

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 540<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 21.8.2015**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr K. K. Ling

Chairman

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Vice-chairman

Professor P.P. Ho

Ms Julia M.K. Lau

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung

Mr Laurence L.J. Li

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),  
Transport Department  
Mr W.L. Tang

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department  
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

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

Assistant Director (R1), Lands Department  
Ms Doris M.Y. Chow

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr H.W. Cheung

**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  
Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang

**Agenda Item 1**

**Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 539<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 7.8.2015**

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 539<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 7.8.2015 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

**Matters Arising**

[Open Meeting]

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

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

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K1/250                      Proposed Eating Place, Shop and Services, Place of Entertainment, Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture in “Open Space”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Cultural Square and Public Open Space with Underground Commercial Complex and Car Park”, “Commercial (7)” Zones and Area shown as ‘Road’, Salisbury Garden, the Avenue of Stars and Tsim Sha Tsui Promenade, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon (Kowloon Inland Lot 10978 and adjoining Government Land)  
(MPC Paper No. A/K1/250)

---

3. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) and Sustainable Foundation Company Limited., which

was a subsidiary of the New World Development Co. Ltd. (NWD) with New World Project Management Limited (NWPM) and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited (MMHK) as two of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

- |                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam   | - having current business dealings with NWD, NWPM and MMHK;   |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau   | - having current business dealings with a subsidiary of NWD and being a docent of LCSD;   |
| Professor P.P. Ho     | - being a member of the History Museum Advisory Panel of LCSD;  |
| Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung | - being the Chairman of the Chinese Traditional Performing Arts Panel of LCSD;  |
| Mr Laurence L.J. Li   | - being the director of a charitable organization which received a donation from another charitable organization under NWD; and |
| Ms Doris M.Y. Chow    | - whose family member working in a subsidiary of NWD.   |

4. The Committee noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had not yet arrived to join the meeting and considered that the interest of Mr Patrick H.T. Lau was direct and agreed that he should leave the meeting temporarily. As Professor P.P. Ho, Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung and Mr Laurence L.J. Li had no involvement in the application, and the interest of Ms Doris M.Y. Chow was indirect, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

[Mr Patrick H.T. Lau left the meeting temporarily and Ms Julia M.K. Lau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

5. The Secretary reported that the Town Planning Board Secretariat had received ten submissions from a Legislative Council Member and various groups after the expiry of the first three weeks of the statutory public inspection period. The submissions should be treated as not having been made under section 16(2H)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance and had been tabled at the meeting for Members' information only.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

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

##### *The Revitalisation Plan*

- (a) the applicants had formulated a revitalisation plan to review the waterfront area stretching from the Salisbury Garden adjoining the Hong Kong Museum of Art through Avenue of Stars (AOS) to the Tsim Sha Tsui (TST) Promenade (the site); and to introduce new activity hubs comprising various small-scale commercial, entertainment and recreational uses to add vibrancy to the waterfront. The applicants sought planning permission for eating place, shop and services, place of entertainment, and place of recreation, sports or culture, with ancillary electrical and mechanical (E&M) and public convenience facilities in support of the proposed revitalisation plan, which comprised the following:
  - (i) Salisbury Garden – a multi-functional central lawn area for visitors and cultural events in tandem with the existing Art Square. The proposed one-storey eating place (GFA of about 66m<sup>2</sup> and building height of about 8.4mPD) would be housed as part of the current utility structure;
  - (ii) Hub 1 (Food and Beverage (F&B) Hub) – the existing building would be expanded to accommodate F&B, shops and lavatory at G/F, with alfresco dining area and public observation deck at 1/F (9.55mPD) with proposed roof trellis up to 14mPD. There was also

a single-storey structure for customer service cum LCSD office;

- (iii) Hub 2 (Theatre and Movie Themed Hub) – three blocks of single-storey structures would be used as movie/art gallery for events of the movie industry (GFA of about 300m<sup>2</sup>), F&B, retail, lavatory and E&M. The roof level of the three blocks would be connected by a public observation deck (roof canopy at a height of 12.986mPD), connecting to the existing footbridge KF35 linking Houston Centre at Mody Road;

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

- (iv) Hub 3 (Bridge Garden and Performance Space) – the area underneath the existing footbridge (currently occupied by planters) was proposed to be a bridge garden with F&B and retail provisions as well as for street performance, and lavatory. A deck structure was proposed to be connected to the existing footbridge to Hung Hom as observation deck with F&B and E&M; and
  - (v) existing AOS – it would be renovated to a seating area with green trellis and planters with seating. The existing handprints, stars tiles and statues would be relocated along the TST Promenade.
- (b) within the “Open Space” (“O”) zone, the proposed total site coverage was 14.93% and the proposed total publicly accessible open space provision within the three activity hubs was 3,310m<sup>2</sup>, of which 1,793.5m<sup>2</sup> was located at observation deck. The proposed total greenery provision was 2,566m<sup>2</sup>;
  - (c) a total of 363 existing trees were identified within the site, 41 of them would be retained. Out of the proposed transplanted trees, 83 would be transplanted within the site and 167 would be transplanted to other locations as agreed with LCSD. 72 trees were proposed to be felled and the same number would be compensated at a compensatory ratio of 1:1;
  - (d) the level of service for all pedestrian link was currently acceptable, and

would be so during operation;

- (e) the Visual Impact Assessment had demonstrated that the revitalisation plan would not affect the visual interests at the public view points and visually sensitive receivers;

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

*Departmental Comments*

- (f) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper and summarised as follows:
  - (i) the Harbour Unit, Development Bureau had no in-principle objection to the inclusion of more commercial elements along the AOS with an aim to add vibrancy to the waterfront but commented on the visual impact of the elevated observation deck in particular for Hub 2. Since the deck could be of substantial size and its construction would create an additional feature on the waterfront partially blocking the view of Victoria Harbour to sites beneath it, there should be sufficient and elaborated precautionary measures to ensure compliance with all the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines;
  - (ii) the Commissioner of Police (C of P) had no adverse comment on the proposed revitalisation project from the traffic policing point of view. However, it was noticed that the site was popular for members of the public, tourists and participants of major events during festive occasions. The crowd management with safe crowd flow should be ensured;
  - (iii) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) considered that the proposed structures were relatively low-rise and would unlikely result in significant adverse visual impact as demonstrated in the Visual

Impact Assessment (VIA). Nevertheless, the applicants should review various design elements at the detailed design stage. She was also of the view that given the linear nature of the site and promenade of the harbourfront location, a phased programme was recommended;

- (iv) the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department (CA/CMD2, ArchSD) considered that the applicants should pay effort to optimise the transparency at the ground level, allowed flexibility between the new and existing building structures to improve the existing pedestrian accessibility in Hub 2 and Hub 3 at the detailed design stage; and
- (v) concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

#### *Public Comments*

- (g) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, 340 public comments were received of which nine showed support to, two raised concerns on and 328 objected to the application. The remaining one proposed improvements to the TST waterfront;
- (h) the public comments supported the application for the reasons that the proposal could create an interesting waterfront for TST while diverting visitors away from AOS which was too crowded; the proposed facilities would provide comfort for visitors under all weather; and the proposal would help boost tourism in Hong Kong. Besides, the relocation of the AOS handprints was also supported;
- (i) two public comments raised concerns about the privatisation of the waterfront, restriction of activities, progress of the renovation works, sufficiency of the temporary and permanent directional signage and the possibility of establishing new sculptures at Centenary Garden permanently;

- (j) the major grounds of objection included, inter alia, further narrowing the existing passageways and compromising pedestrian circulation and safety, creating barriers to access to the public open space along the promenade; concerns on public safety and crowd control; traffic congestion and management problem, loading/unloading (L/UL) arrangement; adverse visual and landscape impact; environmental problems; inappropriate F&B facilities; inappropriate location of facility celebrating the film industry; introduction of F&B affecting other businesses in the district; conflict of interest; lack of consultation; and impact on public enjoyment of the waterfront promenade by entire closure of the site for 3 years;
  
- (k) a public comment proposed improvements to the TST waterfront, the elements of which included fine restaurants, a place equally shared by tourists and locals, more trees to be grown along the waterfront, relocation of AOS handprints to other places, wood architectures and recognizable signature designs;

*Comments from the Harbourfront Commission (HC)*

- (l) the Task Force of HC support the general direction of the project especially in creating a vibrant harbourfront. Their comments on the earlier scheme included, inter alia, the greening ratio and some existing facilities should be maintained; the visual corridor from Nathan Road to the waterfront should be preserved and enhanced; more pedestrian connections should be provided to connect the AOS with the hinterland; the increase of coach parking spaces along Salisbury Road would attract more traffic; and residents of Hung Hom should be consulted etc. Scheduling the construction works in phases was also suggested so that part of the waterfront could be opened earlier for public enjoyment. Another briefing to the Task Force on the current proposal would be held on 1.9.2015; and

*PlanD's View*

- (m) PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper and summarised as follows:

Planning Intention and Concept

- (i) the proposal was generally in line with the planning intention of the concerned zones. Although the proposed site coverage at the TST waterfront was 14.93% (about 5% above the site coverage under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines for district open space), in view of the regional/territorial importance of the AOS and the TST Promenade, such increase was considered acceptable from land use planning perspective;

Urban Design and Visual Considerations

- (ii) the proposed development was small in scale and low-rise. The VIA demonstrated that the proposed structures would unlikely result in significant adverse visual impact;

Landscape Consideration

- (iii) the trees proposed to be felled would be compensated at a ratio of 1:1. 83 trees would be transplanted within the site and 167 trees would be transplanted off-site. Given a net loss of 167 trees within the site, the applicants proposed an increase of the greenery provision by 154.8m<sup>2</sup> within the activity hubs;

Air Ventilation Consideration

- (iv) the proposal would not impose blockade to the existing air paths from Victoria Harbour to TST, and no air ventilation assessment was required. CTP/UD&L had no objection from air ventilation point

of view;

### Traffic Consideration

- (v) the proposed development would maintain the current widths of the pedestrian walkway (ranging from 4.7m to 12.9m) except the part occupied by the proposed stairs leading to the observation deck at Hub 2. The applicants had demonstrated in the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) that no adverse impact on the pedestrian flow arising from the proposal was anticipated. Moreover, traffic improvement measures had been proposed to meet the expected increase in pedestrian flows. The Commissioner for Transport had no objection to the proposed traffic improvement measures to meet the expected increase in pedestrian flows, and the car parking and L/UL arrangement. C of P also had no adverse comment on the revitalisation project from traffic policing point of view but had comments on crowd management;

### Environmental and Drainage Considerations

- (vi) the Environmental Assessment (EA) had demonstrated that the proposed development would not generate adverse environmental, drainage and sewerage impacts on the area. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) and Director of Drainage Services had no in-principle objection to the application;

### Implementation

- (vii) taking into account, inter alia, the environmental impacts and safety issues, the implementation of the revitalisation plan by simultaneous closure of the site for 3 years was proposed by the applicants but part of the revitalised waterfront (i.e. Salisbury Garden) would be re-opened by early 2017. Otherwise, a phased development would last for 7 years due to site constraints, and fulfilment of emergency

and maintenance access requirements; and

### Public Comments

- (viii) regarding the public comments, the assessments above were relevant. The proposal would add vibrancy to the TST waterfront which was in line with the Harbour Planning Principles and Harbourfront Planning Guidelines. The applicants had demonstrated that the proposal would not generate visual and landscape impacts, and explained that the closure of the site would be lengthened to 7 years due to the site constraints, emergency and maintenance requirements.

### *Uses requiring Planning Permission*

7. In response to the Chairman's request and Members' queries on the components of the proposed development requiring permission from the Committee, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen elaborated that the site was mainly covered by three land use zonings on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), namely "O", "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Cultural Square and Public Open Space with Underground Commercial Complex and Car Park" ("OU(CSPOS)") and area shown as 'Road'. She explained the details of the proposal as follows:

#### Salisbury Garden

- (a) the renovation of the Salisbury Garden was always permitted under the "OU(CSPOS)" zone but the proposed one-storey eating place with gross floor area (GFA) of about 66m<sup>2</sup> and an alfresco dining area required planning permission;

#### Hub 1: F&B Hub

- (b) the proposed eating place and shop and services at the G/F and an alfresco dining area at 1/F to be accommodated in an existing structure which would be expanded and renovated, would require planning permission. Other

uses within the proposed structure such as covered public space and public toilet, etc. were always permitted within the “O” zone;

- (c) the proposed single-storey structure for customer services centre cum LCSD office was considered as an ancillary use to the “O” zone and no planning permission was required;

#### Hub 2: Theatre and Movie Themed Hub

- (d) the proposed eating place, shop and services, place of entertainment and place of recreation, sports or culture to be accommodated in three blocks of structures would require planning permission;
- (e) while the proposed public observation deck at roof level of the three blocks connecting to the existing footbridge linking Houston Centre at Mody Road was an always permitted use in the “O” zone, its roof-over area would result in a two-storey high structure; and

#### Hub 3: Bridge Garden and Performance Space

- (f) the proposed eating place/shop and services and place of recreation, sports or culture at G/F and the proposed eating place/shop and services at 1/F of the structures proposed to be built would require planning permission within the “O” zone and area shown as ‘Road’. An observation deck, which fell within the “O” zone, connecting to the existing footbridge to Hung Hom would be proposed. The proposed observation deck at 1/F and the lavatory at G/F were always permitted within the “O” zone. As there were roof trellises on 1/F of the proposed structure, the proposed structures would be interpreted as two-storey high.

8. The Chairman said that although some of the uses in the proposed structures did not require planning permission, the applied use to be accommodated in those structures formed an integral part of the application and could not be separated from the permitted uses. Thus, Members should consider whether permission should be granted to the individual uses

that require planning application as well as to the development of the structures which accommodated such uses as a whole.

9. In response to a Member's query on the operation of the proposed F&B facilities, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen said that indoor eating places with alfresco dining were proposed at the Salisbury Garden and Hub 1, while F&B facilities without alfresco dining were provided at Hubs 2 and 3. The total GFA for F&B facilities was about 822m<sup>2</sup>.

10. Two Members noted that there were public concerns on possible collusion between the Government and private developer on the implementation, management and operation of the proposal and asked whether such matters were factors that Members should take into account in considering the application. In response, the Chairman said that the Committee should only consider the land use proposal. The implementation and operation mode of the proposal, including the choice of operation partner were not under the purview of the Committee.

11. In response to a Member's question on whether there was any policy guidelines for public-private partnership (PPP) in development and renovation of public facilities, especially along the waterfront, the Chairman said that PPP was established government practices and would be adopted to individual development proposal by concerned departments as and when appropriate.

12. In response to a Member's query on whether the implementation programme of the proposal which would require closure of the place for 3 years should be taken into account in considering the application, the Chairman said that while the implementation programme could be a factor to be considered by the Committee, it was not subject to the approval of the Committee.

#### *Operation of the proposed development*

13. In response to the Vice-chairman's query on the operation of the Movie-themed Gallery, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen said that according to the information provided by the applicants, the Sustainable Foundation Company Limited, which was a non-profit making organisation, would be responsible for the management and operation of the entire site while

the ownership of the site remained with LCSD. The applicants had not provided any details on the operation of the Movie-themed Gallery and the public spaces.

#### *Development Scale and Land Use Compatibility*

14. In response to the Chairman's query on development proposals of similar scale in the territory, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen said that there were other waterfront developments subject to building height (BH) restriction on the OZP. For "OU" zone for cultural and/or commercial, leisure and tourism related uses on the Quarry Bay OZP, BH restriction was up to 25mPD to 35mPD. The "OU" zones for waterfront related commercial and leisure uses on the Wan Chai North and Central District (Extension) OZPs also had BH restrictions of 10mPD to 15mPD and 13mPD to 25mPD respectively. The proposed BH of 12.986mPD to 16.014mPD of the subject development were comparable to these BH restrictions.

15. In response to the Vice-chairman's query on the increase in F&B facilities of the proposed development as compared with the existing development, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen said that the existing F&B facilities included a restaurant at Hub 1 and some kiosks along the AOS. The GFA of the F&B facilities under the proposal would increase to about 822m<sup>2</sup> and distributed at Salisbury Garden, Hubs 1, 2 and 3.

#### *Pedestrian Circulation*

16. In response to the Chairman's query, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen said that the pedestrian pathway at the eastern portion of Hub 2 would be reduced from an existing width of about 7.5m to 5m in order to accommodate a stairway structure to the elevated deck. Together with the proposed movie star statue nearby, there were public concerns on the pedestrian circulation in this area.

17. In response to another Member's query on the pedestrian flow before and after the revitalisation, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen said that as contained in the TIA based on the results of the pedestrian count surveys for the section between Hub 2 and Hub 3, which were done on peak periods (early afternoon and evening daily), the existing pedestrian trips generated was about 90 to over 200 pedestrians trips per hour. After the revitalisation, it was estimated that the 2018 design pedestrian flows with F&B and customer services/retail

facilities would be increased to over 3000 pedestrians trips per hour. It was estimated that the peak pedestrian flow would occur in the early afternoon of Saturdays.

18. In response to a Member's query on the measures to enhance pedestrian flow and disabled access to the site, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen said that the applicants had proposed to provide a new connection from MTR East TST station to the subway KS61 connecting to the site with escalators to facilitate pedestrian circulation. Details of the connection would be addressed in the liaison between the applicants and MTRCL at the detailed design stage of the proposal. Lifts would be provided connecting the observation decks at 1/F of Hubs 1 to 3. The requirements for disabled access would also be addressed at the building plans submission stage. Should the application be approved by the Committee, an approval condition requiring the applicants to implement the traffic improvement measures to the satisfaction of C for T was suggested to be imposed for timely implementation of the measures to enhance pedestrian circulation in the area.

#### *Traffic Considerations*

19. A Member noted that coach parking and loading/unloading (L/UL) activities at the existing lay-by along Salisbury Road had caused traffic congestion in the area. He asked whether the proposed revitalisation would aggravate the traffic conditions in the area and whether the applicants had proposed any traffic improvement measures to cope with the expected increase in vehicular traffic. In response, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen said that the Transport Department (TD) had proposed to lengthen the coach lay-by at Salisbury Road opposite to Wing On Plaza and expand the Hong Kong Coliseum Coach Park to cope with the current heavy L/UL activities along Salisbury Road. The applicants also proposed to provide a new coach park at Salisbury Road under the Hung Hom Bypass in area shown as 'Road' on the OZP. All those traffic improvement measures were always permitted.

20. In response to a Member's query on the impact of lengthening the coach lay-by on the existing bus stop, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen said that while the traffic improvement measure would result in a reduction of the bus stop area, the measure as proposed by TD should not cause adverse traffic impact. Mr W.L. Tang, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban) supplemented that the length of the bus stop area of about 26m was sufficient for the operation of buses in the area. He also considered the applicants' proposal

of providing new car parking and L/UL facilities nearby the site and making use of the parking and L/UL facilities in the car parks of the New World Centre upon redevelopment and the underground car park underneath the Salisbury Garden adequate to meet the increased traffic demand.

### *Environmental Concerns*

21. In response to a Member's question on the possible noise impact generated by Hung Hom Bypass on Hub 3, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen said that the applicants had submitted an EA for the proposed development and DEP had no adverse comment on the EA. Nevertheless, with regard to the potential air quality impact during the operation phase, DEP considered the proposed fresh air intake for Hub 3 located next to the Cross Harbour Tunnel Vent Building not desirable. Hence, a filter to be incorporated in the development was proposed by the applicants to minimise the possible adverse air quality impact.

### Deliberation Session

#### *Development Scale and Detailed Design of the Promenade*

22. A Member supported the proposed development as it could add impetus to the TST promenade and considered the proposed renovation of the existing structure in the Salisbury Garden to accommodate eating places, together with the alfresco dining area, acceptable. For Hub 1, the Member was concerned about the unclear demarcation between the alfresco dining area and the public open space on the observation deck and opined that a suitable amount of public space should be reserved for public enjoyment. For Hub 2, although the Member welcomed the provision of an activity node in the middle part of the lengthy TST promenade, the proposed development should not be excessive. The Member further said that the design of Hub 2 was not satisfactory, especially the design of the roof canopy covering the observation deck which was rather imposing and might obstruct the view towards the harbour. The stairs leading to the observation deck would also narrow the width of the pedestrian walkways. Given the rather small size of the movie/art gallery, the Member also questioned the need and function of the proposed facility. The design of Hub 2 could be improved to reduce the bulkiness of the structure. As for Hub 3, the Member noted that it was located at the eastern end of the TST promenade where the atmosphere was

relatively tranquil. As the proposed development were mostly located underneath the footbridge, there were doubts on whether injecting new activities and facilities would help enhance vibrancy in the area.

23. The Vice-chairman generally supported the proposed development and agreed that advice on enhancing the design of the proposal should be given to the applicants. He said that the planning objectives of the application, i.e. whether the application would enhance the pedestrian flow of the site or create activity nodes, should be considered carefully. The proposal would attract visitors coming from the two ends of TST promenade. Although the proposed F&B facilities along the waterfront could enhance the pedestrian experience along the waterfront, the proposed activity nodes might block the smooth pedestrian flow along the waterfront. He also opined that the AOS was established due to its close proximity to the Hong Kong Cultural Centre – the venue of the annual Hong Kong Film Awards, which could create a synergy effect. Under the revitalisation plan, the arts and movie theme would be extended to the eastern end of TST promenade, which might be out of context.

24. The Chairman said that the proposal could be considered in a larger context and reminded Members to consider whether the locations of the proposed activity hubs were appropriate and invited comments on any concerns. TST promenade was about 1.5km long stretching from the Salisbury Garden in the west to Hung Hom Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Station in the east. He recalled that since the opening of the promenade there were public comments on the lacking of canopy/trellis and F&B facilities along the promenade, except an existing F&B outlet at the western end of the East TST promenade adjoining the AOS and existing kiosks. The revitalisation plan could respond to the lack of facilities at the site. The Chairman further said that although Hub 3 was currently a tranquil area, it would be connected to the Hung Hom promenade with hotel and residential developments under construction in the area. Hence, the proposal would increase the pedestrian flow and enhance the connection between TST and Hung Hom. A Member concurred that the vibrancy of the area at Hub 3 should be enhanced. Members also noted there were several activity spaces reserved at Hub 3 for street performance.

*Pedestrian Circulation and Traffic Considerations*

25. Several Members raised concerns on the reduction of the pedestrian pathway from 7.5m to 5m at the eastern portion of Hub 2, which would affect smooth pedestrian circulation. The Vice-chairman said that the applicants should address the concerns and make every endeavour to maintain the width of the existing pedestrian pathway to at least 7.5m.

26. A Member asked whether coaches could be parked underneath the Hong Kong Coliseum. The Chairman pointed out that it was the railway reserve and there was an existing coach park on the ground level besides the Hong Kong Coliseum. The Chairman also noted that TD had proposed to expand the Hong Kong Coliseum Coach Park with an aim to diverting pedestrian flow to the eastern end of TST promenade, and enter the promenade from Hub 3. The same Member also suggested that parking spaces was essential for Hub 3 so as to divert tourists/visitors to that area and revitalise Hub 3 into a new gateway for TST promenade. Mr W.L. Tang supplemented that TIA was conducted on the assumption that pedestrians would come from the two ends of TST promenade. Members generally considered the traffic implication of the proposal acceptable.

*Implementation Aspect*

27. A Member said that although it was clarified in the question and answer session that the implementation, management and operation of the proposal were not under the purview of the Committee, the public was concerned about possible collusion between the Government and private developer. The Member asked how it could be clearly conveyed to the public what the subject matters were under the Committee's purview. The Secretary said that the Committee had to consider the application in accordance with the relevant provision under the Town Planning Ordinance and the relevant OZP. In addition, according to the practice of the Town Planning Board (the Board), a spokesperson of the Board would normally give a media briefing on cases that might attract public attention. For the subject case, the spokesperson could help convey the Committee's message to the public.

28. A Member noted that the Board had an established mechanism to brief the media on the decision of the Board but asked whether the Government would explain the PPP

policy to address public concerns. In response, the Chairman said that the responsibility should rest on the relevant bureaux/departments. Another Member concurred and said that it was the responsibility of the Government and the applicants to explain the project to the public. The Member further said that the proposal had been discussed in the Tourism Strategy Group of the Tourism Commission (the Group) earlier this year and the Group generally supported the proposal as it could add new elements to the tourism industry in Hong Kong, which was advocated by the tourism sector for a long time.

29. On the implementation programme, Members noted that the applicants had taken into account all relevant factors in deriving the implementation programme. To address the public concerns, however, the Vice-chairman suggested and Members agreed that the applicants could be advised to review the implementation programme with a view to shortening the closure period or closing the site by phases.

#### *Conclusion*

30. The Chairman concluded that Members generally supported the proposal as it would provide additional facilities to serve and attract visitors to the TST promenade. Members generally agreed to and had no comment on the proposed development at Salisbury Garden, Hubs 1 and 3, but were concerned about the bulkiness of the proposed structures at Hub 2, particularly on the design and height of the canopy on top of the observation deck. There were also concerns on the reduced width of the pedestrian pathway near the movie/art gallery which might affect smooth pedestrian flow and circulation, especially during special events in the area. To address the pedestrian circulation concern, Members agreed that an additional approval condition requiring the applicants to maintain the existing width of the pedestrian pathway to at least 7.5m should be imposed. An advisory clause would also be added to advise the applicants to note Members' comments on the need to revise the design of structures at Hub 2 so as to maintain the visual openness of the area. Regarding the proposed closure of the entire TST promenade for 3 years, Members agreed to add an additional advisory clause requesting the applicants to review the implementation programme with a view to shortening the closure period or adopting a phased closure programme.

31. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The

permission should be valid until 21.8.2019, 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 pedestrian passageway on the waterfront promenade at Hub 2 with at least 7.5m wide to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a revised tree preservation proposal and landscape master plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the implementation of the traffic improvement measures in the Traffic Impact Assessment, as proposed by the applicants, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of traffic and crowd management plan to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Police and the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (e) the implementation of the proposed measures identified in the approved traffic and crowd management plan to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Police and the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB as required under approval condition (d) above;
- (f) the submission and implementation of car parking and loading/unloading spaces proposal to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (g) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (h) the submission of a revised Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;

- (i) the implementation of flood mitigation measures proposed in the DIA in approval condition (h) above and any other stormwater drainage facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (j) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

32. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants of the following:

- “(a) to note the comments of the Committee that the implementation programme should be reviewed with a view to shortening the site closure period or adopting a phased closure programme;
- (b) to note the comments of the Committee on the bulkiness of the proposed structures at Hub 2, the design of which should be revised to maintain the visual openness of the area;
- (c) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Kowloon West, Lands Department that detailed design and layout, etc. of the proposal shall be scrutinised upon receipt from the applicants or at the building plan stage as the case may be. There is no guarantee that the schematic design as presently proposed in the subject s.16 application will eventually be accepted under the Engineering Conditions or lease governing the land concerned. If lease modification is required for implementation of the proposal and application for the same is received by her Department, it will be considered by her Department acting in the capacity as the landlord at its sole discretion. In the event any such application is approved, it would be subject to such terms and conditions including, among others, the payment of premium and administrative fee as may be imposed by her Department;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department that:

- (i) the applicants should appoint an Authorized Person and a Registered Structural Engineer to prepare and submit buildings plans for the proposed change in use/alterations and additions works at Salisbury Garden to demonstrate compliance with the current provisions of the Buildings Ordinance (BO), including but not limited to provision of adequate means of escape to the premises in accordance with Building (Planning) Regulation 41(1) and the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 (FS Code); separation of the premises from the remaining portion of the building by fire barriers of adequate fire resistance rating pursuant to Building (Construction) Regulation 90 and the FS Code; and provision of access and facilities for persons with a disability to the premises in accordance with Building (Planning) Regulation 72 and Design Manual: Barrier Free Access 2008;
- (ii) the applicants are required to observe the licensing requirements imposed by the relevant licensing authority;
- (iii) for unauthorised building works (UBW) erected on private land/buildings, enforcement action may be taken by the Building Authority to effect their removal in accordance with BD's enforcement policy against UBW as and when necessary. The granting of any planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of any UBW on the application site under the BO;
- (iv) the applicants should observe the Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers PNAP APP-47 that the Building Authority has no powers to give retrospective approval or consent for any UBW; and
- (v) detailed comments under the BO can only be formulated at the building plans submission stage.

- (e) to note the comments of the Commissioner of Police that inconvenience caused to pedestrians during the revitalisation period should be minimised. Temporary arrangement such as, but not limited to, the provision of temporary pedestrian access routes with clear signage shall be made;
  
- (f) to note the comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/Kowloon, Highways Department (HyD) that the applicants shall consult his office prior to the commencement of any works on the site in the vicinity of Cross-Harbour Tunnel and shall at his own expenses take adequate precautions and measures to ensure that any such works do not affect the structural integrity and safety of any works, structures, facilities or installations of Cross-Harbour Tunnel. The applicants should exercise extreme care in order not to damage adjacent road/structures/facilities/road drains/services maintained by HyD in the vicinity of the site. The applicants shall also be responsible for the cost of making any damages to the adjacent road, footpath, highways features and highways structures resulting directly or indirectly from the works. Any such damages shall be brought to the attention of his office immediately. The applicants should ensure free Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA) to the Cross-Harbour Tunnel Vent Building at all times for the tunnel operator. A 2m clearance from the soffit and around columns and abutments should generally be made available for inspection and maintenance works at all times. Upon reasonable notice being given, the applicants shall allow his officers, constructors, servants, agents workmen, or other persons so authorized by him with or without tools, equipment, machinery or maintenance vehicles a free and restricted access to the site at all times for inspection, maintenance and repairing of the highway structures;
  
- (g) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans. The applicants are advised to observe the requirements of EVA as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings in 2011 which is administered by the

Building Authority;

- (h) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department on the edge treatment between the alfresco dining area and the public accessible space at Hub 1; adequate spaces around the tree pit or planter areas should be ensured for outdoor dining operation and pedestrian circulation; for the roof deck area at Hub 1 which will provide a different waterfront viewing experience for the public, the area designated for public usage should be maximised as far as practicable; the location of the relocated statues should be reviewed to avoid affecting public circulation; and the design of each hub and its relating building structures should be in permeable form as far as practicable and aim to directly engage with the pedestrian space to maximise the waterfront outlook and enliven the public realm at the detailed design stage;
- (i) to note the comments of the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department that the applicants should pay effort to optimise the transparency at the ground level, allow flexibility between the new and existing building structures to improve the existing pedestrian accessibility, in particular at Hub 2 and Hub 3 at the detailed design stage;
- (j) to note the comments of the Commissioner of Tourism that during the temporary closure of the Avenue of Stars (AOS) and exhibition of some of the existing AOS attraction features and installations in the Tsim Sha Tsui East Waterfront Podium Garden in the interim period, the applicants shall continue to communicate with the tourism trade on the details of temporary arrangement concerned.

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

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 4**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K2/214                      Religious Institution in "Residential (Group A)" Zone, 1/F, Cheng Hong Building, 47-57 Temple Street, Yau Ma Tei, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K2/214)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a)    background to the application;
- (b)    religious institution (church);

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

- (c)    departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d)    no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period and no local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Yau Tsim Mong); and
- (e)    the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The church under application was considered not incompatible with the uses in the subject composite building and the surrounding land uses with a mixture of residential and commercial developments from land use point of view. The church visitors could gain access to the Premises by two passenger lifts, with a lift exclusively serving the non-domestic podium and the other one that could reach all the floors of the non-domestic podium

(from G/F to 3/F) and the odd floors of the residential portion of the building. Also, no local objection had been received in relation to the nuisance to the residential floors arising from the current church use at the Premises which was in operation since 2000. Sympathetic consideration might be given to the application.

34. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

35. 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 service installations and water supplies for fire fighting within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 21.2.2016; 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.”

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

- “(a) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department that:
  - (i) the applicant shall appoint an Authorized Person/Registered Structural Engineer to provide a structural calculation/assessment report to substantiate the structural adequacy of the existing structures to sustain the revised loadings and justify the provisions of means of escape for the development for his consideration;

- (ii) the development should in all aspects comply with the Buildings Ordinance;
  - (iii) adequate means of escape, means of access for fire fighting and rescue, emergency vehicular access (EVA) and fire resisting construction should be provided in accordance with Building (Planning) Regulations 41(1), 41A, 41B, 41C, 41D, Building (Construction) Regulation 90 and the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 (FS Code); and
  - (iv) detailed comments under the Buildings Ordinance will be given at the building plan submission stage; and
- (b) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that:
- (i) detailed fire services requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans; and
  - (ii) the applicant is advised to observe the requirements of EVA as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Building 2011 which is administered by the Buildings Department.”

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

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K20/125                      Proposed Religious Institution in “Residential (Group A) 1” Zone,  
1-2/F(part) with Entrance on G/F, Commercial Podium of Imperial  
Cullinan, 10 Hoi Fai Road, Tai Kok Tsui, Kowloon  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/K20/125)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

37.            The Secretary reported that Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD) and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

|                     |   |   |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - | having current business dealings with LD and AECOM; and |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | } | having current business dealings with AECOM.            |
| Professor P.P. Ho   |   |   |
| Ms Julia M.K. Lau   |   |   |

38.            As the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, Professor P.P. Ho and Ms Julia M.K. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

39.            The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 4.8.2015 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information in support of the application and to address the public and departmental comments. This was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

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

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

### **Agenda Item 6**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/430                      Proposed Hotel in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone,  
45-51 Kwok Shui Road, Kwai Chung  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/430)

---

41.            The Secretary reported that Townland Consultants Limited (TCL) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, Professor P.P. Ho and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had declared interests in the item as they had current business dealings with TCL. Mr Clarence W.C. Leung had also declared an interest in the item as he had an office in Kwai Chung which might have a view of the application site. As the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application, and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, Professor P.P. Ho and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. The Committee also agreed that Mr Clarence W.C. Leung could stay in the meeting but should refrain from discussion of the item

42.            The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 6.8.2015 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow sufficient time to address the Transport Department's comments. This was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

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

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

### **Hong Kong District**

#### **Agenda Item 7**

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

[Open Meeting]

Y/H14/4                      Application for Amendment to the Approved The Peak Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H14/11, To rezone the application site from "Green Belt" to "Residential (Group C) 6", Government land opposite to 23 Coombe Road, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. Y/H14/4)

---

44.            The Secretary reported that LWK & Partners (HK) Ltd (LWK) and LLA Consultancy Limited (LLA) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

Mr Laurence L.J. Li                      -    having current business dealings with LWK; and

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam                      }  
Mr Patrick H.T. Lau                      }    having current business dealings with LLA.

45.            The Committee noted that Mr Laurence L.J. Li had left the meeting already. As

the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

46. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 14.8.2015 for deferment of the consideration of the application for one month so as to allow more time for the applicant to provide response to address the departmental comments on the application. This was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

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

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

## **Agenda Item 8**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H25/17                      Proposed Exterior Design for the West Vent Building (WVB) of the Exhibition Station (EXH) of the Shatin to Central Link (SCL) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Railway Ventilation Building” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Amenity Area” Zones, WVB of the EXH of the SCL at the junction of Fleming Road and Convention Avenue, Wan Chai, Hong Kong  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/H25/17)

---

48.                      The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by MTR Corporation Ltd. (MTRCL) with Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (ARUP) as the consultant of the applicant.    The following Members had declared interests in the item:

|                     |   |   |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | } | having current business dealings with MTRCL and ARUP; and |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau |   |   |
| Professor P.P. Ho   | - | having current business dealings with ARUP.               |

49.                      The Committee considered that the interests of Mr Dominic K.K. lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau were direct and agreed that they should leave the meeting temporarily.    As Professor P.P. Ho had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam left the meeting temporarily and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

50.                      With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed exterior design for the west vent building (WVB) for the Exhibition Station (EXH) of the Shatin to Central Link (SCL)

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok and Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no comment on the application. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application on the grounds that the proposed low-profile design would unlikely detract the public’s attention from the intermediate and long-distance views of the harbourfront area and beyond. However, she considered that the applicant should further explore maximising the greening opportunities and provide information to demonstrate if there were any constraints that might limit the provision of landscaping. The Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS) had also comments on the plant species and tree pit proposed for the WVB. While DLCS had no objection to the applicant’s clarifications regarding the maintenance responsibility of the landscaping works, the Chief Highways Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department advised the applicant to provide documents to support that relevant departments had agreed to undertake the management/maintenance of the landscaping works;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, three adverse public comments were received from Renaissance Harbour View Hotel Hong Kong, Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC) (Management) Limited and a member of the public. They objected to the application on the grounds that the proposed exterior design appeared to be visually out of context with its immediate environment; the height of the WVB would obstruct the view of one of the restaurants of the Renaissance Harbour View Hotel, leading to possible loss of business; and the proposed

WVB would be a smelly landscaped green wall and unlikely be pedestrian-friendly;

- (e) the District Officer (Wan Chai) advised that the proposal was discussed at the meeting of the Development, Planning and Transport Committee of Wan Chai District Council on 31.3.2015. One member opined that the visual quality of the exterior design of the WVB could be enhanced and MTRCL might wish to consider organising a competition on the exterior design of the WVB; and
  
- (f) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed WVB would be surrounded by roads and high-rise commercial developments in the future. The applicant had made efforts to minimise the massing of the WVB by locating most of the facilities underground, resulting in an overall height of not more than 9.6mPD, which was substantially lower than the building height of 25mPD allowed for the subject “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Railway Ventilation Building” zone. The proposed design concept of “natural stone topography” with different forms of greening would enable the proposed WVB to subtly immerse into the surrounding context which would minimise the visual impacts. The proposed WVB was considered not incompatible with the existing and planned urban setting of the future harbourfront in Wan Chai North. Although not forming part of the current application, the applicant had proposed to construct a pedestrian footpath around the WVB with two drop kerbs in the southern and western sides of the future traffic island to allow additional north-south and east-west pedestrian connections. For the concerns that the planned open space around the HKCEC would be replaced with a ventilation shaft with poor pedestrian connectivity, it should be noted that the application site had been planned for railway ventilation building for the SCL gazetted under the Railways Ordinance. The portion of “OU” annotated “Amenity Area” zone in the current application would be dedicated for greening and landscaping.

51. Members had no question on the application.

### Deliberation Session

52. A Member suggested that landscape treatments/pavement of the drop kerbs at the southern and western sides of the site could be enhanced by adding, inter alia, some benches for public enjoyment. The Chairman said that as the proposed development was a ventilation building, the public were not encouraged to stay around the area but pedestrian circulation would be enhanced under the proposal.

53. A Member considered that the concept of ‘natural stone topography’ for the ventilation building was difficult to achieve and might not blend in well with the urban context. The greening and landscaping proposed around the ventilation building should be sufficient to conceal the WVB structure. The same Member suggested that apart from the use of natural beige-coloured granite stone cladding tiles to resemble the texture and grain of natural stone, flexibility could be provided to the applicant to use alternative materials for the façade of the ventilation building to achieve the design concept. The Chairman suggested and Members agreed that an advisory clause incorporating the Member’s suggestion should be added.

54. 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 21.8.2019, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following condition:

“the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

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

“(a) to note the comments of the Committee that alternative materials, apart from natural beige-coloured granite stone cladding tiles, could be used on the façade of the ventilation building to achieve the design concept of the

proposal;

- (b) to note the comments of the Chief Estate Surveyor/Railway Development, Lands Department in paragraph 9.1.1 of the Paper regarding the processing of future land-holding document for Shatin to Central Link (SCL) including that for the proposed West Ventilation Building (WVB);
- (c) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department in paragraph 9.1.4 of the Paper regarding the need to maximise the provision of greening and the use of large shrubs to enhance the landscape and visual amenity of the proposed WVB;
- (d) to note the comments of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services in paragraph 9.1.5 of the Paper regarding the maintenance responsibility of the landscaping, the selection of plant species and adoption of trough planting for the proposed WVB, and that the provision of irrigation system and maintenance access shall be agreed and accepted by the future maintenance agent(s);
- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Highways Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department in paragraph 9.1.7 of the Paper regarding the need to confirm with the relevant departments on the maintenance/management responsibility of the proposed landscaping works for the WVB; and
- (f) to note the comments of the Project Manager (Hong Kong Island & Islands), Civil Engineering and Development Department in paragraph 9.1.8 of the Paper regarding the implementation arrangement for the pedestrian footpath and at-grade pedestrian crossings around the WVB, as proposed by the applicant; and
- (g) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection in paragraph 9.1.10 of the Paper regarding the need for compliance with the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance.”

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

**Agenda Item 9**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H3/425 Proposed Eating Place and Shop and Services on the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floors of the Proposed Composite Commercial/Residential Development in “Residential (Group A) 12” and “Residential (Group A)” Zones and Area shown as ‘Road’, 37-39, Elgin Street and 73-73E, Caine Road, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/425)

---

56. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Sun Crystal Limited, which was a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD). The following Members had declared interests in the item:

- |                        |   |   |
|------------------------|---|---|
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau    | } | having current business dealings with HLD;  |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam    |   |   |
| Professor P.P. Ho      | - | being an employee of the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) which received a donation before from a family member of the Chairman of HLD; |
| Mr Clarence W.C. Leung | - | being the director of a non-government organization that received a private donation before from a family member of the Chairman of HLD;      |

- Mr Roger K.H. Luk - being a member of the Council of CUHK which received a donation before from a family member of the Chairman of HLD; and
- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok - being an employee of the University of Hong Kong which received a donation before from a family member of the Chairman of HLD.

57. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had already left the meeting and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had left the meeting temporarily. As the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application, and Professor P.P. Jo, Mr Roger K.H. Luk and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. In response to a query from Mr Clarence W.C. Leung, the Committee noted that the donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD was given to Mr Leung's organisation more than three years ago, and agreed that no declaration of interest would be required from Mr Leung.

58. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 5.8.2015 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow sufficient time to address the departmental comments. This was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

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

[Mr Tom C.K. Yip, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), was invited to the meeting and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam returned to join the meeting at this point.]

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 10**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K11/218                      Proposed Holistic Centre for Youth Development (Proposed Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture, Social Welfare Facility, Training Centre, Place of Entertainment, Residential Institution, Eating Place, Shop and Services) in “Government, Institution or Community (2)” Zone, Government Land bound by King Fuk Street, Sam Chuk Street and Tsat Po Street, San Po Kong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K11/218A)

---

60.                      The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Tung Wah Group of Hospitals with Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) as one of the consultants of the applicant.    The following Members had declared interests in the item:

|                     |   |   |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | } | having current business dealings with ARUP; and                               |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau |   |   |
| Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan | - | her father was a member of the Advisory Board of Tung Wah Group of Hospitals. |

61.                      The Committee noted that Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had already left the meeting.    As Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

## Presentation and Question Sessions

62. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application – the site was rezoned from “Open Space” to “Government, Institution or Community (2)” (“G/IC(2)”) to facilitate the proposed holistic centre development under an approved section 12A application (No. Y/K11/3);
- (b) the proposed holistic centre for youth development (place of recreation, sports or culture, social welfare facility, training centre, place of entertainment, residential institution, eating place, shop and services) with minor relaxation of setback of 15m and 16m from the lot boundary fronting Tsat Po street and King Fuk street respectively;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no comment on the application. The Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department advised that for tree planting on the roof, sufficient space should be reserved to accommodate the required soil depth, structural support and drainage in addition to the functional space requirement for area below. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) advised that the applicant should consider to improve the visibility of public open space (POS) on 2/F by adding signage; to widen some circulation space; and to indicate the surrounding road facilities and road layout on the landscape master plan;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, 16 public comments were received of which, one public comment supported the application, three submitted by the same commenter objected to the application and 12 raised concerns and provided suggestions. The commenter who submitted three comments objected to the application on

the grounds that the proposal was unacceptable, the open space would be underutilized and open space in urban areas was being built on under the excuse of providing community facilities. The other commenters raised concerns and provided suggestions on: (i) greening area should be increased and completely open for citizens; (ii) plot ratio should be increased to avoid waste of urban land; (iii) more facilities and more variety of activities for the youth should be provided; and (iv) more public car parking spaces should be provided. No comment was received by the District Officer (Wong Tai Sin); and

- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was in line with the planning intention of the “G/IC(2)” zone and not incompatible with the surrounding uses. The proposed development was supported by the Secretary for Home Affairs and the Wong Tai Sin District Council. To address the Committee's concerns on proper planning control on the content and design of the proposed holistic centre in the previous section 12A application, the applicant had enhanced the design of the holistic centre and POS in the current application to achieve better integration. Regarding the minor relaxation of setback requirement, due to the Civil Engineering and Development Department's proposal to widen King Fuk Street, the southern boundary of site had been retreated by 2m. As a result, a small portion of the building would fall within the 16m setback from the lot boundary. The effective width of the ventilation corridor for King Fuk Street remained the same. Also, a portion of the proposed landscape terrain (with a maximum height of about 4m) fell within the 15m setback area fronting Tsat Po Street. The landscape terrain would help present a more comfortable and convenient public passage and allow more room for passive recreational activities and design features. CTP/UD&L, PlanD had no adverse comment on the Air Ventilation Assessment submitted by the applicant.

63. In response to a Member's question, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, said that as compared with the indicative scheme submitted by the same applicant in the previous s.12A

application, the exhibition area for youth was relocated from 3/F to G/F adjacent to the foyer with direct connection to the at-grade POS to facilitate the public to access exhibitions to be held on the site.

### Deliberation Session

64. 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 21.8.2019, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the submission and implementation of a revised tree preservation proposal and Landscape Master Plan (LMP) to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (b) the provision of fire services installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

- “(a) to liaise with the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department on land administration matters;
- (b) to note the following comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, Buildings Department (BD) that:
  - (i) Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-151 on Building Design to Foster a Quality and Sustainable Built Environment and PNAP APP-152 on Sustainable Building Design Guidelines are applicable to the proposed development;

- (ii) under Building (Planning) Regulation (B(P)R) 49A, a place of public entertainment (PPE) shall not be situated in a building which is used for any purposes other than those of such PPE. The mixing of the performance and exhibition venues for PPE (e.g. auditorium and exhibition hall) with the youth hostel in the proposed building is not in compliance with B(P)R 49A and 49C;
- (iii) venues for PPE are required to fulfill the special provisions on means of escape as stipulated in Part B Section 3 of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 (e.g. the site should abut upon and have frontage to two or more thoroughfares; for PPE which has an occupant capacity of more than 500 but not more than 2,000 persons, one of the thoroughfares should be at least 12m wide, two of the exit routes from each tier or floor of the PPE should open into different thoroughfares or ways, staircase design, exit route provisions, etc.);
- (iv) the youth hostel is accountable for domestic site coverage and plot ratio under B(P)R 20 and 21. The permitted percentage of site coverage for a domestic buildings over 30m but not exceeding 36m in height in a Class A site is 42% under First Schedule of B(P)R;
- (v) the youth hostel should comply with the natural lighting and ventilation requirements under B(P)R 30 and 31, open space requirements under B(P)R 25 and service lane requirements under B(P)R 28;
- (vi) PPE and hostel would come under the ambit of the Places of Public Entertainment Ordinance (Cap.172) and Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance (Cap. 349). The applicant should be advised to comply with the requirements imposed by the relevant licensing authorities;
- (vii) detailed comments under the Buildings Ordinance can only be

formulated at the building plan submission stage;

- (c) to note the following comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/Kowloon, Highways Department (HyD) that:
  - (i) a minimum of 2m clearance all around the future subway SW2/staircase/lift shall be maintained with suitable modification of the proposed building layout if required;
  - (ii) 24-hour free maintenance access shall be allowed within the holistic centre site for the HyD's maintenance of the lift/staircase/subway;
  - (iii) the exact future site boundary/lot boundary of the proposed holistic centre with necessary setback if required, during the land grant stage, should be subject to the satisfaction of the HyD;
  - (iv) the above requirements and relevant land lease special conditions for protection of highways structures should be incorporated into the lease conditions of the proposed holistic centre. The draft lease conditions shall be forwarded to the HyD (and others) for comment before finalising;
- (d) to note the comments of the Project Manager (Kowloon), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) that all the proposed drainage, sewerage works and the associated connection works would be designed and constructed by the applicant at their own cost. CEDD's contractor is carrying out the road widening/reconstruction works at Tsat Po Street, Sam Chuk Street and King Fuk Street under CEDD's Contract No. KL/2012/02 Kai Tak Development – Stage 3A Infrastructure at Former North Apron Area. The above road works is scheduled for phased completion by end 2016. The applicant should ensure the feasibility of the proposed connection by coordination with CEDD's consultants and seek comments on the proposal from the relevant authorities;

- (e) to note the comments of the Commissioner of Police that the applicant should make effective use of the loading/unloading bays and parking spaces to avoid potential obstruction to other road users;
- (f) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection that the applicant should observe the “Noise Control Guidelines for Holding Open Air Entertainment Activities” which is available in the Environmental Protection Department’s website;
- (g) to note the following comments of the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department that:
  - (i) intensive tree planting has been proposed throughout the site. The applicant should be reminded that sufficient space should be provided for each tree’s root ball and to accommodate the required soil depth;
  - (ii) for tree planting on the roof, sufficient space should be reserved to accommodate the required soil depth, structural support and drainage in addition to the functional space requirement for area below. In particular, the floor to floor height between 2/F Rehearsal Studio and the tree planting area above is only about 4m. The applicant is advised to review if the height is sufficient;
  - (iii) some hostel rooms are positioned near the site boundary, especially those at the north-eastern part of the site, and may not be able to fulfill the statutory prescribed window requirement. The applicant is reminded that the statutory lighting and ventilation requirements should be complied with;
  - (iv) the access to hostel rooms is through a long corridor with dead-end. The applicant is advised to review the layout for a more pleasant spatial design;

- (v) the connection between the POS in the east and north on G/F appears narrow near Activity Room (4). The applicant is suggested to review if the connection can be improved;
  - (vi) the planting proposed on the periphery of the roof may impede installation of maintenance systems, e.g. gondola or scaffolding, for the building faces;
- (h) to note the following comments of the Director of Fire Services that:
- (i) detailed fire services requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans;
  - (ii) Emergency Vehicular Access shall be provided in accordance with Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 which is administered by BD; and
- (i) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department on the landscape design including opening up sight lines to provide adequate signage to direct the public to the open space, showing the receptor location of transplanted tree T13 on LMP, indicating the road facilities and layout adjoining the application site on LMP to ascertain adequate circulation space between the building and the application site boundary, and providing tree planting at the roof.”

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 11**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K13/297 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (for Letting of Monthly Accessible Parking Spaces to Non-residents) for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group A)” Zone, Two Monthly Accessible Parking Spaces, 1/F and 2/F, Carpark of Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate, Ngau Tau Kok, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K13/297)

---

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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Mr K.K. Ling<br>as the Director of Planning   | - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and the Building Committee of the HKHA;                                |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan<br>as the Chief Engineer (Works) of the Home Affairs Department | - being an alternate member of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA; |
| Professor P.P. Ho   | - being a member of the Building Committee of HKHA;   |
| Ms Julia M.K. Lau   | - being a member of the Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA;   |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam   | } having current business dealings with<br>HKHA; and  |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau   |   |

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his wife working in the Property Services Administration Unit of the Housing Department (HD) which had submitted the application

67. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had already left the meeting and considered that the interests of Mr K.K. Ling, the Chairman, Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Professor P.P. Ho, Ms Julia M.K. Lau and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam were direct and agreed that they should leave the meeting temporarily. As the Chairman had to withdraw from the meeting, Members agreed that the Vice-chairman should take over and chair the meeting for the item. The Vice-chairman chaired the meeting at this point.

[Mr K.K. Ling and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam left the meeting temporarily and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Professor P.P. Ho and Ms Julia M.K. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

68. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary public vehicle park (for letting of monthly accessible parking spaces to non-residents) for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no comment on the application. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had no in-principle objection to the proposal from traffic engineering viewpoint provided that an annual review of the demand of accessible parking spaces from the residents should be carried out byHD;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, eight public comments were received, of which two supported the application, five

objected to the application and the remaining one provided comments on the parking provision of the estate. The supportive comments were submitted by two Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC)'s members. One of them supported the application as it made better use of resource, reduced illegal parking and increased the Government's revenue while the other did not indicate the reason. The objections were submitted by two KTDC's members and the Vice-chairman of the Kwun Tong Central Area Committee on the grounds that as Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate Phase 2 would soon be completed, the monthly parking spaces should not be let out to non-residents before in-take of new residents. The remaining comment made by an individual remarked that Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate was close to Mass Transit Railway station with numerous bus routes and raised doubt on whether the estate needed so many parking spaces. No comment was received by the District Officer (Kwun Tong); and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. To achieve better utilization, the applicant proposed that the two monthly accessible parking spaces might be rented to the general public if they were not occupied by residents of the estate and advised that higher priority would be accorded to residents of the estate and parking spaces allocation would be reviewed upon the population in-take of Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate Phase 2. Concerned government departments including C for T had no objection to/no adverse comments on the application. An approval condition regarding the priority and the number of parking space to be let was recommended. Regarding the public comments, the assessments above were relevant and the parking provision of the Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate was in accordance with the endorsed Planning Brief and agreed by C for T.

69. In response to the Vice-chairman's query on PlanD's suggestion that the Committee might alternatively defer making a decision on the application pending the submission of further information by the applicant on the results of the review on parking spaces allocation after the population in-take of Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate Phase 2, Mr

Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, said that the Committee could be more prudent by awaiting the results of the applicant's review if the Committee considered that the impending completion of Phase 2 in September 2015 was an important consideration of the application. PlanD however had no objection to the application based on the assessments presented by him earlier at the meeting.

70. In response to the Vice-chairman's further query, the Secretary said that there was no precedent that the effective date for commencement of the planning permission be set at a date later than the date the Committee approved the application.

#### Deliberation Session

71. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 21.8.2018, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition:

“priority should be accorded to the residents of Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate Phases 1 and 2 in the letting of the vacant accessible parking spaces and the total number of the accessible parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.”

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

“an annual review of the demand of accessible parking spaces from the residents should be carried out by the applicant, particularly after the population in-take of Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate Phase 2.”

[The Vice-chairman thanked Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Joyce So, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting and Mr K.K. Ling and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam returned to join the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 12**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/723            Proposed Hotel in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 11  
Tai Yip Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/723)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

73.            With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms. Joyce So, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel (wholesale conversion of an existing industrial building);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) advised that the applicant was required to provide the details of site constraint about infeasibility of accommodating the coach and heavy goods vehicles (HGV) within the site; to review the proposed loading/unloading (L/UL) facilities so as to accommodate the provision of a L/UL bay for HGV and coach as required under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG); to provide motorcycle parking spaces; and that the submitted swept path analysis was not satisfactory. The Chief Highway Engineer/Kowloon, Highways Department (CHE/K, HyD) and the Commissioner of Police (C of P) had no objection to the application. However, CHE/K, HyD raised concern on whether the frequent vehicular traffic on the backlane would affect the revitalization work of the Energizing Kowloon East Office and C of P had raised concern that insufficient parking facilities in the proposed hotel development might cause traffic congestion along Tai Yip Street;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments were received. One supportive comment was received from the Chairman of Kwun Tong Central Area Committee without giving reasons. The other comment was submitted by the Chairman of Owners' Corporation of the adjoining Ho King Industrial Building who raised objection to the application mainly on the grounds that the noise produced in the factory at night would affect the tourists inside the hotel. Also, the L/UL activities might impose hazards on the tourists who walked to the hotel. No comment was received by the District Officer (Kwun Tong); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed hotel development was not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for development within “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) (TPB PG-No. 22D) in that the parking and L/UL spaces provision was below the required standards in terms of number and size. C of P had raised concern that insufficient parking facilities in the proposed hotel development might cause traffic congestion along Tai Yip Street and C for T also raised adverse comments on the parking and L/UL provision. In addition, C for T considered the swept path analysis submitted by the applicant not satisfactory. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for hotel development without the provision of necessary supporting parking and L/UL spaces, the cumulative impacts of which might result in adverse traffic implications on the already congested road network in the Kwun Tong Business Area. Regarding the public comments, the assessments above were relevant. Moreover, the applicant sent an email to request the Town Planning Board to approve the application and impose an approval condition on the provision of parking and L/UL spaces. PlanD had relayed the applicant's suggestion to the Transport Department (TD) for comment and TD maintained its previous adverse comments from traffic point of view.

74. A Member noted that the only concern of the application was related to the traffic aspect. Whilst CHE/K, HyD and C of P had no objection to the application, C for T did not express his position clearly as to whether the application was acceptable from the traffic perspective. The Member also recalled that some planning applications for wholesale conversion of industrial buildings for hotel use had been approved even though the parking and L/UL provisions could not meet the requirements stipulated in HKPSG. Noting that PlanD had recently promulgated the “2014 Area Assessments of Industrial Land in the Territory” (the Assessments), the Member asked whether the Assessments would change the planning circumstances of the site and whether it should be taken into consideration in assessing the application. In response, the Chairman said that the site fell within an area zoned “OU(B)” on the approved Kwun Tong (South) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K14S/20 and the planning intention of the zone was primarily for general business uses. The recommendation of the assessments had not caused any change to the “OU(B)” zoning which was to facilitate the transformation of industrial land.

75. Mr W.L. Tang, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), responded that TD did not support the application on the grounds that the number and size of car parking and L/UL provision were below the required standards and the applicant’s swept path analysis for the parking and L/UL spaces was not satisfactory. TD had discussed with the applicant regarding their concerns several times. However, the applicant still failed to demonstrate that the traffic concerns could be satisfactorily addressed.

[Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung left the meeting at this point.]

#### Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed hotel is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines (TPB PG-No. 22D) for development within “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone in that the proposed number and size of parking and loading and unloading spaces cannot fulfil the requirements of the

Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines;

- (b) the layout of the proposed parking and loading and unloading spaces is unsatisfactory; and
- (c) approval of the application will set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for hotel development without provision of adequate and acceptable parking and loading and unloading spaces, the cumulative impacts of which may result in adverse traffic implications on the road network in the Kwun Tong Business Area.”

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

**Agenda Item 13**

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K18/313                      Proposed School (Kindergarten) in "Residential (Group C) 3" Zone, 3  
Flint Road, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/313A)

---

77.            The Secretary reported that Lanbase Surveyors Limited (Lanbase) and MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau                      -    having current business dealings with  
Lanbase and MVA;
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam                      -    having current business dealings with  
MVA;

Ms Julia M.K. Lau - having current business dealings with MVA; being the Director of a company owing a property in Kowloon Tong; and her family members were living in Waterloo Road; and

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung - currently living in La Salle Road.

78. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Ms Julia M.K. Lau had left the meeting already. As the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application, and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had no involvement in the application and the living place of Mr Clarence W.C. Leung did not have a direct view on the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

79. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 31.7.2015 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months as further comments were received from the Transport Department (TD) and the applicant was preparing supplementary materials/assessment in response to the departmental comments. This was the applicant's second request for deferment. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including responses to address comments from the Environmental Protection Department and the Urban Design and Landscape Section of the Planning Department, and a Traffic Impact Assessment in response to comments from the TD and the Hong Kong Police Force.

80. 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. Since this was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Agenda Item 14**

Any Other Business

81.           There being no other business, the meeting closed at 12:40 p.m.