

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 618th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 21.12.2018

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer /Kowloon,
Transport Department
Mr David C.V. Ngu

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Dr. Sunny C.W. Cheung

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

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Gary T. L. Lam

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 617th MPC Meeting held on 7.12.2018

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 617th MPC meeting held on 7.12.2018 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 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/KC/13 Application for Amendment to the Draft Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/KC/29, To Rezone the Application Site from “Industrial” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Columbarium (2)”, 24-28 Wing Lap Street, Kwai Chung, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. Y/KC/13B)

3. The Secretary reported that the application was for rezoning the application site to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Columbarium (2)” for columbarium development. The following Members had declared interests on this item :

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang (<i>the Vice-chairman</i>)	-	being a member of the Private Columbaria Appeal Board (PCAB); and
Mr Sunny L.K. Ho	-	being a member of the PCAB.

4. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the interest of Messrs Lincoln L.H. Huang and Sunny L.K. Ho were indirect, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

5. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 30.11.2018 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the further comments of the Transport Department and Hong Kong Police Force. It was the third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment in March 2018, the applicant submitted a revised routing plan of the owner/operator arranged bus, a revised Traffic Impact Assessment, a revised G/F layout plan and responses to department comments.

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

[Ms Katy C.W. Fung, 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/K5/802 Shop and Services (Fast Food Shop) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated
“Business (2)” Zone, Part of Workshop A2 (Shop A2D), G/F, Block A,
Hong Kong Industrial Centre, 489-491 Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha
Wan, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K5/802)

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms. Katy C.W. Fung, 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 (fast food shop);
- (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, no public comment was received;
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone and was considered compatible with the changing land use character of the area. It was also considered not incompatible with other uses of the same industrial building. 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 on the developments within the subject building and adjacent areas, and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

8. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

9. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the submission and implementation of fire safety measures, including the provision of fire service installations, within six months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 21.6.2019; 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 be revoked immediately without further notice.”

10. 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 Katy C.W. Fung, STP/TWK for her attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TW/502 Proposed Shop and Services (Fast Food Shop) in “Industrial” Zone,
Workshop 2 of Unit A, G/F, Sun Fung Industrial Building, 8-12 Ma Kok
Street, Tsuen Wan

(MPC Paper No. A/TW/502)

11. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan. The following Members had declared interests on this item :

- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and

- Professor John C.Y. Ng - his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.

12. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the property of Professor John C.Y. Ng’s spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

13. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 4.12.2018 deferment of the consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from the Transport Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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 a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the

applicant that one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/454 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for the Permitted ‘Information Technology and Telecommunications Industries (Data Centre)’ Use in “Industrial” Zone, Cargo Consolidation Complex, 43 Container Port Road, Kwai Chung, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/454)

15. The Committee noted that the application was rescheduled.

[The Committee agreed to advance the consideration of Agenda Items 8, 9 and 12.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H15/278 Ship-building, Ship-breaking and Ship-repairing (excluding building and/or repairing of steel ships or boats) in “Industrial” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, No.3, Ap Lei Chau Praya Road, Ap Lei Chau, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/278)

16. The Committee noted that the application was withdrawn by the applicant.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K7/115 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Residential Development in “Residential (Group B) 1” Zone, 5-7 Ho Man Tin Street, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K7/115)

17. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Ho Man Tin. Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with ARUP; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his firm having current business dealings with ARUP; |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | having past business dealings with ARUP; and |
| Mr Stanley T.S. Choi | - | jointly with his spouse owning a property in Ho Man Tin and his spouse being a director of a company which owned a property in Ho Man Tin. |

18. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application, Mr. Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting, and Messrs Stanley T.S. Choi and Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

19. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 14.12.2018 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information in response to departmental comments. It was

the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K9/273 Eating Place (Restaurant) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Pier" Zone, Shop K6, Lower Deck, Hung Hom (North) Ferry Pier, Hung Hom, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K9/273)

21. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Hung Hom. New World First Ferry Services Limited (a subsidiary of New World Development Co. Limited (NWD)) was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his firm having past business dealings with Automall Limited which was a subsidiary company of NWD; and |
| Mr Stanley T.S. Choi | - | owning a flat in Hung Hom. |

22. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration

of the application and Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

23. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 10.12.2018 deferment of the consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

24. 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 one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H20/190 Religious Institution (Temple) in "Green Belt" Zone, Government land at the hillside near Siu Sai Wan Sitting-out Area No. 1, Chai Wan, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H20/190)

25. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Chai Wan. Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | - | being an ex-employee of Hong Kong Housing Society which currently having business dealings with KTA; |
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
(<i>the Chairman</i>) | - | jointly with his spouse owning a flat in Chai Wan and his spouse owning a property in Chai Wan; and |
| Mr Sunny L.K. Ho | - | owning properties in Chai Wan. |

26. The Committee agreed that as Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, and properties of Messrs Sunny L.K. Ho and Raymond K.W. Lee (the Chairman) and his spouse had no direct view of the application site, they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

27. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Jerry Austin, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the religious institution (temple);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. District Officer (East) advised that the Chairman of Island Resort Owners Committee cum Vice-chairman of Yee Wan Area Committee was concerned about the potential environmental nuisance and relevant stakeholder (such as local residents living in the vicinity) should be consulted at an appropriate juncture. 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, a total of 4,108 public comments were received. Amongst the public comments received, 4,106 supported the application of which 4,098 were in the form of standard comments from individuals, and the remaining two opposed the application. The supporting comments were submitted by Legislative Council members, District Council members, Owners' Corporation of Cheerful Garden, local associations and members of the general public, while the opposing comments were submitted by members of the general public. Major views and objection grounds were set out in paragraph 11 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 12 of the Paper. There was a general presumption against development in the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone. According to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 (TPB PG-No.10), new development in a “GB” zone would only be considered in exceptional circumstances and had to be justified with very strong planning grounds. The current proposal was to redevelop an existing temple which had been serving the residents of Siu Sai Wan since 1990. Given its relatively small scale, the proposed temple development was considered not incompatible with the character of the surrounding areas. It was also anticipated that the proposed temple with a gross floor area of 37.5m² would not overstrain the capacity of existing and planned infrastructure, be susceptible to adverse environmental effects, or be a source of pollution. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. In view of the above, it was considered that the application generally complied with the criteria as set out in TPB PG-No. 10. Regarding the public comments, the departmental comments and the planning assessment above were relevant.

28. Some members raised the following questions:

Nuisance and impact

- (a) what the concerns from residents of Island Resort were and what the possible nuisance would be;
- (b) whether there were adverse visual impact and fire risk to the surroundings;

Scale of development

- (c) noting that there would be significant increase in development scale comparing to the existing temple, whether the enlarged temple could be considered as 'redevelopment';
- (d) whether supporting facilities, e.g. toilet, would be provided;

Operation of the temple

- (e) whether the future temple users would be charged and details of operation plan for the temple;
- (f) land administration arrangement for the existing and future temple;

Other issues

- (g) location of other existing temples in the area;
- (h) the definitions of temple and shrine, and whether shrines would be provided in the proposed temple for worship; and
- (i) whether there was any detailed building layout for the proposed temple.

29. Mr Jerry Austin, STP/HK, made the following responses:

Nuisance and impact

- (a) residents of Island Resort might be concerned about possible nuisance caused by the exhausted air from the temple. However, the minimum distance between the temple and the nearest residential development (Fullview Garden) was about 110m, while the Island Resort was further away from the temple. The Director of Environmental Protection considered that the proposed development would unlikely give rise to insurmountable environmental nuisances;
- (b) given the proposed height of the temple was only 1 storey and the surrounding setting with vegetation cover, visual impact would be minimal. An incense burner for burning of joss sticks in the proposed temple would be provided. The Director of Fire Services (D of FS) had no objection to the application on fire safety aspect subject to approval condition;

Scale of development

- (c) the proposed temple would be considered as 'redevelopment' as it involved demolishing the existing temple and rebuilding it at the original site, though the redevelopment covered an enlarged site area. With the proposed building set back of at least 3m from the public footpath (Leaping Dragon Walk), conflicts between worshippers of the temple and hikers could be minimised;
- (d) public facilities including toilets were available at nearby public open space;

Operation of the temple

- (e) according to the applicant, the temple would be operating from 7am to 4pm daily. Volunteers would serve the operational needs of the proposed

temple and no information had been provided by the applicant on the detailed operation plan;

- (f) the existing temple was under Short Term Tenancy (STT) and the applicant should apply to the Lands Department for a new STT if the application was approved;

Other issues

- (g) there were four existing temples in Chai Wan and Siu Sai Wan which were far away from the subject temple;
- (h) shrines were generally smaller in scale, while temples normally involved buildings for worshippers to carry out their religious activities. Portraits/statues (including Tin Hau and Guanyin) would be placed in the proposed temple for worship and the existing shrine outside the temple would be retained. It was expected that worshippers would be attracted to the temple during festivals only; and
- (i) no detailed building plan had been provided in the application.

[Mr. Franklin Yu and Dr. Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join the meeting during the question session.]

Deliberation Session

30. A Member pointed out that the status of the applicant, the extent of site formation work involved and possible nuisance should be taken into account when considering this application. Another Member had no objection to the application but would like to have more information on its operation.

31. A Member opined that the proposed temple should have no significant impact on the neighbourhood and users of the adjacent footpath given its relatively small size and the

proposed set back from the existing footpath. However, environmental nuisances arising from daily operation should be minimised. The Chairman supplemented that although there would be burning of joss sticks in the proposed temple, no burning of joss paper was proposed according to the applicant.

32. With regard to the potential conflict with the surroundings, Members noted that 13 nos. of compensatory trees were proposed at the site. Since the site area was small and the proposed structure was only 1 storey, minimal visual impact was anticipated.

33. Some members supported the application and considered that there would be enhancement in the overall condition and environment if the application was approved, and considered that the existing footpath could be widened with the set back of the proposed temple. The Vice-chairman supplemented that given the long history of the existing temple and support by the general public, there should not be major concern on its mode of operation and the applicant's status.

34. 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 21.12.2022, 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 provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (b) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr Jerry Austin, STP/HK for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/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/K9/271 Proposed Hotel in “Residential (Group A) 4” Zone, 84 and 86 Wuhu Street, Hung Hom, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K9/271A)

36. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Hung Hom. Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had declared interests on the item as he owned a flat in Hung Hom.

37. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

38. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Tourism (C for Tourism) supported the application for hotel development provided that it was agreeable to all relevant government departments. 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 periods, a total of 38 public comments were received. Among the public comments, 36 comments from a Kowloon City District Council Member, an Owners' Incorporation of a nearby building and individuals raised concerns on or objected to the application. The remaining two provided views/had no comment on the application. Major views 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. Although the proposed hotel use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group A)” zone, the Site was located within an area predominantly occupied by residential developments with commercial uses on the ground floor and with a mix of commercial building and hotels. An existing 11-storey hotel abutted on its north and a vacant site with planning permission for a 17-storey hotel development approved abutted on its west. The proposed hotel development was considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments in terms of land use. Given its location being sandwiched between two existing/planned hotel developments, and it was covered by a previous planning application approved with conditions by the Committee, the current application might warrant special consideration. C for Tourism supported the application as it would help increase the provision of hotel facilities, broaden the range of accommodations for visitors, and support the development of convention and exhibition, tourism and hotel industries. Regarding the adverse public comments, comments of concerned departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

39. A Member enquired whether the previous planning permission was still valid and was there any change in the total floor area for the proposed development. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, said that general building plans based on the previously approved scheme were approved and the applicant could develop the hotel accordingly. The

total gross floor area (GFA) of the proposed hotel development remained the same as the previously approved scheme, the applicant proposed to convert the GFA for restaurant under the previously approved scheme to provide additional hotel rooms in the current application.

Deliberation Session

40. 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 21.12.2022, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the submission of a Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (b) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the SIA to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K9/272 Proposed 'Public Vehicle Park (exclude Container Vehicles)' at basement level of proposed residential/commercial redevelopment under the authorized Urban Renewal Authority Bailey Street/Wing Kwong Street Development Project in "Residential (Group A)" Zone, 107-109 Ma Tau Wai Road (odd nos.), 2-50 Wing Kwong Street (even nos.), 1-13 Wan Tat Street (odd nos.), 1-19 Wan Fat Street, 1-20 Wan Hing Street, 1-20 Wan Lok Street and 3-21 Bailey Street (odd nos.), Hung Hom, Kowloon and 4 private streets (Wan Tat Street, Wan Fat Street, Wan Hing Street and Wan Lok Street) and multiple alleyways
(MPC Paper No. A/K9/272A)

42. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Hung Hom. The application was submitted by Urban Renewal Authority (URA). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
<i>(the Chairman)</i>
<i>as Director of Planning</i> | - | being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of URA; |
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang
<i>(the Vice-chairman)</i> | - | being the Deputy Chairman of Appeal Board Panel of URA; |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - | being a non-executive director of the URA Board, a member of the Lands, Rehousing and Compensation Committee and the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee, and a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund (URF) of URA; |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung |] | |
| |] | being a director of the Board of the URF of URA; |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law |] | |

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with URA;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with URA;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being an ex-employee and ex-Director (Development & Marketing) of Hong Kong Housing Society which was currently in discussion with URA on housing development issues; and
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - owning a flat in Hung Hom.

43. As the interests of Messrs Raymond K.W. Lee (the Chairman), Lincoln L.H. Huang (the Vice-chairman), Thomas O.S. Ho, and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon were direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, as a matter of necessity, the Chairman or the Vice-chairman should continue to assume the chairmanship. As the interest of the Vice-chairman was comparatively less direct than the Chairman, the Vice-chairman should take over the chairmanship for the item but a conscious effort should be made to contain his scope of involvement in an administrative role.

44. The Committee noted that Messrs Stanley T.S. Choi and Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee agreed that as the interests of Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung and Ms Lilian S.K. Law were indirect, and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, they could stay in the meeting.

[Mr Raymond K.W. Lee (the Chairman) left the meeting temporarily at this point. Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

45. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) the proposed 'Public Vehicle Park (exclude Container Vehicles)' at basement level of proposed residential/commercial redevelopment under the authorized URA Bailey Street/Wing Kwong Street Development Project;
- (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 periods, a total of 16 public comments were received. Among the public comments received, 14 comments from the nearby Sung Chi Building Owner's Incorporation, its residents and an individual supported the application and/or supported the increase in public vehicle park (PVP). The remaining two provided views/had no comment on the application. Major views 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. URA indicated that the proposed PVP was for relocation of on-street metered parking spaces for private car and motorcycle within Action Area 1 (AA1) so as to free up street space for traffic calming and pedestrianisation. The proposed PVP was also for meeting the parking demand of other developments in AA1. In terms of land use, the underground PVP would create planning benefits in AA1 and could help to address public parking demand. It was considered not incompatible with the surrounding residential developments. According to the submitted traffic impact assessment, the proposed PVP would not create adverse traffic impact in the area and the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had no adverse comments on the application subject to (i) the proposal of the PVP and detailed design of the proposed road network in connection with the proposed PVP, including but not limited to the junction and pedestrian assessment; and (ii) the detailed arrangement of on-street metered parking

spaces and motorcycle parking spaces were to his satisfaction and relevant approval conditions were suggested. Regarding the adverse public comments, comments of concerned departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

46. A Member enquired whether the existing on-street metered parking spaces for private car and motorcycle within Action Area 1 would all be relocated into the proposed PVP. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, said that it was the applicant's intention to relocate all of the on-street private car and motorcycle parking spaces in AA1 into the proposed PVP. However, whether some on-street parking spaces had to be retained would be subject to C for T's agreement and consultation for the traffic network enhancement scheme in the later road gazettal stage.

Deliberation Session

47. 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 21.12.2022, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the submission of a revised Traffic Impact Assessment including but not limited to the junction and pedestrian assessment, arrangement of on-street metered parking spaces and motorcycle parking spaces and implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) or of the TPB;
- (b) the design and provision of the underground public vehicle park including vehicular access to the satisfaction of the C for T or of the TPB; and
- (c) the provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

48. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as

set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

[The Vice-chairman thanked Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Raymond K.W. Lee (the Chairman) returned to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 13

Any Other Business

49. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 10:16 a.m..