

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 572<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 23.12.2016**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

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 K.K. Cheung

Mr Franklin Yu

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong), Transport Department  
Mr Peter C.K. Mak

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Tony W.H. Cheung

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

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

**In Attendance**

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Sally S.Y. Fong

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

**Agenda Item 1**

**Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 571<sup>st</sup> MPC Meeting held on 9.12.2016**

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 571<sup>st</sup> MPC meeting held on 9.12.2016 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

**Matters Arising**

[Open Meeting]

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

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting]

Y/K11/5                      Application for Amendment to the Draft Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K11/28, To rezone the application site from “Government, Institution or Community” to “Residential (Group B)”, 99 Shatin Pass Road and Adjoining Government Land, Wong Tai Sin  
(MPC Paper No. Y/K11/5)

---

3. The Secretary reported that BMT Asia Pacific Ltd. (BMT) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho            - having past business dealings with BMT.

4. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee also noted that the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that Mr Patrick H.T Lau could stay in the meeting as he had no involvement in the application.

5. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 8.12.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for one month to allow time for consultation with relevant government departments, especially the Environmental Protection Department and the Urban Design and Landscape Section of the Planning Department, and preparation of further information to address their comments. It was the second time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address the departmental comments.

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

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

[Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen and Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, Senior Town Planners/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STPs/TWK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 4**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K1/256                      Proposed Massage Establishment in “Commercial (6)” zone, 2/F, CFC  
Tower, 22-28 Mody Road, Tsim Sha Tsui  
(MPC Paper No. A/K1/256)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed massage establishment;
- (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, six public comments were received objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam 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 massage establishment was not incompatible with the surrounding developments and was generally in line with and could meet the relevant planning criterion as laid down in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 14B. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the assessments above were relevant.

8. Members had no question on the application.

### Deliberation Session

9. 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 23.12.2020, 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 condition :

“the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

### Agenda Item 5

#### Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TW/484                      Temporary Shop and Services for a Period of 5 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone, Workshops B3-1 and B3-2, G/F, Superluck Industrial Centre (Phase 2), 57 Sha Tsui Road and 30 -38 Tai Chung Road, Tsuen Wan  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/484)

---

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 temporary shop and services for a period of 5 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departments 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, no public comment was received; 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 applied use was in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone and complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D (TPB PG-No. 22D) in that it would not induce adverse fire safety, traffic, environmental and infrastructural impact on the developments within the subject building and the adjacent areas. The premises was the subject of two previous planning applications, one of which was submitted by the applicant. Both of them were revoked due to non-compliance with the approval conditions on fire safety measures. According to the applicant, a fire consultant had been engaged to deal with the approval conditions once planning permission was obtained. Thus, a shorter compliance period was proposed to monitor the progress of compliance with approval conditions should the Committee decide to approve the application.

12. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether it was a common practice to grant a temporary approval period for 5 years for such type of application;
- (b) the meaning of “other applications approved by the Committee that floor area not accounted for aggregate commercial floor area in the Fire Services Department (FSD)’s assessment” as stated in paragraph 6.2 of the Paper ; and
- (c) the normal compliance periods for approval conditions on the submission and implementation of the proposal for the fire service installations and equipment.

13. Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, STP/TWK, made the following responses:

- (a) the applicant sought planning permission to use the premises for the applied use for a period of 5 years, and there were other temporary planning permissions granted within the subject “OU(B)” zone. There was also provision under the Outline Zoning Plan for application for shop and services as a permanent use;
- (b) according to TPB PG-No. 22D, uses which were for the purposes of supporting the industrial activities and the workers in the subject building, such as fast food counter and bank, were not accounted for the aggregate commercial floor area of 460m<sup>2</sup>, while commercial uses serving the nearby population, such as real estate agency and retail shop, were accounted for the aggregate commercial floor area. As for the subject application, the applied shop and services use should be accounted for the aggregate commercial floor area of 460m<sup>2</sup>; and
- (c) the normal compliance period for approval conditions on the submission and implementation of the proposal for the fire service installations and equipment for other applications were 6 and 9 months respectively.

Deliberation Session

14. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 23.12.2021, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission of the proposal for the fire service installations and equipment in the premises within 3 months from the date of approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 23.3.2017;
  
- (b) the implementation of the proposal for the fire service installations and equipment in the premises within 6 months from the date of approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 23.6.2017;  
and
  
- (c) if any of the above planning conditions (a) or (b) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen and Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, STPs/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. Ms Yuen and Mr Kwong left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 6**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TWW/112                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted House Development in “Residential (Group C) 1” zone, Lot No. 425 in D.D. 399, Ting Kau, Tsuen Wan  
(MPC Paper No. A/TWW/112A)

---

16.            The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 15.12.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months to allow time for preparation of further information to address the departmental comments. It was the second time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including a Geotechnical Assessment report.

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

**Hong Kong District**

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

**Agenda Item 7**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H3/429                      Proposed Composite Residential and Commercial 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, 6-22 Chung Ching Street, Sai Ying Pun  
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/429A)

---

18.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Camluck Development Ltd., which was a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd. (HLD). Kenneth To & Associates Ltd. (KTA) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau            -    having current business dealings with HLD, KTA and Arup;
  
- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok            -    being an employee of the University of Hong Kong which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD;
  
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung            -    being a Director of the Hong Kong Business Accountants Association which had obtained sponsorship from HLD;

- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HLD and Arup;
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with Arup; and
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with Arup.

19. The Committee noted that Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Mr Franklin Yu had not arrived at the meeting yet. As the interest of Mr Patrick H.T. Lau was direct, the Committee agreed that he should leave the meeting temporarily. As the interest of Dr Wilton W.T. Fok was not direct and 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.

[Mr Patrick H.T. Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

20. 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 residential and commercial development (flat, eating place, and shop and services) and minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction;
- (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 two statutory publication periods, fourteen public comments were received from individuals. Of which,

eleven objected to the application, one provided views and two indicated no comment. Major objection grounds and views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; 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. As compared with the last approved scheme under application No. A/H3/427, the application was mainly to include 20-22 Chung Ching Street as part of the site. The planning merits in the approved scheme had been retained and enhanced, i.e. the provision of a hammerhead, a setback of 2.7m from Chung Ching Street to provide a wider pavement, and an enlarged pedestrian street cum sitting-out area. The proposed maximum BH of 104.2mPD had been maintained which was the same as that of the approved scheme. The proposed increase in gross floor area (GFA) due to the enlargement of the site area would not generate any adverse impact in terms of traffic, sewerage, visual, air quality, and air ventilation. As for the public concerns on the open space provision and the use of the widened street for alfresco dining, there was a surplus in the provision of the existing and planned local and district open space within the Central and Western District and the applicant had confirmed that there would be no alfresco dining within the surrendered area.

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

21. A Member asked about the use of 20-22 Chung Ching Street and whether the area falling within the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone (i.e. 6-14 Chung Ching Street) was required for any GIC purpose. In response, Mr J.J. Austin said that 20-22 Chung Ching Street was currently zoned “Residential (Group A)7”. As for the “G/IC” site, it was under private ownership and had been included as part of the application site in the last approved application. In the early 1980s, it was intended to develop the “G/IC” site into a local open space. To cater for this intention, the applicant would provide a pedestrian street cum sitting out area in the proposed development for public use.

22. Some Members raised the following questions/points:

- (a) whether the proposed hammerhead would be surrendered to the Government;
- (b) noting that users of the visitor car parking space of the proposed development would need to make use of the proposed hammerhead for vehicle manoeuvring, whether it would set an undesirable precedent of using public space for private purpose;
- (c) whether the site area proposed to be surrendered had been taken into account for plot ratio (PR) calculation for the proposed development;
- (d) whether it was a normal practice for the Government to take up the maintenance and management of the area surrendered to the Government; and
- (e) whether the fire fighting arrangement of the proposed development was acceptable, in particular the proposed development would be surrounded by existing buildings on three sides which could not be accessed by the fire appliance and aerial ladder.

23. Mr J.J. Austin made the following responses:

- (a) the proposed hammerhead would be surrendered to the Government, which would then form part of a public road and be maintained and managed by the Government. The Transport Department (TD) had no adverse comment on the traffic arrangement of the proposed visitor car parking space;
- (b) the surrendered area had been taken into account for PR calculation;
- (c) there were precedent cases of developers surrendered area for pavement widening and the Government would take up the subsequent maintenance and management. The Government would examine whether the pavement

widening was essential and could meet the standards required by the Highways Department before deciding to take up the management and maintenance of the said area upon surrender; and

- (d) the Fire Services Department had no objection to the proposed development subject to imposition of an approval condition on the provision of fire services installations and water supplies for fire fighting. The existing Chung Ching Street, with a width of 5.5m, could be accessed by fire appliance.

24. Mr Peter C.K. Mak, Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong) (CTE(HK)), TD, supplemented that the proposed hammerhead was located within the site and the purpose of which was to provide a vehicle turning space for public use. TD considered that the proposed traffic arrangement was acceptable.

25. The Vice-chairman raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed development would create adverse impact on Chung Ching Street given the concerned street was a dead-end road with limited width;
- (b) the traffic generation from the proposed development; and
- (c) the connectivity of the proposed footpath.

26. Mr J.J. Austin made the following responses:

- (a) with reference to Table 6.2 of the Traffic Impact Assessment submitted by the applicant, the proposed development would generate/attract 13 pcu/hour in the morning and 11 pcu/hour in the afternoon. No adverse traffic impact due to the proposed development was anticipated; and
- (b) the proposed development would set back 2.7m from the site boundary to provide a 2m wide footpath. However, there was no footpath provided at

the nearby lots adjoining Des Voeux Road West. The provision of a continuous footpath between the proposed development and Des Voeux Road West would be subject to future redevelopment of the nearby lots.

27. In response to a Member's question about the site classification under the Buildings Ordinance, Mr J.J. Austin said that the site would be classified as a Class A site without surrendering of the proposed hammerhead.

#### Deliberation Session

28. A Member noted that the proposed hammerhead which would form part of a public road after surrendered to the Government would be used for vehicle manoeuvring of the visitor car parking space of a private development, and expressed concern if such arrangement would set an undesirable precedent. In response, Mr Peter C.K. Mak, CTE(HK), TD, said that given the unique circumstance of the site in that the visitor car parking space was located right next to the proposed hammerhead and the purpose of the hammerhead was to facilitate public vehicle turning, the proposed traffic arrangement would unlikely set an undesirable precedent.

29. Members in general had no objection to the application. Regarding approval condition (a), Mr Peter C.K. Mak suggested to add "and carriageway" after "for footpath" to clarify that the setback area was for both footpath and carriageway widening, in particular the road bend connecting Chung Ching Street and the proposed hammerhead. The Vice-chairman was concerned that such amendment might allow the applicant to use the entire setback area for carriageway widening. Another Member was also concerned about the width of the footpath. In this regard, Members noted that of the 2.7m setback, 2.2m was for footpath widening and 0.5m was reserved for the widening of Chung Ching Street as shown in Appendix Id of the Paper. The 2.5m-wide of the setback area would be surrendered to the Government, and the remaining 0.2m-wide strip of land along the major façade of the proposed development would be owned and managed by the applicant. The Chairman drew Members' attention that the 2.7m-wide setback area was proposed by the applicant; the applicant would be required to provide the setback area to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board under approval condition (a), and there should be sufficient control by TD. Members in general agreed with the

amendment proposed by TD to the approval condition (a).

30. 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 23.12.2020, 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 and carriageway 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 257m<sup>2</sup> for public use, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the design and provision of internal transport facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) the submission and implementation of a landscape master plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (e) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) report to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (f) 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
- (g) 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.”

31. 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. Mr Austin left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Patrick H.T. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 8**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H6/81                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Non-building Area Restriction for Proposed Footbridge connecting Lee Garden Two and Lee Garden Five in an area shown as 'Road' and "Commercial" zone, Yun Ping Road (between Lee Garden Two (28 Yun Ping Road) and Lee Garden Five (18 Hysan Avenue)), Causeway Bay  
(MPC Paper No. A/H6/81)

---

32.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Minsal Ltd. and Barrowgate Ltd., which were subsidiaries of Hysan Development Co. Ltd. (Hysan). MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup) were two of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho   | - his company having current business dealings with Hysan and MVA; |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - having current business dealings with MVA and Arup;              |
| Mr K.K. Cheung      | - his firm having current business dealings with Arup;             |

Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with MVA and Arup; and

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

33. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee also noted that the applicants had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Franklin Yu and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam could stay in the meeting as they had no involvement in the application.

34. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 8.12.2016 for deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for the applicants to address the comments raised by relevant government departments. It was the first time that the applicants requested for deferment of the application.

35. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicants 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 applicants. If the further information 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 two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

## **Kowloon District**

[Mr Tom C.K. Yip, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng and Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, Senior Town Planners/Kowloon (STPs/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 9**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Kowloon Tong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K18/19  
(MPC Paper No. 20/16)

---

36. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the approved Kowloon Tong Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K18/19 were mainly related to a site in Kowloon Tong. Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, who was living in the City University of Hong Kong's quarters in Kowloon Tong, had declared an interest on the item. The Committee agreed that Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon could stay in the meeting as his quarters did not have a direct view of the site.

#### **Presentation and Questions Session**

37. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, 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 the rezoning of a site near the junction of Lung Cheung Road and Lion Rock Tunnel Road (the site) from "Green Belt" ("GB") to "Residential (Group C)11" ("R(C)11") and areas shown as 'Road' for private housing development;

### The Site

- (b) the site (about 1.13ha) was on government land. It was located at the mid-hill of Beacon Hill, north of Lung Cheung Road. The southern and eastern portions of the site were covered by wooded areas, while the northern portion was paved and currently allocated to the Water Supplies Department as temporary works area and storage compound;

### Rezoning Proposal

- (c) the proposed “R(C)11” zone was subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 3.6 and a maximum building height (BH) of 160mPD. The proposed private housing development was targeted to provide about 680 flats;

### Technical Aspects

- (d) the technical aspects, including traffic, air ventilation, visual, landscape, environment and water supply, of the proposed development were detailed in paragraph 4 of the Paper. Various technical assessments had been conducted to ensure the feasibility of the proposed development and mitigation measures were recommended to minimise any adverse impacts on or arising from the proposed development, such as widening the existing access road to a 7.3m-wide single carriageway with minimum 2.5m-wide footpath on both sides, provision of landscape buffer along major roads abutting the site boundary and provision of buffer distance from Lung Cheung Road and Lion Rock Tunnel Road as well as from the tunnel portal opening; and

### Public Consultation

- (e) on 17.11.2016, the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) was consulted and members of KCDC had no adverse comments on the proposed amendments to the Kowloon Tong OZP. The Housing and Infrastructure Committee of KCDC would be further consulted during the plan exhibition

period.

38. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the vehicular access arrangement of the proposed development;
- (b) the traffic generation of the proposed development and its impact on Lung Cheung Road;
- (c) whether the traffic tailed back from the Lion Rock Tunnel would affect the vehicular access to the site;
- (d) the design assumptions, e.g. floor to floor height and site coverage, of the proposed development;
- (e) rationale for the site configuration;
- (f) whether the proposed footbridge across Lung Cheung Road falling within the “GB” zone required planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board); and
- (g) whether the slope located to the further north of the site was a natural slope and whether it would be maintained and managed by the future development.

39. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, made the following responses:

- (a) the existing access road leading to the service reservoir off the Lung Chung Road eastbound carriageway would provide access for the site, and would be widened to cope with the current standards of highway design and traffic safety;
- (b) the traffic flow of Lung Cheung Road was 5900 pcu/hour while the proposed development with an estimated number of 680 flats would only

generate/attract 115 pcu/hour in the AM peak and 80 pcu/hour in the PM peak. According to the Traffic Impact Assessment, no insurmountable traffic impact on Lung Cheung Road arising from the proposed development was anticipated;

- (c) under Amendment Item B1, an additional deceleration lane leading to the site would be provided along the northern curb of the Lung Cheung Road eastbound carriageway to facilitate vehicles entering the site. A merging distance of 170m would be allowed for vehicles leaving the site for Lung Cheung Road. The Transport Department had no adverse comment on such arrangement;
- (d) the elevation of the site was at about 95mPD to 105mPD. With the proposed BH restriction of 160mPD, the proposed development would be around 60m high. Based on an indicative scheme with a floor-to-floor height of 3m and a site coverage of 22%, the proposed development would be of 20-storey high and was feasible to accommodate the proposed PR of 3.6. Similar floor-to-floor height assumption was adopted for drawing up indicative schemes for amendments to other OZPs;
- (e) taking into account the comments from the Environmental Protection Department, the site boundary was delineated with due regard to the provision of buffer distance (i.e. at least 100m from the Lion Rock Tunnel portal opening in the northeast corner of the site and 20m from road curbs of Lung Cheung Road and Lion Rock Tunnel Road) to address air quality problem. The buffer distance of 20m from the major roads would also help address noise impacts, preserve the existing trees and allow a landscape buffer along Lung Cheung Road and Lion Rock Tunnel Road;
- (f) the proposed footbridge was considered as 'Road' use and was always permitted on the OZP. Thus, no planning permission was required from the Board; and
- (g) the slope located to the north of the service reservoir was a natural slope.

Given the slope was located quite far away from the site and the proposed development would have no impact on the slope, the future developer and/or residents of the proposed development would not be required to take up the maintenance and management responsibilities of the slope.

40. In response to the Chairman's follow-up questions on site coverage restriction and the proposed footbridge, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that no site coverage restriction was proposed to be imposed on the OZP, and the future development would be subject to the maximum site coverage permitted under the Building (Planning) Regulation (B(P)R), i.e. a site coverage restriction of 33.33% for Class A site. The proposed footbridge would be gazetted under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance, and the detailed implementation arrangement of the proposed footbridge would be subject to further liaison between relevant departments.

41. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Kowloon Tong OZP and its Notes and that the draft Kowloon Tong OZP No. S/K18/19A (to be renumbered to S/K18/20 upon exhibition) and its Notes were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Kowloon Tong OZP No. S/K18/19A (to be renumbered to S/K18/20 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP and agree that the revised ES was suitable for publication together with the OZP.

**Agenda Item 10**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/737                      Proposed Shop and Services (Bank/Fast Food Counter/Electrical Shop/Local Provisions Store/Showroom) at Units A, B (portion), C (portion) & E; and  
Proposed Shop and Services at Units D & F (portion) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone, Units A, B (portion), C (portion), D, E & F (portion), Blocks G & H, G/F, East Sun Industrial Centre, 16 Shing Yip Street, Kwun Tong  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/737)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

42.            Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, 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 (bank/fast food counter/electrical shop/local provisions store/showroom);
- (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, one public comment was received supporting the application as the proposed uses would speed up the development for site improvement; 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 uses were generally in line with the planning intention of the

“Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone and compatible with the changing land use character of the surrounding area. The proposed uses also complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D in that they would not induce adverse fire safety, traffic, environmental and infrastructural impacts on the developments within the subject building and the adjacent areas.

43. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

44. 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 23.12.2018, 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 approval 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 TPB 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.”

45. 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 Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, and Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng and Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STPs/K, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. Mr Yip, Ms Cheng and Mr Chan left the meeting at this point.]

## **Housing and Office Land Supply Section**

[Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan, Chief Town Planning/Housing & Office Land Supply (CTP/HOLS), Ms Yvonne Y.T. Leong, Senior Town Planner/HOLS (STP/HOLS) and Mr W.K. Li, Planning Assistant/HOLS were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 11**

[Open Meeting]

Further Consideration of the Draft Planning Brief for the  
“Comprehensive Development Area” zone at Site 3 of the New Central Harbourfront  
(MPC Paper No. 19/16)

---

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

46. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Yvonne Y.T. Leong, STP/HOLS, presented the background and the results of the consultation with the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island of the Harbourfront Commission (TFHK) and the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) on the draft Planning Brief (PB) as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

#### **Background**

- (a) on 30.9.2016, the Metro Planning Committee of the Town Planning Board (the Board) considered that the draft PB for the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone at Site 3 of the New Central Harbourfront (the site) was suitable for consultation with TFHK and C&WDC;
- (b) TFHK and C&WDC were consulted on the draft PB on 19.10.2016 and 20.10.2016 respectively. In response to the TFHK’ request, an informal design workshop on the subject matter was held on 2.11.2016 to collect further views from TFHK’s members;

Views of TFHK and C&WDC on the Draft PB

- (c) while both TFHK and C&WDC raised no in-principle objection to the draft PB, the members also raised comments on the proposed uses of the site, the building height (BH) restrictions, the provision of public open space (POS), the demolition of the General Post Office Building, pedestrian connectivity, the provision of public car parking spaces, pick-up/drop-off spaces and transport facilities, the reconstruction of the old Star Ferry Clock Tower (SFCT), the design and construction of the site, and the implementation arrangement. A motion requesting the Government to take forward the design concepts recommended under the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS) was passed by C&WDC. TFHK and C&WDC's major comments on the draft PB were detailed in paragraph 3 and Appendices IV and V of the Paper;

Revised Draft PB

- (d) in respect of the comments received from TFHK and C&WDC, the Planning Department had consulted the relevant bureau and departments and revised the draft PB. Some major amendments were proposed as follows:
- (i) to enhance the diversity and vibrancy of the POS, the remarks under Item 12 on "Open Space Provision" were revised by incorporating elements including 'outdoor seating and shades' and 'alfresco dining facilities'. Moreover, the floor spaces of alfresco dining facilities, food kiosks and open air cafes within the POS would be disregarded in determining the maximum commercial gross floor area (GFA) for the site. An indicative layout showing the location and basic parameters (such as area) of these facilities should be submitted at the Master Layout Plan (MLP) submission stage for the Board's consideration;

- (ii) to improve the internal and external pedestrian connectivity of the site, the remarks under Item 18 on “Pedestrian Connections” were revised to incorporate requirements to provide direct, convenient, barrier-free access and weather protected pedestrian access, and provision of escalators where possible. In addition, the future developer was required to explore the possibility of providing additional underground connections / openings between the three land parcels within the site and with the nearby existing/planned developments. Furthermore, provision of traveller(s) running in a south-north direction within the site should be explored where possible;
- (iii) the remarks under Item 16 on “Transport Facilities” and Item 19 on “Traffic and Transport Aspects” were revised to require provision of on-street pick-up/drop-off spaces within the site along Lung Wo Road frontage for public use, the location and number of which would be subject to the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) and the agreement of the Commissioner for Transport. Also, to allow more design flexibility, it was proposed to delete the requirement for reprovisioning of the existing transport facilities at Man Kwong Street at ground floor level within the site; and
- (iv) to enhance lighting and ventilation to the lower levels, the remarks under Item 10 on “Urban Design Considerations” were amended to encourage the provision of voids/skylights on the podium roof/landscaped deck/ground level or using atrium design, where possible, to enhance lighting and ventilation to the lower levels.

47. The Chairman said that the site was one of the eight key sites under the UDS. The PB for the site was prepared based on the recommendations of the UDS. The purpose of the PB was to set out the broad planning parameters and development requirements to facilitate the preparation of MLP for the development at the site. Since the site was zoned “CDA”, the future developers, after obtaining the site through land disposal, should make reference to the PB and prepare a MLP for the consideration and approval of the Board.

The Chairman further said the Committee had considered in September 2016 that the draft PB for the site was suitable for consultation with TFHK and C&WDC, and a revised draft PB incorporating the comments received was now submitted to the Committee for further consideration.

*Urban, Landscape and Architectural Design*

48. The Vice-chairman and some Members raised the following questions/points:
- (a) whether the revised draft PB could state explicitly that the design of the site should be compatible with the City Hall Complex given that the site was next to City Hall which was a very important building that would be preserved;
  - (b) whether the revised draft PB could specify some design guidelines for the site to achieve a compatible design with the proposed piazza fronting City Hall and City Galley in order to recreate the atmosphere of Edinburgh Place for the public to reminisce the past;
  - (c) elaboration on the meaning of “maintain a clear vista from Statue Square to harbourfront”;
  - (d) whether the revised draft PB could include an additional item on “Architectural Design” to provide guidelines on the spatial arrangement and architectural style and features of the future developments at the site, and whether the PB could specify some criteria on architectural design to facilitate the tender assessment upon site disposal; and
  - (e) noting that the future development at the site would provide an extensive underground space, whether the revised draft PB could specify some design guidelines to encourage penetration of natural sunlight to the underground levels.

49. Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan, CTP/HOLS, made the following responses:

- (a) with reference to Plans 2 and 4 of Appendix 1 of the Paper, the western portion of the site was restricted to a maximum building height (BH) of 50mPD while the eastern portion was restricted to 16mPD. The designation of the lower BH on the eastern portion had given due regard to its location along the Historic Corridor where the City Hall Complex was situated. Moreover, it had been stated clearly in Item 13 on “Landscape and Greening Aspects” that the design of the site should enhance integration with the City Hall Complex;
- (b) given the BH restriction on the eastern portion and that a minimum 12,000m<sup>2</sup> of POS should be provided at grade, a clear vista from Statue Square to the harbourfront could be achieved;
- (c) Item 10 on “Urban Design Considerations” had provided some design requirements to guide future developments. As for the approach for site disposal, it would be further considered by the Government and the PB would not prescribe the site disposal arrangement; and
- (d) the remarks under Item 10 on “Urban Design Considerations” had already been beefed up by including “provision of voids/skylights on the podium roof/landscaped deck/ground level or using atrium design, where possible, to enhance lighting and ventilation to the lower levels would be encouraged”.

50. The Vice-chairman considered that Item 13 on “Landscape and Greening Aspects” referred mainly to the landscape design integration with the City Hall Complex and was of the view that relevant requirements on architectural design to integrate with the City Hall Complex could be incorporated in Item 10 on “Urban Design Considerations”. In response, the Secretary suggested and Members agreed to add “with due consideration to the setting and design of the City Hall Complex” at the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> bullet of Item 10.

51. A Member considered that the last paragraph of the remarks under Item 10 on

“Urban Design Considerations” should be further refined to reflect the intention of provision of skylights to the underground levels. Another Member said that in order to be in line with the latest Government’s practice, any development within the site should give due consideration to provision of vertical greening and biodiversity and suggested to refine Item 13 on “Landscape and Greening Aspects” to address this aspect. Members agreed to refine Items 10 and 13 to address the concerns.

*Traffic Arrangement and Pedestrian Connection*

52. Some Members raised the following questions/points:

- (a) the revised draft PB should not only focus on the functionality of the pedestrian network of the site with surrounding developments, and some design guidelines should be provided to integrate the pedestrian circulation network with the pockets of POS to enhance public enjoyment; and
- (b) noting that the revised draft PB had placed much emphasis on a direct north-south pedestrian connection of the site, whether a continuous east-west pedestrian connection from International Finance Centre (IFC) through the reconstructed old SFCT to the City Hall Complex could also be provided in order to recreate the historical connection of the area and whether some design requirements to promote east-west pedestrian connectivity could be included in the revised draft PB.

53. Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan provided the following responses:

- (a) as provided for under Item 18 on “Pedestrian Connections”, a comprehensive multi-level pedestrian network plan including at-grade, elevated and underground pedestrian links providing direct accesses with adjacent existing and future developments should be formulated and included as part of the MLP submission; and
- (b) provision had been made under Item 14 on “Reconstruction of Old SFCT” to require that the design of the reconstructed old SFCT and its landscape

setting should respect its original design, reinforce the spatial character of the historical landmarks within the Historic Corridor running in a north-south direction within the site, and integrate with the visual axis and the landscape setting of the surrounding environment. As for the east-west pedestrian connection, as required under Item 18 on “Pedestrian Connections”, elevated walkways would be provided between IFCII and the site. The originally proposed Road D6 located to the east of the site was no longer required and was proposed to be a landscaping area connecting City Hall. As such, the proposed POS at the site, together with the said landscaping area connecting City Hall, the proposed piazza in Edinburgh Place and the proposed waterfront promenade at Site 7, would form a larger POS to facilitate a barrier-free environment at grade.

54. In view of the Member’s concern on the east-west pedestrian connection, the Secretary suggested and Members agreed to revise the remarks under Item 14 on “Reconstruction of Old SFCT” to strengthen the design integration with the north-south and east-west visual axes and the landscape setting of the existing Statue Square Corridor and the new piazza at Edinburgh Place fronting City Gallery and City Hall.

*Car Parking Provision and Traffic Arrangement*

55. Some Members raised the following questions/points:

- (a) noting that the future developments at the site and the demolition of the existing Star Ferry Carpark would worsen the problems of inadequate provision of car parking spaces in the Central area and lead to illegal parking outside IFC, whether additional car parking spaces, on top of the proposed 325 public car parking spaces in the revised draft PB, could be provided at the site in the future; and
- (b) the ingress/egress points of the proposed underground public carpark of the site.

56. Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan provided the following responses:

- (a) in accordance with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, the proposed commercial developments at the site would need to provide around 500 ancillary car parking spaces depending on the mix of uses, such as food and beverage (F&B) and retail facilities, of the proposed commercial developments. According to the notional scheme, around 350 car parking spaces for the retail facilities could be used by the public. As such, together with the proposed 325 public car parking spaces, a total of around 675 car parking spaces would be available for public use; and
- (b) the details of the ingress/egress points were not specified in the revised draft PB. The future developer of the site was required to submit the proposed traffic arrangement of the site including the location of the ingress/egress points of the underground public carpark as well as a TIA, as part of the MLP submission, to the Board for consideration. According to the notional scheme, the northern and central portions of the site could be accessed at Man Yiu Street, and the southern portion of the site could be accessed at Connaught Place. The Transport Department had no objection to the proposed ingress/egress points of the notional scheme.

*Environmental Aspect*

57. A Member said that according to the remarks under Item 22 on “Environmental Aspect”, it was stated that the design and development of the site should give due consideration to, amongst others, the site coverage of greenery recommended for the area. As such, it might be relevant to include “heat island effect” to the list of possible environmental impacts that might be caused by the future developments. Mr Tony W.H. Cheung, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment), Environmental Protection Department, supplemented that corresponding revision should then be made to the said item by adding “and relevant authority” after “the Director of Environmental Protection” as the vetting authority of the environmental assessment. In response, Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan said that Item 21 on “Air Ventilation Aspect” stipulated the requirement for a

quantitative air ventilation assessment to be carried out as part of the MLP submission to demonstrate that the future developments would be acceptable in air ventilation term, which might help address Members' concern in this regard. Members generally agreed that the provision of greenery would help address "urban heat island" and appropriate amendments to the revised draft PB should be made to reflect this aspect.

*Others*

58. The Vice-chairman and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the revised draft PB should emphasize the provision of uses such as F&B facilities and gallery at the ground level for public enjoyment;
- (b) whether the existing observation wheel would be removed due to the future developments at the site; and
- (c) whether the future developments at the site would have impact on the circuit of Formula E should it become an annual event in Hong Kong.

59. Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan provided the following responses:

- (a) the relevant requirement of inclusion of alfresco dining facilities, food kiosks and open air cafes in the design of the POS had been specified in Item 12 on "Open Space Provision" of the revised draft PB;
- (b) the tenancy area of the observation wheel was outside the boundary of the site; and
- (c) the major sections of the circuit of Formula E, i.e. Lung Wo Road and Yiu Sing Street, would remain and would not be affected by the future developments at the site. Other large events currently took place to the east of the observation wheel would not be affected by the future developments at the site.

60. A Member suggested to delete the last paragraph in the remarks under Item 7 on “Maximum GFA” as it was unusual to state that “the commercial GFA shall not be undermined”. Members agreed.

61. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) note the views of the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island of the Harbourfront Commission and the Central and Western District Council as summarised in paragraph 3 and detailed in Appendices IV and V of the Paper respectively, and the responses of government departments as summarised in paragraph 4 of the Paper; and
- (b) endorse the revised draft Planning Brief (PB) at Appendix I of the Paper subject to refinements to Items 7, 10, 13, 14 and 22 of PB, as agreed at the meeting, to address the Committee’s views/suggestions.

**Agenda Item 12**

**Any Other Business**

62. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 12:00 p.m..