

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 587th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 25.8.2017**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Lincoln L. H. Huang

Vice-chairman

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. Wilson Y. W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Miss Sandy H. Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),  
Transport Department  
Mr Peter C.K. Mak

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

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

Assistant Director (R1), Lands Department  
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Professor T. S. Liu

**In Attendance**

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Kevin C.P. Ng

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Harris K.C. Liu

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 586<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 11.8.2017

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 586<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 11.8.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/H4/11                      Application for Amendment to the Approved Central District Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H4/16, To delete the word ‘tram’ in paragraph 7(a) of the covering Notes and paragraph 8.5 of the Explanatory Statement, The section of tramway along Des Voeux Road Central and Queensway from Jubilee Street to Arsenal Street, Hong Kong (MPC Paper No. Y/H4/11)

---

3.                      The Committee noted that the applicant had indicated that he would not attend the meeting. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr Louis K.H. Kau            -    District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK);  
and

Mr Jerry J. Austin            -    Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK).

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a)                      background of the application;
- (b)                      the proposed amendment to delete the word ‘tram’ in paragraph 7(a) of the covering Notes and paragraph 8.5 of the Explanatory Statement (ES);

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. The Secretary for Transport and Housing (STH) and the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) did not support the application. The Public Transport Strategy Study confirmed the hierarchy of roles and positioning of different public transport services. Tram provided frequent and affordable services for around 180,000 passengers every day and helped to alleviate crowdedness of other public transport. Dissecting the tramway would undermine the seamless service from Kennedy Town to Shau Kei Wan. Furthermore, the affected passengers might turn to other road-based transport if the tramway was removed, worsening the traffic congestion problem. Other concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
  
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a total of 6,122 public comments were received from Legislative Council members, Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) members, various concern groups and individuals. All received public comments, except one, raised objection to the application. The District Officer (Central & Western) conveyed that the previous application No. Y/H4/10, which was the same as the current application, was objected to by C&WDC members. Major objecting grounds were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
  
- (e) PlanD's Views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposal was more or less identical to the previous application No. Y/H4/10 which was rejected by the Committee on 23.10.2015. Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the covering Notes intended to provide flexibility in the provision, maintenance and repair of basic infrastructure (including tram stops and track), and paragraph 8.5 of ES was mainly a description of the existing tram services in the area. It was inappropriate to delete the word 'tram' from the covering Notes and the relevant paragraph from the ES. Both STH and C for T did not support the application. The

applicant had not submitted any impact assessment to substantiate the proposal and failed to demonstrate that the proposed amendment would not cause adverse impacts. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications.

5. As the applicant did not attend the meeting and there was no question from Members, the Chairman said that the hearing procedure had been completed and the Committee would deliberate the application. He thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, and Mr Jerry J. Austin, STP/HK, left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

6. A Member did not support the application but noted that the current application with the proposals of Tram Museum and rezoning of two tram depots at Sai Wan Ho and Whitty Street was not completely identical to the previous one. Another Member considered that the applicant should lobby the relevant departments and policy bureau for the proposal, instead of making repeated applications to the Board.

7. After deliberation, the Committee decided not to agree to the application for the following reasons :

- “(a) paragraphs 7 and 8 of the covering Notes set out different uses that are always permitted on land within the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) so as to provide flexibility for the provision of basic infrastructure, public utilities, transport-related facilities and the implementation of public works coordinated by the Government. It is considered inappropriate to delete the word ‘tram’ from paragraph 7(a) of the covering Notes;
- (b) it is considered inappropriate to delete paragraph 8.5 of the ES of the OZP which provides a description of the existing tram services in the planning scheme area;

- (c) the applicant fails to justify the proposed amendment to the OZP and to demonstrate that the proposal would not cause adverse impacts on the surrounding area; and
- (d) the approval of the application will set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for areas shown as 'Road' on the OZP."

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

#### **Agenda Item 4**

##### **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, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/489A)

---

8.            The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 15.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from the Environmental Protection Department. It was the second time the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

9.            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 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.

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TY/134                      Proposed Temporary Concrete Batching Plant for a Period of 5 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Boatyard and Marine-oriented Industrial Uses” Zone, Tsing Yi Town Lots 14 and 15 and Adjoining Government Land, Tam Kon Shan Road, Tsing Yi, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TY/134B)

---

10.            The Secretary reported that LLA Consultancy Limited (LLA) and BMT Asia Pacific Limited (BMT) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests in the item:

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

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho            - his firm having past business dealings with BMT and involving concrete business; and

Mr Peter C.K. Mak            - co-owning with spouse a flat in Tsing Yi.

11.            The Committee noted that the applicant had requested a deferral of consideration of the application. Since Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr Partrick H.T. Lau had no involvement in the application and the property of Mr Peter C.K. Mak did not have a direct view of the site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

12.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 14.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the departmental comments. It was the third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. The applicant had all along demonstrated efforts in submitting further information to address concerns of relevant department.

13. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Chairman said that as this was the third deferment, the applicant would be advised that no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances, should the request for deferral be acceded to.

14. 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 6**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/TY/135                      Proposed Temporary Asphalt Plant for a Period of 5 Years in "Industrial"  
Zone, Tsing Yi Town Lot 108 RP (Part), Sai Tso Wan Road, Tsing Yi,  
New Territories  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/TY/135)

---

15. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Hongkong United Dockyards Limited, which was a joint venture of CK Hutchison Holdings Limited (CKH) and Swire Pacific Limited (Swire). The following Members had declared interests in the item:

- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with CKH and past business dealings with Swire;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with Swire and his firm involving in concrete business;
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with Swire; and
- Mr Peter C.K. Mak - co-owning with spouse a flat in Tsing Yi.

16. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested a deferral of consideration of the application. The Committee agreed that Mr Partrict H.T. Lau and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion as their interests were direct. Since Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application and the property of Mr Peter C.K. Mak did not have a direct view of the site, the Committee also agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

17. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 10.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for reparation of further information to address the departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

18. 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, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Items 7 and 8**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/15  
(MPC Paper No.5/17)

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan  
No. S/H15/31  
(MPC Paper No.6/17)

---

19. The Committee noted that the two agenda items were related to the rezoning of five sites for public housing developments in close proximity and agreed that they could be considered together.

20. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments involved rezoning of five sites for public housing developments by the Housing Department (HD) which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee  
(the Chairman) (SPC) and the Building Committee of the HKHA;  
*as the Director of  
Planning*

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - being an alternate member for the Director of Home  
*as the Chief Engineer* Affairs who was a member of the SPC and Subsidised  
(Works) of Home Affairs Housing Committee of HKHA;  
*Department*

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with HKHA and  
owning a flat in Tin Wan;

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with HKHA;
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with HKHA;
- Mr Franklin Yu having past business dealings with HKHA;
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse working in HD, which was the executive arm of the HKHA, but had no involvement in planning work; and
- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok - co-owning with his spouse a flat in Ap Lei Chau and his company locating at Cyberport being covered by the Pok Fu Lam OZP.

21. Mr K.K. Cheng also declared an interest in the item as he had current business dealings with Ebenezer School and Home for the Visually Impaired, the subject of a previous rezoning application No. Y/H10/5 discussed in MPC Paper No. 5/17.

22. The Committee noted that Dr Wilton W.T. Fok had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and agreed that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau could stay in the meeting as his property did not have a direct view of the sites. Since application No. Y/H10/5 was not the proposed amendment item, the Committee agreed that Mr K.K. Cheng could stay in the meeting. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Board, as the proposed public housing developments by HD in relation to the rezoning sites were subjects of amendments to the Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs) proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of the Members in relation to HKHA would only need to be recorded and they should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

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

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

23. The following government representatives and consultants were invited to the meeting at this point:

- Mr Louis K.H. Kau - District Planner Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), PlanD;
- Mr Derek P.K. Tse - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), PlanD;
- Mr Theron K.K. Chan - Chief Planning Officer/2 (CPO/2), HD;
- Mr Antony K.C. Chung - Senior Architect/5, HD;
- Mr Joe B.M. Leung - Senior Civil Engineer/2 (SCE/2), HD;
- Mr Frankie H.K. Leung - Civil Engineer, HD;
- Mr S.C. Lo - Senior Landscape Architect/2, HD;
- Ms Bess C.Y. Cheng - Planning Officer/24, HD;
- Mr James W.C. Yip - Senior Engineer/Special Duties (Works), Civil Engineering and Development Department (SE/SD(Works), CEDD);
- Mr V.S. Chan - Engineer/SD(Works), CEDD;
- Ms C.Y. Ho - Senior Nature Conservation Officer (S), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD);
- Ms Chole C.U. Ng - Nature Conservation Officer (HK), AFCD;
- Mr Chan Siu Yuen - Project Manager, Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup);
- Dr Kin Lo - Associate Director, Arup;

- Mr Brad Fong - Senior Engineer, Arup;
- Ms Kristin Lai - Engineer, Arup; and
- Mr Geoff Carey - Director, AEC Limited.

24. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited Mr Derek P.K. Tse, STP/HK, to brief Members on the Papers. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Derek P.K. Tse, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Papers and covered the following main points:

Background

- (a) the 2014 Policy Address announced the partial lifting of the Pok Fu Lam Moratorium (PFLM) to facilitate the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate (WFER) and the public housing developments at the five sites which would serve as major reception resources for WFER and provide additional public housing units. WFER together with the proposed public housing developments would provide about 11,900 additional public housing units. In parallel, the Government was actively considering the South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)) proposed with a view to addressing the associated transport needs;
- (b) to better preserve and to minimise adverse impact on natural stream courses with high ecological value, the old Dairy Farm remains and existing hiking trails, the total development area had been reduced from 18ha to 13ha and the original boundary of Kai Lung Wan site had been revised. The Kai Lung Wan site was spilt into Kai Lung Wan (North) (KLW(N)) and Kai Lung Wan (South) (KLW(S)) sites;

Development Proposals

- (c) according to HD's conceptual plan for the proposed development, the proposed public housing developments would comprise 11 residential

blocks providing about 8,900 units (or equivalent to domestic gross floor area of 443,000m<sup>2</sup>). Stepped building height (BH) concept had been adopted with two height bands of 200mPD and 230mPD. Retail outlets, government institution and community (GIC) facilities and a public vehicle park would also be provided. The proposed public housing developments were expected to be completed in 2025 to 2027 by phases;

- (d) despite the reduction in total development area, the overall flat production was proposed to remain unchanged, resulting in an increase in the overall domestic plot ratio (PR) from about 6 to about 7;

#### Technical Considerations

- (e) various technical assessments on traffic, ecological, cultural heritage, air ventilation, visual and landscape aspects had been conducted, which concluded that there would be no insurmountable technical problem for the proposed public housing developments. HD and CEDD would review the technical assessment results and carry out detailed design and relevant detailed technical assessments at the detailed design stage;
- (f) the traffic impact assessment (TIA) had assessed the scenarios of with and without SIL(W) in place and its findings indicated that with the implementation of the proposed road improvement works at Pok Fu Lam Road/Victoria Road junction, traffic performance at key junctions and road links in the area would be acceptable. Besides, a new road was proposed to connect the KLW(N) site from Pok Fu Lam Road and a public vehicle park was planned within the KLW(N) site to re-provision the affected open-air vehicle parks and to meet the parking needs in the district. New pedestrian facilities and bus/mini-bus lay-bys would also be provided;
- (g) areas of high ecological value had been excluded from the development areas. Nevertheless, two fauna species and four floral species of conservation importance were identified within the development areas. Besides, natural stream courses of low to moderate ecological value and

secondary woodlands of moderate ecological value fell within development areas would be affected. Relevant mitigation measures were proposed to mitigate the potential ecological impact,;

- (h) according to the preliminary tree assessment, approximately 4,480 trees would be affected by the proposed developments. 2,060 trees would be retained, 59 trees would be transplanted and 2,364 trees would be felled. To mitigate the landscape impact, the preliminary tree compensation proposal stated that the felled trees would be compensated at a ratio of 1:1;
- (i) while no site of archaeological interest or declared monument were identified, one proposed Grade 3 historic structure fell within the proposed works area. CEDD would conduct heritage impact assessment subject to the final grading results;
- (j) the proposed developments were visually not incompatible with the surrounding existing developments. The proposed BH of KLW(N) site of 230mPD was similar to that of Chi Fu Fa Yuen. With the proposed BH of the remaining sites of 200mPD and 170mPD, a stepped BH profile could be maintained in the area. Regarding the potential air ventilation impact, six local air paths with minimum widths of 20m to 30m were reserved. HD would carry out a quantitative air ventilation assessment (AVA) at the detailed design stage. The stepped BH concept and the requirement of AVA had been stated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the Pok Fu Lam OZP;
- (k) provision of GIC facilities and open space generally met the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG);

Proposed Amendment Items

- (l) Wah Fu North site (Amendment Item A) and Wah King Street site (Amendment Item B) were proposed to be rezoned from “Open Space” (“O”) to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”), Wah Lok Path site

(Amendment Item C) from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “R(A)”, KLW(S) site (Amendment Item D) from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “R(A)”, and KLW(N) site (Amendment Item E) from “GB” to “R(A)1” with ‘Public Vehicle Park’ as always permitted use on the Pok Fu Lam OZP. Since part of the KLW(S) site fell within the planning scheme area of the Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP, it was proposed to excise that portion from the Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP for incorporation into the Pok Fu Lam OZP;

- (m) given that the proposed developments were subject to the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) as well as PFLM and a planning brief would be prepared setting out the planning parameters of the five sites, no PR, BH and site coverage (SC) restrictions were proposed in the Notes of “R(A)” zone. This was in line with other “R(A)” sites on the Pok Fu Lam OZP;

#### Public Consultation

- (n) on 31.7.2017, the District Development and Housing Committee (DDHC) of Southern District Council (SDC) had been consulted on the proposed public housing developments and the proposed amendments to the approved Pok Fu Lam OZP. DDHC passed a motion supporting the proposals and requesting the Government to address all different views of the affected residents and to commence the detailed planning works for SIL(W) immediately. Members of SDC also raised concerns on traffic and visual impacts arising from the proposed public housing developments and WFER as well as the details and programme of WFER; and

#### Rezoning Application No. Y/H10/5

- (o) the Committee rejected the rezoning application to rezone the site of Ebenezer School & Home for the Visually Impaired from “G/IC” to “R(C)7” but agreed to rezone the site to “Comprehensive Development Area” to ensure the continuous provision of services by the school. Since

then, the applicant had not made any progress nor confirmed any relocation plan. It was considered more appropriate to retain the site as “G/IC” zone as there was no imminent need for the proposed development. Should the details of the relocation plan be available in future, the applicant could submit a fresh rezoning application.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join the meeting and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

### Proposed Development Scheme

25. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) clarification on the total number of flats of the proposed public housing developments and WFER;
  - (b) the current number of flats in WFE and the net increase in number of flats upon WFER, and whether it was possible to further increase the flat production of WFER; and
  - (c) whether planning permissions would be required if the five sites were used for private residential developments and Wah Fu Estate was redeveloped into a private residential development.
26. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, and Mr Theron K.K. Chan, CPO/2, HD made the following responses:
- (a) according to the 2014 Policy Address, WFER together with the proposed public housing developments would provide an additional 11,900 public housing units, among which 8,900 new units from the five proposed public housing developments and 3,000 additional units from WFER;
  - (b) the current number of flats of WFE was 9,200. WFER would adopt PRs of 6 to 7 and the total number of flats would be increased by 3,000 units to

12,200 units in total. Apart from traffic constraint, WFER would also adopt the stepped BH concept and hence, room for further increase in flat production was limited; and

- (c) no planning permission would be required for private residential development in “R(A)” zone. Nevertheless, the purpose of partial uplifting PFLM was to release the five rezoning sites for public housing developments to facilitate WFER. Having considered that the traffic generation arising from public housing development would be less significant than those from private residential development and given the constraints of traffic infrastructure in Pok Fu Lam area, WFE would only be redeveloped for providing public housing.

#### GIC facilities and Open Space Provision

27. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) any social welfare facility for the elderly was planned within the proposed public housing developments;
- (b) the reasons for not reprovisioning the affected Wah Chui Street Sitting-out Area;
- (c) noting that the open space provision was sufficient to meet the requirements of HKPSG, whether such provision would be able to meet the updated standards of open space provision in future, and the current utilization of the open space in the area;
- (d) any sites would be reserved within WFER for reprovisioning of the rezoned “G/IC” and “O” sites;
- (e) noting that there were shortfalls of clinic/health centre and sport centre in Pok Fu Lam area, whether there was any need to reserve “G/IC” sites for free-standing GIC facilities; and

- (f) whether the residential blocks would be built on top of the proposed public vehicle park.

28. Mr Louis K.H. Kau and Mr Theron K.K. Chan made the following responses:

- (a) a GIC block with social welfare facilities for the elderly was planned within Wah Fu North site and KLW(N) site (i.e. Amendment Items A and E), but the types of GIC facilities to be provided were not yet firmed up at this stage. HD would liaise with relevant departments to identify suitable GIC facilities to meet the local needs;
- (b) the Leisure and Cultural Services Department had advised that no replacement site for the affected Sitting-out Area was required as local open space would be provided within the proposed public housing developments. The planned population of Southern District was about 305,000 and the total open space provision, including both local and district open space, was 81.65ha. According to HKPSG, the standard for provision of open space was a minimum 20ha per 100,000 persons. The current provision was sufficient to meet the requirements of HKPSG. Besides, the current open space provision per person of about 2.67m<sup>2</sup> was higher than the recommended ratio of 2.5m<sup>2</sup> per person under Hong Kong 2030+. There was no information on the current utilization of open space in the area;
- (c) according to HD's proposed development scheme, GIC facilities would be provided within the proposed public housing sites. Also, local open space would be provided based on the population of the proposed developments. As such, reprovisioning of the "G/IC" and "O" sites was not necessary;
- (d) with reference to the Attachment VII of the MPC Paper No. 5/17, while there were shortfall of one clinic/health centre and one sports centre in the Pok Fu Lam area, there were three existing clinic/health centres and six existing sports centres in Southern District. Hence, no additional "G/IC"

site was required for the provision of free-standing GIC facilities at this juncture; and

- (e) given the site configuration of KLW(N) site, a podium design would be adopted for accommodating GIC facilities and the proposed public vehicle park.

### Traffic and Accessibility Issues

29. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether WFER would be taken place in parallel with the proposed public housing developments and whether the TIA had taken into account the cumulative traffic impact of both developments;
- (b) what the reasons were for not taking into account the increased population and traffic generation of WFER;
- (c) since the KLW(S) site was isolated from the other four sites, whether the future residents of KLW(S) site would be served by the proposed Wah Fu Station or Tin Wan Station of the proposed the SIL(W) line; and
- (d) whether there were any pedestrian connection between the KLW(S) site and Tin Wan or Wah Kwai Estate.

30. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, Mr Theron K.K. Chan, Mr James W.C. Yip, SE/SD(Works), CEDD, and Mr Joe B.M. Leung, SCE/2, HD made the following responses:

- (a) since the proposed public housing developments would serve as the major reception resources for WFER, the study of WFER would commence once the proposed public housing developments were confirmed. Significant increase in population and traffic flow arising from the proposed developments was not expected. The TIA conducted did not cover the

traffic impact arising from WFER as its implementation details were not available at this stage and HD wished to conduct the TIA when planning parameters were more firm at later stage. Furthermore, the implementation of SIL(W) and other transportation infrastructures such as SIL(E) and Central-Wan Chai bypass would have significant implications on the traffic condition of Pok Fu Lam area. Therefore, a separate TIA would be conducted by HD to assess the overall traffic impact of the area taking into account the WFER and SIL(W) when implementation details of both were available;

- (b) various pedestrian linkages, including footbridge and at-grade crossing, were planned to integrate the five proposed public housing development with the WFE to form a larger neighborhood. It was expected that future residents of the proposed developments, including the KLW(S) site, would be served by the proposed Wah Fu Station through the above pedestrian linkage; and
- (c) the KLW(S) site was far away from Tin Wan and separated from Wah Kwai Estate by steep slopes. However, a footbridge across Shek Pai Wan Road next to the site and pedestrian improvement works along Shek Pai Wan Road south bound linking to the KLW(N) site with a lift tower were proposed to enhance the connectivity of KLW(S) site.

#### Rezoning of the “GB” sites and Ecological and Landscape Impacts

31. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that the KLW(S) site forming part of a large “GB” zone located to the northeast of Shek Pai Wan Road and a green channel was proposed within the site, whether the site was of high ecological value and whether the proposed rezoning of the site would affect the integrity of the “GB” zone;
- (b) how the boundaries of KLW(N) and KLW(S) sites were delineated and

whether an assessment had been conducted to assess the ecological value of the entire “GB” zone or only focus on the rezoning sites;

- (c) how the ecological value of the affected natural stream course could be compensated;
- (d) the reasons for not rezoning the “GB” area located in-between KLW(N) and KLW(S) sites for residential use in view of the keen demand of housing land supply; and
- (e) noting that 2,364 trees would be felled and only about 260 trees would be re-planted within the five development sites and surrounding areas, what the mitigation measures were to compensate the remaining number of trees to be felled.

32. Mr Louis K.H. Kau and Mr James W.C. Yip made the following responses

- (a) with reference to Drawing 11 of MPC Paper No. 5/17, the proposed green channel within KLW(S) site was to compensate a 214m long natural stream course of moderate ecological value located within the KLW(N) site. It would also provide a potential habitat for translocating affected fauna species of conservation importance. Regarding the ecological value of KLW(S) site, while the site was covered with vegetation, there were man-made slopes and retaining wall structures near Shek Pai Wan Road and the vegetation cover was mainly composed of shrubland of lower ecological value;
- (b) PlanD had carried out two rounds of “GB” review to identify suitable “GB” sites for residential development. The Stage 2 GB review covered “GB” sites located in the fringe of built-up areas close to the existing developed areas or public road, and the original Kai Lung Wan Site was identified with potential for housing development. Subsequently, a feasibility study had been conducted to evaluate the ecological value of these potential housing sites, which revealed that there were a natural stream course and

woodland area with species of conservation value within the site. The Kai Lung Wan site was therefore divided into KLW(N) and KLW(S) sites and their boundaries were delineated to avoid woodland of high ecological value and areas of conservation importance;

- (c) in view of the steep slope to the south of the KLW(S) site and hydrological consideration, the proposed green channel would run through the site from east to north so as to create a suitable habitat and to maintain a shallower gradient of the green channel following the contour. The proposed green channel would adopt natural bedding and would be longer than the natural stream course in the KLW(N) site to be compensated. Extending the boundary of the KLW(S) site southwards would require a large scale of slope-cutting which would generate more construction waste;
- (d) according to the preliminary tree compensation proposal, the trees felled would be compensated at a ratio of 1:1 in quantity and new tree planting would be within the five sites and in roadside areas, as well as woodland planting at surrounding slope areas. As estimated by HD, about 260 trees could be planted within the five development sites and in roadside amenity areas; and compensatory woodland planting of about 6.5ha would be carried out in the vicinity of the sites at a compensation ratio of 1:1.

#### Development Restrictions in the Notes for “R(A)” zone

33. The Vice-chairman enquired the reasons for not imposing PR, BH and SC restrictions for the “R(A)” on the OZP and whether such practice was common in other OZPs or to allow flexibility for the proposed public housing developments. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that in the Notes of the Pok Fu Lam OZP, there were PR and SC restrictions for “R(B)” and “R(C)” zones, but not for “R(A)” zone. Generally speaking, no PR and SC restrictions were imposed within “R(A)” zone on the OZPs on Hong Kong Island, and the development intensity of this type of high-density residential developments was generally subject to the provisions of the B(P)R. As for public housing developments, they would also be subject to control of the relevant planning brief.

34. The Vice-chairman had reservation on rezoning “GB” sites for residential use, in particular the KLW(S) site which was relatively isolated from the other four sites as well as Wah Fu and Wa Kwai Estates. The Vice-chairman considered the site should be retained as “GB” zone to protect the proposed green channel and to provide a less disturbed environment.

35. A Member was of the view that the KLW(S) site was important for facilitating WFER as it would contribute to provide public housing units for rehousing the affected residents of WFE. Besides, the connectivity issue of the site was not insurmountable. Although there was no detailed design on the proposed green channel, it was not uncommon to find some natural streams in close proximity to residential developments in other areas. Another Member echoed the importance of rehousing affected residents within the same district and considered that the isolated location of KLW(S) site could be addressed by appropriate public transportation provision in future.

36. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Theron K.K. Chan supplemented that the KLW(S) site would provide about 1,320 units. Besides, pedestrian improvement works were proposed to strengthen the connectivity of the sites including the connectivity between the KLW(S) and KLW(N) sites which would serve as a key transportation hub with retail and welfare facilities for the developments. The distance between the KLW(N) and KLW(S) sites was about 150m.

37. A Member considered that the rezoning proposals could be exhibited for public inspection to gauge public view. The Board would consider the public view and ensure that the rezoning of the “GB” and “O” sites for residential use was fully justified before making a final decision. If local rehousing was an important consideration, the Member suggested that consideration could be given to redeveloping WFE in phases.

38. The Chairman concluded that Members generally agreed that all amendment items were suitable for exhibition. The Board would consider the representation(s) and comment(s) received and ensure that the rezoning proposals were fully justified, especially from traffic and ecological aspects.

39. The Vice-chairman enquired if opportunities should be taken to impose

development restrictions for “R(A)” zone on the Pok Fu Lam OZP. The Chairman explained that generally speaking, for “R(A)” zones on Hong Kong Island, the development parameters of residential development would be subject to the provisions of the B(P)R. The development parameters of the proposed public housing developments would be specified in the relevant paragraphs of the ES. A planning brief would also be prepared to set out the detailed planning requirements of the sites.

40. Noting that development restrictions were specified in the Notes of other residential zones on the Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP, a Member suggested that the development restrictions for the “R(A)” zone should be incorporated into the Notes in due course as development in the Pok Fu Lam area had been frozen for a long while. Another Member considered and the Vice-chairman agreed that it was not appropriate to impose the development restrictions at this juncture without detailed study and the imposition of development restrictions for the “R(A)” zone should be subject to a comprehensive review and the practice adopted in other OZPs in the metro area.

41. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Pok Fu Lam OZP and that the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/15A at Attachment II of MPC Paper No. 5/17 (to be renumbered to S/H10/16 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of MPC Paper No. 5/17 were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance;
- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment IV of MPC Paper No. 5/17 for the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/15A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP;
- (c) agree to the proposed amendment to the approved Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP and that the draft Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP No. S/H15/31B at Attachment II of MPC Paper No. 6/17 (to be renumbered to S/H15/32 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of MPC Paper No. 6/17 were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and

- (d) adopt the revised ES at Attachment IV of MPC Paper No. 6/17 for the draft Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP No. S/H15/31B as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP.

[The Chairman thanked the government representatives and consultants for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 9**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H18/81                      Proposed House (Private Garden and Recreation Use Ancillary to Existing House at RBL 787) in "Green Belt" Zone, Government Land near Rural Building Lot 787, Big Wave Bay Road, Shek O, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H18/81)

---

[Withdrawn]

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

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 10**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K13/306 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Fast Food Shop) for a Period of 5 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Unit 4A, G/F, Wing Fat Industrial Building, 12 Wang Tai Road, Kowloon Bay, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K13/306)

---

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

42. 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 temporary shop and services (fast food shop) for a period of five years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) 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 on a temporary basis for a period of five years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated ‘Business’ zone and not incompatible with the surrounding areas. The application complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D in that the applied use would not induce adverse fire safety, traffic, environmental and infrastructural impacts to the developments within the same industrial building and the adjacent areas, and concerned departments had no objection to or adverse comment on the application. To address the comments of the Director of Fire Services, relevant approval condition was recommended.

43. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

44. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 25.8.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the submission and implementation of the proposal for fire safety measures, including the provision of fire service installations in the application premises within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 25.2.2018; and
- (b) if the above planning condition (a) 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.

45. 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. Mr Sunny L.K. Ho and she left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Items 11 and 12**

### **Section 16 Applications**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/747 Proposed Shop and Services (Bank/Fast Food Shop/Electrical Shop/Local Provisions Store) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Factory Unit B, G/F, Tung Lee Industrial Building, 9 Lai Yip Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon

A/K14/748 Proposed Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Factory Unit A, G/F, Tung Lee Industrial Building, 9 Lai Yip Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/747 & 748)

---

46. The Committee noted that the two applications were similar in nature and the premises under applications were located within the same building and within the same “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone. The Committee agreed that they could be considered together.

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

47. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the applications;
- (b) the proposed shop and services (bank/fast food shop/electrical shop/local provision store) at premises under application No. A/K14/747 and the proposed shop and services at premises under application No. A/K14/748;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the applications;

- (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 applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied uses were generally in line with the planning intention of the “OU(B)” zone and compatible with the changing land use character of the area. The applications complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D in that the applied uses would not induce adverse fire safety and environmental impacts on the developments within the subject building and the adjacent areas, and concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the applications. Relevant approval conditions were recommended to address the concern of the Director of Fire Services.

48. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed ‘Shop and Services’ use could be allowed under the lease; and
- (b) whether using the premises as a show flat could be considered as ‘Shop and Services’ use and any government departments would be involved in monitoring the change in internal layout of the premises for show flat use.

49. Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan made the following responses:

- (a) since the condition of sale of the subject lot was for the purpose of industrial and/or godown (excluding offensive trades) use only, the applicant should apply to the Lands Department for a lease modification or temporary waiver for the proposed ‘Shop and Services’ use at the premises, upon obtaining planning permission;
- (b) the premises under application No. A/K14/748 was currently occupied by a showroom for show flat. According to the Definition of Terms,

'Showroom' was a use subsumed under 'Shop and Services' use. If change in internal layout or structures was involved for the show flat use, approval by the Building Authority might be required.

### Deliberation Session

50. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications, on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission for application No. A/K14/747 should be valid until 25.8.2021, 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 for application No. A/K14/748 had no time clause as the applied use under application was already in existence. The permissions were subject to the following conditions :

#### A/K14/747

- (a) the submission and implementation of the proposal for fire safety measures, including the provision of fire service installations and equipment at the application premises and means of escape separated from the industrial portion of 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 (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.

#### A/K14/748

- (a) the submission and implementation of the proposal for fire safety measures, including the provision of fire service installations and equipment at the application premises and means of escape separated from the industrial portion of the subject industrial building within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 25.2.2018; and

- (b) if the above planning condition (a) 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.

51. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant of applications No. A/K14/747 and A/K14/748 to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendices III and IV of the Paper respectively.

[The Chairman thanked Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 13**

Any Other Business

52. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 11:10 a.m.