

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 580th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 12.5.2017**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Professor T.S. Liu

Mr Franklin Yu

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

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 Denis K.N. Li

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**  
Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

**In Attendance**

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

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Anita M.Y. Wong

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 579<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 28.4.2017

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 579<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 28.4.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

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

[Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK), and Ms Agnes Y.M. Tang, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

## **Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

### **Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Further Consideration of the Draft Planning Brief for the Two "Comprehensive Development Area" Zones at the Lin Cheung Road Site, Sham Shui Po

(MPC Paper No. 2/17)

---

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

3. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, presented the background and the results of the consultation with the Sham Shui Po District Council (SSPDC) and the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (TFKTK) of the Harbourfront Commission (HC) on the draft Planning Brief (PB) for the two "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") zones as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

#### **Background**

- (a) on 30.9.2016, the Committee considered that the draft PB for the two "CDA" zones at the Lin Cheung Road Site was suitable for consultation with the SSPDC and TFKTK;
- (b) SSPDC and TFKTK were consulted on the draft PB on 8.11.2016 and 18.11.2016 respectively;

#### **Views of SSPDC and TFKTK on the draft PB**

- (c) while SSPDC and TFKTK had no in-principle objection to the draft PB, some comments were raised on the public open space (POS) including the waterfront promenade and the disused pier, the development intensity and

building height (BH) profile, traffic and pedestrian connectivity and environmental nuisances. The major comments of SSPDC and TFKTK on the draft PB were detailed in paragraph 3 and Appendices IV and V of the Paper;

Responses to Comments Raised by SSPDC and TFKTK

- (d) in response to the comments raised by SSPDC and TFKTK, the Planning Department and concerned government bureaux and departments had the following consolidated responses:

POS/Waterfront Promenade/Disused Pier

- (i) the developer of the “CDA” site would be required to design and construct the POS within the site and the northwestern section of the waterfront promenade while the developer of the “CDA(2)” site would be required to design, construct, manage and maintain the southeastern section of the waterfront promenade including the disused pier fronting his site. To ensure that there would be an integrated and coherent design, the design of the respective sections of the waterfront promenade would form part of the Master Layout Plan (MLP) and Landscape Master Plan submissions for each “CDA” site;
- (ii) whilst the PB did not prescribe the types of water-land interface facilities to be provided, the developer of the “CDA(2)” site would be required to conduct a study at his own cost to explore opportunities to include public landing facilities to enhance accessibility to the waterfront promenade and would be responsible to complete relevant statutory and administrative procedures for implementing any proposed public landing facilities;

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

### Development Intensity and BH Profile

- (iii) the proposed maximum BH of 100mPD for the “CDA” and “CDA(2)” zones were generally in line with the urban design concept of stepped BH profile with BH descending from the residential developments in the north and northwest (148mPD – 185mPD), the proposed housing development at North West Kowloon Reclamation Area Site 6 (NWKR Site 6) (about 140mPD), and the public rental housing and subsidised sale flats development at the “Residential (Group A)12” (“R(A)12”) site (around 125mPD) towards the waterfront. The developer of each of the “CDA” sites would be required to submit a visual impact assessment as part of the MLP submission;

### Traffic and Pedestrian Connectivity

- (iv) in addition to conducting a traffic impact assessment as part of the MLP submission, the developer of each of the two “CDA” sites would be required to prepare a Pedestrian Network Plan to further enhance pedestrian connection between the harbourfront sites and the inland areas of Sham Shui Po;

### Environmental Nuisance

- (v) the developer of each of the two “CDA” sites would be required to submit an environmental assessment as part of the MLP submission to address any potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed development and propose mitigation measures to tackle them;

Revised draft PB

- (vi) the draft PB had been further revised to take into account the comments received and the proposed amendments were highlighted in Appendix I of the Paper.

4. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Chairman explained that the PB was prepared to provide guidance/control for the future developers to prepare MLP submissions on the "CDA" sites for approval by the Town Planning Board (the Board).

5. The Chairman and some Members raised the following questions:

Waterfront Promenade/Disused Pier

- (i) noting that the northwestern section of the waterfront promenade would be designed and constructed by the future developer and handed back to the government for management and maintenance while the southeastern section of the waterfront promenade would be designed, constructed, managed and maintained by the developer of the "CDA(2)" site, whether any mechanism was in place to ensure an integrated design of the two sections of the waterfront promenade and that the southeastern portion of the waterfront promenade and the disused pier would be available for public use/access;

Pedestrian Connectivity

- (ii) in addition to the proposed footbridge spanning across West Kowloon Highway connecting "R(A)12" site and NWKR Site 6, whether there were other pedestrian connections between the waterfront and the hinterland;
- (iii) how the future residents of the public housing developments at the "R(A)12" site and NWKR Site 6 gained access to the POS and the waterfront promenade;

- (iv) with reference to Plan 7A of the draft PB, whether heavy traffic flow was expected for the Planned Road A between the two waterfront “CDA” sites and “R(A)12” site; and
- (v) details on the type of developments and the development parameters of the “R(A)12” site and NWKR Site 6 and the construction programme of the pedestrian footbridge connecting the two sites.

6. Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, made the following responses:

Waterfront Promenade/Disused Pier

- (i) according to the draft PB, the southeastern section of the waterfront promenade was to be designed, constructed, managed and maintained by the developer of the “CDA(2)” site. The use of the waterfront promenade and the disused pier would be governed under the lease. Besides, the requirement for 24-hour free public access of the waterfront promenade would be stipulated in the lease conditions;
- (ii) the design of the waterfront promenade should be in line with the Town Planning Board’s Vision Statement for the Victoria Harbour and the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines adopted by the Harbourfront Commission, as well as the guidelines on “Public Open Space in Private Development”. Moreover, to ensure an integrated and coherent design, the design of the respective sections of the waterfront promenade would form part of the MLP submission for the “CDA” sites for approval by the Board;

Pedestrian Connectivity

- (iii) in addition to the proposed footbridge connecting the “R(A)12” site and NWKR Site 6, there was an existing footbridge at the western part of the “CDA” site spanning across West Kowloon Highway. A network of pedestrian walkways/footbridges north of the West Kowloon Highway were



also proposed to facilitate better pedestrian connectivity between the waterfront and the hinterland. Besides, convenient at-grade access was available from the nearby Mass Transit Railway exit near the Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Food Market to the two “CDA” sites and the waterfront promenade;

- (iv) the Planned Road A between the “R(A)12” site and the two “CDA” sites was mainly a local road serving the developments in the area. It was anticipated that the traffic flow would be low and at-grade pedestrian crossing was feasible; and
- (v) the NWKR Site 6 was for a proposed comprehensive development of public rental housing while the “R(A)12” site was for public rental housing and subsidised sale flats. The proposed footbridge connecting these two sites would be constructed in tandem with the public housing development at both sites. The future users/residents of the two “CDA” sites and the future residents of the “R(A)12” site and NWKR Site 6 could make use of the footbridge and the POS within the “CDA” site to access the waterfront and inland areas.

7. Members had no further question on the draft planning brief.

8. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- (a) note the views of the SSPDC and the TFKTK as summarised in paragraph 3 and detailed in Appendices IV and V of the Paper respectively, and the Government’s responses in paragraph 4 of the Paper; and
- (b) endorse the revised draft Planning Brief at Appendix I of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, and Ms Agnes Y.M. Tang, STP/TWK, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

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

**Agenda Item 4**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/KC/445                Proposed Minor Relaxation of Domestic Plot Ratio Restriction from 5 to 6 and Building Height Restriction from 160mPD to 165mPD for Permitted Public Rental Housing Development in "Residential (Group A)" Zone, Vacant Site opposite to Fu Yiu House of Lai Yiu Estate, Lai Cho Road, Kwai Chung  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/445)

---

9.                The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) with the Housing Department (HD) as its executive arm. Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD) and AECOM Consulting Services Limited were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee<br>(the Chairman)<br><i>as the Director of Planning</i>          | - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and the Building Committee of the HKHA;                       |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan<br><i>as Chief Engineer (Works),<br/>Home Affairs Department</i> | - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and Subsidised Housing of the HKHA; |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau  | - having current business dealings with HKHA, LD and AECOM;  |

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with HKHA and past business dealings with AECOM;
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with HKHA;
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work; and
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HKHA and AECOM.

10. The Committee noted that Messrs Patrick H.T. Lau and Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had already left the meeting and Mr Franklin Yu had not arrived to join the meeting. As the interest of Mr Martin W.C. Kwan was direct, he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for this item. The Committee agreed that as Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, he could stay in the meeting.

11. The Committee also noted that the interest of Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, the Chairman, was direct, but the Vice-chairman had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, if the matter was subject to a statutory time limit, as a matter of necessity, the Chairman 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 this arrangement.

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

12. 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 proposed minor relaxation of domestic plot ratio (PR) restriction from 5 to 6 and building height (BH) restriction from 160mPD to 165mPD for permitted public rental housing (PRH) development;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, one public comment was received from an individual raising concerns on the application. Major concerns were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposal was in line with the government policy to increase flat supply and could help optimize scarce land resources. The proposed increase in PR and BH was not incompatible with the surrounding developments and would not cause any adverse impacts on visual, air ventilation, landscape, environmental, drainage, sewerage and traffic aspects. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

13. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed development would be affected by the traffic noise from Kwai Chung Road to the west and northwest of the site; and
- (b) whether the future residents would share the supporting facilities provided in Lai Yiu Estate.

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

14. Ms Fannie F.L. Hung, STP/TWK, made the following responses:

- (a) the application site was located on a higher ground with Kwai Chung Road at a lower elevation some distance away. The applicant had carried out an environmental assessment and demonstrated acceptability of the proposed development. The future development would need to be constructed in accordance with relevant environmental regulations. The Environmental Protection Department considered that no insurmountable impact was expected from the proposed development; and
- (b) according to HD, supporting facilities including wet market and shopping mall at Lai Yiu Estate to the east of the application site were sufficient in meeting the needs of the future residents of the proposed development which would provide only about 820 flats.

15. Members had no further question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

16. 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 12.5.2021, 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:

- (a) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board.

17. 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.]

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 5**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K3/574                      Proposed Office in "Residential (Group A)" Zone, 3/F to 5/F, 598  
Shanghai Street, Mong Kok, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K3/574)

---

18.            The Secretary reported that Lanbase Surveyors Limited (Lanbase) and T.K. Tsui & Associates (TKT) 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 Lanbase; and

Mr K.K. Cheung                              - his firm having current business dealings with TKT.

19.            The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee agreed that as Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, he could stay in the meeting.

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

20.            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 office;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department commented that the applicant should ensure no adverse impact from the proposed development on its neighbouring Grade 2 historic buildings which were under a heritage preservation and revitalisation project undertaken by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) and that protective measures for the historic buildings should be proposed to AMO’s satisfaction. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment from an individual was received raising concern on the application. Major concerns 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 assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the planning intention of the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone was primarily for high-density residential developments, the proposed office at the site was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were predominantly mixed commercial/residential in nature with commercial uses such as shops and restaurants at lower floors. The proposed development was also considered not incompatible with the adjoining URA revitalisation project and the surrounding developments to the south. Given the small size of the site, the proposed development would have insignificant impact on the housing land supply and was not expected to have significant adverse effect on the character of the neighbourhood. The comments of AMO could be addressed by incorporating suitable approval condition. The proposed development was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 5 in

that the proposed purposely-designed office development was compatible with the surrounding land uses and would not generate adverse traffic impact on the adjacent road network. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

21. Some Members raised the following questions:

Interface with the URA Revitalisation Project

- (i) details of the URA revitalisation project and its interface with the proposed development;
- (ii) noting the comments of AMO, what impact the proposed development would have on the Grade 2 historic buildings adjoining the site;
- (iii) whether the proposed development was compatible with the URA revitalisation project in terms of design and building height (BH); and

BH of the Proposed Development

- (iv) whether the cockloft in the proposed development was considered as one storey such that 2/F for the proposed office use would also require planning permission.

22. Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen, STP/TWK, made the following responses:

Interface with the URA Revitalisation Project

- (i) the URA revitalisation project adjoining the northern boundary of the site fell within the URA Shanghai Street/Argyle Street Development Scheme Plan No. S/K3/URA3/2 and was intended for revitalisation and adaptive re-use of the historic shophouses for commercial uses with building height (BH) of 3 to 6 storeys. The BH of the proposed development, which was



6 storeys, was comparable with the adjacent URA revitalisation project;

- (ii) since the application site was adjoining the historic buildings under the URA revitalisation project, the construction works, including foundation works, might affect the historic buildings, particularly on the stability of the wall or structures shared between the application site and No. 600 Shanghai Street. As such, an approval condition requiring the applicant to propose appropriate protection measures and/or non-destructive monitoring system was suggested to address AMO's comments in that respect;
- (iii) according to the URA scheme, the colonnade design of the historic buildings would be retained and the scheme boundary also covered the pavement. For the subject application, with reference to Drawing A-4 of the Paper, the proposed development would be confined within the lot and no cantilevered structure projecting over the pavement of Shanghai Street was proposed;
- (iv) the BH of the developments, including roof-top structures, under the adjacent URA revitalisation project was about 27.9mPD to 29.23mPD, which was similar to the BH of the proposed development, which was 33.35mPD including the emergency generator room at the upper roof; and

#### BH of the Proposed Development

- (v) the Buildings Department (BD) had advised that if the cockloft formed part of the ground floor, it would be counted together with the ground floor as one storey. Detailed calculation of BH and gross floor area would be considered by BD during the building plan submission stage. Although 'Shop and Services' and 'Office' uses were always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building in the "R(A)" zone, the proposed development under application was considered as a whole on a scheme basis.

23. Members had no further question on the application.

## Deliberation Session

24. Members in general were concerned with the interface of the proposed development with the adjoining historic buildings. Some Members made the following main points:

### Design

- (a) given the colonnade design of the adjoining pre-war buildings with canopy proposed for the new buildings under the URA revitalisation project, the applicant could consider providing a cantilevered structure/canopy at the application site to better complement the URA revitalisation project and allow a continuous strip of covered pavement to provide shading for pedestrians;
- (b) whilst it would be ideal for the proposed development to be designed to blend in with the adjacent URA revitalisation project, the development intensity of the proposed development had respected the site context and the proposed development was considered acceptable;
- (c) the juxtaposition of old and new developments was considered acceptable, and the application could be supported; and

### BH

- (d) noting that the existing building at the site was already taller than the adjoining historic buildings under the URA revitalisation project, and that the maximum BH restriction of the “R(A)” zone was 80mPD, the BH of the proposed development was considered acceptable.”

25. The Chairman concluded that Members generally considered the proposed development acceptable in terms of its use and scale. As for the suggestion of providing a canopy projecting over the pavement of Shanghai Street to tie in with the design of the URA revitalisation project and provide shading for pedestrians, the applicant could take that into

account when formulating detailed design of the development.

26. 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 12.5.2021, 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 of a sewerage impact assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board (the Board);
- (b) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the SIA to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Board;
- (c) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Board; and
- (d) the submission of protective measures and/or non-destructive monitoring system, as appropriate, for the adjoining Grade 2 historic buildings at Nos. 600, 602, 604, 606, 612, 614, 620, 622, 624 and 626 Shanghai Street, and submission of monitoring records in the course of carrying out redevelopment works at the Site to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the Board.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 6**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K3/575 Proposed Flat, Shop and Services and Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction in "Residential (Group E)1" Zone and an area shown as 'Road', 25-29 Kok Cheung Street and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Kok Tsui, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K3/575)

---

28. The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) and WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff (Asia) Limited (WSP) 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 KTA; and

Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with WSP.

29. The Committee noted that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee also noted that the applicants had requested deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that as Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, he could stay in the meeting.

30. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 4.5.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months to allow more time for preparation of further information in response to departmental comments. It was the first time the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Mr M.S. Ng, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 7**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K5/780                      Proposed Shop and Services in "Other Specified Uses" annotated  
"Business(2)" Zone, Unit 1 and Unit 2 on Ground Floor, Clifford Centre,  
782 Cheung Sha Wan Road, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/780)

---

32.            The Secretary reported that Centaline Property Agency Limited (CPA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr K.K. Cheung had declared an interest on the item as his firm had current business dealings with CPA. The Committee agreed that as Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, he should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

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

33.            With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr M.S. Ng, STP/TWK, 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. Concerned government departments had no

objection or no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment from a Sham Shui Po District Councillor was received raising concern on the application. Major concerns 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 assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed use under application was considered generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone and was not incompatible with the other uses of the subject industrial-office building which mainly comprised offices, industrial-related offices and trading firms on the upper floors. The subject industrial-office building was subject to a maximum permissible limit of 460m<sup>2</sup> for aggregate commercial floor area on ground floor. However, as the entire ground floor would be converted to the proposed shop and services use and 1/F to 7/F remained as car parking floors to serve as the buffer floor purpose, the 460m<sup>2</sup> criterion would not apply to the current use. The proposed use complied with Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D in that it would not induce significant adverse fire safety, traffic, environmental and infrastructural impacts to the developments within the subject building and the adjacent area. Regarding the public comments, the planning assessments above were relevant.

34. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

35. The Committee noted that the validity period of the planning permission should follow the normal four years for commencement of the change of use.

36. 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 12.5.2021, 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 fire safety measures, including the provision of fire service installations and equipment in the subject Premises and means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion, 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 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.”

37. 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 M.S. Ng, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 8**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/489                      Proposed Office in "Industrial" Zone, Unit 7, 10/F, Wang Lung Industrial Building, 11 Lung Tak Street, Tsuen Wan  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/489)

---

38. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 26.4.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

[Mr Louis K.H. Kau, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK) and Miss Jessica K.T. Lee, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Hong Kong District**

#### **Agenda Item 9**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H15/31

(MPC Paper No.3/17)

---

40. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments were in the Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau area and involved, amongst others, the rezoning of a site arising from a section 12A application for development of public rental flats by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS). The following Members have declared interests on the item:

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being an ex-officio member of the Supervisory Board  
*as Director of Planning* of the HKHS;



- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with HKHS;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having past business dealings with HKHS;
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being an ex-employee of HKHS;
- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok - co-owning with spouse a flat in Ap Lei Chau; and
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - owning a flat in Tin Wan.

41. The Committee noted that Messrs Patrick H.T. Lau and 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. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, as the proposed public rental flats by HKHS in relation to the rezoning site was to take forward the decision of the Committee on an approved section 12A application, the interests of those Members in relation to HKHS would only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting. The Committee agreed to this arrangement. The Committee also agreed that as the property co-owned by Dr Wilton W.T. Fok and his spouse did not have a direct view of the amendment items, he should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

42. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Jessica Lee, STP/HK, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

#### Background

- (a) on 28.10.2016, the Committee agreed to a section 12A application (No. Y/H15/11) to rezone a piece of government land at the junction of Shek Pai Wan Road and Tin Wan Hill Road from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) for development of public rental flats by the HKHS for the purpose of rehousing tenants to be affected by the redevelopment of Yue

Kwong Chuen in phases. The proposed development comprised a 28-storey building with a building height (BH) of 100mPD and a gross floor area (GFA) of 27,414m<sup>2</sup>, providing 600 units. The existing Food and Environmental Hygiene Department's pest control office currently occupying a portion of the site would be reprovisioned within the future development (Amendment Item A);

Proposed Amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP)

- (b) Amendment Item A – rezoning a site at the junction of Shek Pai Wan Road and Tin Wan Hill Road (about 0.78ha) from “G/IC” and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “R(A)5”, subject to a maximum GFA of 27,414m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum BH of 100mPD;
- (c) Amendment Item B – rezoning a strip of land (about 0.08ha) to the immediate southwest of the site under Amendment Item A from an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Green Belt” to reflect its current condition; and
- (d) Amendment Item C – rezoning two pieces of land (about 0.16ha) adjoining the Aberdeen Wholesale Fish Market from “Open Space” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC”, subject to a maximum BH of 2 storeys, to reflect the as-built alignment of Aberdeen Praya Road and the existing boundary of the Aberdeen Wholesale Fish Market; and

Departmental Consultation

- (e) concerned government bureaux and departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed amendments.
43. Members had no question on the proposed amendments.
44. After deliberation, the Committee:
- (a) agreed to the proposed amendments to the approved Aberdeen & Ap Lei

Chau OZP and that the draft Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP No. S/H15/31A at Attachment II (to be renumbered to S/H15/32 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and

- (b) adopted the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings of the draft Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP No. S/H15/31A and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, and Miss Jessica K.T. Lee, STP/HK, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 10**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H6/82                      Proposed Access Road for Residential Development at 4-4C Tai Hang Road in "Green Belt" Zone and an area shown as 'Road', Inland Lot 7426 (Part) and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Hang Road, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H6/82)

---

45.            The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Causeway Bay. Townland Consultants Limited (Townland) and MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) 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 MVA and past business dealings with Townland;
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho	

- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with MVA;
- Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - self-occupying a flat in Tai Hang; and
- Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo - self-occupying a flat in Tai Hang Road.

46. The Committee noted that Messrs Patrick H.T. Lau and Thomas O.S. Ho and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee also noted that the applicant had requested deferment of the application and agreed that as Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, he could stay in the meeting. As the interest of Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo, the Secretary, was remote, the Committee also agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

47. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 26.4.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments raised by relevant government departments. It was the first time the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

**Agenda Item 11**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H7/172 Proposed Office, Shop and Services and Eating Place in "Residential (Group A)" Zone, 8 Leighton Road, Causeway Bay, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H7/172)

---

49. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Wong Nai Chung. Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) and MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - co-owning with spouse a flat in Happy Valley and being the Chairman of the Happy Valley Residents' Association; |
|                     | - having current business dealings with KTA and MVA;  |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho   | - having current business dealings with MVA;  |
| Mr Franklin Yu      | - having past business dealings with MVA;   |
| Mr K.K. Cheung      | - co-owning with spouse a flat in Happy Valley;   |
| Dr Wilton W.T. Fok  | - his parents owning a property in Blue Pool Road, Happy Valley;  |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - his spouse owning a flat at Caroline Hill Road, Causeway Bay; and   |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan | - his close relative owning property at The Beverly Hill.   |

50. The Committee noted that Messrs Patrick H.T. Lau, Thomas O.S. Ho and Dominic K.K. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee also noted that the applicant had requested deferment of the application and

agreed that if the properties respectively owned by Mr K.K. Cheung and his spouse, Dr Wilton W.T. Fok's parents and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan's relative had no direct view of the application site, they should be allowed to stay in the meeting. The Committee also agreed that as Mr Franklin Yu's interest was indirect, he should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

51. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 28.4.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months to allow time for the applicant to prepare responses to comments of various government departments. It was the first time the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

## **Kowloon District**

### **Agenda Item 12**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K18/320 Proposed Institutional Use (Educational Research Institute) in  
"Residential (Group C) 1" Zone, 15 Kent Road, Kowloon Tong,  
Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K18/320C)

---

**(Withdrawn)**

**Agenda Item 13**

**Any Other Business**

53.           There being no other business, the meeting closed at 10:40 a.m..