

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 626<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 3.5.2019**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Professor T.S. Liu

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),  
Transport Department  
Mr Michael H.S. Law

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  
Ms Daisy W.C. Wong

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

**In Attendance**

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

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

Assistant Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Andrea W. Y. Yan

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 625<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 12.4.2019

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 625<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 12.4.2019 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting]

Y/K9/12                      Application for Amendment to the Approved Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/26, to Rezone the Application Site from “Residential (Group A)4” to “Government, Institution or Community”, Hung Hom Inland Lots 238 S.F RP and 238 S.G, 37 Winslow Street, Hung Hom, Kowloon  
  
(MPC Paper No. Y/K9/12)

---

3.                      The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Hung Hom and the application was for columbarium use.    The following Members had declared interests on the item :

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang	}	being a member of the Private Columbaria Appeal Board (PCAB); and
Mr Sunny L.K. Ho		
Mr Stanley T.S. Choi	-	owning a flat in Hung Hom.

4.                      The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.    As the interest of Mr Sunny L.K. Ho was indirect and the property owned by Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

5.                      The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 15.4.2019 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 on the Environmental and Sewerage Impact Assessment and to respond to public comments.    It was the first time that the applicant requested 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 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, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

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

#### **Agenda Item 4**

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

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/460                      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Industrial-Office Redevelopment in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone, 57-61 Ta Chuen Ping Street, Kwai Chung, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/460)

---

7. The Secretary reported that Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD) and Wong & Ouyang (Hong Kong) Limited (WOHK) were two of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on this item:

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho                      -    having past business dealings with LD;

Mr Alex T.H. Lai                         -    his firm having current business dealings with  
WOHK; and

Mr Franklin Yu - his firm having current business dealings with Wong & Ouyang (Building Services) Limited which was related to WOHK.

8. The Committee noted that the applicants had requested deferment of consideration of the application, Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr. Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting.

9. The Committee noted that the applicants' representative requested on 12.4.2019 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 first time that the applicants requested deferment of the application.

10. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicants pending the submission of further information from the applicants. 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 applicants. If the further information submitted by the applicants 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 applicants that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

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

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TY/138                      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) (Surplus Car Parking Spaces Only) and Minor Relaxation of Non-Domestic Plot Ratio (from 0.05 to 0.14) for the Proposed Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group A)” Zone, Easeful Court, Tsing King Road, Tsing Yi, New Territories  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/TY/138)

---

11.                      The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsing Yi and the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests on this item:

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee<br>(the Chairman)<br><i>as the Director of Planning</i>          | - | being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and the Building Committee (BC) of HKHA;   |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan<br><i>as the Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department</i> | - | being an alternate representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and the Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA, and his close relatives owning properties at Villa Esplanada in Tsing Yi; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho  | - | having current business dealings with HKHA;   |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai   | - | his firm having current business dealings with HKHA;  |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon  | - | his spouse being an employee of the Housing Department (HD) (the executive arm of HKHA), but not involved in planning work;   |
| Mr Franklin Yu   | - | being a member of BC of HKHA; and   |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau   | - | being an ex-Director (Development and Marketing) of Hong Kong Housing Society,  |

which was in discussion with HD on housing development issues.

12. The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr. Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting. As the interest of Mr Martin W.C. Kwan was direct, the Committee agreed that he should leave the meeting temporarily for the item. The Committee also noted that the interest of the Chairman was direct, the Vice-chairman should assume the chairmanship. As the Vice-chairman, Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, if the matter was subject to a statutory time limit, then as a matter of necessity, the Chairman should continue to assume the chairmanship but a conscious effort should be made to contain his scope of involvement in an administrative role to minimize any risk that he might be challenged. As Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

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

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

13. 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 renewal of planning approval for temporary public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) (surplus carparking spaces only) and minor relaxation of non-domestic plot ratio (from 0.05 to 0.14) for the proposed public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) for a period of 3 years until 3.5.2022;
- (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 statutory publication period, one public comment expressing concern on the application was received. The major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. As there was no change in the total number of vehicle parking spaces within the site, the proposal would not generate traffic flow in the area. The application was in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34B in that there was no material change in planning circumstances in the surrounding areas since the last approval, no adverse planning implication arising from the renewal application, and the approval period sought was reasonable. The Transport Department had no objection to the application and an approval condition was recommended to ensure that priority would be given to the residents in letting the vehicle parking spaces. Regarding the public comment received, the comments of government departments and planning considerations above were relevant.

14. In response to a Member's question relating to a similar planning application No. A/TY/107 which was rejected by the Committee on 9.4.2010, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK said that as set out in paragraph 6.3 of the Paper, the application was rejected on the ground that car parks were intended for meeting the car parking demand of the residents, and there was no planning justification for letting out the car parking spaces to non-residents in view of the low vacancy rate and the strong demand for car parking provision as evident from the large number of objections.

15. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) noting the overall vacancy rate ranged from about 3% to 7% over the last three years and about 10% of the total parking spaces was proposed for public vehicle park use in the current application, on what basis such proportion was proposed;

- (b) the demand for public car parking spaces in Tsing Yi; and
- (c) whether conversion of the car park to other uses had been explored by the applicant.

16. Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK made the following responses:

- (a) with reference to the survey of utilisation rate of car parking spaces at the site in the past three years, a maximum of about 10% of the total parking spaces was proposed by the applicant to cater for fluctuation in vacancy. As compared with the previously approved application No. A/TY/133 where about 30% of the total parking spaces were proposed for public vehicle park, the current proposal had been largely reduced the number of public vehicle park after taking the actual vacancy rate into account;
- (b) based on his experience and observation, there had been strong demand for public monthly car parking spaces in Tsing Yi and the provision of car parking spaces on temporary basis by way of on short term tenancy was quite common in order to address the demand; and
- (c) in view of the relatively small number of surplus parking spaces and the technical constraints involved in the application site, it was considered not feasible to convert the existing car parks to other uses. Notwithstanding that, the applicant would continue to review the feasibility for conversion of individual car parks to other uses when suitable opportunities arise.

17. In response to a Member's enquiries, Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, said the location of proposed 10 parking spaces for letting to non-residents was indicative in nature while the visitor parking spaces would be allocated under a floating parking system.

#### Deliberation Session

18. A Member was of a view that the applicant should review the car parking provision in the area as a whole to provide more public parking spaces if there had been a

strong demand from the public.

19. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a further period of 3 years until 3.5.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition :

“Priority should be accorded to the residents of Easeful Court in Tsing Yi in the letting of the surplus vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 6**

#### **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, New Territories  

---

(MPC Paper No. A/TW/502B)

21. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan. The following Members had declared interests on the 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.

22. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the properties owned by Professor John C.Y. Ng's spouse and the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi's spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

23. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 17.4.2019 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address comments from the Transport Department. It was the third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had not submitted further information to address departmental comments.

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 two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information. Since it was the third deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for the preparation of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Mr Louis K.H. Kau, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK) and Mr Brian C.L. Chau, Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

## Hong Kong District

### Agenda Item 7

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Further Consideration of Proposed Amendments to the Approved Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H7/19

(MPC Paper No.5/19)

---

25. The Secretary reported that the rezoning site was located in Wong Nai Chung and AECOM Asia Company Ltd. (AECOM) was the consultant for the proposed amendments. The following Members had declared interests on the item :

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai    | - his firm having current business dealings with AECOM and his parents co-owning a flat at The Leighton Hill in Causeway Bay; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho   | - having current business dealings with AECOM;  |
| Mr Franklin Yu      | - having past business dealings with AECOM;   |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law  | - co-owning with spouse a flat on Ventris Road in Happy Valley; and   |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan | - his close relative owning a flat in Causeway Bay.   |

26. The Committee noted that Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan had not yet returned to join the meeting. As the properties co-owned by Ms Lilian S.K. Law and her spouse had no direct view of the rezoning site, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

### Presentation and Question Sessions

27. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main

points :

Background

- (a) on 8.3.2019, the Committee considered the proposed amendments to the approved Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H/19, which were to facilitate the proposed District Court and commercial development at the site at the junction of Caroline Hill Road and Leighton Road (the CHR site);
- (b) at the meeting, the Committee generally agreed with land use zonings, development density, public facilities and provision of local open space, but decided to defer the consideration of the proposed amendments to the OZP and requested more information be provided regarding the justifications for the locations of District Court and commercial development, block disposition in connection with the locations of the public open space, pedestrian connectivity within and outside the CHR site and Government's priority of providing various social welfare facilities at the commercial site;

Further Information in Response to Members' Concerns

*Justifications for the Locations of District Court and Commercial Development*

- (c) locating the commercial development at the southern portion fronting Leighton Road was a natural extension of the "Commercial" zone from the commercial core of Causeway Bay; and as public facilities were proposed to be provided at the commercial site, a more central location was preferred. Moreover, swapping the District Court site with the commercial site would not fully meet the functional and operational requirements of the Judiciary and might hamper pedestrian connection between Causeway Bay commercial core area and the proposed commercial development;

*Block Disposition*

- (d) the disposition, layout and detailed design of the site would be worked out at the detailed design stage. A possible design option of swapping the

building blocks of the District Court had been explored to address Members' concern on providing a larger set back from CHR (West);

*Pedestrian Connectivity*

- (e) the pedestrians in the Caroline Hill area mainly relied on at-grade footpaths and pedestrian crossings to/from the core area of Causeway Bay, MTR Station and public transport facilities. The future developer of the commercial site would be required to reserve an underground opening within the development for possible pedestrian connection to MTR Station which was subject to further feasibility study;

*Provision of Government, Institution or Community (GIC) Facilities*

- (f) based on a planned population of about 185,000 persons, there was no shortfall on major GIC facilities in the area. A District Health Centre (DHC) and Child Care Centre (CCC), together with other public facilities, would be provided within the commercial site. For the Residential Care Home for the Elderly as suggested by the Wan Chai District Council (WCDC), there was a deficit in the district and multi-pronged approaches would be adopted to increase its provision. Given the location of the CHR site and the demand for health and child care service in the district, priority had been given to the development of DHC and CCC; and

Public Consultation

- (g) on 9.4.2019, the Development, Planning and Transport Committee (DPTC) of WCDC passed a motion demanding abandonment of the subject proposed amendment item until further consultation with WCDC and the public. WCDC was consulted twice in 2018 and 2019, and would be further consulted during the exhibition period of the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/20 for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

### Pedestrian Connectivity

28. In response to a Member's enquiry on the pedestrian connection between Yun Ping Road and the CHR site, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that although widening of pedestrian waiting zone at the junction of Leighton Road/Yun Ping Road/Pennington Street/CHR (East) was not feasible due to space constraints, improvement work for increasing the green traffic signal time for pedestrians crossing Leighton Road at that junction was proposed.

29. A Member asked whether the possible underground pedestrian connection would provide a direct connection between the CHR site and MTR Station. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the feasibility of an underground pedestrian subway connecting the MTR Station to CHR Site would be explored under a study conducted by the Highways Department. The two possible alignment options of the underground pedestrian subway, subject to further feasibility study, would run from the MTR Station, via Pennington Street or Sunning Road, to the CHR site. In this regard, the future developer of the commercial site would be required to reserve an underground opening within the proposed development for the possible pedestrian connection to MTR Station and such requirement would be incorporated into the land sale conditions.

30. Noting the pedestrian crossing outside Po Leung Kuk would be removed, a Member pointed out that residents from Happy Valley had been using the said pedestrian crossing to Causeway Bay for a long time. The Member was of a view that more considerations should be given to the pattern of pedestrian movement when contemplating any new measures for pedestrian crossing.

31. A Member further added that the pedestrian crossings at the junction of Leighton Road/Yun Ping Road/Pennington Street/CHR (East) and outside Po Leung Kuk were essential for linking the CHR site and the surrounding developments. The Member considered that upon implementation of the underground pedestrian subway from MTR Station, the pedestrian connectivity would be largely improved and the reliance on at-grade pedestrian facilities would also be reduced.

32. A Member suggested that an elevated pedestrian connection at the northern part



of the commercial site could be provided between the proposed open space in south-eastern part of the site and the commercial tower as there was a significant level difference between the proposed open space and the new access road. The Member also suggested that a requirement for submission of a Master Layout Plan could be incorporated in the lease so as to ensure the accessibility and connectivity for pedestrians.

### Landscape

33. A Member sought clarification on whether the Old and Valuable Tree (OVT) would be isolated by the proposed buildings and a retaining structure at the District Court site as shown on Plans 8 and 9 of the Paper. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the Judiciary was further consulted and an alternative design option was explored to allow more open area around the OVT. Due to security reason and operational needs, the landscape area together with the OVT would not serve as public open space. Regarding the retaining structure, Mr Kau explained that as the existing OVT was at a higher level (about 15mPD) while the proposed new access road would be at a lower level, a retaining structure was therefore required. In response to the Member's further enquiry on the location of the OVT, Mr Kau explained that the tree shown on Plan 9 of the Paper was not the OVT. The plan was simply a conceptual illustration to show the visual impacts of the proposed development.

34. Noting that the fruit tree at the western periphery of the CHR site might be affected by the proposed road improvement works, a Member pointed out that the fruit tree was worth preserving for educational and sentimental value. The Chairman supplemented that the relevant government departments would consider the appropriate measures such as tree preservation or transplanting of the affected trees at the detailed design stage of the road improvement works.

### Block Disposition

35. A Member asked whether the design of the proposed development would take into account the comments raised by Members or to be received from the public during the exhibition period of the draft OZP. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that design flexibility should be allowed for the layout of the proposed development, but if Members considered it appropriate, some requirements could further be incorporated in the Explanatory

Statement (ES) of the OZP or the conditions of lease.

36. Referring to the previous conceptual layout plan as shown on Plan FC-3 of the Paper, a Member suggested that District Court Block 1 could be rotated, say by 90 degrees, and set back from the new access road so as to allow more open areas between the proposed open space and the OVT. The Member also considered that more innovative building design should be adopted for the building blocks of the District Court. While appreciating the revised block disposition as shown in the conceptual layout, another Member shared the view that the disposition of the building blocks could be further enhanced to provide more open areas near the OVT, as well as improving air ventilation at the District Court site.

#### Visual Impacts and Air Ventilation

37. Noting the Visual Appraisal and Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) were prepared based on the conceptual scheme, a Member sought clarification on whether technical assessments would be prepared in the detailed design stage. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that some design elements incorporated in the conceptual scheme were recommended in the findings of the AVA. If the future developer of the commercial site and the project proponent of the District Court decided not to follow the recommended design elements, they would need to demonstrate with a quantitative AVA that the impacts of their latest schemes would not be worse-off than the conceptual scheme. Such requirement had been included in the ES of the OZP and would be incorporated in the relevant land documents.

#### Public Consultation

38. In response to a Member's enquiry about the motion passed by DPTC of WCDC demanding abandonment of the subject proposed amendment item, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the Development Bureau issued a letter to WCDC on 29.4.2019, to explain that comments from WCDC members were considered by the Planning Department and relevant government departments. On 8.1.2019, WCDC was further consulted on the revised development proposal. Majority of the WCDC members supported the provision of DHC and CCC but had a general concern on the traffic impacts of the proposed development at the CHR site. In addition, the findings of the relevant technical assessments were made

available to the WCDC members during the consultation and for public inspection after the last submission to the Committee on 8.3.2019. The Government had endeavoured to address local concern through the two DC consultations. Upon the Committee's agreement on the proposed amendments, WCDC would be further consulted during the exhibition period of the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/20 (draft OZP) for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance.

39. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, explained that DPTC of WCDC held a scheduled meeting on 9.4.2019. It was not a meeting held for consultation on the proposed amendments to the Wong Nai Chung OZP.

#### Others

40. In response to a Member's question on how to ensure a better coordination of the proposed developments at the CHR site, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the future developer would be required to design and construct a new access road within the CHR site connecting eastern and western sections of CHR to serve both the District Court and the commercial development. A close liaison between the relevant parties and government departments would be maintained with a view to devising and taking forward the proposed developments in this regard. Moreover, the design of the later phase of the developments at the CHR site should take into account the findings of the AVA in respect of early phase of the developments at the site. The Chairman supplemented that land uses and major development parameters were set out in the OZP while some detailed design requirements were included in the ES of the OZP to guide the future developments at the CHR site.

41. A Member expressed concern regarding the use of public open space in private development and queried whether there was any measure to improve the accessibility. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the future developer was required to follow the requirements under the guidelines on "Public Open Space in Private Developments Design and Management Guidelines" promulgated by the Development Bureau.

42. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the Environment Bureau was mapping out the long-term strategy for waste recycling in urban area. There was no information on the waste recycling strategy for the CHR site at hand.

The Chairman suggested that Dr. Sunny C.W. Cheung, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment), Environmental Protection Department, might provide supplementary information in respect of the territorial waste recycling strategy for Members' information after the meeting.

### Conclusion

43. To sum up, the Chairman concluded that Members generally agreed to the proposed uses and development intensity of the CHR site for commercial development and the District Court and noted that some good design concepts had been stipulated in the ES of the OZP to guide the future developments while allow flexibility at the detailed design stage. Some Members expressed concerns on the two pedestrian crossings at the junction of Leighton Road/Yun Ping Road/Pennington Street/CHR (East) and on Link Road and suggested the concerned government department should further explore other possible improvement works to enhance the pedestrian connectivity to the CHR site, while not adversely affecting the traffic condition in the area. Alternative design concepts should also be explored to provide more open areas surrounding the OVT at the proposed District Court site.

44. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Wong Nai Chung OZP and that the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/19A at Attachment II in F-Appendix I (to be renumbered to S/H7/20 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III in F-Appendix I were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment IV in F-Appendix I for the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/19A 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. ”

45. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if

appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revision would be submitted for the Board's consideration.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Brian C.L. Chau, TP/HK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

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

### **Agenda Item 8**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Further Consideration of Proposed Amendments to the Approved Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H15/33  
(MPC Paper No.6/19)

---

46. The Secretary reported that the rezoning site was located in Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau and one of the consultants for the proposed amendments was AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM). The following Members had declared interests on this item:

- |                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai  | - his firm having current business dealings with AECOM;             |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - having current business dealings with AECOM;                      |
| Mr Franklin Yu    | - having past business dealings with AECOM; and                     |
| Ms. Daisy Wong    | - her spouse owning a flat and car parking space in Wong Chuk Hang. |

47. The Committee noted that Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr. Franklin Yu had no involvement in the amendment items and the properties owned by Ms. Daisy Wong's spouse had no direct view of the rezoning site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

### Presentation and Question Sessions

48. The following government representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr Vincent W.Y. Wong - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK);  
and

Mr W.K. So - Engineer/Southern 1, Transport Department  
(Engr/S1, TD).

49. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Vincent W.Y. Wong, STP/HK presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

#### Background

- (a) on 22.3.2019, the Committee considered the proposed amendments to the approved Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H15/33 for rezoning a piece of government land at Nam Fung Road from “Green Belt” to “Residential (Group B)”;
- (b) after deliberation, the Committee decided to defer the consideration of the proposed amendments and requested further information be provided on the traffic condition of the area, in particular, the frequency of the temporary closure of the Aberdeen Tunnel after the commissioning of the South Island Line (East) (SIL(E)) and the historical background and existing conditions of the Wong Chuk Hang Kau Wai Village (Kau Wai Village);

#### Further Information in Response to Members’ Concern

##### *Traffic condition*

- (c) the frequency of intermittent closure (FIC) of the Aberdeen Tunnel (northbound), as shown in F-Annex III of the Paper, had been declining

since the commencement of operation for SIL(E) in December 2016;

*Background of the Kau Wai Village*

- (d) the Kau Wai Village was a small village with the only access from Nam Fung Path to the south of the Village while the northern portion was only accessible by footpath from Nam Fung Path;
- (e) according to “Southern District Relics and Legends” published by the Southern District Council, the Kau Wai Village was an old village which was established since 1759;
- (f) the estimated population was about 200, with about 80 living quarters identified. The Kau Wai Village comprised both private lots and government land. The concerned private lots were all old schedule building lots held under Block Government Lease for terms of 21 or 999 years; and
- (g) the Government did not have any redevelopment proposal towards the Kau Wai Village. There was no declared monument, graded building or new item pending heritage assessment identified. The Antiquities and Monuments Office, Development Bureau had no comment on the proposed housing development from the heritage conservation perspective.

Traffic Aspect

50. A Member noted that the FIC of the Aberdeen Tunnel (northbound) had been increased since second half of 2018 and enquired if it was resulted from an increase in vehicle trips from the new developments in the area. In response, Mr W.K. So, Engr/S1, TD, said that the FIC in the second half of the year was normally higher than that of first half of the year according to the records. The overall FIC in 2018 was slightly decreased compared to overall FIC in 2017. Having considered factors such as the additional vehicle trips from the new and planned developments, the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) concluded that the traffic impacts arising from the proposed development under the amendment item would be insignificant.

### Site Constraints

51. In response to the Chairman's query on the site constraints, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the site was situated on a steep terrain. Having considered the topography of the site and the location of the proposed run-in/out as recommended in the TIA (i.e. Nam Fung Road at a level of about 56mPD), it was assumed that a podium design would be provided at the site. Mr Kau further added that the future developer could adopt different design options but vehicular access issue had to be satisfactorily addressed.

52. With reference to Plan 4 of the MPC Paper No. 2/19, a Member noted that the vehicular access to the St Paul's Co-educational College Primary School was via Nam Fung Path while the vehicular access to the site was proposed at Nam Fung Road.

### Conceptual Scheme

53. Referring to the photomontages, some Members raised concerns on the bulky built form of the proposed development. A Member considered that it would be more desirable to adopt a stepped building height and adopt sensible landscape treatments to make the development more compatible with the surroundings. Sharing the concern about the visual impacts arising from the proposed development, some Members were doubtful on whether there were sufficient incentives for the future developer to adopt a more sensitive design taking into account the landscape and topographic condition of the site as a podium design could readily solve the issue of vehicular access and provide an open view for future residents' enjoyment.

54. Some Members suggested that more stringent development restrictions such as lower maximum building height or stepped building height restrictions within the site should be considered to reduce the visual impact.

55. A Member considered it acceptable that the site was suitable for residential development and supported the proposed rezoning, while echoing the need for a more sensitive design of the future development.



56. Some Members had reservation on whether the site was suitable for residential development in view of its close proximity to portal area of the Aberdeen Tunnel, adverse visual impact against vegetated slope on the periphery of a country park and the ridgeline of the mountain in the backdrop, as well as whether development would be cost-effective given the relatively small number of flats (about 150 units) to be produced.

#### Impacts on Kau Wai Village

57. A Member pointed out that Kau Wai Village was long established and the “Southern District Relics and Legends” might not provide a comprehensive reference on the historical significance of the village to facilitate consideration on suitability of residential development at the site adjacent to the village. He considered the historical value of the village should be prudently considered.

58. In response to a Member’s question, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the private lots in the village were granted for a fixed term of 21 or 999 years. Upon the end of the fixed term of 21 years, the lease could be renewed for another 75 years. To undertake any development on private land for public purpose, the government would need to invoke the Land Resumption Ordinance to resume the private land. However, the government did not have any development proposal at the Kau Wai Village.

#### Conclusion

59. To sum up, the Chairman said that in general, Members maintained their previous reservation on the suitability and cost effectiveness of selecting the site for residential development. Members were particularly concerned about the visual impact caused by the proposed residential development and generally considered that given the landscape and topographic constraints of the site, the proposed residential development, was not compatible with the surrounding environment. Some Members were of the view that the possibility of providing a more environmentally sensitive design at the site was limited due to the site constraints. A Member also considered there was insufficient information on the historical background of the Kau Wai Village to enable more comprehensive assessment on the potential impact of the proposed development on the village.

60. After deliberation, the Committee decided to not agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, Mr Vincent W.Y. Wong, STP/HK and Mr W.K. So, Engr/S, TD, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 9**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/H19/79                      Proposed Holiday Camp (Open Deck Extension and Boat Storage Area) in "Government, Institution or Community" Zone, Strip of Government Land to the North of the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups Stanley Holiday Camp, Stanley Bay, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H19/79)

---

61. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 25.4.2019 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 government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

62. 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.

[Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K) and Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 10**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Wang Tau Hom and Tung Tau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K8/21

(MPC Paper No.8/19)

---

63. The Secretary reported that one of the proposed amendment items was to facilitate proposed public housing redevelopment by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). One of the consultants for the proposed amendments was Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP). The following Members had declared interests on this item:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee<br>(the Chairman)<br><i>as the Director of Planning</i>          | - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and the Building Committee (BC) of HKHA;   |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan<br><i>as the Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department</i> | - being an alternate representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and the Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho  | - having current business dealings with HKHA and ARUP;  |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai   | - his firm having current business dealings with HKHA and ARUP;   |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon  | - his spouse being an employee of the Housing Department (HD) (the executive arm of HKHA), but not involved in planning work;                 |
| Mr Franklin Yu   | - being a member of BC of HKHA and having   |

past business dealings with ARUP; and

- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being an ex-Director (Development and Marketing) of Hong Kong Housing Society, which was in discussion with HD on housing development issues.

64. The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Board, as the proposed public housing redevelopments by HKHA in relation to the rezoning sites were subjects of amendments to the OZP proposed by the Planning Department, the interests of the Chairman and Members in relation to the proposed amendments would only need to be recorded and they could be allowed to stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

65. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

##### Background

- (a) in accordance with the principles laid down in the Long Term Housing Strategy and the established policy, the HKHA announced in August 2017 the redevelopment plan for Mei Tung House and Mei Po House at Mei Tung Estate. Apart from these two public housing blocks, the Mei Tung Estate comprised another two high-rise blocks completed in 2010 and 2014 (i.e. Mei Yan House (138mPD) and Mei Tak House (120mPD));

##### Proposed Amendments

- (b) Amendment Item A – rezoning of Mei Tung Estate from “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) to “R(A)1”, with a domestic and total plot ratio (PR) of 7.5 and 9 respectively and a maximum building height of 120mPD for the eastern portion and 140mPD for the western portion;

- (c) Amendment Item B1 – rezoning of the upstream and midstream sections of the Kai Tak River from “Open Space(1)” (“O(1)”) and “Undetermined” respectively to areas shown as ‘Kai Tak River’ to reflect the as-built conditions;
- (d) Amendment Item B2 – rezoning of a small piece of land at the southeastern portion of Shek Ku Lung Road Playground and a section of Prince Edward Road East from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Landscape Elevated Walkway” to “O” and an area shown as ‘Road’ respectively to reflect the existing use;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP

- (e) corresponding revision to the Notes and ES had been made to take into account the proposed amendments and to follow the revised Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans promulgated by the Town Planning Board;

Technical Assessments

- (f) to ascertain the technical feasibility of the proposed redevelopment, various technical assessments had been conducted, which confirmed that the proposed redevelopment would not cause insurmountable problems on visual, landscape, air ventilation and traffic aspects with implementation of appropriate mitigation measures as identified in the technical assessments at Attachments Va, Vb, Vc, and Vd of the Paper;
- (g) under the established practice, HD would carry out Environmental Assessment Study and Sewerage Impact Assessment at the detailed design stage and recommend mitigation measures as appropriate;
- (h) concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed redevelopment;

Provision of Government, Institution or Community Facilities (GIC) and Open Space

- (i) the provision of open spaces and various GIC facilities in the area was generally sufficient except that there would be a shortfall in hospital beds (-254 beds). Even with the provision of a Neighbourhood Elderly Centre, a Day Care Centre for Elderly and a Residential Care Home for the Elderly in the proposed redevelopment, there would be shortfalls in the area; and

Consultation with Wong Tai Sin District Council (WTSDC)

- (j) HD consulted the Housing Committee of the WTSDC on 24.10.2017. The WTSDC members had no adverse comment on the proposed redevelopment except some comments on the proposed rehousing arrangement.

The Conceptual Scheme

66. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, said that the existing net site PR for Mei Tung Estate was about 4.25. Upon completion of the redevelopment, the total domestic PR for Mei Tung Estate, including the recently completed housing blocks, would be about 7.5, which was the maximum domestic PR stipulated for the proposed "R(A)1" zone.

67. Noting the GIC facilities as required by the government were exempted from PR calculation, a Member sought clarification relating to the proposed non-domestic PR. Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, said that the maximum domestic and total PR for the subject redevelopment proposal were 7.5 and 9 respectively with a resultant maximum non-domestic PR of about 1.5. The non-domestic uses at the site would be subject to HKHA's further study.

68. A Member considered that the proposed building height was not incompatible with the surrounding developments and enquired about the podium design. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, said that HKHA did not provide specific justifications for adopting a podium design. She explained that the site was at a level about 22mPD which

meant that the absolute building heights of the proposed public housing blocks were about 100m/120m under the current rezoning proposal. Besides, efforts were made by HKHA to enhance the overall wind permeability at the site by provision of setback from the kerb of Tung Tau Tsuen Road, building separations (with two 15m-wide and one 30m-wide gaps) and empty bays at ground floor and/or podium floor.

69. While supporting the provision of GIC facilities to meet the local needs, a Member considered that more considerations should be given to age/community mix within the redevelopment at the building design stage.

70. A Member asked if there was any planned treatment for the retaining slope at the northern periphery of the redevelopment site. Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, said that the retaining slope would not be affected and there was no planned treatment to be carried out. Taking note of the visual impact of the retaining slope towards the redevelopment, the same Member suggested the HKHA to carry out some landscape treatments for the purpose of enhancing the greenery and amenity of the site.

#### GIC Facilities

71. In response to a Member's question, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, said that the GIC facilities would be provided at the podium level. Such arrangement would not affect the number of flats produced as the GIC facilities as required by the government would be exempted from PR calculation.

72. Noting there were other residential developments in the proximity of the site, a Member asked if opportunity was taken in the redevelopment proposal to provide more social welfare facilities for meeting the local needs. Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, said that as GIC facilities were exempted from PR calculation in the proposed redevelopment proposal, flexibility was allowed for HKHA to provide suitable GIC facilities at the site subject to further study by HD and the Social Welfare Department at detailed design stage.

#### Rehousing Arrangement

73. In response to a Member's question, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, said that

the affected households could all be accommodated in nearby the Tung Tau (II) Estate Phase 8 which was under construction and was expected to be ready for population intake in mid-2020. As the target clearance date of the proposed redevelopment would be in Q4 of 2020, no time gap on rehousing was anticipated.

74. In response to a Member's question, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, said that the affected households, after decanting to Tung Tau (II) Estate Phase 8, would not be moved back to in Mei Tung Estate upon its redevelopment. The Member also opined that such option could be offered to the affected households taken into account their sense of belonging to the community.

#### Heritage Preservation

75. A Member was of a view that the site was of social, cultural and heritage significance to the local residents, due consideration should be given in the detailed design stage in preserving the heritage value of the site as far as possible.

#### Technical Amendments

76. Some Members supported Amendment Item B1 and appreciated the effort of rehabilitation and maintaining the Kai Tak River as open waterway to in response to the public views. A Member considered that landscape treatments for the Kai Tak River should take into account the concept of urban biodiversity.

77. Some Members supported Amendment Item B2 for better integration with the Preservation Corridor for Lung Tsun Stone Bridge remnants and the planned pedestrian connections, as well as conservation of the heritage in the area.

#### Conclusion

78. The Chairman concluded that Members generally agreed to the proposed rezoning proposal while some Members were of the view that consideration should be given to the age/community mix, heritage value, rehousing options and better treatment of the adjoining retaining slope at the detailed design stage. The above views would be conveyed



to HKHA for further consideration.

79. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree the proposed amendments to the approved Wang Tau Hom and Tung Tau OZP No. S/K8/21 and that the draft Wang Tau Hom and Tung Tau OZP No. S/K8/21A at Attachment II (to be renumbered to S/K8/22 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment IV for the draft Wang Tau Hom and Tung Tau OZP No. S/K8/22 as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land uses zonings of the OZP and the revised ES was suitable for public inspection together with the OZP.

80. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revision would be submitted for the Board's consideration.

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

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

**Agenda Item 11**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K/20                      Renewal of Planning Approvals for Temporary ‘Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle)’ (Surplus Car Parking Spaces only) for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group A)” Zone, (a) Lei Yue Mun Estate, (b) Yau Chui Court and Yau Tong Estate, and (c) Wo Lok Estate, Kwun Tong District, Kowloon  
  
(MPC Paper No. A/K/20)

---

81.                      The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Authority. The following Members had declared interests on this item:

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee<br>(the Chairman)<br><i>as the Director of Planning</i>          | - | being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and the Building Committee (BC) of HKHA;   |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan<br><i>as the Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department</i> | - | being an alternate representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and the Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA;   |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho  | - | having current business dealings with HKHA;   |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai   | - | his firm having current business dealings with HKHA;  |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon  | - | his spouse being an employee of the Housing Department (HD) (the executive arm of HKHA), but not involved in planning work;                   |
| Mr Franklin Yu   | - | being a member of BC of HKHA; and   |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau   | - | being an ex-Director (Development and Marketing) of Hong Kong Housing Society, which was in discussion with HD on housing development issues. |

82.                      The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had

tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had already left the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Martin W.C. Kwan and Franklin Yu were direct, the Committee agreed that they should leave the meeting temporarily for the item. The Committee also noted that the interest of the Chairman was direct, the Vice-chairman should assume the chairmanship. As the Vice-chairman, Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, if the matter was subject to a statutory time limit, then as a matter of necessity, the Chairman should continue to assume the chairmanship but a conscious effort should be made to contain his scope of involvement in an administrative role to minimize any risk that he might be challenged. As Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

[Messrs Franklin Yu and Martin W.C. Kwan left the meeting at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approvals for temporary public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) (surplus vehicle parking spaces only) under applications No. A/K15/118 (for carpark (a)), A/K15/117 (for carpark (b)), and A/K/15 (for carpark (c)) for a period of 3 years until 3.5.2022;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Postmaster General advised that there was an operation need for Hong Kong Post to operate the Speedpost Operation Centre and rent 2 private car and 16 light goods vehicle parking spaces to serve the postal demand in the area. Other concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

- (d) during the statutory publication period, eight public comments were received from the Chairman of the Yau Tong Estate, Yau Chui Court and the Redevelopment of Yau Tong Estate (Phase IV) Owners' Corporation, the Chairman of Yau Tong Police Quarter Residents' Association, a Kwun Tong District Council Member and individuals expressing views on the application. The major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The letting of the surplus monthly vehicle parking spaces to non-residents would help utilise public resources more efficiently. The application was in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34B in that there was no material change in planning circumstances of the surrounding areas since the previous temporary approvals were granted, and there was no adverse planning implication and no adverse comment from the relevant government departments. The Transport Department had no objection to the application and an approval condition was recommended to ensure that priority would be given to the residents in letting the vehicle parking spaces. Regarding the public comments received, the comments from government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

84. Noting some public comments indicated that there was a strong demand for parking spaces in Yau Tong, and 51 nos. of private car parking spaces had been converted for a Speedpost Operation Centre of Hong Kong Post, a Member asked the number of applications for monthly rental of private car parking spaces in Lei Yue Mun Estate. Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, said that as of April 2019, there were a total of 175 applications on the waiting list (6 nos. from residents and 169 nos. from non-residents), which reflected the demand for private car parking spaces in the area.

85. A Member enquired when providing parking spaces in new public housing developments, whether reference would be made to the issue of surplus parking spaces in the existing public housing estates. Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, said that the parking spaces in new public housing would be provided in accordance with the requirements set out in

Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). Although provision of public parking space in public housing developments was not a mandatory requirement in HKPSG, HKHA would, in consultation with relevant government department and without affecting the provision of housing units, provide public parking spaces as appropriate.

#### Deliberation Session

86. Noting a Member's concern on the strong demand for public parking spaces, the Chairman invited Mr Michael H.S. Law, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), Transport Department (AC for T (Urban), TD), to share the actions taken by the government on this matter. Mr Law said that in addition to encouraging the provision of public parking spaces as far as practicable in new developments and identifying suitable sites for construction of public vehicle parks in line with the "Single Site, Multiple Uses" principle, TD had conducted some pilot schemes such as opening up the school premises for parking of school buses and allowing goods vehicles to park at ancillary loading/unloading spaces in certain types of existing developments at night time.

87. Regarding the competing demand for different land uses, a Member opined that relevant government departments should give priority to the views and demand of the residents in taking forward the initiative of optimising the use of land.

88. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a further period of 3 years until 3.5.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following condition :

“Priority should be accorded to the respective residents of Lei Yue Mun Estate, Yau Chui Court, Yau Tong Estate, Yau Lai Estate and Wo Lok Estate in the letting of the surplus vehicle parking spaces and the proposed number of vehicle parking spaces to be let to non-residents should be agreed with the Commissioner for Transport.”

89. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clause as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

[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 12**

**Any Other Business**

90. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 12:00 p.m.