

**TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**Minutes of 541<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 4.9.2015**

**Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr K. K. Ling

Chairman

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Vice-chairman

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

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

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

Assistant Director (R1), Lands Department  
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Professor P.P. Ho

Ms Julia M.K. Lau

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung

Mr Laurence L.J. Li

Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

**In Attendance**

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

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Sincere C.S. Kan

**Agenda Item 1**

**Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 540<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 21.8.2015**

[Open Meeting]

1. The Secretary reported that a typographical error was found in paragraph 66 of the draft minutes and it was proposed to revise the paragraph as follows:

“ Mr Martin W.C. Kwan  
as the ~~Assistant Director~~ *Chief Engineer (Works)* of the Home Affairs  
Department”

2. The Committee agreed that the minutes of the 540<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 21.8.2015 were confirmed subject to the incorporation of the above amendment.

**Agenda Item 2**

**Matters Arising**

[Open Meeting]

3. The Secretary reported that there were no matters arising

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/768                      Proposed Comprehensive Development for Residential, Commercial and Government, Institution or Community Uses with Public Open Space Provision (Amendments to Approved Scheme) in “Comprehensive Development Area” zone, Urban Renewal Authority Development Scheme Area at Hai Tan Street/Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street, Sham Shui Po, Kowloon  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/768)

---

4.                      The Secretary reported that the application was a redevelopment project of the Urban Renewal Authority (URA), and was submitted by Swiss Investments Limited, which was a subsidiary of Cheung Kong (Holdings) Ltd. (Cheung Kong). AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM), LWK & Partners (HK) Ltd. (LWK), Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ) and Greg Wong & Associates Ltd. (GWA) were four of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr K.K. Ling                      - being the non-executive director of the Board  
(the Chairman)                      of URA;  
*as the Director of Planning*

Mr Simon S.W. Wang                      - being the alternate member of the  
*as the Assistant Director*                      non-executive director of the Board of URA;  
*(Regional 1) of the Lands*  
*Department*

Mr H.W. Cheung                      - being the co-opted member of the Planning,  
Development and Conservation Committee of  
URA;

Professor P.P. Ho	- being the conservation consultant of URA; and having current business dealings with Cheung Kong and AECOM;
Mr Laurence L.J. Li	- being the non-executive director of the Board of URA; and having current business dealings with LWK;
Mr Patrick H.T. Lau	- having current business dealings with URA, CK Hutchison (a subsidiary of Cheung Kong) and AECOM;
Mr Stephen H.B. Yau	- being the member of the Wan Chai District Advisory Committee of URA;
Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon	- being the non-executive director of the Board of URA;
Ms Julia M.K. Lau	- having current business dealings with AECOM and Environ; and
Mr Dominic K.K. Lam	- having current business dealings with AECOM, Environ and GWA.

5. The Committee noted that Professor P.P. Ho, Mr H.W. Cheung, Mr Stephen H.B. Yau, Mr Laurence L.J. Li and Ms Julia M.K. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

6. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting. However, as the interests of Mr K.K. Ling, Mr Simon S.W. Wang, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon were direct, the Committee agreed that they should refrain from participating in the discussion. The Vice-chairman took over the chairmanship of the meeting at this point.

7. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 21.8.2015 for deferment of the consideration of the application for a period of not more than eight weeks in order to allow sufficient time for the preparation and submission of further information/technical clarifications in response to departmental comments received and to allow time for the various departments to consider the submitted information. This was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

8. 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 Martin W.C. Kwan and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

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

## **Hong Kong District**

### **Agenda Item 4**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H24/23                      Proposed Eating Place, Shop and Services, Private Club in "Open Space" zone and an area shown as 'Road', Fenwick Pier, 1 Lung King Street, Wan Chai, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H24/23)

---

9. The Secretary reported that Townland Consultants Ltd. (Townland), MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) and Urbis Ltd. (Urbis) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having current business dealings with Townland, MVA and Urbis;

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with Townland and MVA;

Professor P.P. Ho - having current business dealings with Townland; and

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

10. The Committee noted that Professor P.P. Ho and Ms Julia M.K. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee also noted that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had no involvement and agreed that they should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr J.J. Austin, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

##### *The Proposal*

- (a) the applicant sought planning permission for the reconstruction and refurbishment of the existing development at Fenwick Pier with uses including the Servicemen's Guides Association (SGA) facilities, food and beverage (F&B) facilities and retail shops;
- (b) the existing development comprised a single storey block and a 4-storey building. According to the proposal, the existing single storey block would be demolished and replaced by a new 4-storey building adjoining the

existing 4-storey building, which would then be refurbished and integrated into one 4-storey building;

- (c) the proposed development had a total gross floor area (GFA) of about 4,562m<sup>2</sup> (24.8% more than the existing development), a plot ratio of about 1.4, a site coverage of about 44.74% (19.75% less than the existing development) and a maximum building height of 4 storeys. The increase in GFA was mainly due to the provision of additional F&B facilities;
- (d) the south-western corner of the existing site (about 327m<sup>2</sup>) was proposed to be excised from the existing site boundary in exchange for the proposed incorporation of portions of ex-Lung King Street into the proposed site boundary; and
- (e) an open space of 1,892m<sup>2</sup> including a rooftop garden for public use and a 24-hour public passage would be provided within the proposed development;

*Departmental Comments*

- (f) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

*Public Comment*

- (g) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period and the publication of the further information, one public comment was received from a Wan Chai District Councillor supporting the opening up of the proposed development to the public with suggestions provided for complementing the proposed facilities for the public's use and access; and



*Planning Department (PlanD)'s View*

- (h) PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed development would not cause adverse traffic, environmental, geotechnical, drainage, water supply and visual impacts. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Moreover, the Harbourfront Commission's Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong, the Development, Planning and Transport Committee of the Wan Chai District Council, and the Land and Development Advisory Committee had no adverse comment on the proposed development.

*Pedestrian Connectivity and Open Space*

12. The Vice-chairman noted that the south-western corner of the existing site was proposed to be excised in exchange for inclusion of a portion of ex-Lung King Street into the site boundary, and asked if there were any public benefits arising from such an arrangement. In response, Mr J.J. Austin, STP/HK, said that Lung King Street was closed permanently under the Wan Chai Development Phase II project (WDII). According to the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront 2011 (UDS), a pedestrian walkway would be provided along the western boundary of the site, and the south-western corner of the site would encroach onto that pedestrian walkway. Therefore, the applicant proposed to excise the south-western corner of the site from the existing site for better pedestrian circulation and a more spacious public open space.

13. A Member enquired the opening hours and accessibility of the rooftop garden for public use. In response, Mr Austin said that the rooftop garden would be open to the public at reasonable hours and two lifts would be provided on the ground floor level to facilitate direct access to the rooftop garden.

14. Another Member raised the following points :

- (a) the northern part of the site was designated as an open space for public use, but the width of the proposed pedestrian pathway was narrow and might

not be able to cater for the future pedestrian flow;

- (b) whether the incorporation of a portion of Lung King Street into the site would interrupt the pedestrian connection between the harbourfront and the hinterland via Lung King Street;
- (c) whether Lung King Street would need to be rezoned prior to incorporating part of the street into the site;
- (d) whether widening of the footpath along Fenwick Pier Street to the south of the site would be required to cater for the future increase in pedestrian flow; and
- (e) whether the proposed development would worsen the pedestrian connectivity between the harbourfront and the hinterland, or impose constraints on the future development of the surrounding areas.

15. In response, Mr Austin said that pedestrians could access to the harbourfront by passing through the 24-hour pedestrian passage on the G/F of the proposed development. Although Lung King Street was closed permanently, a strip of land would be available between the proposed development and the future extension of the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts (HKAPA) to provide a connection leading to the harbourfront. The Chairman noted that the site was no longer fronting the Victoria Harbour due to the reclamation works under WDII and asked for the width of the strip of the land to the east of the site that would be kept for pedestrian circulation taking into account the future extension of HKAPA, Mr Austin said that there was no such information available at hand.

16. The Chairman asked how the design of the northern and western parts of the site could be integrated with the adjacent 'art event plaza' that was proposed for art display and public gathering in UDS. In response, Mr Austin said that an open space with landscaping for public use would be provided at the northern part of the site so as to integrate with the future 'art event plaza'. Retail shops and F&B facilities would also be provided at the ground floor along northern and western parts of the proposed development to serve the visitors of the 'art event plaza' as well as to enhance the diversity of activities in the area.

Unlike the existing Fleet Arcade with fencing, the northern and western parts of the proposed development would be open up with sliding doors only.

#### *Site Area*

17. In response to the Chairman's question on the existing and proposed boundaries of the site, with reference to Drawing A-13 of the Paper, Mr Austin said that the blue dotted line indicated the existing site boundary while the red dotted line indicated the proposed site boundary, and there was no change to the total site area.

18. A Member asked whether it was a mandatory requirement that the proposed site area should be the same as the existing one. The same Member considered that if there was flexibility in the site area, the northern part of the site should be excluded from the proposed site area and incorporated into the 'art event plaza' to facilitate a more comprehensive design. Similarly, the eastern part of the site along Lung King Street should also be excluded to create a more spacious public area between the proposed development and the future HKAPA extension. In response, Mr Austin said that it was not a requirement for the Government to provide the applicant with the same site area. However, the Government was generally supportive of the continued operation of Fenwick Pier which provided services and facilities to visiting naval personnel.

#### *Car Parking*

19. Another Member said that several on-street public car parking spaces were provided along Lung King Street. Since the street was closed permanently, whether there was any re-provisioning of public car parking spaces in the area. The same Member also asked whether there was any difference between the number of existing and proposed car parking spaces on site. In response, Mr Austin said that Lung King Street was closed due to the reclamation works under WDII and the affected public car parking spaces would be re-provided near the Star Ferry Pier to the west of the site so as to serve the visitors of the harbourfront. Regarding the car parking provision of the proposed development, 10 car parking spaces and 3 loading/unloading (L/UL) bays would be provided, which were 1 car parking space and 2 L/UL bays more than that of the existing provision. Mr W.L. Tang, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), Transport Department (TD), supplemented

that according to the recent survey conducted by TD, there was spare capacity in a number of car parks in the surrounding areas, such as Shui On Centre and the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre. Moreover, TD was of the view that the provision of on-street car parking spaces was considered not desirable especially at the harbourfront, and thus any future car parking provision should be incorporated into commercial and residential developments.

20. The Vice-chairman asked for the number of visitors to Fenwick Pier in 2014. In response, Mr Austin said that the required information was not available but the overall tourism expenditure from servicemen in 2011 was given in paragraph 10.1.19 of the Paper.

### Deliberation Session

21. The Vice-chairman said that there were originally three places in Hong Kong serving visiting naval personnel in the past, including Sailors and Soldiers Home, China Fleet Club and Fenwick Pier. The former two facilities were already closed, and the Fenwick Pier was the remaining facility to cater for visiting naval personnel. He further said that although Fenwick Pier no longer had a sea frontage due to the reclamation works and the number of visiting naval personnel was anticipated to be decreased gradually, the existing development still had its functions to perform. Therefore, the proposed refurbishment of the Fenwick Pier was worth supporting, which could retain its functions without affecting the planning and design concept of the New Central Harbourfront nor involving huge relocation cost. The major concerns of the proposed development would be whether there was a need to ensure that the proposed site area should be the same as the existing one, and how the redevelopment of the Fenwick Pier could blend in with the design of the New Central Harbourfront.

22. The Chairman concurred and said that the Fenwick Pier could be regarded as showcasing the history of the Central Harbourfront, and the proposed additional F&B facilities and retail shops could also inject vibrancy to the New Central Harbourfront. Consideration should also be given to integrating the rooftop garden with F&B facilities in order to enhance its attractiveness and utilization rate. The Chairman noted that Members were more concerned about how the proposed development could facilitate the pedestrian flow towards the New Central Harbourfront. The Chairman suggested that Members could

first consider whether the proposed uses and building bulk of the proposed development were acceptable, and then how the proposed scheme could be further improved such as if the proposed open space for public use should be excluded from the site area, and be incorporated as part of the large public open space.

23. A Member said that since a 24-hour pedestrian passage would be provided at the G/F of the proposed development, pedestrian accessibility should not be a main concern. For the landscape design of the proposed open space at the northern part of the site, it should be better integrated with the 'art event plaza' and the proposed planting at the northern edge of that open space was considered not desirable. Regarding the strip of land to the east of the site, it should be integrated well with the future open space to the north of Lung King Street to enhance public accessibility to the harbourfront, and should not be reduced to a narrow strip of land with fences on both sides that might be erected by the proposed development and the future HKAPA extension.

24. A Member agreed that the building bulk was acceptable and the development should be retained for historical reasons, but considered that the proposed development would impose adverse impact on the design of the New Central Harbourfront in UDS. In particular, Lung King Street, though closed, the concerned land would be a popular pedestrian access as well as an art corridor leading to the harbourfront. It was therefore considered not desirable to convert part of Lung King Street to car parking spaces for the proposed development. The size of the open space proposed at the northern part of the site was considered too small and its design should better be integrated with the adjoining 'art event plaza'. The excision of the south-western corner of the site for better pedestrian circulation might not be necessary as pedestrian flow might be low. The Member also pointed out that more information regarding the interface treatment of the western edge of the site was required. Another Member concurred and said that since the northern part of the site should be easily accessed by the public, it should be excluded from the site for a more integrated design with the 'art event plaza' so as to become a real public open space.

25. A Member said that since the application was to seek permission for the reconstruction and refurbishment of the existing development with a higher development intensity within the "Open Space" ("O") zone, planning gain should be provided by the applicant to justify the proposed development and increase in development intensity within

the “O” zone. The applicant should consider adopting its existing eastern site boundary so that a more spacious open space between the site and the future HKAPA extension could be maintained, and at the same time surrender the northern part and south-western corner of the site to facilitate a comprehensive design of public open space and a better pedestrian circulation respectively. The Vice-chairman said that more information on how the site boundary was determined and how the design of the proposed development including the open space for public use could be integrated with the surrounding environment should be provided. Another Member considered that the entire existing site boundary should be maintained. Instead of excising the south-western corner of the site, it could be used to accommodate car parking spaces which were proposed to be located at the eastern part of the site under the application.

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

26. The Vice-chairman said that the major functions of the SGA facilities within the development were to handle administrative works as well as to allow the picket to take disciplinary action against sailors and soldiers, if required. Therefore, physical barriers were needed to separate the SGA facilities from the facilities for public use. In view of this, the Vice-chairman considered that apart from the required site area for the SGA facilities, the proposed area for public use could be excluded from the site and be better integrated with the surrounding environment. He asked whether there was information on the delineation between the publicly accessible and inaccessible areas within the proposed development. In response, the Secretary said that relevant information was provided in the Pedestrian Circulation Diagram in Appendix 4 of the Supplementary Planning Statement submitted by the applicant.

27. In response to Members’ earlier questions on the surrounding pedestrian circulation and landscape treatment of the site, the Secretary said that the Fenwick Pier was originally proposed to be demolished and relocated elsewhere. However, since no suitable relocation site could be found and the existing location had been confirmed as most suitable to serve naval personnel, the Government agreed that the existing facilities should be retained on the site. After the completion of the reclamation works, the development would be land-locked and surrounded by open space, and the nearby road network would be re-aligned. According to UDS, Road D11 located to the west of the site would become a major pedestrian gateway to the harbourfront while Lung King Street would no longer exist.

Therefore, the applicant proposed to excise the south-western corner of the site to enhance the visual permeability of the area and pedestrian accessibility to the harbourfront. Together with an existing Banyan Tree to be preserved near the entrance of the proposed development, a welcoming open space for public use would be provided at the south-western part of the site that would be directly connected with the 24-hour pedestrian passage at the G/F of the proposed development leading to the pedestrian pavement along Road D11 and the 'art event plaza'.

28. The Chairman concluded that Members generally had no objection to the proposed uses, as well as the increase in GFA and building height of the new building up to 4 storeys. On the other hand, approving the application with conditions might not be able to address Members' concerns on various design aspects of the proposed development. Members might consider deferring a decision on the application pending submission of further information on the design of the proposed development to facilitate Members' further consideration of the application.

29. Members generally agreed to defer a decision on the application pending submission of further information on the design of the proposed development. The Chairman concluded that the Committee generally agreed with the design concept of the south-western corner of the site and had no strong view if the said corner was to be excised from the site boundary. For the eastern part of the site, since no information on the width and design of the strip of open space between the site and the future HKAPA extension was provided, the Committee was unable to consider if the use and design treatment of the eastern part of the site was compatible and appropriate. For the northern part of the site, the Committee generally agreed that it should be developed as an open space for public use, but there was insufficient information to consider whether this part of the site should be included in the site. In view of the above, more information should be provided on the design of the proposed open spaces for public use and their integration with the adjoining land uses.

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

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

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H9/75 Proposed Hospital in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (1)” zone, 3 A Kung Ngam Village Road, Shau Kei Wan, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H9/75A)

---

31. The Secretary reported that Townland Consultants Ltd. (Townland), MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam	}	having current business dealings with Townland, MVA and Arup;
Mr Patrick H.T. Lau		

Professor P.P. Ho - having current business dealings with  
Townland and Arup; and

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

32. The Committee noted that Professor P.P. Ho and Ms Julia M.K. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

33. The Committee also noted that the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau could stay in the meeting.

34. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 19.8.2015 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to address the comments of the Transport Department (TD), Architectural Services Department and Water Supplies Department, particularly TD’s comments in relation to major technical issues raised in the traffic impact assessment. This was the second time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application. Following the approval of the first deferment, the applicant submitted further information on 17.7.2015 and 3.8.2015 to address departmental comments.



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

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 6**

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

[Open Meeting]

A/K15/114                      Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development in “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zone, 5 and 8 Tung Yuen Street, and adjoining Government Land, Yau Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/114)

---

36. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Korn Reach Investment Ltd. and Glass Bead Ltd., which were the subsidiaries of Cheung Kong (Holdings) Ltd. (Cheung Kong) with Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTA), LWK & Partners (HK) Ltd. (LWK), Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ) and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Ltd. (MMHK) as four of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

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

- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with CK Hutchison (a subsidiary of Cheung Kong) and KTA;
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having current business dealings with KTA, Environ and MMHK;
- Mr Laurence L.J. Li - having current business dealings with LWK; and his spouse's relative owning a factory in Yau Tong; and
- Ms Julia M.K. Lau - having current business dealings with Environ.

37. The Committee noted that Professor P.P. Ho, Mr Laurence L.J. Li and Ms Julia M.K. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

38. The Committee also noted that it was a request for deferment of consideration of the application by the Planning Department (PlanD) and agreed that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau could stay in the meeting.

39. The Committee noted that the site fell within the "Comprehensive Development Area (1)" ("CDA(1)") zone on the draft Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K15/22. A Planning Brief (PB) was prepared by PlanD to guide the development and submission of the Master Layout Plan for the "CDA(1)" zone, and the consultation of the PB with the Kwun Tong District Council and the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing of the Harbourfront Commission were held on 7.7.2015 and 1.9.2015 respectively. The views collected together with the revised PB would be submitted to the Committee for further consideration and endorsement in October/November 2015. To ensure provision of comprehensive guidance/control of the development in the "CDA(1)" zone with due consideration of public views, PlanD requested that a decision on the application be deferred until the endorsement of the PB.

40. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by PlanD. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for

its consideration after the endorsement of the PB which was expected to be in October/November 2015.

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

### **Agenda Item 7**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K18/315                      Proposed Shop and Services (Convenience Store) in “Residential (Group C) 9” zone, Ground Floor (Part), 57A Nga Tsing Wai Road, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/315)

---

41.                      The Secretary reported that the site was located at 57A Nga Tsing Wai Road, and Ms Julia M.K. Lau had declared an interest in this item as she was the director of a company which owned a property in Kowloon Tong. The Committee noted that Ms Julia M.K. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

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

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed shop and services (convenience store);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment was received from the the Incorporated Owners of Nga Tsing Villa

objecting to the application mainly on the grounds that the neighbourhood population did not require a store in the vicinity; there was already a convenience store near the junction of Nga Tsin Wai Road and Fuk Lo Tsuen Road; and the proposed store would create nuisance and inconvenience, particularly at night, to the neighbourhood; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed shop and services use was considered not compatible with the residential use of the existing building and the general residential character of the area. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications for shop and services uses in the area leading to reduction of ancillary parking space serving the residential development and proliferation of commercial uses into the residential neighbourhood.

43. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

44. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. Members then went through the reasons for rejection as stated in paragraph 11 of the Paper and considered that they were appropriate. The reasons were :

- “(a) the proposed shop and services use is considered not compatible with the general residential character of the area; and
- (b) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications for shop and services uses in the area leading to reduction of car parking space serving the residential development and proliferation of commercial uses into the residential neighbourhood.”

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

**Agenda Item 8**

**Any Other Business**

45.           There being no other business, the meeting closed at 10:30 a.m..