

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 591st Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 27.10.2017

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Dr 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

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

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr. 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 Apologies

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr Franklin Yu

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms W.H. Ho

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

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 590th MPC Meeting held on 13.10.2017

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 590th MPC meeting held on 13.10.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K20/128 Proposed Comprehensive Development for Residential (Flat), Commercial Uses (Eating Place, Shop and Services, Off-course Betting Centre and Market) and School (Kindergarten, Nursery, Language, Computer, Commercial and Tutorial Schools, Art Schools, Ballet and Other Types of Schools Providing Interest/Hobby Related Courses) with Minor Relaxation of Domestic Plot Ratio Restriction in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, The “Comprehensive Development Area” Site bounded by Lai Hong Street, Fat Tseung Street, Sham Mong Road and West Kowloon Corridor and a small strip of land on Lai Hong Street
(MPC Paper No. A/K20/128A)

3. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Wolver Hollow Company Limited, which was a joint-venture of Kerry Properties (H.K.) Limited (KPL) and Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK). Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD), Ronald Lu & Partners (RL&P) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - having current business dealings with SHK and RL&P; |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - having current business dealings with SHK, LD, RL&P and Arup; |
| Mr K.K. Cheung | - his firm having current business dealings with KPL, SHK and Arup; |

- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with SHK and Arup; and his spouse being an employee of SHK;
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an ex-employee of KPL;
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a Director of the Hong Kong Business Accountants Association which had obtained sponsorship from SHK before;
- Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being a member of the Council of the Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU) and RL&P was working for HKBU; and
- Mr C.F. Wong - co-owning with spouse a flat in Tai Kok Tsui area.

4. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested for deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Franklin Yu had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr Patrick H.T Lau were direct, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. Since the interests of Mr K.K. Cheung, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong were not direct and the property of Mr C.F. Wong did not have a direct view on the site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

5. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 9.10.2017 for deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for the preparation of further information to address the comments received from government departments. It was the second time that the applicant requested for deferment of the application.

6. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application

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

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

[Ms Esther M.Y. Tang, 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/K5/789 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Public Housing Development (including Flat, Government Use (Housing Department's Office and Data Centre), Social Welfare Facility, Shop and Services, Eating Place and School (Kindergarten) within the Lowest Three Floors of the Public Housing Blocks) in "Residential (Group A)" Zone, North West Kowloon Reclamation Site 1 (East), Junction of Tung Chau Street and Tonkin Street, Cheung Sha Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/789)

7. 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 (the Chairman) <i>as Director of Planning</i> | - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and the Building Committee of HKHA; |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan <i>as Chief Engineer (Works), 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 | - 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; and |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work. |

8. The Committee noted that Mr Franklin Yu had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had already left the meeting temporarily. As the interests of the Chairman, Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho were direct, the Committee agreed that they should leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting. The Vice-chairman took over the chairmanship at this point.

[The Chairman, Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Esther M.Y. Tang, 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 building height restriction (BHR) for permitted public housing development (including flat, Government use (HD's office and data centre), social welfare facility, shop and services, eating place and school (kindergarten) within the lowest three floors of the public housing blocks);
- (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) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a total of five public comments were received with two individuals objecting to the application. The remaining three including two Sham Shui Po District Council Members and one individual provided comments on the application. Major views and 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 public housing development was in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group A)” zone. The proposed scheme, with minor relaxation in BHR from 100mPD to 126mPD, would bring about an increase in the public housing flat supply by 189 units, which was in line with the Government's prevailing policy to increase and expedite housing supply. The proposed scheme would provide an additional building gap of 15m between Block 1 and Block 2 near Lai Chi Kok Road, in addition to the one between Block 2 and Block 3 under the baseline scheme. It would

enhance the visual permeability of the public housing development and enable the development to attain a slightly better air ventilation performance at the site boundary than the baseline scheme under annual wind condition. The proposed increase in building height (BH) was considered not incompatible with the high-rise residential developments in the vicinity. The proposed scheme would not result in unacceptable visual impact nor insurmountable problem on traffic, sewerage and environmental aspects. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments in the Paper and planning assessments above were relevant.

10. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) noting that the BHR of 100mPD for the site was lower than the BH of some of the surrounding developments, in particular the developments to the southwest of the site, the rationale of the BHR for the site and the surrounding area;
 - (b) noting the differences in BHR between the Cheung Sha Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and the South West Kowloon OZP, whether consideration had been given to the overall BH profile of the two OZPs when stipulating the BHR for the sites in the South West Kowloon OZP;
 - (c) the number of flats on each floor and the average flat size for the proposed public housing development;
 - (d) the feasibility of the possible future footbridge connection between the site and the West Kowloon Law Courts Building and/or the Joint-user Government Office Building across Tung Chau Street and/or Tonkin Street given that the West Kowloon Corridor was right above Tung Chau Street;
 - (e) the reason for the provision of HD's office and data centre within the site and whether consideration had been given to reserving space for the provision of community facilities;

- (f) the planning merits of the application;
- (g) whether there was an optimum height for a residential building block and whether the efficiency of the residential development would be affected by an increase in BH; and
- (h) given that approval condition (b) on fire services installations and water supplies for firefighting should be complied with to the satisfaction of the Fire Services Department, the reason for including the Town Planning Board (TPB) in the approval condition.

11. Ms Esther M.Y. Tang, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) the site was located near the southwestern boundary of the Cheung Sha Wan OZP and the developments to the southwest of the site fell within the South West Kowloon OZP. In general, the BHR on the OZP was stipulated taken into account a number of factors, including the BH profile of the existing committed and planned developments. The BHR for the Cheung Sha Wan OZP was stipulated in 2010; while the BHR for sites on the South West Kowloon OZP was stipulated at a later stage taking into account the characteristics of developments in the area;
- (b) in the stipulation of BHR for sites on the South West Kowloon OZP, PlanD had examined the BH profile of the entire area comprehensively and had taken into account a number of factors, including air ventilation and visual aspects;
- (c) the average flat size was about 45m². The applicant had not provided the number of flats per floor;
- (d) the feasibility of the possible future footbridge connection would be subject to further study at a later stage. Nevertheless, a connection point had been reserved in the West Kowloon Law Courts Building and the Joint-user Government Office Building respectively for future footbridge connection;

- (e) according to HD, there was a genuine need for the proposed HD office as HD was currently renting office space in the private sector. HD had consulted the Social Welfare Department and two social welfare facilities, namely a residential care home for elderly and a neighbourhood elderly centre, would be provided on the podium of the proposed development, taking into account the locational requirements;
- (f) the proposed minor relaxation of BHR could bring about an increase in the public housing flat supply by 189 units. It could also enable the provision of an additional building gap which could enhance the visual permeability of the proposed development and air ventilation in the vicinity; and
- (g) the planning assessment mainly focused on air ventilation, visual and environmental impacts as well as site constraints. Building efficiency was not a major consideration in the assessment.

12. In response to the question on approval condition, the Secretary said that it was an established practice to state that the respective approval condition should be complied with to the satisfaction of either the concerned government department or the TPB. In general, unless there was any disagreement on the compliance of approval condition between the applicant and the concerned government department, submission to the TPB was not required.

Deliberation Session

13. A Member said that the baseline scheme prepared by the applicant was not well prepared and did not present a scenario showing full utilisation of the permitted plot ratio (PR) of the site under the current BHR. As a general practice, a compliance scheme should be prepared to demonstrate full compliance of the development restrictions of a site. If the site was constrained by a number of factors, such as requirements on setback and provision of air path, a proposed scheme could be prepared to demonstrate the planning gain/merits that could be achieved by minor relaxation of development restrictions, as compared with the compliance scheme. The Member said that application for minor relaxation of BHR should

be considered based on the planning gain/merits of the proposal, including the enhancement of air ventilation and visual permeability, rather than solely for the purpose of achieving the maximum PR of the site. However, given the proposed minor relaxation of the BHR for the site would not generate any adverse impacts on the surrounding area, the Member considered the proposal acceptable. Another Member concurred with the above views and suggested HD to improve the built form of the proposed development at the detailed design stage.

14. In response to some Members' concern on the feasibility of the possible footbridge connection across the West Kowloon Corridor, Mr Wilson W.S. Pang, Assistant Commissioner (Urban), Transport Department (TD), said that the West Kowloon Corridor would be a constraint for the construction of the footbridge. TD was undertaking studies on the construction of the footbridge and a number of alternative options, including the provision of a subway, were being explored. The meeting noted that the provision of a footbridge was not a major consideration in the application.

15. Members in general noted that the proposal would bring about an increase in the public housing flat supply and enhance the air ventilation and visual permeability of the proposed development.

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 27.10.2021, 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 maximum building height of the development not to exceed 126mPD;
and
- (b) the submission and implementation of fire services installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

[The Vice-chairman thanked Ms Esther M.Y. Tang, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[The Chairman, Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr Lawrence W.C. Poon returned to join the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/KC/450 Shop and Services in "Industrial" Zone, Portion of Workshop B (B1 & B2), G/F, Effort Industrial Building, 2-8 Kung Yip Street, Kwai Chung
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/450)

Presentation and Question Sessions

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the 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) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment submitted by a Kwai Tsing District Council member was received indicating no comment on the application; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the

applied use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use was considered not incompatible with the uses of the subject industrial building, and there was no material change in planning circumstances since the granting of the previous shop and services use for a temporary period of three years. The applied use generally complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 25D for Use/Development within “Industrial” (“I”) Zone on fire safety, land use and traffic aspects. The aggregate commercial floor area on the G/F including the premises, if approved, would amount to 162.807m², which was still within the permissible limit of 460m². In order not to jeopardise the long-term planning intention of industrial use for the subject premises and to monitor the supply and demand of industrial floor space in the area, a temporary approval of three years was recommended. The approval of the application on a temporary basis was also consistent with the Committee’s previous decisions on similar applications in the subject building within the subject “I” zone.

19. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

20. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years until 27.10.2020, 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 fire safety measures, including fire service installation and water supplies for firefighting within 6 months from the date of the approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 27.4.2018; 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.”

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

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam left the meeting at this point.]

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Submission for Partial Fulfillment of Approval Conditions (a) under Application No. A/H15/232-2, Proposed Hotels in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Ocean Park" Zone, Ocean Park, Wong Chuk Hang
(MPC Paper No.8/17)

22. The Secretary reported that the concerned hotel, i.e. Fisherman's Wharf Hotel (FWH) was located in Ocean Park, Wong Chuk Hang. The submission for partial fulfilment of approval condition was made by the Tourism Commission (TC). AECOM Asia Limited (AECOM), Ocean Park Corporation (OPC) and Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - his firm having current business dealings with OCP and past business dealings with AECOM;

- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with TC, but he had no relationship with the applicant and had no involvement in the application;
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with AECOM and LD, and past business dealings with OCP; and owning a flat in Aberdeen area;
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with OPC;
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with AECOM;
- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok - co-owning with spouse a flat in Ap Lei Chau area; and
- Mr Wilson W.S. Pang - owning a flat in Ap Lei Chau area.

23. The Committee noted that Mr Franklin Yu had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had already left the meeting. Since the interest of Mr Thomas O.S. Ho was direct, the Committee agreed that he should leave the meeting temporarily. As the interests of Mr K.K. Cheung and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau were not direct and the properties of Mr Wilson W.S. Pang and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok did not have a direct view on the proposed FWH, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

[Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

24. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Jessica K.T. Lee, STP/HK, presented the applicant's submission and covered the following main points as detailed in the Paper :

Background

- (a) on 29.7.2016, the applicant submitted a Master Layout Plan (MLP) of the proposed FWH for partial fulfilment of approval condition (a) on the building form, layout, design, disposition and building height (BH) to the satisfaction of the Committee of the Town Planning Board (TPB). The Committee agreed that the submission had satisfactorily fulfilled part of approval condition (a) for the proposed FWH on 26.8.2016 and suggested the applicant to fine-tune the building design. A refined scheme was subsequently submitted by the applicant on 27.10.2016 (the compliance scheme);
- (b) on 29.8.2017, the applicant submitted a revised MLP of the proposed FWH with a view to enhancing the waterfront experience at the proposed FWH as well as taking into account various detailed technical considerations (the current proposal);

Submission under Approval Condition (a)

- (c) the major development parameters of the proposed FWH in the current proposal was the same as the compliance scheme;
- (d) the current proposal included the following changes:
 - (i) modification on the disposition of the two proposed curvilinear hotel blocks by reducing the curvature of the hotel blocks while the 15m building gap between the hotel blocks was maintained;
 - (ii) an enhanced waterfront promenade of 10m wide at 1/F and provision of a new seafront plaza at G/F fronting the seaside;
 - (iii) a new staircase to link up the new seafront plaza at G/F with the waterfront promenade at 1/F;

- (iv) relocation of the proposed grand staircase to the eastern side of the proposed FWH closer to the Water World; and
- (v) relocation of car ramp, lay-bys, car parking spaces and loading and unloading area to the back of the hotel blocks to free up space for amenity at the waterfront area;

Departmental Comments

- (e) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 5 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the current proposal;

Planning Department (PlanD)'s View

- (f) PlanD had no objection to the building form, layout, design, disposition and BH in the revised MLP for the proposed FWH for partial fulfilment of approval condition (a) based on the assessments set out in paragraph 6 of the Paper. The overall design of the waterfront promenade in the current proposal was an enhancement over the compliance scheme in that an additional seafront plaza for possible functions and events would add to the vibrancy of the area and enhance the pedestrian experience at ground level, where the two levels of waterfront promenade would provide an open, spacious and welcoming waterfront area for public enjoyment. As for the changes in the disposition of the hotel blocks, there was no apparent difference between the compliance scheme and the current proposal in terms of visual impact. The current submission was for further refinement and enhancement of the compliance scheme, and the key development parameters of the proposed FWH remained unchanged.

25. Some Member raised the following questions:

- (a) what the Committee's major comments were on the previous MLP submitted in 2016, and whether such comments had been addressed in the

current proposal;

- (b) the accessibility along the waterfront between the proposed FWH and Sham Wan, and between G/F and the waterfront promenade at 1/F;
- (c) whether any pier facilities would be provided at the proposed FWH so that tourists could travel by yachts or water taxis from Aberdeen Typhoon Shelter;
- (d) the glass walls at the waterfront promenade at 1/F; and
- (e) the reason of modifying the disposition of the two proposed curvilinear hotel blocks.

26. Miss Jessica K.T. Lee, STP/HK, made the following responses;

- (a) the Committee's major comments in 2016 were on the cascading effect in the West Tower, greening for the proposed FWH and visual impact that might be caused by the proposed FWH. Taking into account the Committee's suggestions, the applicant had proposed some refinements with an enhanced stepped BH profile descending from east to west and more greenery on the podium decks in the compliance scheme. Besides, reflective materials would be avoided for the façade of the proposed FWH in order to minimise any adverse visual impact;
- (b) there was an existing pavement along the waterfront of Sham Wan Road connecting to the proposed FWH to the Water World. Whilst the 3m width of the existing pavement along Sham Wan Road would be maintained, the section in front of the proposed FWH would be widened to form a seafront plaza. The 10m-wide promenade at 1/F would be open for public access 24 hours a day and could be accessed from G/F via escalators, staircases and lifts. Barrier-free access design would be adopted in accordance with the Buildings Department's requirements;

- (c) according to the current proposal, no pier facilities would be provided at the proposed FWH. At present, boats and yachts were mainly anchored in the Sham Wan area. Since there might be coral reef in the nearby sea area, further studies and consultations with concerned departments, such as the Marine Department and the Environmental Protection Department, would be required for any pier facilities;
- (d) glass façade design at the waterfront promenade at 1/F was adopted in both the compliance scheme and the current proposal. Whilst food & beverage and retail facilities were proposed behind the glass walls in the compliance scheme, a two-storey high headroom hotel lobby next to the grand staircase was proposed in the current proposal; and
- (e) the revised disposition of the hotel blocks would reduce their curvature and increase their perceived façade length in order to avoid problems of overlooking and narrow room width, as well as opening up the view towards the mountain from the waterfront promenade.

Deliberation Session

27. A Member said that the current proposal had demonstrated enhancements on the waterfront promenade and increased the areas for public enjoyment. It was suggested that a checklist on Members' comments on the previous MLP and applicants' responses on such aspects should be prepared to facilitate discussion and consideration. The Chairman said that the Committee had agreed that the previous MLP had partially fulfilled approval condition (a) for the proposed FWH on 26.8.2016 and the applicants had proposed refinements to address some Members' comments in the current submission of a revised MLP. If there was any further refinement to the MLP of the proposed FWH in the future, a checklist could be prepared for Members' easy reference.

28. After deliberation, the Committee agreed that the submission had partially fulfilled approval condition (a) for the proposed FWH. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VIII 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.]

Agenda Item 7

Any Other Business

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