and Nursing and Healthcare programmes which were initiated in response to the then Chief Executive's policy on developing Hong Kong's six crucial industries. Jubilee College had to accommodate many special equipment for these courses. By providing these courses, Jubilee College would provide the essential human resources to these three fields which were not provided by the UGC-funded universities.

15. The Vice-chairman enquired on the ratio of the number of students studying in distance learning mode to those in full-time/part-time mode and whether there would be changes in this ratio in the next five years. Mrs Cybill Lam replied that OUHK had 12,000 distance-learning students and 7,000 full-time students, with no part-time students. Distance-learning students had to come to campus to take some classes every month even though they would take course materials home to study by themselves. This type of

students would come to campus to attend classes at night on weekdays and also the whole day of Saturday and Sunday. For full-time students, they would attend classes during daytime on weekdays until 7p.m. The semesters for distance-learning students were from October to March and from April to September, with no summer recess. The full-time students had two semesters, from September to May, but there was a trend for having a third semester during the summer from May to August. Therefore, the campus of OUHK was opened all the year round and had been fully utilised.

16. Noting that KCDC had concerns on the traffic impact and the provision of open space, the Chairman asked PlanD why the proposed development was considered acceptable on these aspects. Mr Tom Yip responded that the traffic impact of the proposed development included impact on vehicular traffic and pedestrian traffic. On vehicular traffic, as the proposed development would only increase space for the existing OUHK's students and there would not be any increase in the number of students, the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) submitted by the applicant had confirmed that the traffic impact induced was slight. On pedestrian traffic, there were existing pedestrian crossings connecting the old campus and new campus of OUHK. The applicant had also proposed to restore the footbridge across Sheung Shing Street connecting the application site and the existing bus terminus where a planned school and a planned community hall would be located in future. The applicant would also consider to construct a footbridge linking the application site across Fat Kwong Street to the existing OUHK main campus if needed. TD had considered the TIA and the footbridge proposals acceptable. As regards the provision of open space, even if the application site was rezoned from "O" to "G/IC", there would still be a surplus of planned "O" land of 4.37ha including a surplus of LO of about 3.83ha and a surplus of DO of about 0.54ha. Moreover, DLCS had no objection to the application and advised that there was no programme to implement any open space at the application site. With the aid of a plan, Mr Yip explained that there were existing and planned "O" sites in various parts of the district to meet the need of the local residents. In conclusion, PlanD considered that no adverse impact on traffic and open space provision was envisaged.

[Ms Julia M.K. Lau arrived and Mr Ken Y.K. Wong returned to join the meeting at this point.]

17. A Member enquired on the overcrowded condition of the students in OUHK

vis-a-vis other private universities. With the government policy to encourage more full-time students, this Member also asked whether OUHK would expand its full-time students in future which might require more land in addition to the current application site. Mr Stephen Ng replied that OUHK was a self-financed public university. It was founded by the Government and supported by the Government in terms of land grant. The GFA per student ratio in OUHK was the smallest when compared with other private or UGC-funded universities. For the number of full-time students, the Board of OUHK intended to retain the number as 7,000 in order to improve educational quality and provide more support to students who were mostly the less benefited in the society.

18. With reference to the comments of the CTP/UD&L, PlanD in paragraph of 8.1.13 of the Paper that open spaces were intended for active/passive recreational purpose and served as spatial/visual relief and ventilation pockets in the urban environment, the same Member considered that the “O” site should not be used if there were other GIC sites available for the campus expansion. In particular, as shown in the photomontage of the Paper, the proposed development was rather bulky and occupied a corner location of a large open space surrounded by high-rise developments. The proposed development would affect the integrity of the open space at large. Mr Tom Yip, with the aid of a photomontage submitted by the applicant, explained that the proposed development was in an area with medium to high-rise residential and GIC developments including the existing OUHK campus at Fat Kwong Street (88mPD), Headquarters of Housing Authority (91 mPD) and Ho Man Tin Estate (159mPD). CTP/UD&L had indicated that the subject site was a breathing space for the area, but subject to there was surplus on the open space provision, no objection was raised to rezone the site for other suitable uses. Although the proposed development would bring some degree of visual impact, suitable mitigation measures such as vertical greening and provision of open plaza at G/F as proposed by the applicant would help mitigate some of the impact. Therefore, CTP/UD&L had no objection to the application from urban design perspective.

19. With regard to the connectivity of the main campus with the proposed new campus, the same Member was of the view that the main campus could be expanded westward towards Princess Margaret Road and asked whether the site of Auxiliary Medical Service Headquarters or other GIC sites had been considered for the extension of OUHK. Mr Tom Yip said that the applicant together with EDB had been searching for more than 20

sites/premises in the territory for the extension of OUHK. These sites/premises were not limited to the Ho Man Tin District and included vacant school sites and vacant premises in shopping malls of some housing estates. However, none of them met the area, location and operational requirements of OUHK. PlanD had also conducted site search of other vacant GIC sites for the proposed development. However, there was no other more suitable site than the application site. Mr Stephen Ng supplemented that the application site had a good synergy effect with the main campus. OUHK had considered the site of Auxiliary Medical Service Headquarters but found that it would not be available for their use.

20. Another Member asked about the source of funding for building the proposed development given that the Government would not subsidise OUHK financially. Mr Stephen Ng explained that most of the fund was from private donation. For example, the fund for the construction of Jubilee College was \$700 million of which \$200 million was from Hong Kong Jockey Club, \$300 million from interest free loan from the Government and the remaining from private donation. The same Member asked whether the facilities in the new campus would be opened to the public. Mrs Cybill Lam responded that OUHK had been holding a principle that the use of facilities in the university could be shared with the public provided that it would not affect the teaching use and operation of the university. The restaurants, classrooms, meeting rooms, lecture halls, podium, sky garden and green roof etc. could all be used by the public. There was a list of venues on-line that could be rented out to the public subject to payment of a fee. In the past, these venues had been rented out for holding meeting or training for various organisations including the Housing Department and Owners' Committee in the nearby area. For the new campus at the subject site, OUHK would continue to allow the public to use its facilities. For Members' information, OUHK had provided a lift from Princess Margaret Road to access the podium of the Jubilee College to facilitate the public/disabled access to Chung Hau Street. This was well received by many local residents.

21. In response to the Vice-chairman's enquiries, Mr Stephen Ng said that the maximum number of full-time student intake was 8,000 which were determined by the Board of OUHK taking into account the various constraints such as cost and ratio of teacher and student. As regards organising new courses, OUHK had the authority to self-accredit the courses but external examiners would be invited to assess the academic standard of these courses.

22. 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 procedures 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 hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

23. The Vice-chairman opined that the application was supported in-principle. However, he noted that for private universities, like Hong Kong Shue Yan University and Hong Kong Chu Hai College of Higher Education, they had to confirm resources before they planned to admit more students and their new courses had to be assessed by the Hong Kong Council for Accreditation of Academic and Vocational Qualifications. For public universities, like the University of Hong Kong (HKU) and the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK), the number of student intake and resources for campus expansion were monitored by UGC. As for OUHK, it appeared that they could start new courses by themselves with no scrutiny. Contrary to the OUHK's objective of 'education for all', OUHK had not organised popular courses but instead offered special courses, like creative arts and cultural studies, testing and certification programmes and nursing and healthcare programmes, which might require special qualification for admission. It appeared that OUHK was operated more like a private university. It might be useful to clarify with EDB the educational role of OUHK and whether there was any mechanism to control the number of student intake of OUHK.

24. The Chairman responded that the concern on the educational policy was noted, but such policy was outside the jurisdiction of the Board which was mainly to consider whether the respective site was suitable for the proposed development. A Member said that although OUHK was not funded by UGC, it was a public organisation governed by The Open University of Hong Kong Ordinance. There was a Court and a Council as the supreme advisory and governing body of OUHK and the Court comprised members from the public to monitor the operation of OUHK. It was also appreciated that OUHK would solicit fund from private donation instead of relying on taxpayers' money. For starting new courses, it

was noted that OUHK would set up a course validation panel inviting external examiners to scrutinise the educational quality/standard of the new courses. This Member supported the application as the proposed development would provide more space for students which was crucial to the growth and learning of the students. Moreover, a new university campus would provide more facilities for the use of the local residents and would bring more benefits to the community than the current storage use at the application site.

25. Another Member was of the view that the major consideration of the application was the loss of an “O” site currently serving as a spatial/visual relief and air ventilation purpose. Given that there was no programme for LCSD to develop the site to a park or open space, and the existing condition of the site which was hard-paved with no greening and occupied by a warehouse, the proposal of developing the site into a new OUHK campus might benefit the community by providing more facilities that the public could use and enjoy such as classroom, lecture room, canteen and open space. Therefore, on balance, it was considered that the application should be supported.

26. A Member considered that education development should be supported but retention of open space was equally important. Given that there would be more high-rise public housing developments to the east of the application site, and the buildings towards Princess Margaret Road were also high, the open space where the application site was located together with the adjacent Hong Kong Police Force Vehicle Pound should be developed into a park for the locality. If the Auxiliary Medical Service Headquarters site could be developed into part of the OUHK, it would help link up the two campuses. However, if the Auxiliary Medical Service Headquarters site was not available, other GIC sites should be considered for the expansion of OUHK and encroachment onto the subject “O” site should be avoided, bearing in mind that the application site was not directly linked with the existing OUHK campus. Recently, vacant GIC sites not required by government departments had been converted to residential sites. There were also cases where “O” sites had been rezoned to “G/IC” when GIC sites were not available. Whilst the rezoning of the subject site to “G/IC” might not cause a concern in the short-term, the retention of the application site as “O” was preferred.

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

27. The Chairman said that many city universities in other countries had several campuses within the city as the expansion of university was generally incremental. Although the existing and proposed campuses of OUHK were separated, they were located within walking distance to one another and would therefore enhance the sharing of educational facilities and resources. To conclude, despite that there were some concerns, on balance, this application was generally supported by Members. Members agreed.

28. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree to the application and that the relevant proposed amendments to the approved Ho Man Tin OZP No. S/K7/22 should be submitted to the Committee for agreement prior to gazetting under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance upon reference back of the approved OZP for amendment by the Chief Executive in Council.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 5

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” annotated “Arts, Cultural, Entertainment and Commercial Uses”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Uses”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Electricity Substation”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Airport Railway Ventilation and Traction Substation Building” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Western Harbour Crossing Ventilation Building” Zones, West Kowloon Cultural District
(MPC Paper No. A/K20/121A)

29. The Secretary reported that Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Ltd. (LD), Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Ltd. (MM) and MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) were the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item :

- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with LD and MVA
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having current business dealings with MM and MVA
- Ms Julia M.K. Lau - having current business dealings with MVA

Members noted that the applicant had requested for a deferral of consideration of the application and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Ms Julia M.K. Lau had no direct involvement in the subject application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

30. The Secretary reported that a letter from Mr Hung Chiu-wah, Derek, a member of Yau Tsim Mong District Council expressing comments on the application received on 19.8.2014 was tabled at the meeting for Members reference.

31. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 18.8.2014 for deferment of the consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from the Planning Department on the visual illustration perspective concerning the buildings around the West Kowloon Terminus of Express Rail Link. This was the second time that the applicant requested for deferment. Since the first deferment on 23.5.2014, the applicant had submitted further information in response to the concerns of relevant government departments on 4.7.2014, 8.8.2014 and 11.8.2014. The applicant requested more time for the preparation of submission of further information to address the departmental comments.

32. 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 since a total of two months had been allowed, no further deferment would

be granted unless under very special circumstances.

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

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

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

33. The Secretary reported that Raymond Chan Surveyors Ltd. was the consultant of the applicant. Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, who had current business dealings with the company, had declared an interest in this item. As Mr Lam had no direct involvement in the subject application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

34. Mr M. S. Ng, STP/TWK, 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 accommodations for visitors, and support the rapid development of convention and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period of the application and further information, a total of seven public comments were received. They objected to the application on the grounds of environmental hygiene, traffic congestion in particular the impact on the access of ambulance to the Caritas Medical Centre (CMC), land use incompatibility and precedent effect. 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 made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Regarding the concern on traffic impact in the public comments, the applicant had submitted a traffic impact assessment to demonstrate that there would be no adverse traffic impacts. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had no objection to the application. For the concern on the access of ambulance to the CMC, C for T advised that the route of ambulance to the Caritas Hospital was mainly from Ching Cheung Road via Wing Tak Road and Po On Road via Misereor Road, the proposed hotel development at Wing Hong Street would unlikely have impacts on the access of ambulance to the CMC. Regarding the concern on environmental hygiene, the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene had no objection to the application and would enhance the street cleansing services to the public pavement in the vicinity of the site if necessary. On the concern on land use compatibility, the proposed hotel development was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business(1)” zone, and was considered not incompatible with its surrounding land uses. On the concern on precedent effect, the site was the subject of a previous application (Application No. A/K5/661) for conversion of the existing office building into a hotel, which was approved with conditions on 5.12.2008 by the Committee. There was no major change in planning circumstances since the approval of the application. Since 2003, 15 similar applications (involving 12 sites) were approved with conditions for hotel development.

35. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

36. 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 22.8.2018, 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 fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB; and
- (d) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the SIA in planning condition (c) above to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

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

- “(a) the approval of the application does not imply that the proposed non-domestic plot ratio of the proposed hotel development and the proposed gross floor area exemption for back-of-house facilities would be granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department (BD) direct to obtain the necessary approval;
- (b) to note the comments of the Chief Officer (Licensing Authority), Home Affairs Department regarding the licensing requirements under the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance;

- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that the arrangement of emergency vehicular access shall comply with the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Building administered by BD;
- (d) to note the comments of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene for obtaining appropriate licence/permit from the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department; and
- (e) to note the comments of the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services regarding the possible impacts on the underground electrical cable. Prior to establishing any structure within the application site, the applicant and/or his contractors shall liaise with the electricity supplier and, if necessary, ask the electricity supplier to divert the underground electricity cable away from the vicinity of the proposed structure. The "Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines" established under the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation shall be observed by the applicant and his contractors when carrying out works in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines."

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

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

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TW/458 Proposed Shop and Services (Retail Shop for Selling Computer Products) in "Industrial" zone, Workshop B5, G/F, Superluck Industrial Centre (Phase 2), No. 57 Sha Tsui Road and Nos. 30-38 Tai Chung Road, Tsuen Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/458)

38. The Committee noted that as advised by the Lands Department, “Tsuen Wan Inland Lot No. 44” should read “Tsun Wan Inland Lot No. 44” in the Paper.

Presentation and Question Sessions

39. Mr. K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed shop and services (retail shop for selling computer products);
- (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) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Tsuen Wan); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. In order not to jeopardise the long term planning intention of industrial use for the subject premises and to allow the Committee to monitor the supply and demand of industrial floor space in the area, a temporary approval of three years was recommended.

40. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

41. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years until 22.8.2017, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission of fire service installations 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 TPB by 22.2.2015;
- (b) the implementation of fire service installations in the application premises within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 22.5.2015; and
- (c) if any of the above planning conditions (a) or (b) 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.”

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

- “(a) a temporary approval of three years is given in order to allow the Committee to monitor the compliance of the approval conditions and the supply and demand of industrial floor space in the area to ensure that the long-term planning intention of industrial use for the subject premises will not be jeopardised;
- (b) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing, Lands Department (LandsD) that the proposed ‘shop and services (retail shop for selling computer products)’ use is not permissible under the lease. If the application is approved by the Board, the owner should apply to his office for a temporary waiver. The waiver application will be considered by LandsD acting in the capacity as landlord at its sole discretion. Any approval, if given, will be subject to such terms and conditions including payment of waiver fee and administrative fee and such other terms as considered appropriate by the Government;
- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department that, under the Buildings Ordinance (BO), no person shall commence or carry out any building works without having first

obtained approval and consent from the Building Authority before commencement of works unless they are exempted under section 41 of BO, or fall within minor works under the Building (Minor Works) Regulation;

- (d) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that a means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion should be available and detailed fire service requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans; and
- (e) to refer to the ‘Guidance Note on Compliance with Planning Condition on Provision of Fire Safety Measures for Commercial Uses in Industrial Premises’ for the information on the steps required to be followed in order to comply with the approval condition on the provision of fire service installations.”

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TW/459 Proposed Shop and Services (Retail Shop) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business(1)" zone, Unit No. 1, G/F, One Midtown, No. 11 Hoi Shing Road, Tsuen Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/459)

43. The Committee noted that as advised by the Lands Department, “Tsuen Wan Inland Lot No. 36” should read “Tsun Wan Inland Lot No. 36” in the Paper.

Presentation and Question Sessions

44. Mr. K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

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

- (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, one public comment was received. The comment supported the application mainly on the grounds that the proposed shop and services could add visual interest and vibrancy to the area. No local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Tsuen Wan); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments made in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

45. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

46. 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 22.8.2016, 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 a means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion and fire service installations (FSI) in the application premises to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB before operation of the use; and
- (b) if the above planning condition is not complied with before the operation of the use, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

- “(a) should the applicant fail to comply with the approval conditions again resulting in the revocation of the planning permission, sympathetic consideration may not be given to any further application;
- (b) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing, Lands Department (LandsD) that the proposed ‘shop and services’ use is not permitted under the lease. The owner should apply to the LandsD for temporary waiver. The temporary waiver application will be considered by the LandsD acting in the capacity as landlord at its sole discretion. Any approval, if given, will be subject to such terms and conditions including payment of waiver fee and administrative fee and such other terms as considered appropriate by the Government;
- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department (BD) that the applicant should notify the Building Authority of the proposed change in use at the subject premises in accordance with section 25 of the Buildings Ordinance. Detailed checking will be made when any notification is received; and
- (d) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that, the applicant is advised to comply with the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings which is administered by BD, and take notice of the Guidance Note on Compliance with Planning Condition on Provision of Fire Safety Measures for Commercial Uses in Industrial Premises. The FSI proposal is unacceptable as it is not provided in accordance with the Code of Practice for Minimum Fire Service Installations and Equipment. Furthermore, there is no FS251, FS314A and NP317 certifying that the FSI Plan has been chopped.”

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TW/460 Shop and Services in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business(1)"
zone, Unit No. 3, G/F, One Midtown, No. 11 Hoi Shing Road, Tsuen
Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/460)

48. The Committee noted that as advised by the Lands Department, "Tsuen Wan Inland Lot No. 36" should read "Tsun Wan Inland Lot No. 36" in the Paper.

Presentation and Question Sessions

49. Mr K.T. Ng, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) 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, one public comment was received. The comment supported the application mainly on the grounds that the proposed shop and services could add visual interest and vibrancy to the area. No local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Tsuen Wan); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

50. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

51. 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 fire safety measures, including the provision of fire service installations (FSI) and equipment in the subject premises and means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion, within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 22.2.2015; and
- (b) if the above planning condition 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.”

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

- “(a) prior planning permission should have been obtained before commencing the development at the subject premises;
- (b) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing, Lands Department (LandsD) that the proposed ‘shop and services’ use is not permitted under the lease. The owner should apply to the LandsD for temporary waiver. The temporary waiver application will be considered by the LandsD acting in the capacity as landlord at its sole discretion. Any approval, if given, will be subject to such terms and conditions including payment of waiver fee and administrative fee and such other terms as considered appropriate by the Government;
- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department (BD) that his no in-principle objection stance under

the Buildings Ordinance is subject to adequate provision of sanitary fitments under the Building (Standards of Sanitary Fitments, Plumbing, Drainage Works & Latrines) Regulation 5 are demonstrated, and two exit doors open in the direction of exit to be provided to the existing Workshop No. 3; and

- (d) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that the applicant is advised to comply with the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings which is administered by BD, and take notice of the Guidance Note on Compliance with Planning Condition on Provision of Fire Safety Measures for Commercial Uses in Industrial Premises. The FSI proposal is unacceptable as it is not provided in accordance with the Code of Practice for Minimum Fire Service Installations and Equipment. Furthermore, there is no NP317 certifying that the FSI Plan has been chopped.”

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

Agenda Item 10

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TY/123 Proposed Temporary Concrete Batching Plant for a Period of 3 Years in
“Industrial” Zone, Tsing Tim Street, Tsing Yi Town Lot No. 98, Tsing
Yi
(MPC Paper No. A/TY/123)

53. The Secretary reported that AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. was the consultant of the applicant. Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, Ms Julia M. K. Lau and Professor P.P. Ho, who had current business dealings with the company, had declared interests in the item. Members noted that the applicant had requested for a deferral of consideration of the application and Mr Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend while Professor Ho had not yet arrived to join the meeting. As Mr Lam and Ms Lau had no direct involvement

in the subject application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

54. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 11.8.2014 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 from the Transport Department (TD). This was the second time that the applicant requested for deferment. Since the first deferment on 25.4.2014, the applicant had submitted further information including a revised layout plan, a revised Traffic Impact Assessment and Environmental Assessment. The applicant requested more time for the preparation of further information to address further comments from TD.

55. 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 since a total of four months had been allowed, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[There was a five-minute break.]

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H15/261 Proposed Shop and Services in "Other Specified Uses (1)" annotated
"Business" zone, Unit A, G/F, E. Tat Factory Building, 4 Heung Yip
Road, Wong Chuk Hang
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/261)

56. The Committee noted that a replacement page (page 9) of the Paper revising the proposed approval conditions was tabled at the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

57. Miss Isabel Y. Yiu, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the 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, one public comment was received. The comment supported the application on the grounds that the proposal would add visual interest to the streetscape, facilitate the transformation of the former industrial area and provoke a facelift of the area after the commissioning of the South Island Line (East). 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 made in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

58. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

59. 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 22.8.2016, 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 a means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion and fire service installations in the application premises to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB before operation of the use; and
- (b) if the above planning condition is not complied with before the operation of the use, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

- “(a) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South, Lands Department for lease modification or temporary waiver for the proposed ‘Shop and Services’ use;
- (b) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department in paragraph 9.1.3 of the MPC Paper that drainage connection plans and details should be incorporated into drainage plans, and submitted together with supporting hydraulic calculations to the

Building Authority for approval; and

- (c) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services in paragraph 9.1.5 of the MPC Paper regarding the compliance of the requirements stipulated in the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings and the Guidance Note on Compliance with Planning Condition on Provision of Fire Safety Measures for Commercial Uses in Industrial Premises.”

[The Chairman thanked Miss Isabel Y. Yiu, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She 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.]

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H3/420 Proposed Hotel in “Residential (Group A) 6” Zone, Nos. 385 and 387
Queen's Road West, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/420A)

61. The Secretary reported that Lanbase Surveyors Ltd. was the consultant of the applicant. Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, who had current business dealings with the company, had declared an interest in this item. The Committee noted that Mr Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

62. 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 application site was

rezoned from “Commercial/Residential” (“C/R”) to “Residential (Group A) 6” (“R(A)6”) with the imposition of building height (BH) and setback restrictions on 7.5.2010. Prior to the rezoning, a set of building plans (BP) was approved by the Building Authority (BA) on 9.7.2009 for a proposed 30-storey hotel development with 48 hotel rooms. Subsequently, BP (amendment submission) were also approved on 3.8.2010, 15.2.2011 and 1.3.2013;

- (b) the proposed hotel highlighting that compared to the approved BP in 2009, the current planning application mainly involved an increase in the number of hotel rooms from 48 to 72 (i.e. +50%) and site coverage from 61.712% to 63.205% (i.e. +2.42%), and reduction in the gross floor area (GFA)/plot ratio (PR) from 1,923.242m²/15.191 to 1,922.737m²/15.187 (i.e. -0.026%) and BH from 102.65mPD to 99.95mPD (i.e. -2.63%), as well as the provision of a setback of 2m from the lot boundary above 15m measured from mean street level abutting Water Street;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Tourism supported the proposed hotel development in Sai Ying Pun as it would increase the number of hotel rooms and broaden the range of accommodations for visitors. Other 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, 18 public comments were received including one from a Central & Western District Council (C&WDC) member, one from Designing Hong Kong and the remaining from members of the public. All comments objected to the application on the grounds that the hotel development would reduce housing supply and drive up property price; the BH would be increased from a few storeys to 30 storeys; the proposed hotel development with no provision of internal transport facilities would further aggregate the traffic problems in the area; hotel accommodation in the surrounding area was more than enough; the proposed PR of 15 was too excessive and would

create adverse air ventilation and visual impact on the surrounding area; the proposed hotel development would cause additional noise and environmental nuisances, create security problem and adversely affect the living environment of the local residents; and construction of the new hotel would affect the structural safety of the adjacent buildings. The District Officer (Central & Western) advised that the C&WDC had all along been very concerned about the potential adverse traffic impacts imposed by new hotel developments on the district; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments made in paragraph 10 of the Paper which were summarised as below:
 - (i) the “R(A)6” zone was intended primarily for high-density residential development. Despite that the proposed hotel development was considered not incompatible with the surrounding development in terms of land use, in view of the clear planning intention for residential development under the “R(A)6” zone and the current shortage of housing land in meeting the pressing housing needs of the community, sites planned for residential use should be developed for its zoned use upon redevelopment unless with strong justifications. Otherwise, the prevailing planning intention for the application site would be deflected and the proposed hotel development would result in reduction of sites for long-term residential developments;
 - (ii) there had already been BP approved for hotel development at the subject site since 2009. Even if this planning application was rejected, the applicant could still proceed with the proposed hotel development under the approved BP;
 - (iii) in terms of development intensity, the proposed PR of 15.187 was much higher than that of the adjacent developments along Queen's Road West. It had been the Board's established practice since

mid-2007 to approve hotel applications at suitable locations within the “R(A)” zone on Hong Kong Island up to a PR of 12 only as such development intensity was considered generally compatible with residential developments with permitted PR of 8 to 10. Applications for hotel development within “R(A)” zone with PR higher than 12 were generally rejected except for some cases involving amendments to a previously approved scheme or in-situ conversion of an existing commercial/office building to hotel use; and

- (iv) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar hotel developments. The cumulative effect of which would adversely affect the general amenity in the area.

63. In response to the Vice-chairman’s enquiry, Ms W.H. Ho replied that the previously approved BP with a PR of 15.191 had included a bonus PR as a result of provision of a setback from Queen’s Road West and a corner-splay at the junction of Queen’s Road West and Water Street. The setback at Queen’s Road West in the approved BP was not the setback required in the current Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). What required in the current OZP was a setback of 2m from the lot boundary above 15m measured from the mean street level abutting Water Street mainly for air ventilation purpose.

64. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Ms W.H. Ho said that PlanD would consider amendments to BP of a site with previously approved BP prior to a change of zoning of the site in accordance to PlanD’s Practice Note for Professional Persons (PNAP) No. 3/2001. The PNAP had stated clearly that PlanD would raise no objection to the revised BP if there were only minor amendments to the previously approved BP without any increase in PR or number of units. In the subject application, the applicant had proposed significant increase of hotel rooms from 48 in the approved BP to 72 in the current scheme. The proposed amendments to the approved BP did not comply with the requirement of the PNAP and hence the proposed development had to be considered against the extant OZP restrictions. Under the current zoning of “R(A)6”, hotel development was a column 2 use and hence this application was submitted.

[Professor P.P. Ho arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

65. In response to the Chairman's enquiries, Ms W.H. Ho clarified that BA had confirmed that the approved BP in 2009 for the subject site was still valid and the applicant could implement the hotel development in accordance with the approved BP. Both schemes in the approved BP and in the current planning application had proposed a setback from Queen's Road West and hence had a PR over 15 which had included the bonus PR allowed from the proposed setback under the Buildings Ordinance. Moreover, both schemes provided a corner splay required by Transport Department (TD). However, the approved BP did not incorporate the 2m setback from the lot boundary above 15m measured from the mean street level abutting Water Street required under the extant OZP while the proposed scheme in the current application had provided this setback. As regards BH, the BH of the proposed hotel development in the approved BP was 102.65mPD and that in the current application was 99.95mPD which was to comply with the BH restriction of 100mPD in the extant OZP.

66. The Chairman said that if the application was rejected, the applicant could still implement the hotel development based on the approved BP. The major differences between the two schemes were that the scheme in the approved BP did not provide a setback of 2m above 15m measured from the mean street level abutting Water Street, the BH was slightly higher than that in the current application by about 2m and less hotel rooms would be provided.

67. Noting that the scheme in the approved BP had a higher BH and PR, with less number of hotel rooms, and had no setback from Water Street for air ventilation purpose, a Member asked about the demerits of the proposed scheme in the current application which had incorporated the setback requirement at Water Street that might benefit the society. Ms W.H. Ho responded that the major consideration of the subject application was that the proposed PR of 15 was excessive. Since 2007, the Board had not approved any hotel development in residential zonings with a PR of 15 on the consideration that the PR of residential zones would usually be up to a PR of 8 to 10 only, and hotel development with a PR of 15 would be incompatible with the surrounding residential neighbourhood. A higher PR for hotel development would only be justified if the hotel development was large in scale and required to accommodate other related facilities. Given the small site area of 126.6m²

in the subject application, a hotel development with a PR of 15 might not be justified.

68. In response to another Member's enquiry, Ms W.H. Ho replied that glass curtain wall was proposed in both schemes under the approved BP and the current application. Should the Committee approve the application, an advisory clause requesting the applicant to avoid extensive use of glass curtain wall had already been recommended in the Paper.

69. With the BP already approved, a Member asked whether there was any foundation work done on the site. Ms W.H. Ho replied that the site was still currently occupied by a 8-storey hotel. No redevelopment had been carried out at the moment.

70. The Vice-chairman asked whether it was the general practice of the Committee of not approving hotel development with a PR exceeding 12 in residential zones and whether the practice was documented. Ms W.H. Ho responded that the Committee had a thorough discussion on the issue in 2007/08, and had been using this assessment criteria to consider hotel development within residential zones. This assessment criteria had been incorporated in the relevant MPC Papers. In response to another Member's enquiry, Ms W.H. Ho replied that the Notes of OZP had not stipulated such restriction on hotel development in residential zones.

Deliberation Session

71. A Member opined that if the applicant due to whatever reason could not implement the scheme in the approved BP, the rejection of the application might render the applicant to consider redeveloping the site into residential development with a lower PR. However, if the applicant could proceed to build a hotel with a PR of 15 at the subject site under the already approved BP, the applicant might simply drop the new scheme in the current application, which was in fact better than the one in the approved BP. Another Member considered that the applicant might make this decision from a commercial perspective. The proposed 48 hotel rooms in the scheme under the approved BP might not be able to provide sufficient commercial incentive for the applicant to implement the hotel development.

72. Assuming that the applicant could implement the scheme with a PR of 15 and 48

hotel rooms under the approved BP, a Member considered that there would be a planning gain of a setback of 2m above 15m measured from the mean street level abutting Water Street if the new scheme in the subject application was approved by the Committee. There should not be a big concern on the increase of hotel room from 48 to 72 from the planning perspective as no adverse comment from the traffic aspect was received. The room size of the hotel rooms in the new scheme was small but still acceptable. Therefore, there was planning merit in the proposed scheme of the subject application which should be approved. Moreover, there was no big difference in terms of PR of the two schemes under the approved BP and in the current application, both of which were about 15.

73. The Chairman asked whether there was any concern on the proposed increase in hotel room from 48 to 72 from the traffic impact perspective. Mr W.B. Lee responded that the TIA submitted by the applicant had clearly indicated that the traffic impact would not be significant. TD considered that the traffic impact of hotel with the range of hotel rooms proposed would not be significant.

74. A Member considered that the application should be supported as the proposed PR and BH were lower than those in the previous scheme in the approved BP and a setback of 2m at podium level would benefit the public. Moreover, the increase in hotel rooms could help relieve the demand for hotel rooms in the tourism industry.

75. A Member considered that it was important to confirm the validity of the previously approved BP. Members noted that BA had confirmed that the 2009 approved BP for hotel development, with the subsequent approved amendments, could be implemented. Another Member opined that as the applicant could implement the previous scheme under the approved BP, the new scheme in the current application should be approved as the new scheme was better than the previous scheme under the approved BP.

76. The Chairman said that the building volume of a development with a PR of 15 would be larger than that with a PR of 12, irrespective of the BH. In the "R(A)" zone of Hong Kong Island, there was an established practice of the Committee to approve hotel development with a PR up to 12. In this case, however, there was an exceptional circumstance in that a BP with a PR of 15.191 for a hotel development at the site had been approved and was still valid. Whilst the Committee might give favourable consideration to

the application, it should not be treated as a precedent case that the Committee would approve hotel development with a PR of 15 within “R(A)” zone. Members agreed.

77. A Member agreed that the application should be treated as an exceptional case as there was an approved BP still in force for the hotel development, the new scheme in the subject application was in all respects better than the previous scheme under the approved BP, the planning merit of setback requirement under the extant OZP had been incorporated in the new scheme, and the site had been continuously used/proposed for hotel development. Under these circumstances, the Committee might consider giving special consideration and deviating from the established practice of not approving hotel development with PR higher than 12 in residential zonings. Owing to the special circumstances, the approval of the subject application should not be treated as a precedent case of similar applications. Noting that the site was now used as a hotel and assuming that the applicant had no intention to redevelop the site for residential use, this Member considered that the new scheme in the application should be compared with the old scheme under the approved BP.

78. The Vice-chairman said that no demerit was envisaged if the application was approved but the applicant subsequently decided to implement the previous scheme under the approved BP. As this was an exceptional case as aforementioned, it should not be treated as a precedent case. Another Member also considered that this application could be approved and it would not constitute a precedent case based on the aforesaid consideration.

79. A Member supported the application in-principle as there was demand for hotels in the area and it was an exceptional case with a set of BP approved in 2009 with subsequent amendment to BP also approved. Moreover, compared with the scheme in the approved BP, the major change in the scheme under the application was to increase the number of hotel rooms which were considered acceptable.

80. The Secretary said that since 2007, the Committee had started not to approve hotel developments with PR exceeding 12 in residential zones. With reference to footnote 3 on page 12 in the Paper, the Secretary drew Members’ attention to a hotel development (Application No. A/H3/391) at 338-346 Queen’s Road West with a PR of 13.2 approved by the Committee on 18.12.2009. For that case, there was a previous approval (No. A/H3/385) for hotel development on the same site at PR12. Application No. A/H3/391 was approved

taking into consideration that the additional PR was absorbed within the already approved building bulk, the further set-back of the podium and improvement to hotel façade through provision of greenery. It served as an example for the reference of the Committee on precedent case.

81. To conclude, the Chairman said that Members generally considered that the application should be approved. The reasons were that the site had all along been for hotel use; there was already an approved set of BP for hotel development which was still valid; and when comparing the previous scheme under the approved BP with the new scheme in the current application, the new scheme with the provision of 2m setback at podium level abutting Water Street for air ventilation purpose was in compliance with the requirement under the extant OZP. Members agreed.

82. In response to a Member's concern on the adequacy of the advisory clause in addressing the concern on the extensive use of glass curtain wall, the Chairman said that in general, requirement on façade design would be included in the advisory clause, rather than in the approval condition.

83. 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 22.8.2018, 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 a setback at Queen's Road West and a corner spray at junction of Queen's Road West and Water Street, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;

- (d) 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 TPB; and
- (e) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

84. 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 bonus plot ratio (PR) and/or gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development will be approved/granted by the Building Authority (BA). The applicant should approach the Buildings Department (BD) and the Lands Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. If the building design elements, bonus PR and/or GFA concession are not approved/granted by BA 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 Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, BD that the proposal should satisfy the requirements laid down under Building (Planning) Regulation 23A and PNAP APP-40. In accordance with the Government’s committed policy to implement building design to foster a quality and sustainable built environment, the sustainable building design requirements (including building separation, building setback and greenery coverage) should be included, where possible;
- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department to ensure that the building design will be sympathetic to the character of the area, to avoid the extensive use of glass curtain wall especially along the southern facade, and to maximise the

landscape planting opportunities for improving the landscape quality of the new hotel and congested streetscape;

- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Officer (Licensing Authority), Home Affairs Department regarding the licensing requirements for hotel use;
- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department to implement the sewerage improvement measures identified in the SIA at his own cost;
- (f) to note the comments of the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department to review the building elevations in particular the design articulation of the podium and at the pedestrian level and to consider providing a canopy along the perimeter of the hotel particularly at the building entrance; and
- (g) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services 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.”

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

[Mr Derek P.K. Tse, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), and Miss Anita M.Y. Wong, Assistant Town Planner/Hong Kong (ATP/HK) were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H6/72 Conversion of Haw Par Mansion to School Use (Haw Par Music Farm) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Residential Development with Historical Site Preserved In-Situ" and "Green Belt" zones and an area shown as 'Road', 15A Tai Hang Road and adjoining Government Land, Tai Hang

(MPC Paper No. A/H6/72)

85. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Haw Par Music Foundation Ltd. (Haw Par) with Earthasia Limited (Earthasia) as one of the consultants. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

| | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Professor P.P. Ho | - | being a Board Member of Haw Par |
| Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan | - | her husband owned properties at The Legend right next to Haw Paw Mansion (HPM) |
| Mr Roger K.H. Luk | - | the Incorporated Owners of his property submitted public comments on the application |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - | being the Director of Earthasia |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - | having current business dealings with Earthasia |

Members noted that Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had no direct involvement in the application, Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting. As the interests of Professor P.P. Ho and Mr Roger K.H. Luk were considered direct, the Committee agreed that they should leave the meeting temporarily.

[Professor P.P. Ho and Mr Roger K.H. Luk left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

86. 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 highlighting that HPM including its garden was a Grade 1 historic building under Batch III of the Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme launched by the Development Bureau (DEVB), under which the Secretary for Development had given in-principle approval to the conservation and adaptive reuse of HPM as the Haw Par Music Farm, a music school with training in Chinese and Western music;
- (b) the application was to seek planning permission to convert the existing HPM for the proposed music school. The HPM and its garden (Main Site) would be restored. Repartitioning works and other modification works mainly to comply with the current building regulations, fire safety standards and barrier free access requirements would be carried out. A small E&M service block, a lift and staircase block, two car parking spaces and one lay-by were proposed at the Ancillary Site. Two footbridges were proposed to provide unobstructed pedestrian access to the Main Site;
- (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) the District Officer (Wan Chai) had no comment on the application. The District Officer (Eastern) had no objection to the application and advised that local residents would support the revitalisation of the historic building of HPM if the applicant could prepare a comprehensive plan to minimise the impact on traffic and natural environment;
- (e) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods of the application and further information, a total of 72 public comments were received. Among them, five comments supported the application. One supporting comment remarked that children and citizens needed music education, while the traffic and class arrangement could be adjusted with

experience. 43 comments objected to the application and 24 comments provided views on the application. These comments raised concerns on traffic congestion and capacity of Tai Hang Road, pedestrian crossing arrangement, car parking spaces provision, loading and unloading arrangement, ingress and egress arrangement, class size of the proposed school, adverse noise impact, air quality problems caused by increase in traffic, visual impact of the proposed footbridge, addition and modification works obscuring details of the original structure, inappropriate conversion of HPM to school use and security and safety of the nearby residents, and suggested to convert the site to an arts centre or similar facilities to provide additional venue for cultural uses, or preserve it as a historic site for tourists. and

- (f) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposal was in line with the planning intention of the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Residential Development with Historical Site Preserved In-Situ" zone. The proposed music school was not incompatible with the surrounding residential developments and school. The proposed demolition, addition, alteration and modification works to the HPM and its garden were to meet the teaching needs of the music school and the current building safety standards on means of escape and barrier free access. The proposal had minimised the impact on the character of the historic building. The overall appearance of HPM and the existing garden was maintained. Both the Commissioner for Heritage's Office (CHO), DEVB and the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) had no objection to the proposed conversion works. There was no programme for the future road falling within the Ancillary Site. The "Green Belt" ("GB") zone within the application site had been hard paved without natural landscape. The proposed E&M service block (9.3m high), a lift and staircase block (14.35m high) and footbridge were small in scale. With the preservation of a mature tree in the middle of the Ancillary Site and provision of a landscape deck and green roofs on the service block, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD had no objection to the

application from landscape point of view. The proposal therefore generally met the assessment criteria under Town Planning Board Guidelines for 'Application for Development within "GB" Zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance'. The proposed music school would not have adverse traffic impact on the area. Transport Department (TD) had no in-principle objection to the application subject to successful implementation of the proposed shuttle bus service with appropriate fleet size. The Government would enter into a Tenancy Agreement with the applicant and CHO would monitor the implementation of the project during the tenancy period. Concerned departments had not raised any concerns on the environmental, sewerage, drainage, water supplies and geotechnical aspects of the application. Regarding the public commenters' concerns on traffic, environment and heritage conservation aspects, the considerations set out above were relevant. As regards the concern on security, the applicant had responded that security guards would be engaged to patrol the whole site including the passageway between HPM and The Legend, and that they would continuously liaise with residents and stakeholders in the vicinity during the planning and operation stages and would provide adequate security measures accordingly.

87. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Derek P.K. Tse responded that the applicant had submitted a conservation assessment in support of the application. AMO had been consulted on the whole conversion plan of HPM and had no objection to the subject application. In future, the applicant was required to submit a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the consideration of the Antiquities Advisory Board and AMO. The Chairman added that for such kind of conversion of historic building, a HIA and a management and maintenance plan for the historic building would generally be required.

88. A Member asked whether TD had any plan to implement the planned road at the Ancillary Site and whether there would be any impact on the local residents if the planned road was not implemented. Mr Derek P.K. Tse replied that TD had no plan to construct any new road and the traffic impact assessment conducted for the application was based on the assumption that the road would not be constructed.

89. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Derek P.K. Tse responded that a lift and staircase block was proposed at the Ancillary Site which fell within the planned road alignment of which TD had no plan to construct. In response to another Member's enquiry, Mr Tse replied that should there be any future need for road works in the area, TD might consider to realign the road. The Chairman said that apart from considering realignment of the road, the facilities at the site might need to be reprovisioned. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Mr Tse replied that the lift and staircase block was proposed in order to meet the barrier-free access requirements to facilitate disabled access to the Main Site.

Deliberation Session

90. A Member expressed support to the application. This Member considered that the detailed conversion works formed a crucial part in the successful implementation of the conservation project. However, the proposed conversion works in the submission of the planning application were not detailed enough. It was necessary for AMO to scrutinise the detailed conversion works of HPM at the detailed planning stage. This Member suggested that the proposed advisory clause (a) in the Paper should be changed to an approval condition requiring the applicant to submit a HIA for the consideration of AMO. Members agreed.

91. The Chairman suggested that the submission of a management plan (including maintenance) of the historic building should also be required and included into the approval condition. Members agreed.

92. 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 22.8.2018, 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 of a Heritage Impact Assessment including a conservation management plan of the Haw Par Mansion to the satisfaction of the Antiquities and Monuments Office under the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB;

- (b) the submission and implementation of shuttle bus service for the proposed music school to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the design and provision of ingress/egress, car parking spaces and lay-by(s) to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission and implementation of tree preservation and landscape proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (e) the provision of fire safety installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

- “(a) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong East, Lands Department in paragraphs 9.1.4(d), (e), (g) and (h) of the MPC Paper regarding the gazettal requirements of the proposed footbridge, need for consent under the Government Land Allocation for the new construction and interference of trees, and amendments to the allocation conditions and boundary;
- (b) the approval of the application does not imply that any proposal on building design elements to fulfill the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines and the relevant requirements under the engineering conditions, any proposal on bonus plot ratio (PR) and/or gross floor area (GFA) concession will be approved/granted by the Building Authority (BA) and the Lands Department (LandsD). The applicant should approach the Buildings Department (BD) and LandsD direct to obtain the necessary approval. If the building design elements, bonus PR and/or GFA concession are not approved/granted by BA and the Land Authority and major changes to the current scheme are required, a fresh planning application to the Board may be required;

- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong East and Heritage Unit, BD in paragraphs 9.1.5(a), (b), (d), (j) to (l) of the MPC Paper regarding the exclusion of ‘Footbridge Linkage Area’ from site area calculation, the computation of PR and site coverage under Buildings Ordinance, the Government policy on Sustainable Building Guidelines, and provisions of means of escape and fire resisting construction, emergency vehicular access, and access and facilities for persons with a disability;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) in paragraph 9.1.7(b) of the MPC Paper regarding the use of transparent balustrade on the footbridge and provision of landscaping to enhance the visual amenity of the area;
- (e) to note the comments and suggestions of the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department in paragraph 9.1.8 of the MPC Paper;
- (f) to note the comments of CTP/UD&L, PlanD in paragraph 9.1.9(c) of the MPC Paper regarding the need for approval from concerned management and maintenance authorities on proposed treatment of existing trees outside the application site;
- (g) to note the comments of the Secretary for Education in paragraph 9.1.13 of the MPC Paper regarding the need for registration of the proposed school under the Education Ordinance; and
- (h) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services in paragraph 9.1.14(b) of the MPC Paper regarding the arrangement of emergency vehicular access.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr Derek P.K. Tse, STP/HK and Miss Anita M.Y. Wong, ATP/HK for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 14

Any Other Business

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