

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 557th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 13.5.2016**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr K. K. Ling

Chairman

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

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin F.L. Yu

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),
Transport Department
Mr Wilson W.S. Pang

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

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

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

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr T.Y. Ip

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr William W.L. Chan

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 556th MPC Meeting held on 22.4.2016

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 556th MPC meeting held on 22.4.2016 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting] [Presentation and Question Sessions]

Y/H3/8

Application for Amendment to the Approved Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/29

- To rezone the Application Site at No. 122A to 130 Hollywood Road and Adjoining Government Land, Sheung Wan from “Government, Institution or Community” to “Government, Institution or Community (2)”
- Stipulation of Building Height Restriction of 1 storey for Man Mo Temple Compound portion and 97mPD for the Youth Hostel Site
- Adding “Residential Institution (Hostel only)” as a use that is always permitted under the proposed “Government, Institution or Community (2)” Zone

(MPC Paper No. Y/H3/8)

3. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Tung Wah Group of Hospitals (TWGHs), with Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTA) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (ARUP) as two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

Mr Franklin F.L. Yu - having current business dealings with TWGHs and ARUP;

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with KTA and ARUP; and

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

4. The Committee noted that Mr Franklin F.L. Yu and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had not arrived to join the meeting yet. As Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

5. The following government representatives and the representatives of the applicant were invited to the meeting at this point:

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang | - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (DPO/HK, PlanD) |
| Mr J.J. Austin | - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), PlanD |
| Mr Kenneth S.W. Tam | - Chief Heritage Manager (Antiquities & Monuments), the Antiquities and Monument Office, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (AMO, LCSD) |
| Mr W.K. Lau | - Senior Heritage Officer 2, AMO, LCSD |
| Mr Ivan T.L. Yiu | } Representatives of the applicant |
| Mr Kenneth L.K. To | |
| Mr H.Y. Ho | |
| Ms Margaret F.Y. Wong | |
| Ms Shirley S.Y. Tsang | |
| Mr Edwin T.S. Chan | |
| Mr Henry H. Chan | |
| Ms Monika Y.P. Lau | |
| Ms Kitty P.S. Wong | |
| Ms Sammy T.S. Yip | |
| Mr W.S. Hsu | |

6. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He then invited Mr J.J. Austin, STP/HK, to brief Members on the background of the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Austin presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) the application was to rezone the site from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Government, Institution or Community (2)” (“G/IC(2)”) with revision of the building height (BH) restriction for the eastern portion of the site currently occupied by TWGHs Lee Sai Chow Memorial Primary School from 8 storeys to 97mPD, while the BH

restriction of the Man Mo Temple Compound (MMTC) in the western portion of the site remained unchanged at 1 storey. Besides, the Notes of the “G/IC” zone was proposed to be amended by adding “Residential Institution (Hostel Only)” as a use that was always permitted under the proposed “G/IC(2)” zone. The proposed rezoning was to facilitate the redevelopment of the existing TWGHs Lee Sai Chow Memorial Primary School into a 21-storey youth hostel. The existing MMTC, which was a Declared Monument, would be preserved on site. The applicant also proposed to specify in the Explanatory Statement of Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) that the design of the youth hostel would follow the recommendations identified in the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA);

- (b) the surrounding area of the site was predominantly residential in nature with a mix of government, institution and community (GIC) uses. The site was about 300m away from the MTR Sheung Wan Station and well served by other means of public transport;
- (c) according to the indicative scheme, the proposed development on the site with an area of about 1,632m² comprised one 21-storey (i.e. about 97mPD) youth hostel block providing 302 bed places with a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 7,057.99m² at a plot ratio (PR) of 4.33 as well as the existing one-storey MMTC at a PR of 0.37 to be preserved on site. Two car parking spaces and one loading/unloading (L/UL) bay would be provided. The scheme had incorporated various design measures proposed in HIA to address the interface between MMTC and the proposed youth hostel. The measures included the provision of a heritage bazaar at G/F of the youth hostel with headroom of 11m high for social and cultural activities, 5.8m setback from Hollywood Road and 3.1m buffer distance from MMTC, as well as the use of pre-fabrication, double-deck catch platform and non-percussive piling method as mitigation measures during construction. The high headroom design of the heritage bazaar was to enhance the visual permeability with MMTC at pedestrian level;

- (d) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper, which were summarised as follows:
- (i) the Secretary for Education had no objection to the proposed youth hostel at the subject vacant school premises;
 - (ii) the Secretary for Home Affairs advised that policy support was given to the application. The youth hostel was in compliance with the Man Mo Temple (MMT) Ordinance as TWGHs had the right to rebuild any buildings belonging to MMT Fund;
 - (iii) the Commissioner for Heritage's Office, Development Bureau (CHO, DEVB) and AMO, LCSD advised that HIA for the youth hostel was accepted by AMO and supported by the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB). The mitigation measures recommended in HIA should be properly implemented. A heritage consultant should be appointed to monitor the implementation of the mitigation measures. A detailed monitoring report should be submitted to AMO before implementation;
 - (iv) the Head of the Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (H(GEO), CEDD) advised that the site was within the Mid-levels Scheduled Area (the Area) and any works within the Area were subject to stringent geotechnical controls under the Buildings Ordinance (BO) to safeguard public safety and ground stability in the Area; and
 - (v) other concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (e) during the first three weeks of the three statutory publication periods, a total of 220 public comments were received, of which 212 against, 6 providing

comments and 2 supporting the application. The public comments were received from Mr Chan Ho-lim, a Central & Western District Council (C&WDC) member, Ms Tanya Chan of the Civic Party, Incorporation of Owners and Building Management of nearby developments, Green Sense, Designing Hong Kong Limited, Central and Western Concern Group, Sai Wan Concern, other concern groups / non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and members of the public. The grounds of the objections / comments were summarised as follows :

- (i) the proposed change of use for youth hostel at such location was inappropriate. The scale of the proposed youth hostel was not compatible with MMTC. The proposed L/UL bay would render the heritage bazaar unusable. No kitchen and emergency vehicular access were provided and windows in the hostel were not openable;
 - (ii) the proposed development would cause structural problems to MMTC, as well as adverse air ventilation and noise impact. Smoke from MMTC would adversely affect the health of the tenants of the youth hostel;
 - (iii) the proposed development violated the MMT Ordinance and would cause permanent damage to MMTC. Buffer zone from MMTC should be provided; and
 - (iv) the proposed development would cause adverse traffic impact along Hollywood Road and Sheung Wan District;
- (f) the District Officer (Central & Western), Home Affairs Department advised that the proposed youth hostel development was discussed at the Food, Environment, Hygiene & Works Committee under C&WDC on 24.7.2014. Members expressed concerns about the proposal including the traffic and visual impacts;

- (g) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the rezoning application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper, which were summarised as follows :
- (i) the use of the site for hostel development was not incompatible with the planning intention of the “G/IC” zone. The applicant had demonstrated the technical feasibility of a youth hostel at that particular location and the proposed “G/IC(2)” sub-zone with hostel use always permitted was acceptable;
 - (ii) the proposed youth hostel, which was under the Youth Hostel Scheme (YHS) mentioned in the Policy Address, was supported by the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB);
 - (iii) the site was located in a predominantly residential area mixed with GIC uses. The proposed youth hostel was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The maximum BH of 97mPD for the youth hostel was compatible with developments in the neighbourhood and in line with the stepped height profile;
 - (iv) HIA conducted by the applicant was accepted by AMO and supported by AAB. The proposed scheme had adopted the design features and mitigation measures recommended in HIA;
 - (v) issues on public safety and ground stability could be addressed at the building plan submission stage; and
 - (vi) regarding the public comments objecting to the application, the planning assessments above were relevant.

7. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application. Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong declared interest in the item at this point as she knew Mr Ivan T.L. Yiu, one of the applicant's representatives, through the Action Committee Against Narcotics. The Committee noted that Ms Wong had not discussed the application with Mr

Yiu, and agreed that she could stay in the meeting. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ivan T.L. Yiu made the following main points :

- (a) YHS was a major project proposed in the 2011-2012 Policy Address. The scheme was to provide hostel to youth with government capital by utilising land of NGOs. The proposed youth hostel would offer rent lower than the market level to youth in low income group;
- (b) young people had difficulty in achieving independent living and housing was among their key concerns. As at September 2015, there were 74,600 youth aged 18 to 29 on the waiting list for public rental housing;
- (c) YHS aimed at providing young people in need with affordable accommodation as well as opportunity to accumulate savings to meet their aspirations of having their own living space; enhancing the capacity of youth tenants to attain independent living; and developing the capacities of youth tenants in participating, serving and contributing to the community;
- (d) the proposed youth hostel at Sheung Wan would be welcomed by the youth due to its high accessibility, proximity to the working places, desirable local environment and low rent;
- (e) MMT had been under the management of Tung Wah since 1908 and the youth hostel would also be managed by TWGHs. TWGHs treasured MMT as a community stakeholder and would take every necessary measure and monitoring step to safeguard MMT throughout the process. TWGHs committed to connect youth with the cultural heritage;
- (f) the proposed youth hostel could facilitate the inheritance of culture. Heritage bazaar with permanent photo gallery exhibiting the history of MMT and Sheung Wan district would be set up at G/F of the youth hostel. The bazaar could provide a venue for educating the youth about MMTC and the cultural significance of the site and local community. Special exhibition on the quarterly festivals of MMT (e.g. birthdays of Wu Di and

Wen Di, Qiu Ji Dian Li) would be held. TWGHs would continue to encourage youth participation in those festivals; and

- (g) TWGHs had consulted AMO, AAB and C&WDC (on 11.10.2012 and 24.7.2014) and general support to the proposed development had been obtained. TWGHs had also consulted C&WDC member of Tung Wah constituency, Ms Kathy Siu by presenting photomontage and visual study in August 2014 and a meeting with local residents arranged by Ms Siu was held in September 2014. No further comment on the proposed youth hostel was received;

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kenneth L.K. To made the following main points on land use consideration :

- (a) to increase housing supply in short and medium term, the Government had completed territorial-wide review of “G/IC” sites without concrete development plan or with planned use no longer required/which could be relocated. A number of “G/IC” sites had been identified for residential development and there were only a few “G/IC” sites remaining which would be suitable for youth hostel development;
- (b) the site was suitable for youth hostel use due to the following reasons :
 - (i) the proposed youth hostel development was in line with YHS which was to build youth hostels on sites of NGOs. Since the introduction of YHS in 2011, only five youth hostel projects were in progress including the subject youth hostel providing 302 hostel places. The other four projects were in Tai Po, Mong Kok, West Kowloon and Yuen Long providing 80, 90, 534 and 1680 hostel places respectively. The project in Tai Po was at the stage of seeking funding approval from the Finance Committee. The project in Mong Kok was at the stage of section 16 application. The remaining two projects at West Kowloon and Yuen Long were still at planning stage;

- (ii) the primary school on site had ceased operation and been left vacant for years. The school building was no longer suitable for school use according to the current standard;
- (iii) the site was under unrestricted lease;
- (iv) among the five youth hostel sites, the subject site was highly accessible and situated in the major working place as well as the historical and cultural centre in Hong Kong. The site location was favourable to the youth tenants who could easily go to work; and
- (v) the proposed development was compatible with the surrounding developments in terms of land use and BH. Concerned departments had no adverse comment on the visual impact assessment and air ventilation assessment.

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr H.Y. Ho made the following main points on the building design of the proposed development :

- (a) the proposed youth hostel building comprised 16 storeys for youth hostel use, 2 storeys for semi-private use by the youth tenants and G/F for heritage bazaar (with an area of 330m²). The heritage bazaar would have a headroom of 11m high so that the visual permeability with MMTC (about 10m high) at pedestrian level could be enhanced;
- (b) the entire development site had an area of about 1,632m² while the portion of the site occupied by the vacant school had an area of about 445m². Two car parking spaces and one L/UL bay were proposed at G/F;
- (c) the G/F portion of the proposed youth hostel building would be setback from Hollywood Road by 5.8m to align with MMTC so that a wide and continuous pedestrian area could be formed. Upper storeys of the proposed youth hostel building would maintain a setback of 2.9m from Hollywood Road. Besides, a buffer distance of 3.1m between the youth

hostel and MMTC was proposed to achieve better interface;

- (d) the heritage bazaar would be open to the public during daytime and closed at night, and its exact opening hour would be managed by TWGHs;
- (e) with the proposed setback at G/F, the forecourt of MMTC could extend to the front part of the proposed youth hostel. High headroom of G/F of the youth hostel could allow unobstructed side view towards MMTC. Besides, the proposed setback and high headroom would make the original congested urban environment more spacious. The proposed heritage bazaar could also provide space for cultural and heritage exhibition activities;
- (f) there were stringent geotechnical controls under BO on the proposed development. The Building Authority would carry out inspections to ensure the safety and relevant provisions of BO were complied with. Heritage consultant would be appointed to monitor the implementation of the proposed measures as specified in HIA and prepare progress reports. Detailed monitoring proposal would be submitted to AMO for comment before implementation. The project would also be closely monitored by TWGHs; and
- (g) geotechnical assessment for the foundation, excavation, lateral support and site formation works of the proposed development has been submitted to the Architectural Services Department during the technical feasibility statement (TFS) stage for the funding arrangement. No further query and adverse comment had been received. Prior to commencement of any construction works, the monitoring check points including ground settlement, tilting check point, utility settlement point and vibration check point and standpipe would be installed. If there was any sign of excessive movement or undue settlement, all works should cease at once. The site works would only be resumed after carrying out the investigation and completing the required remedial works.

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ivan T.L. Yiu made the following main points :

- (a) the proposed youth hostel development was compatible with surrounding areas and the development scale was acceptable to nearby residents. The development was also technically feasible in terms of construction, geotechnical, environmental, visual and air ventilation aspects. TFS had been approved by DEVB and all construction works would strictly comply with the statutory requirements under BO;
- (b) the proposal was approved at AAB meeting and TWGHs would follow up closely with AMO for necessary monitoring of the proposed development; and
- (c) the development would make good use of the valuable land resource and would provide planning gains. The youth hostel development could also provide favourable personal space for the youth to do creative work.

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

Eligibility, Rent, Room Provision and Management of Youth Hostel

11. In response to a Member's question, Mr Ivan T.L. Yiu said that the eligibility criteria for youth hostel tenants would follow relevant government requirements and TWGHs' policy. The youth hostel would target at those with low income and special need. The maximum income limit for hostel tenants was proposed to be the 75th percentile of the monthly employment earnings of employed persons aged between 18 and 30.

12. A few Members asked about the control of rental level of the youth hostel. In response, Mr Yiu said that as government capital would be used for implementation of the youth hostel project, TWGHs was required to sign a deed with HAB, and therefore the rental level (which was to be not more than 60% of the market rental level) could be regulated by the Government through the deed. Noting the relatively high market rental level at Sheung Wan, and to offer an affordable rent to youth tenants, TWGHs would explore whether the

rent of the proposed youth hostel could be reduced to lower than 60% of the market rental level. Consideration would be given to use the rental income for contribution to the local community and youth activities.

13. In response to a Member's questions, Mr Yiu said that both single and double rooms for newly-wed would be provided for the tenants of the youth hostel. Besides, TWGHs would engage the youth hostel tenants in the management of the youth hostel. TWGHs had similar experience in engaging local residents in the management of Tin Sau Bazaar.

Relationship with MMT and Local Community and Heritage Preservation

14. A Member asked whether the proposed development had any features to enhance the relationship between MMT and local community. In response, Mr Yiu said that the proposed heritage bazaar would be used as a gallery exhibiting the history of MMT and its relationship with the development of the local community. With the proposed setback at G/F of the youth hostel, the forecourt of MMTC could be extended to the area in front of the proposed youth hostel so that more space would be available for worship activities and community uses. In response to the Chairman's question on the use of the two semi-private floors of the youth hostel, Mr Yiu said that those floors were mainly for use of the youth tenants but opportunities would be explored to open up some floor spaces for local community use.

15. In response to a Member's question on the provision in the youth hostel for heritage education use, Mr Yiu said that since MMTC was always congested with tourists and worshippers, the proposed heritage bazaar could provide an area for heritage education purpose.

16. A Member asked whether the vehicles using the proposed car parking spaces and L/UL bay at G/F of the youth hostel would make the proposed heritage bazaar on the same floor not usable. In response, Mr Yiu said that the car parking spaces would not be used by any tenant or staff of the youth hostel. The car parking spaces and L/UL bay were mainly to facilitate the tenants when they were moving in or out from the hostel, and were anticipated to be of infrequent use given that major furniture would be provided in the hostel.

Vehicular movement within G/F of the youth hostel would be closely monitored by the hostel management to avoid any conflict with the activities in the heritage bazaar.

17. Noting that the public commenters had raised a number of concerns on the heritage preservation aspects as stated in paragraph 10 (p) to (u) of the Paper, a Member asked the government representatives to elaborate on how those concerns were addressed. In response, Mr W.K. Lau, Senior Heritage Officer of AMO, LCSD said that HIA conducted by the applicant's heritage consultant had strictly followed the guidelines introduced by DEVB vide Technical Circular (Works) No. 6/2009. Various heritage charters/principles (e.g. Burra Charter and China Principles) had been taken into account when formulating the conservation plan for the proposed development. Various potential impacts of the proposed youth hostel development on MMT (e.g. visual impact) were evaluated and appropriate mitigation measures and enhancement (e.g. buffer distance between MMTC and youth hostel) were proposed in HIA. The applicant was required to properly implement the mitigation measures recommended in HIA. HIA was accepted by AMO and supported by AAB.

18. A Member asked whether it was possible to convert the vacant school building for youth hostel use in order to minimise its impact on MMT. In response, Mr Yiu said that it would be undesirable as the maintenance cost of the school building, which was built in 1959, would be high and bed spaces provision would be reduced by two-third, which was not considered a good use of land resource.

19. In response to a Member's question, Mr Yiu said that the proposed development was in compliance with MMT Ordinance according to the legal advice sought by the applicant. According to MMT Ordinance, TWGHs, as the manager of the MMT Fund, had the right to rebuild any of the buildings belonging to the Fund, and the surplus generated by the operation of the youth hostel could be used to assist in any charitable or philanthropic institution for the benefit of the community.

20. In response to the same Member's further question, Mr Yiu said that TWGHs had already adopted treatment measures on the smoke from burning of joss in MMT. Similar measures had been successfully adopted for other temples near residential area and no complaints had been received. TWGHs would also study the possibility of providing more air treatment facilities at the youth hostel site. The windows in the youth hostel were

openable, and mechanical ventilation would be provided in the development.

Development Intensity

21. A Member asked whether the proposed youth hostel and MMTC should be considered as two separate sites. In response, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang, DPO/HK said that the proposed youth hostel and MMTC were considered as one single site since both of them were owned by MMT Fund and managed by TWGHs. The application did not involve any transfer of PR from one site to another.

22. In response to a Member's question, Mr H.Y. Ho said that the entire development site had an area of about 1,632m² while the eastern portion of the site occupied by the vacant school had an area of about 445m². PR of the MMTC portion was 0.37 and that of the youth hostel portion was 4.33, which made up a total PR of 4.7.

23. As the applicant's representatives had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairman informed them that the hearing procedure for the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the government representatives and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

24. The Committee noted that the Central and Western Concern Group (CWCG) had delivered a petition and submitted a letter before the meeting. The letter was against the subject application on the grounds mainly including negative visual impact, violation of heritage conservation principles, structural and geotechnical risks, non-environmental friendly design of youth hostel, heritage bazaar being just a car parking space, availability of alternative sites for youth hostel, and suggestion to reuse the subject school building for educational and community purposes. Those grounds had been covered in the Paper and would be taken into account during consideration of the application. The letter was circulated to Members at the meeting.

Deliberation Session

25. A Member considered that the youth hostel and MMT were of two different nature and should be regarded as two separate sites. Based on the youth hostel site itself (about 445m²), the proposed gross floor area of 7,057.99m² would constitute a PR of about 16 which was much higher than other residential developments in the vicinity. The proposed increase in BH by nearly three times (i.e. from 8 storeys to 21 storeys) might also be excessive. Consideration could be given to reduce the development intensity of the “G/IC” site so as to achieve better compatibility between the youth hostel and MMTC.

26. Members in general considered that the development intensity of the proposed youth hostel was acceptable. The proposed BH of the youth hostel was compatible to surrounding developments. The proposed increase in BH was considered acceptable as it would enable the site to accommodate more hostel rooms which would benefit the youth and better utilise the “G/IC” site to serve the community. The Committee also noted that to treat the youth hostel and MMTC as one single site was in compliance with BO. If the development was based on the youth hostel portion only (about 445m²), site utilisation efficiency would be reduced as it would be subject to a site coverage restriction under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R), and only small floor plates could be built which might not be able to accommodate common facilities for the youth hostel.

27. A Member was concerned that the development intensity of the proposed youth hostel might be intensified in the future since the proposed PR of 4.7 had not fully utilised the development potential of the site, i.e. maximum PR restriction of 9 under B(P)R. The Committee noted that should the proposed BH restrictions of 97mPD and 1 storeys for youth hostel and MMTC portions respectively be stipulated on the OZP, any future relaxation of the BH restrictions to allow more plot ratio at the site would need to be submitted to the Committee for consideration.

28. Some Members considered that the proposed heritage bazaar at G/F of the youth hostel could not fully respect and establish relationship with MMTC. The design of the youth hostel should be improved to make the youth hostel more compatible to MMTC environment. TWGHs should provide more facilities in the proposed youth hostel (e.g. information centres and learning rooms) to cater for heritage education in relation to MMT.

29. Given rental level of the youth hostel would fluctuate according to past experiences, a Member suggested the Government to closely regulate the rental level of the subject youth hostel to ensure that it would be affordable to the youth with low income.

30. Members in general supported the proposed youth hostel development at the site since the development would provide affordable housing for the youth at a highly accessible and central location, as well as better utilise the “G/IC” site to serve the community.

31. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree to the application, and that an amendment to the approved Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/29 would be submitted to the Committee for agreement prior to gazetting under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance upon reference back of the approved OZP for amendment by the Chief Executive in Council.

[Mr Franklin F.L. Yu arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/H3/7

Application for Amendment to the Approved Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/29 and Draft Central District Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H4/15, To rezone the application site from an area shown as 'Road' to

(1) “Open Space (1)” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Environmentally Friendly Public Transport System”; or

(2) “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pedestrian Area and Environmentally Friendly Public Transport System”

Des Voeux Road Central (from Morrison Street to Pedder Street)

(MPC Paper No. Y/H3/7B)

32. The Secretary reported that the application was based on, inter alia, reports and study findings published by the Hong Kong Institute of Planners (HKIP) and the Chairman and the Secretary had declared interests in the item:

- Mr K.K. Ling
(the Chairman)
- being a Fellow of HKIP and had previously participated in the work of a Working Party formed by HKIP and the Chartered Institute of Transport in putting forward the concept of pedestrianisation of Des Voeux Road Central between Western Market and Pedder Street (DVRC Scheme) in 2000. A report on the DVRC Scheme was published in 2001; and
- Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
(the Secretary)
- being the Immediate Past President of HKIP and had previously participated (in his capacity as President of HKIP) in HKIP's promotion of the DVRC Scheme together with other collaborating parties (including MVA Traffic Consultants, School of Energy and Environment of City University of Hong Kong, and Civic Exchange) in April 2014 when an updated Report on the DVRC Scheme was submitted to the Chief Executive Office and announced in a press conference held on 28.4.2014.

33. As the application was not submitted by HKIP and HKIP had not submitted any comment on the application, the Committee agreed that the interests of the Chairman and the Secretary were remote and they could stay in the meeting.

34. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 19.4.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months to allow time for the traffic consultant to complete the technical assessment report to respond to relevant departmental comments. It was the applicant's third request for deferment. Since the last deferment, the applicant had indicated that a traffic study was being conducted and would be submitted together with the urban design proposals in mid June 2016.

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

applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within three months from the date of receipt of FI from the applicant. If FI 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 FI. Since it was the third deferment of the application, the Committee agreed to advise the applicant that the Committee had allowed a total of six months including the previous deferments for preparation of submission of FI, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/DPA/TW-CLHFS/3 Proposed Residential Development (Houses) and Excavation of Land in "Unspecified Use" Area, Tsuen Wan Town Lot No. 389 (Part) and Adjoining Government Land, Chuen Lung, Tsuen Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/DPA/TW-CLHFS/3)

36. The Secretary reported that Urbis Ltd. was one of the consultants of the applicants. Mr Franklin F.L. Yu had declared interest in the item as he had current business dealings with Urbis Ltd. The applicants had requested for deferment of consideration of the application. As Mr Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

37. The Committee noted that the applicants requested on 26.4.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for one month to allow time for preparation of further information (FI) to address the comments of concerned government departments. It was the applicants' first request for deferment.

38. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicants pending the submission of FI from the applicants. The

Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of FI from the applicants. If FI submitted by the applicants 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 applicants that one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of FI, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Ms Fannie F.L. Hung, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

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

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TWK/10 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary "Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle)" for a Period of 3 Years (Surplus Car Parking Spaces Only) in "Residential (Group A)" and "Government, Institution or Community" Zones,
(a) Kwai Shing West Estate, Kwai Chung
(b) Lai King Estate, Kwai Chung
(c) Lai Yiu Estate, Kwai Chung
(d) Cheung Ching Estate, Tsing Yi
(MPC Paper No. A/TWK/10)

39. 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 (the Chairman) <i>as the Director of Planning</i>	- being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and the Building Committee of HKHA;
--	--

- Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA;
as the Chief Engineer (Works) of Home Affairs Department
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho
Mr Franklin F.L. Yu
- } having current business dealings with HKHA;
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with HKHA;
and
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse working in the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of HKHA, but having no involvement in the application.

40. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had already left the meeting temporarily. As the interests of Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Franklin F.L. Yu were considered 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 Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

41. The Committee noted that the interest of Mr K.K. Ling, the Chairman was direct, but the Vice-chairman, Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang, had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Board, if the matter was subject to a statutory time limit, then as a matter of necessity, Mr K.K. Ling should continue to assume the chairmanship but a conscious effort should be made to contain his scope of involvement in an administrative role to minimise any risk that he might be challenged. The Committee agreed to the arrangement.

[Mr Patrick H.T. Lau left the meeting at this point. Mr Martin W.C. Kwan and Mr Franklin F.L. Yu left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

42. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Fannie F.L. Hung, 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) (surplus car parking spaces only) under previous application No. A/TWK/8 for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments from individuals were received. One of them considered that the site partly fell within “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone which was intended to provide recreational and community needs and HD must release the land for its designated government, institution and community use, and suggested that the excess car parking spaces could be redesigned for the provision of community services. The commenter also stated a Member’s concern raised at the previous Committee meeting on a similar application about the take-up rate of the vacant parking spaces. Another commenter indicated no comment on the application. No local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Kwai Tsing); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Regarding the public comments received, the subject car parking facilities only fell within

“Residential (Group A)” zone. An advisory clause was suggested to advise the applicant that consideration might be given to letting surplus vehicle parking spaces for community uses so as to fully utilize the surplus vehicle parking spaces in the subject public housing estates.

43. A Member noted that there were no requirements for additional GIC facilities at the subject estates and the open-air car parks at the estates had scope for further housing development which could incorporate the car parks. In response, Ms Fannie F.L. Hung, STP/TWK, said that HD had not provided such information in the application. Based on her understanding, HD might submit a planning application for further intensification of housing development in Lai King Estate later. Another Member said that given the subject planning permission had been renewed three times, it might be a good timing to review the use of those surplus car parking spaces for other uses such as recreational or housing use.

44. In response to a Member’s question, the Chairman said that in considering whether the approval period for renewal of a temporary planning permission should be shortened, the Committee would normally take account of some future plans with concrete programme that would affect the concerned site. However, that was not applicable to the subject application.

45. In response to a Member’s question, Ms Hung said that the vacancy rate provided by the applicant was the average figure of monthly vacancy rates within the period from February 2015 to January 2016. The monthly vacancy rate referred to the percentage of car parking spaces in the estate, after deducting those let to residents, that could be let to non-residents.

46. In response to a Member’s question, Ms Hung said that in each annual allocation of parking spaces, HD would give priority to residents of the subject estates in letting the spaces, and the remaining spaces would then be available for letting by non-residents.

47. In response to a Member’s question, the Chairman said that there was no restriction on the number of times of renewing the planning permission for temporary use by the applicant under the Town Planning Ordinance.

Deliberation Session

48. Members in general had no objection to the application.

49. A Member said that the Committee could set a standard vacancy rate of car parks in public housing estate for approving applications for letting surplus car parks to non-residents. In response, the Chairman said that it would be difficult to set such standard since each housing estate would have different context and each application should be considered on its individual merits. Another Member said that a mechanism could be set up to review possible alternative uses of car parking spaces that had been left vacant for a long time. The Committee said that the latter Member's concerns would be conveyed to HD for consideration.

50. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 25.5.2019, 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 Kwai Shing West Estate, Lai King Estate and Lai Yiu Estate in Kwai Chung, and Cheung Ching Estate in Tsing Yi in the letting of the surplus vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.”

51. 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 Ms Fannie F.L. Hung, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

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

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Mr Franklin F.L. Yu and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon returned to join the meeting at this point.]

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok left the meeting at this point. Mr Sunny L.K. Ho left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H25/18 Temporary Shop and Services (Motor-vehicle Showroom) for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” Zone, Basement Level B1 of the Car Park Complex, Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (Phase 1), 1 Harbour Road, Wan Chai

52. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Automall Ltd. which was a subsidiary of New World Development Company Limited (NWD) and Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) 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 NWD and KTA;
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with NWD; and
- Mr K.K. Cheung - having past business dealings with the Automall Ltd.

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

54. The Committee noted that after the issuance of the paper, the applicant requested on 10.5.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for one month to allow time for preparation of further information (FI) to address the comments from the Transport Department. It was the applicant’s first request for deferment. The deferment letter was

tabled at the meeting for Member's consideration.

55. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of FI from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of FI from the applicant. If FI 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 FI, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

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

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/732 Proposed Shop and Services in "Other Specified Uses" annotated
"Business" Zone, Unit B3, G/F, Lladro Centre, No. 72 Hoi Yuen Road,
Kwun Tong
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/732)

Presentation and Question Sessions

56. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Joyce Y.S. So, 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;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Fire Services (D of FS) had no

objection to the application, and advised that the subject building was protected with a sprinkler system so that the maximum permissible aggregated commercial floor area on G/F was 460m² in accordance with Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D for development within “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone (TPG PG-No. 22D). However, as advised by the D of FS’ representative at the 314th Meeting of the Committee on 28.10.2005 when considering similar applications No. A/K14/479, 481, 482, 483 and 484, a 5% flexibility could generally be allowed for commercial use on G/F of an existing industrial/industrial-office (I-O) building and it was agreed by the Committee. The proposed use should be counted up to the aggregated commercial floor area. Other concerned 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 supporting the application was received from the Chairman of Kwun Tong Central Area Committee, Mr Chong Yam-ming, without providing any reason. No local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Kwun Tong); and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed use complied with TPB PG-No. 22D in that it would not induce adverse fire safety, traffic, environmental and infrastructural impacts on the uses/developments within the subject building and the adjacent areas.

[Mr Sunny L.K. Ho returned to join the meeting at this point.]

57. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

58. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the

terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 13.5.2018, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

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

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

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

Agenda Item 9

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

Application No. A/K4/67

Invitation to Meeting Received

60. The Committee noted that an email from the Tai Hang Sai Estate Residents Right Concern Group (the Group) was received on 3.5.2016 and the email was tabled at the meeting. The Group invited Members to meet with the Group for exchanging views on the application No. A/K4/67 for redevelopment of the existing Tai Hang Sai Estate to a comprehensive development with six residential towers and retail facilities. As further information of the application was published for public inspection on 6.5.2016 until

27.5.2016, the application was re-scheduled for consideration by the Committee on 24.6.2016. The Committee agreed to issue a reply to the Group stating that the Group could submit comments on the application to the Town Planning Board (the Board) during the public inspection period for the Committee's consideration, and the Group could approach the Secretariat of the Board for any enquiries on the application.

61. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 11:05 a.m..