

**TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**Minutes of 583<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 23.6.2017**

**Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

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 (Strategic Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr C.F. Wong

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

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apology**

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

**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  
Miss Karmin Tong

**Agenda Item 1**

**Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 582<sup>nd</sup> MPC Meeting held on 9.6.2017**

[Open Meeting]

1. The Secretary reported that proposed amendment to the first sentence of paragraph 48 of the draft minutes of the 582<sup>nd</sup> MPC meeting held on 9.6.2017 was received, which was set out below:

“ 48. Mr Peter C.K. Mak, Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, TD, said that TD supported the full utilisation of car parks and had requested HD to investigate the feasibility of flexible use of surplus private car parking spaces for nanny vans on a short term basis. ”

2. The Secretary also reported that editorial errors were found on pages 21 and 26 and the relevant parts of the minutes were proposed to be amended to reflect that Mr Martin W.C. Kwan had left the meeting before the presentation and question sessions of Agenda Item 8.

3. The Committee agreed that the minutes of the 582<sup>nd</sup> MPC meeting held on 9.6.2017 were confirmed subject to the incorporation of the above amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

**Matters Arising**

[Open Meeting]

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

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/K20/127                      Proposed ‘Flat’, ‘Office’, ‘Social Welfare Facilities (Special Child Care Centre cum Early Education and Training Centre)’, ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’ in “Residential (Group A) 3” Zone, 875-877 Lai Chi Kok Road and Adjoining Government Land, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K20/127B)

---

5.                      The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Patrick H.T. Lau had declared an interest on the item as he had current business dealings with KTA. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of the 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.

6.                      The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 6.6.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information on 19.4.2017, 25.4.2017 and 27.4.2017 in response to departmental comments received.

7.                      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 shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information. Since it was the third deferment and a total of six months had been allowed for

preparation of the submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Agenda Item 4**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/446                      Temporary “Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle)” for a Period of 5 Years (Surplus Monthly Vehicle Parking Spaces Only) in “Government, Institution or Community (2)” and “Residential (Group B) 7” Zones, Kwai Chung Town Lot 373, Tsui Yiu Court, 1 Lai Chi Ling Road, Kwai Chung  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/446)

---

8.                      The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), with the Housing Department (HD) as its executive arm. 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 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 SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA; |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau  | } | having current business dealings with HKHA;  |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho  |   |  |
| Mr K.K. Cheung   | - | his firm having current business dealings with HKHA;   |

- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HKHA; and
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work.

9. The Committee noted that the applicant has requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the interests of Messrs Martin W.C. Kwan, Patrick H.T. Lau and Thomas O.S. Ho were direct, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. As the interests of Mr Franklin Yu and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon were indirect and Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. The Committee also noted that the interest of Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, the Chairman, was direct, but the Vice-chairman, Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang, had tendered apology 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, then as a matter of necessity, Mr Lee should continue to assume the chairmanship but a conscious effort should be made to contain his scope of involvement in an administrative role to minimise any risk that he might be challenged. The Committee agreed to the arrangement.

10. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 14.6.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

11. 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.



preparation of further information to address departmental and public comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

15. 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.

[Miss Jessica K.T. Lee, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 6**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H18/79                      Proposed 'Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre' (Extension of Academic Building) and Proposed Excavation of Land for Site A and Proposed Residential Institution (Extension of Residential Block) for Site F in "Site of Special Scientific Interest" and "Green Belt" Zones, The Swire Institute of Marine Science, Faculty of Science, The University of Hong Kong, Cape D'Aguiar Road, Shek O, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H18/79)

---

16. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the University of Hong Kong (HKU). Percy Thomas Partnership (HK) Limited (Percy Thomas) and Geotechnics & Concrete Engineering (H.K.) Limited (GCE) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members have declared interests on the item :

- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok - being a staff of HKU;
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with HKU;
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with Percy Thomas;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with GCE; and
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being the Chairman of the Accounting Advisory Board of School of Business, HKU.

17. The Committee noted that Dr Wilton W.T. Fok had not yet arrived to join the meeting and agreed that Messrs K.K. Cheung, Patrick H.T. Lau, Thomas O.S. Ho and Wilson Y.W. Fung could stay in the meeting as they had no involvement in the application.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Jessica K.T. Lee, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed 'Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre' (extension of academic block) and proposed excavation of land and proposed 'Residential Institution' (extension of residential block);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. The Director of Environmental Protection had no objection to the application and Environmental Permit for the proposed works under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance was issued

on 12.6.2017. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, five objecting public comments were received from local residents and the general public. Major objection grounds 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 assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed expansion of the existing academic and related residential facilities was to cater for the current and growing research and educational needs of the Swire Institute of Marine Science (SWIMS). The proposed extension of academic block at Site A, which was for educational and research purposes to support the conservation of the features in Hok Tsui Site of Special and Scientific Interest (SSSI), was considered generally in line with the planning intention of the “SSSI” zone. The associated excavation works was necessary to facilitate construction of the proposed development and its related utilities installation. The proposed extension of residential block at Site F was essential and ancillary to the operation of SWIMS and complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10. The scale and intensity of the proposed extensions were considered not incompatible with the predominantly natural environment of the area and would unlikely cause significant adverse traffic, environmental, sewerage, drainage, geotechnical, ecological, visual and landscape impacts on the surrounding area. The Secretary for Education and the University Grant Committee had given policy support to the proposed extensions and concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

19. A Member raised the following questions :

- (a) the rationale for allowing developments for educational or research

purposes in the “SSSI” zone;

- (b) elaboration on the waste disposal and sewage treatment arrangement for the proposed development;
- (c) whether the area in proximity to an existing radio communication station was suitable for habitation; and
- (d) whether there were similar planning applications for such scale of development within the “SSSI” zone in other areas of Hong Kong.

20. Miss Jessica K.T. Lee, STP/HK, made the following responses:

- (a) the planning intention of “SSSI” zone was to conserve and protect the features of special scientific interest. Whilst there was a general presumption against development in the “SSSI” zone, developments that were needed to support the conservation of the features of special scientific interest, to maintain and protect the existing character of SSSI, or for educational and research purposes, might be permitted. The subject research facility, which was for promoting local marine life research, education and conservation, had already been established when the Cape D’Aguilar area was designated as Hok Tsui SSSI in 1990. The south-eastern portion of the area was subsequently rezoned to “SSSI” on the OZP in 2000. The proposed extension of the research centre was generally in line with the planning intention of the zone;
- (b) the sewage from the existing academic block at Site A and the residential blocks at Sites B and F were discharged to and treated at the existing sewage treatment facility at Site A. A new sewage holding tank would be provided at Site F upon the proposed extension to collect the sewage generated from the residential blocks. The sewage would be tankered away to an off-site sewage treatment facility by registered tanker company fortnightly. The volume of treated effluent discharged from the existing

on-site treatment facility into inshore waters was expected to be reduced;

- (c) there were existing residential facilities at Sites B and F and the current proposal involved extension of the residential block at Site F accommodating three additional units. It was expected that the existing radio communication station would have minimal impact on these accommodations. The Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services had no adverse comment on the application; and
- (d) whilst there was no information in hand on planning applications involving the “SSSI” zone in other parts of Hong Kong, there was no similar application pertaining to the subject “SSSI” zone on the OZP.

21. Another Member raised the following questions :

- (a) details on the visitor centre and museum within the proposed development;
- (b) the need for the SWIMS to be sited at this unique location in terms of its operation and nature of research;
- (c) elaboration on the existing and proposed residential facilities at the site;
- (d) impact of the proposed development on the Cape D’Aguilar Lighthouse which was a declared monument; and
- (e) the reason for not implementing the previously approved application (No. A/H18/38).

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

22. Miss Jessica K.T. Lee made the following responses :

- (a) the proposed extension of the academic block at Site A was regarded as ‘field study/education/visitor centre’ use under the Definition of Terms used in Statutory Plans and within the subject “SSSI” zone, planning permission from the Town Planning Board was required for such use. The museum space within the development had already been converted to laboratory and research stations;
- (b) SWIMS had played a major role in the research and conservation of marine lives in the Cape D’Aguilar Marine Reserve as well as the whole territory. Researchers would collect sea water and marine samples from the waters within the Marine Reserve and other locations such as Sai Kung. There was a slipway along the shoreline for mooring of boats;
- (c) the existing residential blocks at Sites B and F comprised twelve and eight bedrooms respectively. The size of the bedrooms in Site F was relatively small and could accommodate only a bed and a desk. These residential facilities were considered essential for accommodating local and overseas researchers/staff who were required to station in SWIMS for a certain period of time to conduct researches;
- (d) the Cape D’Aguilar Lighthouse was located about 115m and 90m away from Sites A and F respectively. The applicant had undertaken to use hand-held tools as far as practicable for any excavation and trenching works near the Cape D’Aguilar Lighthouse. An approval condition requiring the submission and implementation of precautionary, protective and monitoring measures to the Cape D’Aguilar Lighthouse to the satisfaction of the Antiquities and Monuments Office of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department was recommended;
- (e) the previously approved application (No. A/H18/38), involving a gross floor area (GFA) of about 970m<sup>2</sup>, was not implemented due to funding

problem. The current scheme, with a GFA of about 280m<sup>2</sup>, was of a comparatively smaller scale and funding support from the University Grants Committee had been obtained for the proposed extension.

### Deliberation Session

23. Members generally supported the application taking into consideration that the proposed extension was mainly for educational and research purposes in support of marine reserve and protection which was generally in line with the planning intention of the “SSSI” zone and relevant government departments had no adverse comment on the application.

24. A Member considered that the provision of on-site accommodation for researchers and staff in support of the research facility was reasonably justified given the remote location of the area and the nature of research work which was usually conducted over a long time span. Another Member opined that the proposed extension of the residential block should adopt a flexible and adaptive internal layout design so as to minimise the need for subsequent alteration and the choice of building materials for the proposed development should be compatible with the surrounding areas.

25. Two Members, whilst indicating support for the application, were of the view that given the sensitive location of the site within the “SSSI” zone, impacts arising from the proposed development on the surrounding areas should be minimised as far as possible. There was a need to strike a sensible balance between conservation and development for educational and research purposes within the “SSSI” zone which should be beneficial to the public at large. They considered that a consistent approach in assessing applications for educational or research-related uses in “SSSI” zone should be adopted.

26. The Chairman recapitulated that there was a general presumption against development in the “SSSI” zone, except for developments that were needed to support the conservation of SSSI or for educational and research purposes, which might be permitted upon application. In general, the scale and form of these developments would have to take into account various factors such as location of the SSSI and the prevailing circumstances. The Chairman remarked that, in addition to undertaking research, SWIMS was also involved

in promoting public education on marine conservation and biodiversity issues according to the information submitted by the applicant. In this regard, Members noted that, with reference to Appendix Ia of the Paper, SWIMS had received a number of group visits per year from schools and community groups since 2005, but some requests for visits had to be turned down due to limited space within the facility.

27. 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 23.6.2021, 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 a landscape and tree preservation proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of the precautionary, protective and monitoring measures to the Cape D’Aguilar Lighthouse, the declared monument, to the satisfaction of the Antiquities and Monuments Office, Leisure and Cultural Services Department or of the TPB.”

28. 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 Miss Jessica K.T. Lee, STP/HK, for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 7**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H19/74                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Hotel Development within “Commercial (1)” Zone and Proposed ‘Hotel’ Use within an area shown as ‘Pedestrian Precinct/Street’, 7 Stanley Market Road and 78 and 79 Stanley Main Street, Stanley (Stanley Inland Lot 124, Stanley Lots 427 and 428), Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H19/74B)

---

29.                      The Secretary reported that Barrie Ho Architecture Interiors Limited (BHA) and Landes Limited (Landes) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item :

Mr K.K. Cheung                      -    his firm having current business dealings with BHA; and

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

30.                      The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that Messr K.K. Cheung and Patrick H.T. Lau could stay in the meeting as they had no involvement in the application.

31.                      The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 12.6.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for the applicant to address departmental comments on tree protection measures, pedestrian circulation and building design. It was the third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant’s representative had submitted further information on 24.4.2017 which included responses to comments of concerned government departments and the public and a revised sewerage impact assessment.

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

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

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 8**

##### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K13/305                      Proposed Shop and Services in "Other Specified Uses" annotated  
"Business" Zone, Unit 3A, G/F, Yuen Fat Industrial Building, 25 Wang  
Chiu Road, Kowloon Bay, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K13/305)

---

33. RHL Surveyors Limited (RHL) was the consultant of the applicant. Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had declared interests on the item as they personally knew the Managing Director of RHL. As Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had no discussion on or no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

34. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Sandy S.K. Ng, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed shop and services;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed use was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone and was not incompatible with the surrounding areas. Four planning applications for ‘Shop and Services’ use on the G/F of the subject building had been approved including two at the subject premises which had been revoked due to non-compliance with approval condition related to fire service installations and two at other units, of which one was still valid. The aggregate commercial floor area on the G/F, including the application premises if approved, would amount to 36.5m<sup>2</sup>, which was still within the permissible limit of 460m<sup>2</sup>. The application complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D in that it would not induce adverse fire safety, traffic, environmental and infrastructural impacts to the developments within the subject building and the adjacent areas.

35. In response to a Member's enquiry on the types of fire services installations required in the previous approvals, Ms Sandy S.K. Ng, STP/K, explained that although the subject building had already been equipped with a sprinkler system, the applicant was required to provide additional fire services installations at the premises, such as fire hose reels and exit signs, etc., as required by the Director of Fire Services under the previous approvals.

#### Deliberation Session

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 23.6.2019, 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 a proposal for fire safety measures, including the provision of fire service installations and equipment at the application premises and means of escape completely separated from the industrial portion in the subject industrial building before operation of the use to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (b) if the above planning condition 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.”

37. 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 Sandy S.K. Ng, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 9**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K22/19                      Proposed Public Utility Installation (Aboveground Gas Governor Kiosk) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Amenity Area” Zone, Government Land near Shing Kai Road outside Tak Long Estate, Kai Tak Development, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K22/19)

---

38.            The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited (HKCGC), which was a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD). The following Members had declared interests on the item :

- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau                      - having current business dealings with HLD;
  
- Mr K.K. Cheung                              - his firm having current business dealings with HKCGC;
  
- Mr Franklin Yu                                - having past business dealings with HLD;
  
- 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 before; and
  
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung                      - being a Director of the Hong Kong Business Accountants Association which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before.

39.            As the interest of Mr Patrick H.T. Lau was direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for this item. As the interests of Dr Wilton W.T. Fok and Messrs Franklin Yu and Wilson Y.W. Fung were indirect 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 at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

40. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, 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 public utility installation (aboveground gas governor kiosk);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed aboveground gas governor kiosk was an essential utility which was to regulate the gas supply pressure from medium pressure to low pressure to serve the commercial and residential developments at North Apron area of Kai Tak Development and cater for the increasing gas demand of the area. The proposed kiosk was small in scale and would not have significant impacts on the environmental, traffic, visual and landscape, gas and electricity safety, fire safety, drainage and water supplies aspects. In respect of site selection, the applicant had considered a number of factors including avoidance of obstruction to pedestrian and traffic flow, maintaining safety distance to buildings and structures, and the future operation/maintenance of the kiosk, etc. Concerned government

departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

41. Members had no question on the application.

### Deliberation Session

42. A Member, though not objecting to the application, opined that an aesthetically pleasing design should be adopted for the proposed kiosk so as to improve the visual amenity of the area and compatibility with the surrounding environment.

43. 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 23.6.2021, 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.

44. 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 Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/K, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 10**

#### Any Other Business

45. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 10:05 a.m..