

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 569th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 11.11.2016**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr K.K. Ling

Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-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

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

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 K.K. Cheung

Mr Franklin Yu

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Doris S.Y. Ting

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Winnie W.Y. Leung

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 568th MPC Meeting held on 28.10.2016

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 568th MPC meeting held on 28.10.2016 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/H10/9 Application for Amendment to the Approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/15, To rezone the application site from “Residential (Group B)” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Eco-heritage Park”, Government Land to the east of Chi Fu Fa Yuen, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong

(MPC Paper No. Y/H10/9)

3. The Secretary reported that as the application site was located in Pok Fu Lam and part of it had been identified as a public housing site of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), with Housing Department (HD) as its executive arm, 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 and the Building Committee of HKHA |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan
<i>as the Chief Engineer (Works) of Home Affairs Department</i> | - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau |]] having current business dealings with HKHA |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho |]] |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam |]] having past business dealings with HKHA |
| Mr Franklin Yu |]] |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - his spouse working in HD but having no involvement in the application |
| Dr Wilton W.T. Fok | - his company locating at Cyberport being covered by the Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan |

4. The Secretary reported that after the issue of the agenda and paper, a request for deferment of consideration of the application was received on 8.11.2016. As the applicant had requested for a deferral of consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that the Chairman, Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho whose interests were direct could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. As the interests of Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon were indirect and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok's company was not located in the vicinity of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. The Committee also noted that Mr Franklin Yu had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

5. The Committee noted that the applicant requested for deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare supplementary information to address departmental and public comments and to provide important information on the ecological and historical value of the application site to support the application. It was the first time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K2/216 Proposed Commercial Bathhouse/Massage Establishment in
“Commercial” zone, 2/F (Portion) & 3/F (Portion), Medilink Square,
Bell House, Nos. 525-543A Nathan Road, Yau Ma Tei, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K2/216)

7. The Committee noted that the applicant’s agent requested on 25.10.2016 for deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information on the separate access arrangement in support of the application. 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. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/439 Proposed Religious Institution (Buddhism Institution) in
“Residential (Group A)” zone, Shop G5 on G/F and 1/F to 3/F,
1-5 Shek Man Path, Kwai Ying Building, Kwai Chung, New Territories

9. The Committee noted that the application was withdrawn by the applicant.

[Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK),
was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TWW/110 Proposed House Development at Plot Ratio of 0.75 in
“Residential (Group C)” zone, Lots 210, 212, 213, 214, 215 s.A, 215 RP,
230, 231 RP, 234, 235 and 427 in D.D. 399 and Adjoining Government
Land, Ting Kau, Tsuen Wan, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/TWW/110B)

10. The Secretary reported that LLA Consultancy Limited (LLA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had declared interest in the item as he had current business dealings with LLA. The Committee noted that Mr Lau had no involvement in the application and agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) the proposed house development at plot ratio (PR) of 0.75;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the three statutory public inspection periods, a total of 39 public comments were received. 36 comments submitted by a Tsuen Wan District Council member, six villager representatives of Ting Kau as well as villagers, landowners and individuals objected to the application mainly on the grounds that the site which was within the village ‘environ’ (‘VE’) of Ting Kau Village should be reserved for development by the villagers; the proposed development on a raised platform would create adverse visual, drainage, air ventilation and air quality impacts on the surrounding; the development would block the staircase/footpath and the pavement of Castle Peak Road – Ting Kau serving the locals; carpark should not be built and there was a lack of public consultation of the application. The two supportive comments from individuals opined that the site had been left vacant for many years and was suitable for residential use. One comment provided comment on the future planning of Ting Kau and proposal for improvement of public transport facilities. No local objection/view was received by the District Officer (Tsuen Wan); and

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (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 house development of a PR of 0.75 was in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) zone for low-rise, low-density residential developments. The revised Traffic Noise and Air Quality Impact Assessment report submitted by the applicant demonstrated that with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the predicted traffic noise levels of the proposed development

would comply with the criterion for residential use in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) had no objection to the application from the environmental planning perspective. The proposed building height (BH) of 3 storeys did not exceed the statutory BH restriction under the OZP. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L), PlanD, had no adverse comments on the application. Relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The site and other sites in the Tsuen Wan West area were previously approved for the same use by the Committee based on the similar consideration that the noise impact from Castle Peak Road would be mitigated. Regarding the public comments, the above assessments were relevant.

12. A Member asked (a) whether the adjoining government land would be included into the application site (the Site), (b) whether there would be potential visual impact of the proposed retaining wall on the existing houses to the south of the Site, and (c) the purpose of creating a gap between the existing retaining wall of Castle Peak Road and the proposed retaining wall by the applicant. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, STP/TWK, with the aid of a plan showing the location of government land within the Site, said that the District Lands Officer/Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing, Lands Department (DLO/TW&KT, LandsD) had no objection to the application and advised that whether the proposed government land would be included in the Site would be further examined during the land exchange stage even if the application was approved by the Town Planning Board (the Board). On potential visual impact of the retaining wall, Mr Kwong said that the Site was proposed to be raised to the same level as Castle Peak Road in order to provide a vehicular access and emergency vehicular access in compliance with the requirements under the Buildings Ordinance. According to the applicant, the current scheme was the most feasible option. Otherwise, a huge ramp taking up a substantial portion of the Site would need to be built and the remaining area would be insufficient for development. To minimize the possible visual impact on the adjacent houses, vertical landscaping would be provided on the retaining wall. Regarding the gap between the existing retaining wall of Castle Peak Road and the proposed retaining wall at the northern part of the Site, Mr Kwong clarified that based on the latest scheme proposed by the applicant, the gap originally reserved for the maintenance of the

existing retaining wall by the Highways Department would be filled up.

13. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Kwong said that the separation distance between the proposed retaining wall and the adjacent houses was about 2 to 3m. However, the applicant had not provided any plan or section for illustration.

14. Another Member asked whether the proposed development to be constructed on a high platform was compatible with the surrounding developments and whether such design would cause flooding to the area. In response, Mr Kwong said that it was not uncommon for similar house developments along Castle Peak Road having a site formation level equivalent to that of the road. Regarding the concern on flooding, Mr Kwong said that the Director of Drainage Services had no objection to the application. As there was a nullah near the Site and the area was served by existing drainage channels, flooding in the area was not anticipated.

15. Noting the villagers' comments on the application, the same Member asked whether the Site was within the 'VE' of Ting Kau Village and whether the existing staircases and footpaths would be blocked by the development as claimed by the villagers. In response, Mr Kwong said that the Site was located within the 'VE' but outside the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone and currently zoned "R(C)" on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The villagers of Ting Kau Village were of the view that all area within the 'VE' should be reserved for the villagers' developments. In fact, the site comprised 75% of private land and 25% of government land and DLO/TW&KT, LandsD said that whether approval would be given to including the government land into the Site would be further examined at the land exchange stage. Mr Kwong further said that Ting Kau Village mainly fell within the "V" zone and was accessible by many existing staircases from Castle Peak Road. There was no public access within the Site and the proposed development would not block any existing public access leading to the village. Among the existing staircases, the one nearest to the Site served only the house on its eastern side.

16. In response to the Chairman's query, Mr Kwong further explained, with the aid of Plan A-2 of the Paper, that the villagers could use the existing staircases and footpaths within the area to walk from Castle Peak Road to their houses including house No. 65 in the vicinity of the Site.

17. A Member asked whether the swimming pool proposed near the vertical landscaped wall would pose threat to the nearby residents. In response, Mr Kwong said that no information regarding the swimming pool capacity was provided by the applicant. However, the concern on building safety could be addressed during the building plan submission stage.

18. A Member asked what the approval conditions of the previous approved application were and whether the satisfactory mitigation of the noise impact from Castle Peak Road was the only criterion for increasing the PR of the Site up to 0.75. In response, Mr Kwong said that the previous application approved by the Committee in 2005 was subject to approval conditions relating to design and provision of noise mitigation measures, fire service installations, landscaping proposal, and sewage treatment and disposal facilities. For the current application, as the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) considered that the sewerage treatment proposal submitted by the applicant was acceptable, the approval condition relating to sewerage disposal would no longer be required. Mr Kwong further said that according the Notes of the OZP, the maximum PR of 0.4 for the "R(C)" zone might be increased to 0.75, provided that the noise impact from Castle Peak Road on the proposed development would be mitigated. At the time when development restrictions were imposed on the "R(C)" zone of the OZP, all concerned government departments except DEP considered that a maximum PR of 0.75 for the zone was technically feasible. To address DEP's concern on noise impact from Castle Peak Road, a two-tier PR restriction for the "R(C)" zone was adopted on the OZP.

19. Noting that the proposed retaining wall of the residential development would abut on house No. 65, a Member asked whether the retaining wall would block the entrance of the house and why the retaining wall could not be set back. In response, Mr Kwong said that the entrance of house No. 65 was located on its western boundary and would not be blocked by the retaining wall. Besides, due to the level difference between Castle Peak Road and the Site and the need to provide a vehicular access and an emergency vehicular access in compliance with the government requirements, if the site was not formed to such a high level, a huge ramp would need to be built within the Site, leaving no space for the development. However, the applicant had not provided any explanation on why the retaining wall could not be set back from house No. 65.

20. A Member asked whether the government land, if granted to the applicant, would be used for gross floor area (GFA) calculation and what the considerations on granting of government land to the applicant were. In response, Mr Kwong said that the current scheme submitted by the applicant had already included the government land in the site area for PR calculation. However, LandsD advised that there was no guarantee that the concerned government land would be granted to the applicant, even if the application was approved by the Committee. The feasibility of including the proposed government land would be further examined during the land exchange stage. In response to the same Member's further query, Mr Kwong said that there was an existing footbridge across Castle Peak Road – Ting Kau. Villagers getting off the public transport on the opposite side of Castle Peak Road could use the existing footbridge to cross the road. By using the staircases on both sides of the Site, there was no need for the villagers to access their houses through the Site.

21. A Member asked whether payment of land premium would be required if the government land was granted for inclusion into the Site for the proposed development. The Chairman remarked that whether land premium would be charged was not a factor in the consideration of the application. In response to the Member's enquiry, Mr Simon S.W. Wang, Assistant Director/Regional 1, LandsD, said that LandsD had no commitment to grant the government land to the applicant even if the application was approved by the Committee and the issue would be further examined at the land exchange application stage. If the granting of government land was subsequently approved by LandsD, the payment of land premium and administrative fee would be required. The Member further asked whether the government land in question would be put up for tender instead of direct granting to the applicant. In response, Mr Wang said that the government land was not granted on a first-come-first-served basis. The possibility of separate disposal of the concerned government land would be carefully examined at the land exchange stage.

22. In response to a Member's question on the location of the communal open space as mentioned in the development schedule, Mr Kwong, with the aid of a master landscape plan, indicated that the communal open space would be located in the central part of the Site. The Chairman added that the communal open space would serve only the residents of the two proposed houses within the development.

Deliberation Session

23. The Chairman said that while there were quite a number of Members having concern on the potential impact of the retaining wall on the adjoining houses, the setting back of the site boundary abutting the two houses in the south might result in management problem for the residual strip of government land between the Site and the nearby houses. The Chairman further noted that the same situation might happen if the proposed retaining wall along the south-western boundary of the Site abutting the existing drainage channel was required to be set back. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on LandsD's usual practice in handling such situation, Mr Simon S.W. Wang said that it was premature to determine to which party the strip of government land would be allocated at the current stage. LandsD would consider the case at the land exchange stage based on individual merits taking into account all relevant considerations such as whether the inclusion of the concerned government land into the site boundary of the proposed development would affect the existing usage of the government land by the residents of house No.65. During the processing of land exchange application, special conditions requiring the set back of the site boundary or restricting the use of government land could also be specified in the lease conditions if required. Views of the concerned government departments and the nearby residents would also be considered.

24. Two Members raised concern on the incompatibility of the proposed development on a high platform, with the existing houses in the surrounding areas. One of them asked whether there was any restriction on the maximum height of the site formation. The Chairman said that the Notes of the OZP stipulated that the Site was subject to a maximum building height of three storeys including car park but there was no statutory control on the maximum height of the platform. Each scheme would be considered based on its individual merits.

25. Having considered that there was no technical reason for not setting back the proposed retaining wall from the existing houses and that the concerned area was on government land which would not give rise to any issue of affecting the development right, a Member considered that there was no strong reason to approve the current scheme with such a high retaining wall abutting the existing houses. There was scope to set back the proposed retaining wall, or to reduce its height by revising the layout of the current scheme. The

concern on the future use and management of the intervening government land should be separately dealt with at the land exchange stage.

26. The Chairman asked whether the southern site boundary on government land should be set back to facilitate the future inspection and maintenance of the proposed retaining wall. In response, Mr Simon W.S. Wang said that priority consideration would be given to allowing sufficient space for the owner of house No. 65 to carry out future maintenance of the façade abutting the Site. The requirement on whether the site boundary should be set back to allow future maintenance of the retaining wall would be subject to the views of relevant government departments during the processing of land exchange application. It was still premature to confirm at the current stage whether the government land would be granted to the applicant and whether setback requirement of the site boundary would be imposed.

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

27. The Chairman asked whether the provision of maintenance access for some existing structures/facilities, such as drainage channel along the south-western boundary of the Site under the current application, would be taken into account in processing land exchange application. Mr Simon W.S. Wang replied in the affirmative and said that relevant government departments would be consulted on such requirement during the processing of land exchange application and their comments would be incorporated into the lease conditions where appropriate. Besides, LandsD would also conduct site visit to see whether there were other issues which needed to be sort out.

28. A Member expressed no objection to the PR of 0.75 for the proposed residential development on the Site as such development intensity was considered compatible to other houses in the surrounding area. However, there was grave concern that the proposed retaining wall would create adverse visual impact on the area. The Member considered that there was scope to reduce the extent of the backfill such that the site formation level of the two platforms could be lowered by about one storey and the visual impact would be minimised. The Member asked if it was possible to impose a condition regarding the design and height of the proposed retaining wall should the application be approved.

29. The Chairman said that should the Board decide to approve the application, an approval condition requiring the set back of the proposed retaining wall to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands could be imposed. The issue on whether the residual government land arising from the setback would be included in the Site for the purpose of PR calculation would be subject to the decision of LandsD. In the event that the government land could not be included resulting in significant change to the development parameters, a fresh planning application might be required. Alternatively, the Board might consider rejecting the application and the applicant would be required to submit a new application to address the Committee's concern.

30. Another Member considered that the application should be rejected as the proposed residential development on an excessively high platform would cause adverse visual impact on the surrounding area. Although payment of land premium would be required if the government land was to be included into the Site, the Member remarked that inclusion of the sizeable government land to the south and south-west of the Site for proposed residential development might arouse criticism on unfair allocation of government land resources.

31. The Chairman responded that issues on land premium and allocation of government land were land administration matters under the jurisdiction of LandsD.

32. A Member who earlier raised concern on the high-level platform, considered that the applicant's justification for the provision of vehicular access not convincing. Alternative layout could be devised to avoid raising the Site to the same level as Castle Peak Road.

33. Another Member concurred that it was not necessary to build a high retaining wall abutting house No. 65 and remarked that the applicant's intention of building such retaining wall was to maximise the view of the private garden. Consideration should be given to exploring alternative design of landscaped garden such as stepped landscaped garden so as to minimise the scale and height of the proposed retaining wall.

34. The Chairman said that the Committee would deliberate on whether the application should be approved subject to the imposition of an additional approval condition

requiring the set back of the retaining wall to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or the application should be rejected. The Committee noted that according to the Notes of the OZP, while a PR of 0.4 was always permitted within the “R(C)” zone, the PR might be increased to a maximum of 0.75 provided that the noise impact from Castle Peak Road on the proposed development could be mitigated. Notwithstanding the above, the Committee could also take into account other relevant considerations before making a decision on the current application.

35. The Secretary said that the current application was for a proposed house development within the “R(C)” zone with a PR of 0.75. According to the Notes of the OZP, such PR might be allowed subject to the satisfactory demonstration to the Board that the noise impact from Castle Peak Road on the proposed development could be mitigated. During the discussion, Members were mainly concerned about the provision and design of the proposed retaining wall adjacent to house No. 65. In view of the above, if the Committee decided to reject the application based on such concern, appropriate rejection reasons would have to be worked out to reflect Members’ concern. However, if the Committee considered that Members’ concerns could be addressed through slight revision to the current scheme, an approval condition relating to the provision and design of the proposed retaining wall could be added. Apart from the above, the Committee could also consider deferring a decision on the application and requesting the applicant to provide more information to address Members’ concerns.

36. A Member said that the application could be rejected on the ground of adverse noise impact as the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the current scheme would be subject to the least noise impact from Castle Peak Road. The proposed house on the upper platform to be constructed up to the same level as Castle Peak Road would be exposed to more adverse noise impact than the alternative scheme of building a house on a platform lower than Castle Peak Road.

37. The Chairman said that since DEP had no objection to the application and considered that the noise impact could be mitigated, it might not be appropriate to reject the application based on adverse noise impact.

38. While considering that the noise impact was not a problem, another Member

opined that the rejection reasons should more appropriately be related to the lack of maintenance access for house No. 65 and the drainage channel.

39. The Vice-chairman said given that the Notes of the OZP had allowed a relaxation of PR up to 0.75 provided that the noise impact could be mitigated and that DEP had no objection to the current application, there was no strong reason to reject the application. Considering that the high retaining wall was an urban design issue, while CTP/UD&L, PlanD had no objection to the application, an approval condition which required the applicant to revise the scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning could still be added. CTP/UD&L should be advised to take into account Members' view in vetting the revised scheme. A Member shared the same view and considered that the urban design issue could be addressed by the imposition of an approval condition on the submission of a revised design.

40. A Member had no objection to the proposed PR of 0.75 for the proposed development and considered that the noise impact was not a concern. While there were alternative schemes which might be able to mitigate the noise impact, the current development scheme which would cause potential visual impact on the surrounding area and was subject to local objections relating to blocking of access/staircases and creating adverse impacts on the environment, was undesirable. The Member considered that the Committee should defer a decision on the application and the applicant should be requested to provide more information to address the visual impact and the local concerns including the possible impact of the proposed development on house No. 65. CTP/UD&L, PlanD and Architectural Services Department should be consulted on the visual impact of the proposed development on the surroundings upon receiving the further information. Alternative scheme which could satisfy both the noise requirement and visual impact would have to be worked out should the application be rejected in future. Two other Members shared the same view and agreed that the consideration of the application should be deferred.

41. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to defer making a decision on the application pending the submission of further information by the applicant to address Members' concern on the visual impact of the proposed development on the surrounding area having regard to the high site formation level; and the possible impact of the proposed retaining wall on house No. 65 to the south of the site.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K18/322 Proposed Religious Institution (Redevelopment of Bethel Bible Seminary with In-situ Preservation of Sun Hok Building) in "Government, Institution or Community (12)" zone, 45-47 Grampian Road, Kowloon City, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/322A)

42. The Secretary reported that Ho Tin & Associates Consulting Engineers Limited (Ho Tin) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had declared interest in the item as he had current business dealings with Ho Tin. The Committee noted that Mr Lau had no involvement in the application and agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

43. The Committee noted that the applicant's agent requested on 27.10.2016 for deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address the comments of the Architectural Services Department. It was the second time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

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

meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information. Since 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 8

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

45. The Secretary informed Members that this was the last meeting of the Metro Planning Committee chaired by Mr K.K. Ling, Director of Planning, prior to his retirement. The Secretary proposed and Members agreed to express a vote of thanks to Mr Ling for his contributions to the Committee and wished him a happy and healthy retirement. Mr Ling thanked all Members for their support over the past years and expressed gratitude for Members' dedication which contributed to the smooth conduct of the Committee's business.

46. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 10:20 a.m.