

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 553rd Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 4.3.2016

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

Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

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
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Ken Y.K. Wong

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

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

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 552nd MPC Meeting held on 19.2.2016

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 552nd MPC meeting held on 19.2.2016 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

[Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Laurence L.J. Li arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K1/253 Proposed Hotel in “Residential (Group A)” Zone, 66-68 Shanghai Street,
Jordan
(MPC Paper No. A/K1/253)

3. The Committee noted that the applicant on 18.2.2016 requested for deferment of the consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the departmental comments and clarify the background information of the application. It was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application

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

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

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/476 Proposed Wholesale Conversion of an Existing Building for Eating Place, Shop and Services and Office in "Industrial" Zone, 60 - 62 Sha Tsui Road, Tsuen Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/476)

5. The Secretary reported that LLA Consultancy Ltd. (LLA) was one 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 LLA; and

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with LLA.

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

7. The Committee noted that the applicant on 24.2.2016 requested for deferment of the consideration of the application to 18.3.2016 in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the departmental comments and for concerned government departments to provide comments on further information. It 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. Whilst the applicant requested to defer making a decision on the application to 18.3.2016, sufficient time should be allowed for government departments to examine the applicant's further information. 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 weeks were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Mr Philip Y.L. Chum, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan arrived to join the meeting and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TWK/9 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Public Vehicle Park
(Excluding Container Vehicle) for a Period of 3 Years (Letting of Vacant
Monthly Vehicle Parking Spaces to Non-Residents) in "Residential
(Group A)" Zone,
(a) Car Park in Chak On Estate, Shek Kip Mei
(b) Car Park in Nam Shan Estate, Shek Kip Mei
(c) Car Park in Pak Tin Estate, Shek Kip Mei
(d) Car Park in Shek Kip Mei Estate, Shek Kip Mei

(MPC Paper No. A/TWK/9)

9. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong

Housing Authority (HKHA), and the four sites were located at Chak On Estate, Nam Shan Estate, Pak Tin Estate and Shep Kip Mei Estate in Shek Kip Mei. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

Mr K.K. Ling (the Chairman) *as the Director of Planning* - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and the Building Committee (BC) of HKHA;

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan *as the Chief Engineer (Works) of Home Affairs Department* - being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA;

Ms Julia M.K. Lau - being a member of the Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA;

Professor P.P. Ho - being a member of the BC of HKHA;

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with HKHA;

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with HKHA;

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - working in the City University of Hong Kong and living in its quarters; and his spouse working in the Housing Department but had no involvement in the application;

Mr H.W. Cheung - owning a property at Parc Oasis; and

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung - his family member owning a property at Dynasty Heights.

10. The Committee noted that Professor P.P. Ho, Mr Clarence W.C. Leung, and Ms

Julia M.K. Lau had not yet arrived at the meeting and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had temporarily left the meeting. As the interests of Mr K.K. Ling, Mr Martin W.C. Kwan and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau were direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had no involvement in the application, the property of Mr H.W. Cheung had no direct view of the site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. The Vice-chairman took over the chairmanship of the meeting at this point.

[Mr K.K. Ling, Mr Martin W.C. Kwan and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) for a period of three years for letting of vacant monthly vehicle parking spaces to non-residents;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, three public comments were received. The first comment agreed that the proposal could maximise utilisation of the vehicle park. The second comment by the Sham Shui Po District Council member was concerned about the inadequate provision of motorcycle parking spaces at Pak Tin Estate. The third comment considered that the vacant parking spaces should be permanently used for community facilities or redeveloped for housing use; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The application complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34B on Renewal of Planning Approval and Extension of Time for Compliance with Planning Conditions for Temporary Use or Development. Regarding the public comments received, more motorcycle parking spaces had been added at Pak Tin Estate. As for the utilization of the vacant parking spaces for alternative uses, an advisory clause to advise the applicant that consideration might be given to letting the vacant vehicle parking spaces for community uses was recommended should the application be approved.

12. Noting that several similar applications for renewal of planning approval of temporary public vehicle park submitted by HKHA had been considered by the Committee recently, a Member asked why permanent planning permission or a longer validity permission period could not be granted given there was no change in the total number of vehicle parking spaces within the estates and priority would be given to the residents of the estates for the letting of the vacant parking spaces. In response, Mr Philip Y.L. Chum, STP/TWK, said that approving the application on a temporary basis for three years could allow the Transport Department to periodically review the parking demand of the residents in the estates in order to determine the number of vacant parking spaces that could be let to non-residents.

Deliberation Session

13. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years from 17.4.2016 to 16.4.2019, 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 respective residents of Chak On Estate, Nam Shan Estate, Pak Tin Estate and Shek Kip Mei Estate in the letting of the vacant vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.”

14. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clause as set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

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

[Mr K.K. Ling, Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon returned to join the meeting and Ms Julia M.K. Lau and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H15/267 Proposed Eating Place in "Open Space" Zone, Site on Aberdeen Promenade near Aberdeen Wholesale Fish Market
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/267A)

15. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Home Affairs Department (HAD). Townland Consultants Ltd. (TCL), Architectural Services Department (ArchSD), BMT Asia Pacific Ltd. (BMT) and MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) were the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan | - being the Chief Engineer (Works) of HAD; |
| Mr Stephen H.B. Yau | - working in an organization which had a project funded by HAD; |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - having current business dealings with HAD, TCL, ArchSD, BMT and MVA; |

- Professor P.P. Ho - having current business dealings with TCL and ArchSD;
- Ms Julia M.K. Lau - having current business dealing with MVA; and
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with TCL, ArchSD, BMT and MVA.

16. The Committed noted that the applicant had requested for deferral of consideration of the application. The Committee also noted that Professor P.P. Ho had not yet arrived at the meeting and agreed that Ms Julia M.K. Lau and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam could stay in the meeting as they had no involvement in the application. As the interests of Mr Martin W.C. Kwan and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau were direct, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion.

17. The Committee noted that the applicant on 18.2.2016 requested for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for the applicant to obtain the steer from the Focus Group on Southern District Signature Projects of the Southern District Council and further respond to the public comments received. It was the second time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information providing responses to departmental comments.

18. 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 it 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.

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H18/75 Proposed Extension of Academic Block (Site A) and Residential Block (Site F) in “Green Belt” and “Site of Special Scientific Interest” Zones, The Swire Institute of Marine Science, Faculty of Science, The University of Hong Kong, Cape d'Aguilar Road, Shek O
(MPC Paper No. A/H18/75)

19. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the University of Hong Kong (HKU). The following Members had declared interests in the item:

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok - being an employee of HKU; and

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with HKU.

20. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested for deferral of consideration of the application and agreed that Dominic K.K. Lam could stay in the meeting as he had no involvement in the application. As the interest of Dr Wilton W.T. Fok was direct, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion.

21. The Committee noted that the applicant on 19.2.2016 requested for deferment of the consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time to prepare further information to address relevant government departments’ comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

22. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the

applicant that one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

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

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

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H3/427 Proposed Composite Commercial/Residential Development (Flat, Eating Place and Shop and Services) and Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction in “Government, Institution or Community” and “Residential (Group A) 7” Zones, 6-18 Chung Ching Street, Sai Ying Pun
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/427)

23. The Secretary reported that the site was located at Sai Ying Pun. Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTA), ADI Ltd. (ADI), Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup) were four 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 KTA and Arup; |
| Ms Julia M.K. Lau | - having current business dealings with Environ; |
| Professor P.P. Ho | - having current business dealings with Arup; |

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam having past business dealings with KTA, ADI, Environ and Arup; and

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung - his family member owning a property in Sai Ying Pun.

24. The Committee noted that Professor P.P. Ho had not yet arrived at the meeting. As Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Ms Julia M.K. Lau and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had no involvement in the application and the property of the family member of Mr Clarence W.C. Leung had no direct view of the site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

25. 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:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed composite commercial/residential development (flat, eating place and shop and services) and minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction;
- (c) departmental comments – detailed departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (PlanD) advised that a substantial part of the pedestrian street cum sitting-out area was a covered space underneath the residential block and enclosed by the structural columns and planters, while the uncovered space was in the form of a passageway with limited seating provision. The pedestrian street cum sitting-out area was less inviting than the public garden in the approved scheme. Design efforts would be required to enhance its appeal and function. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, fifteen public comments were received. Of which, twelve comments opposed the application on the grounds of the removal of a public garden; the increase in development intensities; the inappropriate design of the pedestrian street cum sitting-out area; the deficit in provision of public open space; and the uncertainty of providing a direct access to the MTR station. The remaining three general comments were mainly related to the possible environmental nuisance and adverse traffic impacts; and

- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed development was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses and the proposed BH was also not incompatible with the BH restriction of the surrounding areas. The proposed minor relaxation of the BH restriction from 90mPD to 100mPD was considered acceptable as it met the criteria set out in the Explanatory Statement of the Outline Zoning Plan in that it was to accommodate the bonus gross floor area (GFA) in relation to surrender of land for use as a hammerhead and pavement as well as the increase in GFA arising from the change in the site classification from a Class A site to a Class B site. The proposed development provided a pedestrian street cum sitting-out area for public use. In order to ensure that the proposed pedestrian street cum sitting-out area would be properly designed, an approval condition requiring the submission and implementation of a landscape master plan was recommended. Relevant government departments had no objection to the application. Regarding the public comments received, the above assessments were relevant.

26. In response to a Member's question on the distribution of the increased GFA of the proposed development as compared with the previous approved scheme under application No. A/H3/294, Mr J.J. Austin, STP/HK, said that the increase in the GFA was 1,078m² (i.e. 22.6%) and according to the applicant, the increase in GFA was due to the change in site classification and the bonus GFA. The Chairman further supplemented that there was no plot ratio or GFA restriction on the approved Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/29, and details of the bonus GFA calculation would be further considered by

the Building Authority at the building plan submission stage.

27. The same Member further asked whether there was any mechanism to ensure that the proposed pedestrian cum sitting out area would be opened to the public. In response, Mr Austin said that such requirement would be stipulated in the Deed of Mutual Covenant of the building and a letter to be registered at the Land Registry. The management and maintenance of the proposed pedestrian cum sitting out area would be taken up by the non-domestic portion of the proposed development.

28. In response to the Vice-chairman's question, Mr Austin said that the area designated for the proposed hammerhead and pedestrian pavement would be surrendered to the Government and concerned government departments would be responsible for the future management and maintenance of the said area.

Deliberation Session

29. 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 4.3.2020, 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 setting back of 2.7m of the site boundary at ground level along Chung Ching Street for footpath widening, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and provision of a pedestrian street cum sitting-out area of not less than 214m² for public use, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission and implementation of a landscape master plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) report to the

satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;

- (e) the implementation of the sewerage improvement measures identified in the SIA report to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (f) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

30. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

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

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

Agenda Item 9

Section 16A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H5/217-2 Proposed Class B Amendments to the Approved Master Layout Plan for a Proposed Hotel and Commercial Development (Hopewell Centre II Development), Kennedy Road and Ship Street, Wan Chai
(MPC Paper No. A/H5/217-2)

31. The Secretary reported that the site was located at Wan Chai. Townland Consultants Ltd. (TCL) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

Mr K.K. Ling - owning a property at Queen's Road East;
(the Chairman)

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | } | having current business dealings with TCL; |
| Professor P.P. Ho | | |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - | having past business dealings with TCL; |
| Ms Julia M.K. Lau | - | owning two properties on Star Street; |
| Mr Clarence W.C. Leung | - | co-owning a property on Queen's Road East with his spouse; |
| Mr Laurence L.J. Li | | co-owning a property near St. Francis Street with his spouse; and |
| Mr Stephen H.B. Yau | - | his office locating at Southorn Centre. |

32. The Committee noted that Professor P.P. Ho had not yet arrived at the meeting. As the interest of Mr Laurence L.J. Li was direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily. Since Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had no involvement in the application and the properties/office of Mr K.K. Ling, Ms Julia M.K. Lau, Mr Clarence W.C. Leung and Mr Stephen H.B. Yau had no direct view of the site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

33. 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:

Background

- (a) the application was submitted for Class B amendments to the approved Master Layout Plan (MLP) for a proposed hotel and commercial

development with provision of a private park (now known as Hopewell Centre II (HCII)) at the site and a public open space at Ship Street under application No. A/H5/217;

- (b) the application was first approved by the Committee on 7.1.1994 (the 1994 Scheme). On 12.12.2008, the Town Planning Board agreed to various Class A amendments to the 1994 Scheme and the MLP incorporated the agreed Class A amendments was deposited at the Land Registry on 17.8.2009 (the 2009 Scheme);
- (c) the road improvement works associated with the proposed HCII was authorized by the Chief Executive in Council in 2010;

Proposed Amendments to the MLP

- (d) the Current Scheme involved the following Class B amendments to the 2009 scheme:
 - (i) addition of an at-grade vehicular egress at 55.5mPD (12/F in the Current Scheme) onto the eastbound lane of Kennedy Road; and
 - (ii) addition of an internal vehicular egress at 49.5mPD (11/F in the Current Scheme) connecting with the adjacent Hopewell Centre (HCI);
- (e) the applicant's justifications for the proposed amendments were set out in paragraph 2 of the Paper;

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

Departmental Comments

- (f) detailed departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;

- (g) the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had reservation on the proposed at-grade vehicular egress at 12/F, as it was not essential and not desirable from traffic management point of view due to additional vehicular egress movements onto Kennedy Road. Moreover, without the provision of a comparison table for the breakdown of hotel facilities of the 2009 Scheme and the Current Scheme, there was insufficient information to demonstrate that there would be no adverse traffic impact on the road network in the vicinity and C for T was unable to agree with the proposed parking spaces and loading/unloading (L/UL) bays in the Current Scheme;
- (h) the District Officer (Wan Chai) (DO(Wch)) advised that both the proposed egress onto Kennedy Road and modification works to be carried out at HCI for provision of an egress for HCII would attract local concerns;
- (i) other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

Planning Department (PlanD)'s Views

- (j) PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. C for T had reservation on the proposed at-grade vehicular egress at Kennedy Road as there would be increase in vehicular turning movements and disruption on the traffic flow along Kennedy Road. Moreover, the proposed at-grade vehicular egress was not essential as the original traffic arrangement authorized in 2010 could cater for the circulation of vehicles between HCI and HCII with the existing egress at HCI serving for vehicles leaving HCI/HCII onto the eastbound lane of Kennedy Road. No technical information had been provided by the applicant to demonstrate the infeasibility or difficulties of the modification works required at HCI and the infeasibility of other alternative egress arrangement. The DO(Wch) also advised that both the modification of the existing egress at HCI and the addition of a new egress at HCII, if any, were very likely to cause concerns and draw comments from the public, particularly the nearby residents and other stakeholders in

the community.

34. In response to a Member's question on the land matters of the site, Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo, STP/HK, said that HCI and HCII were subject to two separate leases and were considered as two individual sites. The Member further asked about the details of Class A amendments and if there was any change to the number of car parking spaces under the Current Scheme. In response, Miss Lo said that a number of changes had been incorporated into the Current Scheme, including changes in gross floor area (GFA) distribution, location of non-domestic uses within the podium, internal layout/disposition of premises and location of ancillary major utility installation. Those changes fell within Class A amendments according to the Town Planning Board (TPB) Guidelines No. 36A for Class A and Class B Amendments to Approved Development Proposals. There was no change to the original car number of car parking spaces under the Current Scheme. The design and provision of car parking spaces and L/UL bays would be subject to the satisfaction of C for T under the relevant approval condition of the original application.

35. In response to the Chairman's question on the proposed internal vehicular egress at 11/F in the Current Scheme, Miss Lo said that the proposed internal vehicular egress was an additional internal connection between HCI and HCII to enhance the vehicular circulations between the two developments and would not affect the traffic flow along Kennedy Road. Mr W.L. Tang, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), Transport Department (TD), confirmed that the proposed internal vehicular egress would not have any implication on the external traffic along Kennedy Road and was not technically interrelated to the proposed at-grade vehicular egress at 12/F of the Current Scheme.

36. A Member concurred with the views that the proposed internal vehicular egress could facilitate vehicular circulations between HCI and HCII and should have no adverse traffic impact on Kennedy Road, and asked if it was possible to partially approve the application under the current mechanism. In response, the Secretary said that it was procedurally proper to partially approve an application containing proposals that were not interrelated.

37. A Member asked if the proposed at-grade vehicular egress onto Kennedy Road could ease the internal traffic circulation and thus minimize the queuing of vehicles along

Kennedy Road for entering the two developments. In response, Miss Lo said that the applicant had not provided any details on that aspect.

38. The Chairman asked if the proposed at-grade vehicular egress, given its close proximity to the existing at-grade egress at HCI, would contravene any prevailing technical and safety guidelines of TD. In response, Mr Tang said that the proposed at-grade vehicular egress was very close (i.e. around 20m) to the existing egress at HCI. Moreover, the section of Kennedy Road fronting HCI and HCII was in a curved shape with a length of about 50m. According to the approved traffic arrangement, that road section would have various transport movements from a proposed tunnel, a proposed flyover, the existing egress at HCI and a proposed ingress near the future private park. At present, there was no detailed information on the location and size of the columns of the proposed flyover. Therefore, there were concerns on the safety threats arising from the proposed at-grade vehicular egress in particular the sightline problem to the road users. In addition, given the traffic arrangement in the approved scheme was technically feasible and the need for minimizing disruption to the mainstream traffic along Kennedy Road, the proposed at-grade vehicular egress was considered not necessary.

Deliberation Session

Internal Vehicular Connection at 11/F

39. The Chairman said that given all concerned government departments had no objection to the proposed internal vehicular connection between HCI and HCII, Members in general supported the approval of such connection.

At-grade Vehicular Egress at Kennedy Road

40. A Member said that TD's comments were crucial in determining the acceptability of the proposed at-grade vehicular egress at Kennedy Road and there was no overriding reason to approve the said egress.

41. The Vice-chairman said that the proposed hotel and ancillary convention uses in HCII would generate more traffic than a commercial/residential building. Taking into

account the potential increase in traffic, the original traffic arrangement had struck the balance in minimizing adverse traffic impacts at Kennedy Road. Any changes to the original traffic arrangement would induce changes to the balance and hence would require very strong justifications. There was no such justification in the current submission. In addition, it was the applicant's responsibility to carry out the structural strengthening and modification works of HCI in order to widen the existing at-grade egress at HCI for heavy and long vehicles.

42. Two Members concurred with the Vice-chairman's views and one of the two Members considered that the heavy and long vehicles could exit HCI and HCII onto the westbound lane of Kennedy Road through the proposed flyover instead of using the existing at-grade egress at HCI.

43. Another Member considered that since HCI and HCII were subject to two separate leases and were considered as two individual sites, each development should be entitled to have its own ingress/egress points. Besides, given that there was no change to the total car parking provision, the number of vehicles exiting through Kennedy Road would remain unchanged. In response, Mr Tang said that since there were changes to the distribution of GFA by different types of use under Class A amendments, it might lead to changes to the provision of car parking spaces and L/UL bays and therefore, it was inappropriate to assume that there was no change in the number of car parking spaces. He reiterated that the proposed at-grade egress would affect the traffic flow along Kennedy Road. There was also road safety concern, as the proposed at-grade egress might not be able to comply with the desirable sightline requirement. Since there would not be any technical constraints on widening of the existing egress at HCI to cater for heavy and long vehicles, the proposed at-grade egress was considered not essential. Four Members concurred with the views of TD and did not support the said egress at Kennedy Road.

Conclusion

44. The Chairman concluded that Members had no objection to the proposed internal vehicular egress connecting HCII and HCI but did not support the proposed at-grade egress at Kennedy Road.

45. The Committee noted that should the application be partially approved, the set of approval conditions and advisory clauses imposed in 1994 should be updated, as appropriate, to reflect the latest practice of the TPB and the names of the responsible authorities and to address the latest departmental comments. Members then went through the revised approval conditions as stated in paragraph 10.3 of the Paper.

46. Mr Tang suggested that since the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) of the application was conducted and submitted many years ago, it might be necessary to request the applicant to update the submitted TIA in order to reflect the latest traffic condition. In response, the Chairman said that apart from the addition of the proposed internal vehicular egress, no change was made to the original traffic arrangement under the application. It might not be reasonable to require the applicant to update the submitted TIA. The Committee agreed to delete the respective approval condition.

47. A Member suggested that the landscape proposal and the detailed design of the proposed building, including external elevation and finishes, under approval conditions (b) and (c) should be submitted to the TPB for approval. After discussion, the Committee agreed that should there be any controversial issues on the landscape proposal and detailed design in processing the compliance for the respective approval conditions, the TPB should be consulted. Regarding the approval condition in relation to the donation of surplus money over the actual costs of the design and construction of the public park, the same Member said that the concerned party, Urban Council, was dissolved and the approval condition should be updated. The Committee agreed and requested the Secretariat to work out the appropriate wording of the said approval condition.

48. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application for addition of an internal vehicular egress at 49.5mPD (on 11/F in the Current Scheme) connecting with the adjacent Hopewell Centre I on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 4.3.2020, 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 with new conditions (a) and (l) and the original approval conditions (a), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) and (i) amended and conditions (c) and (l) deleted:

- “(a) the submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan, taking into account the approval conditions (b) to (i) and (k) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal for the whole development, including public pedestrian circulation areas and a tree felling report, to the satisfaction to the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the detailed design of the proposed building, including external elevation and finishes, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (d) the widening of and improvement to Ship Street, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (e) the widening of and improvement to Kennedy Road, including the provision of a new flyover and tunnel access to the application site as necessitated by the proposed development and the design of pedestrian access to the proposed development, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (f) the design and provision of car parking spaces, loading/unloading facilities, ingress/egress arrangement for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (g) the design and construction of a public open space of not less than 2,030m² in area, including an option to provide a pedestrian route through the park and connecting to Ship Street, at no cost to the Government, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB before the issue of the occupation permit for the proposed development on the site;
- (h) to spend not less than HK\$80 million on the design, construction and landscaping of the public park, and that any surplus money over the actual costs will be donated, as proposed by the applicant, to the relevant authority

to be agreed by the Director of Planning or the TPB, for expenditure on provision of other open space within Wan Chai District;

- (i) the design and construction of a private open space of not less than 3,850m² in area within the proposed development, and opening it to the general public at reasonable hours, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB;
- (j) the submission and implementation of sewage disposal facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (k) the submission and implementation of a development programme, including the implementation of works necessitated by the proposed development, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (l) the provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

49. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

50. The Committee also decided to reject the application for addition of an at-grade vehicular egress at 55.5mPD (on 12/F in the Current Scheme) onto the eastbound lane of Kennedy Road. The reasons were:

- “(a) the proposed additional egress at Kennedy Road will cause potential disruption to the general traffic at Kennedy Road due to the additional vehicular egress movements; and
- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed additional egress at Kennedy Road is essential.”

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

[Mr H.W. Cheung and Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Tom C.K. Yip, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K) and Ms Sandy S.K. Ng, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 10

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K11/27

(MPC Paper No.3/16)

51. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments were related to the rezoning of a site for the provision of a departmental quarter (DQ) for the Customs and Excise Department (C&ED). The Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) was the consultant of the proposed DQ. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

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

52. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (TPB), as the proposed DQ was the subject of amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the Committee agreed that the interests of Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Professor P.P. Ho and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam on the item only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

53. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Sandy S.K. Ng, STP/K, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

Proposed Amendments

- (a) the proposed amendments were related to i) the rezoning of a site at Sheung Fung Street, Tsz Wan Shan (the site) from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) with revision of building height restriction (BHR) (Amendment Item A); and ii) incorporation of ‘Art Studio’ as Column 1 use in the Schedule II for industrial or industrial-office building for “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone;

Amendment Item A

- (b) the site (about 3,598m²) was previously occupied by staff quarters of the Housing Department, and was currently vacant. There were two development platforms in the site, upper platform at about 63mPD and lower platform at about 59.5mPD. A slope of an area of about 1,539m² was located at the western and northern part of the site;
- (c) the site was proposed to be rezoned from “G/IC” to “R(A)” for a 27-storey staff quarters development (about 156 quarters) for C&ED, subject to the same plot ratio (PR) control as other sites in the “R(A)” zone on the subject OZP, i.e. a maximum domestic PR of 7.5 or a total PR of 9 with a revision of BHR from 6 storeys to 145mPD;

Visual Aspect

- (i) a Visual Appraisal had been carried out. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD considered that the proposed development scale with BH of 145mPD at the site was not

incompatible with the surrounding townscape;

Air Ventilation Aspect

- (ii) an Air Ventilation Assessment Initial Study had been carried out, and concluded that the proposed scheme would have better air ventilation performance than that of an OZP compliant scheme (i.e. a 6 storeys building with wider footprint), and the proposed mitigation measures such as smaller building footprint and building setbacks;

Landscape Aspect

- (iii) the existing trees at the slope area of the site would not be affected; while most of the trees at the development platform had an average to poor condition and were of a low amenity value and only three mature trees in fair conditions would be retained. The loss of trees would be compensated by the planting of 20 heavy standard grade trees. A minimum of 20% green coverage could also be achieved in the proposed development;

Traffic, Environmental, Drainage and Sewerage Aspects

- (iv) traffic impact assessment, preliminary environmental review, drainage and sewerage impact assessment had been conducted, which concluded that the proposed development would not have any adverse traffic, environmental, drainage and sewerage impact; and

Public Consultation

- (d) on 19.1.2016, the Wong Tai Sin District Council was consulted on the proposed OZP amendment related to the proposed staff quarters development. Members generally supported the proposal but expressed concerns on the nuisance generated during the construction period, car

parking provision, and the possible adverse air ventilation, visual, environmental and traffic impacts.

54. Members had no question on the proposed amendments.

Deliberation Session

55. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong OZP and that the draft Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong OZP No. S/K11/27A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/K11/28 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong OZP No. S/K11/27A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the TPB for various land use zonings of the OZP and agree that the revised ES was suitable for publication together with the OZP.

56. Members noted that, as a general practice, the TPB Secretariat would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before its publication under the Ordinance. Any major revision would be submitted to the TPB for consideration.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K and Ms Sandy S.K. Ng, STP/K, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 11

Any Other Business

57. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 10:55 a.m..