

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 634th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 6.9.2019

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

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
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor John C.Y. Ng

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms April K.Y. Kun

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss Denise M.S. Ho

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 633rd MPC Meeting held on 16.8.2019

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 633rd MPC meeting held on 16.8.2019 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/K10/2 Application for Amendment to the Draft Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K10/25, To Rezone the Application Site from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Commercial Development with Public Vehicle Park” to “Residential (Group A) 4”, 128 Carpenter Road, Kowloon City, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. Y/K10/2A)

3. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup), Wong Tung & Partners Ltd. (WTP) and MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with Arup and MVA;

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with Arup, WTP and MVA; and

Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with Arup and MVA.

4. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative had requested deferment of consideration of the application, and Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, while Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived at the meeting.

5. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 28.8.2019 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 the Transport Department. This was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the

application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to respond to departmental 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 second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for the preparation of the further information, 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/TW/508

Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Non-polluting Industrial Development (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of Dangerous Goods) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone, 18-20 Pun Shan Street, Tsuen Wan, New Territories

(MPC Paper No. A/TW/508)

7. The Secretary reported that Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited (MMHK) and Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - his firm having current business dealings with MMHK;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with MMHK; and
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which was having current business dealings with KTA.

8. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

9. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 20.8.2019 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. This was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

10. 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 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K3/582 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Non-polluting Industrial Use (excluding industrial undertakings involving the use/storage of Dangerous Goods) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 107-111 (Odd Numbers Only), Tung Chau Street, Tai Kok Tsui, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K3/582)

11. The Secretary reported that the Planning Department (PlanD) recommended deferment of the consideration of the application as the building height restriction of the application site was the subject of one of the amendment items under the draft Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K3/31 and adverse representations relating to the application site were received during the exhibition period of the draft OZP and the substance of the representations was relevant to the subject application. According to the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 33), a decision on the current application should be deferred until the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) considered the draft OZP and the relevant representations.

12. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as recommended by PlanD. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration after CE in C considered the draft OZP and the representations.

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/808 Proposed Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated
“Business” Zone, Portion of Workshop A1, G/F, Kimberland Centre, 55
Wing Hong Street, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/808)

13. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 22.8.2019 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. This 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 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 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/464 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Non-polluting Industrial Development (Excluding Industrial Undertakings Involving the Use/Storage of Dangerous Goods) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 20-24 Kwai Wing Road, Kwai Chung, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/464)

15. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 22.8.2019 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. This was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

16. 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.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

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

- (b) the temporary concrete batching plant for a period of five years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 and Appendix V of the Paper. Concerned departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, one public comment was received from an individual expressing concern 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. Whilst the application site (the Site) fell within “Industrial” (“I”) zone which was intended primarily for general industrial uses to ensure an adequate supply of industrial floor space to meet demand from production-oriented industries, the temporary concrete batching plant under application for five years was considered not incompatible with the planning intention for the site from land use point of view. Previous applications for similar or same uses had been approved by the Committee and approval of the application on the temporary basis was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions. In support of the current application, a revised traffic impact assessment and environmental assessment were submitted by the applicant. Relevant departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the adverse public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessment above were relevant.

[Messrs Franklin Yu and Michael H.S. Law arrived to join the meeting during the presentation session.]

20. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

21. Noting that the Site was restricted to ship building under the lease, a Member asked about the planning for dockyard industry. The Chairman said the outlook of dockyard industry in Hong Kong was pertained to economic environment. The current application for temporary concrete batching plant was to meet the current local construction demand. Since the Site was far from the residential area, the potential environmental impacts posed by the concrete batching plant would be less significant.

22. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of five years until 6.9.2024, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no queuing on public roads in the vicinity of the application site resulting from the operation of the concrete batching plant shall be allowed at any time during the planning approval period;
- (b) the submission of a traffic management plan including contingency plan and associated mitigation measures and traffic facilities within six months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB, by 6.3.2020;
- (c) in relation to (b) above, the implementation of the approved traffic management plan during the operation period of the concrete batching plant to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) the existing fire services installations implemented at the application site under application No. A/TY/126 shall be maintained in efficient working order at all times during the planning approval period to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (e) the implementation of the approved Barging Operation Plan under application No. A/TY/126 and the maintenance of the proposed measures at all times during the planning approval period to the satisfaction of the

Director of Marine or of the TPB;

- (f) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (c), (d) or (e) is not complied with during the planning approval / operation period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (g) if the above planning condition (b) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

23. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VI 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.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 9

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/17
(MPC Paper No.11/19)

24. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendment items were located at Cyberport. Some of the Innovation and Technology Bureau (ITB)'s representatives were from Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited (HKCMCL) and Urbis Limited (Urbis). The following Members had declared interests on the item.

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho]	his firm having current business dealings with
]	
Mr Alex T.H. Lai]	Urbis; and
Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong	-	being a personal friend of the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of HKCMCL.

25. The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had no involvement in the proposal, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

26. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD), Transport Department (TD) and ITB were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD's representatives:

Mr Jerry Austin	-	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK);
Mr Mann M.H. Chow	-	Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK);

TD's representative:

Mr. T.H. Hung - Engineer/Southern, TD;

ITB's representatives:

Ms. Eva Y.L. Yam - Principal Assistant Secretary for Innovation and Technology (PAS(IT)), ITB;

Ms. Salina K.T. Mak - AS for Innovation and Technology (AS(IT)), ITB;

Mr. Peter Yan - CEO, HKCMCL;

Mr. Howard Cheng - Chief Operating Officer, HKCMCL;

Mr. Joel C.S. Chan - Group Director, P&T Architects and Engineers Ltd.;

Mr. Samuel C.Y. Tse - Associate Director, P&T Architects and Engineers Ltd.;

Ms. Anson Yim - Senior Planner, Urbis;

Mr. Stanley Chan - Director, OZZO Technology (HK) Limited; and

Mr. Steve Lo - Senior Environmental Consultant, Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Limited

27. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the Paper. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, STP/HK, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

Background

- (a) a new site adjoining the existing Cyberport had been identified for Cyberport expansion (the proposed Cyberport expansion) which would allow the facilities with specific operational requirements to be provided in a more comprehensive manner, creating a favourable and sustainable innovation and technology ecosystem for technology companies and start-ups. The Financial Secretary had announced in the 2019-20 Budget that \$5.5 billion would be earmarked for the proposed development. To take forward the Budget initiative, amendment to the Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) was necessary;

- (b) Route 7 (currently known as Route 4) was originally proposed as a strategic link along the western coast of Hong Kong Island. The Government had decided that the proposed Route 7 would not be implemented. As such, the alignment of the proposed Route 7 as shown on the OZP was obsolete and should be deleted;

Proposed Amendments to the OZP

- (c) Amendment Item A1 – it was proposed to rezone a site (about 1.63 ha), which was a piece of government land mainly shown as ‘Road’ to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “(Cyber-Port) (1)” (“OU(Cyber-Port)(1)”) zone with a maximum building height restriction (BHR) of 65mPD, a maximum gross floor area (GFA) restriction of 66,000m² and provision of not less than 5,000m² at grade open space;
- (d) Amendment Item A2 – it was proposed to rezone a site (about 4.53 ha), which was a piece of government land mainly shown as ‘Road’ and partly zoned “OU(Cyber-Port)” to “Open Space” (“O”) zone to reflect the planning intention of the area;
- (e) Amendment Items C to E – proposed amendments related to the deletion of Route 7 as set out in paragraph 5 of the Paper;
- (f) other Technical Amendments and Minor Boundary Adjustments – to reflect the road scheme of the “Interchange at Junction of Pok Fu Lam Road and Sassoon Road” completed in 2003, amendments deemed to be approved under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) incorporated into the OZP;
- (g) technical amendments to the Notes in respect to the promulgation of a revised set of Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans on 11.1.2019 and other amendments as appropriate;

Technical Assessments

- (h) various technical assessments had been conducted which demonstrated that the proposed Cyberport expansion would not induce unacceptable impacts on the local area in terms of traffic, environmental, visual, air ventilation and landscape aspects;

Departmental Consultation

- (i) relevant bureaux and departments consulted had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed amendments;

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

- (j) based on a planned population of about 102,820 persons, there was no shortfall on major GIC facilities in the area in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. While Items A1, C1 to C3 and E involved reduction of areas zoned as “O”, there would be a net increase of about 2.97ha of areas zoned “O” in the area, mainly due to the rezoning proposal of Item A2. Besides, an at-grade public open space of not less than 5,000m² would be provided within the proposed Cyberport expansion; and

Public Consultation

- (k) the HKCMCL consulted the District Development and Housing Committee (DDHC) of Southern District Council (SDC) on 27.5.2019, and ITB and HKCMCL consulted DDHC again on 18.7.2019. At the meeting on 18.7.2019, Members of DDHC indicated support for the project which could help the long-term development of innovation and technology (I&T) in Hong Kong. Some Members expressed concerns on the traffic conditions of the area, the enhancement works at Cyberport Waterfront Park and the public space provided by Cyberport. DDHC pressed for the

expeditious construction of South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)) and urged for improvements to transport and pedestrian facilities. In this regard, two motions were passed by the DDHC, one to urge for construction of the SIL(W) and the other for implementation of associated projects for improving connection between Cyberport and the neighbouring communities as well as implementation of traffic mitigation measures.

28. The Chairman suggested and Members agreed to first discuss the proposed Amendment Items A1 and A2 related to the proposed Cyberport expansion and then the proposed deletion of the obsolete alignment of Route 7 and its associated zoning amendments.

Amendment Items A1 and A2

Provision of Facilities at Cyberport and Relation with Local Community

29. In response to some Members' questions on the nature of the companies to be accommodated in the additional space provided by the proposed Cyberport expansion project, how the promotion of I&T industry in Cyberport would be related to the local community, Mr Peter Yan said that Cyberport had all along been playing an important role in promoting the overall I&T ecosystem in Hong Kong. Cyberport consisted primarily of companies which were involved in technology-related business operations and provided them with co-working spaces and incubator facilities. Ms Eva Y.L. Yam, PAS(IT), ITB, added that promoting I&T development was high on the government's policy agenda. Over the past two years, the government had invested over \$100 billion in the sector. Cyberport had been playing an important role in taking forward I&T development. HKCMCL had so far nurtured over 600 start-ups under its Cyberport Incubation Programme and three of which had become unicorns. The proposed Cyberport expansion was to attract more quality technology companies and start-ups to establish their offices in Cyberport and provide a pathway for young people to pursue a career in I&T industry which was important to Hong Kong's economy and could improve Hong Kong people's quality of life. On Cyberport's relation with the local community, HKCMCL had been working closely with the local community with a view to encouraging the use of I&T and creating synergy. HKCMCL was most willing to identify ways to further strengthen its cooperation with the local

non-governmental organisations as suggested by SDC. Cyberport would consider opening up the conference facilities in the proposed development for use by the local community.

30. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the role of Cyberport in the I&T development in Hong Kong and its occupancy rate;
- (b) any overlap in provision of the proposed conference facilities and the existing ones; and
- (c) the estimated working population in relation to the proposed office space.

31. Mr Peter Yan made the following response:

- (a) regarding the role of Cyberport in Hong Kong as compared with other technology parks, Cyberport focused mainly on digital technology such as cloud and digital technology platform while other parks might focus on technology research, bio-tech or advance manufacturing development. Occupancy rate of the existing Cyberport office space was over 90%. To illustrate Cyberport's need for office space, he cited the example that while there were about 600 to 700 applications for the Cyberport Incubation Programme each year, Cyberport could only admit around 100 companies as a result of shortage of facilities;
- (b) for conference facilities, the largest existing function rooms, which could only accommodate about 300 persons, could not meet current demand. There were at least three invitations last year to host large-scale international events which Cyberport had to turn down due to the lack of appropriate conference venue. The proposed conference facilities with a capacity of a maximum of 1,000 persons were considered necessary to meet such demand; and
- (c) the additional office space was expected to accommodate approximately an

additional 2,000 employees and 1,000 technology firms and start-ups.

Other Elements in Cyberport

32. Some Members raised questions on whether there were any innovative elements, such as art, being incorporated in the Cyberport which could benefit the local people and contribute to promoting I&T, and what the government was doing to promote STEM (“Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics”) education. Ms Eva Y.L. Yam, PAS(IT), ITB, responded that the Education Bureau (EDB) had introduced STEM elements in the curriculum of primary and secondary schools. Specifically on I&T, the Government launched the Enriched IT programme in eight secondary schools to incorporate information technology (IT) elements on top of the current curriculum. Schools could also apply for funding to conduct extra-curricular activities. In view of the positive response of the programme, the IT Innovation Lab in Secondary Schools (the Lab) initiative would be implemented subject to funding approval by the Legislative Council. The Lab would provide funding to 500 publicly-funded secondary schools in Hong Kong to set up IT innovation labs for a maximum of \$1 million to procure IT equipment and professional services such as cloud service, and organise IT-related extra-curricular activities.

33. Mr Peter Yan supplemented that the proposed expansion project was to cater for the extension of the facilities of the current Cyberport. For example, the Cyberport Creative Micro Fund provided seed funding for entrepreneurs to help turn innovative ideas into prototypes. E-sports was an emerging sector in Hong Kong. HKCMCL had launched two schemes to provide financial assistance for the development of the e-sports industry. HKCMCL was working with one of its start-ups to further promote digital art. It would continue to find ways to incorporate technology on campus and in its facilities.

Development Control

34. A Member enquired whether the maximum GFA of 66,000m² with the breakdown of office uses and other commercial uses was indicative only and whether there would be adjustment on the breakdown. In response, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, said that maximum GFA restriction was not intended to provide control on detailed breakdown on different type of uses. Minor relaxation of GFA restriction might be considered by the

Town Planning Board (the Board) on application under section 16 of the Ordinance.

Traffic and Pedestrian Linkage

35. A Member raised a question on the development programme of SIL(W) and whether the existing traffic capacity could cater for the proposed Cyberport expansion. In response, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, said that as advised by the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB), the implementation of the SIL(W) would be subject to the programme for the development in the Wah Fu area and redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate as well as the build-up of transport demand. Assessment would be undertaken holistically to examine the overall impacts on the provision of SIL(W) as well as the proposed stations to the areas. For early planning of the SIL(W), THB had invited the MTR Corporation Limited in June 2019 to submit a proposal for SIL(W).

36. In response to some Members' question on pedestrian facilities in the area and pedestrian linkages from Cyberport to Telegraph Bay and Waterfall Bay, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK said that the existing and planned open spaces along Kellett Bay, Waterfall Bay, Telegraph Bay and Sandy Bay already allowed the provision of a continuous open space network with a possible walking trail along the coast of Pok Fu Lam as pedestrian walkway was always permitted within the "O" zone. Ms Eva Y.L. Yam, PAS(IT), ITB, supplemented that better linkages between Cyberport and the nearby area would be welcomed. The proposed pedestrian links to Sandy Bay and Waterfall Bay Park as mentioned by the SDC members had been discussed at the district level for some time and much work had been done by SDC. As the two links were outside the boundary of the Cyberport, they should be considered separately from the Cyberport expansion project. Ms Eva Y.L. Yam indicated that meanwhile, ITB and Cyberport would further discuss with government bureaux and departments concerned on the proposed pedestrian links.

Visual Impact, Building Design and Air Ventilation

37. Some Members enquired whether there was any visual impact on the neighbourhood especially from Residence Bel-air. Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, responded that according to the visual impact assessment (VIA) conducted by HKCMCL, the proposed Cyberport expansion would in general only constitute insubstantial to moderate visual

impacts at most of the viewing points due to long distance and screening by existing developments and trees. The Cyberport Waterfront Park was the only viewing point that would experience negative visual impact even with the implementation of the design measures.

38. A Member further enquired if the proposed BHR of 65mPD would allow stepped height profile for the area. In response, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK said that the existing Cyberport Phases 1 and 2 were subject to BHR of 85mPD. For sub-area 3 and 4 which were mainly residential developments, the BHR was 185mPD. The proposed BHR of 65mPD had taken into account the stepped height profile for the area.

39. Some Members raised the following questions regarding the building design:

- (a) according to the cross-section plan as shown in the Paper, the proposed building with 65mPD might pose visual impact on the surrounding, whether there were any details provided on the building design; and
- (b) with reference to the Drawings of the Paper, whether the building design as shown in the indicative drawing was elongated along the shoreline without stepping height from uphill to waterfront.

40. In response, Mr Peter Yan and Mr Joel C.S. Chan, ITB's representatives, made the following points:

- (a) the ground floor of the proposed building would be made available as public space accessible to campus users and nearby residents. As suggested by a member of SDC, Cyberport was actively considering opening up the podium or even the roof of the proposed building as a viewing platform and for recreational use so that the public could enjoy a more diverse public space. While there would be a slightly adverse visual impact on the surrounding, there was a need to strike a balance on development need. HKCMCL would endeavour to improve the design of the building taking into consideration the comments received; and

- (b) referring to Drawing 2a of the Paper, the proposed building with stepping height from the waterfront towards the hinterland would reduce visual impact on the surrounding. Besides, there would be, among others, a 32m wide empty bay on G/F, permeable building design on ground and upper floors, and a 36m wide community garden on 3rd floor of the building. Nevertheless, the building design as shown in the Drawings of the Paper was indicative only. The detailed design would be modified taking into account different stakeholders' comments.

GIC Provision and Elderly Population

41. In response to a Member's question on planned GIC provision, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, said that in the Pok Fu Lam area, GIC facilities were generally sufficient in meeting local needs, except for the provision of kindergarten/nursery, clinic/health centre, residential care homes for the elderly and community care services facilities.

42. A Member enquired about the population of elderly in the district. Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, explained that in 2014, there were about 12,000 elderly residents representing 15% of the population of the district. The elderly population was expected to increase to 21,500 or 23% in 2024.

Waterfront Promenade

43. In response to a Member's concern on the management and opening hours of the future waterfront promenade, Mr Peter Yan said that the future waterfront promenade within the Cyberport Waterfront Park would be managed by HKCMCL and it would be open to the public 24 hours a day. Members in general welcomed the arrangement.

44. In response to a Member's question, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, said that currently there was no provision of cycling track in the waterfront park. Whether cycling tracks would be provided would be subject to the detailed design of the park taking into account views of the local community. No assessment had been conducted on the possibility of providing marine access to the waterfront park.

Land Administration

45. A Member was concerned about the future land administration and selection of tenants in the proposed Cyberport expansion area. In response, Ms Eva Y.L. Yam, PAS(IT), ITB, said that the initial idea was that the site would be granted to HKCMCL under the prevailing practice. On the selection of tenants for the new office space, Mr Peter Yan said that the existing criteria would be deployed and the tenants should be I&T-related companies or those companies providing ancillary services in support of the I&T ecosystem.

Conclusion and Suggestions on Amendment Items A1 and A2

46. Members generally supported the proposed Amendment Item A since I&T industry was an important industry in Hong Kong. As the site was located along the shoreline of Pok Fu Lam district, detailed planning with stepped height profile was recommended to minimise the possible visual impact. ITB and HKCMCL should proactively interact with the local community to achieve a successful and welcoming development. Given the different working styles of I&T entrepreneurs, a Member suggested that sports facilities such as a gym could be included in the expansion project. Some Members added that there was room for improvement of ancillary facilities such as carpark, the variety of dining places and shops.

Amendment Items B1 to E

47. A Member asked whether there was any relation between the reduction of open space (by using existing Cyberport Waterfront Park for Cyberport expansion) under Item A1 and the proposed rezoning from areas shown as 'Road' to "O" under Items B1 and B2. In response, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, said that those areas zoned "O" were immediately adjoining the existing Waterfall Bay Park (under Item B1) and currently developed as an existing open space (Kellett Bay Park) under Item B2. The proposed rezoning of these sites to "O" was not meant to compensate for the loss of open space caused by the proposed Cyberport expansion.

48. Some Members raised questions on the reason for rezoning Item C2 from an area shown as 'Road' to "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") zone. In response,

Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, said that a large part of the site was a piece of government land currently used as pedestrian walkway being managed by the University of Hong Kong (HKU). The site was formed when the HKU developed the sport centre (zoned “G/IC”) and the site was licenced to HKU for management. A Member further enquired if the nature of the site was similar to the waterfront promenade in Central and Kwun Tong. Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK supplemented that those waterfront promenade located in the Central and Kwun Tong were zoned “O” with supporting facilities while the site in question was only a 6m wide narrow footpath along the shoreline adjacent to the sports centre. Some Members were of the view that the sports grounds and the adjoining footpath should be considered as a whole and agreed that the site should be rezoned to “G/IC”.

49. A Member enquired on the planned Government facilities under Item C1. In response, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK said the “G/IC” zone consisted of the existing Sandy Bay Preliminary Treatment Works Plant and a planned school development.

50. Regarding Item D, a Member asked whether a footpath could be constructed within the “Green Belt” zone. In response, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK said that footpath was always permitted and application for the Board’s approval was not required.

51. Members had no comment on the other amendment items.

Conclusion

52. To sum up, the Chairman concluded that Members generally agreed to the proposed amendments.

53. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Pok Fu Lam OZP and that the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/17A at **Attachment II** (to be renumbered to S/H10/18 upon exhibition) and its Notes at **Attachment III** are suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at **Attachment IV** for the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/17A 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 will be published together with the OZP.

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

55. The Chairman thanked the representatives of PlanD, TD and ITB to attend the meeting to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K10/261 Proposed Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) in "Residential (Group B)" Zone, 349 Prince Edward Road West, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K10/261A)

56. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 19.8.2019 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. This was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to respond to departmental comments.

57. 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 second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for the preparation of the further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K10/262 Proposed Flat, Shop and Services in "Residential (Group E)" Zone, 33
Sheung Heung Road, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K10/262)

58. The Secretary reported that Siu Yin Wai & Associates Limited (SYW) was the consultant of the applicant. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared interest on the item as his firm was having current business dealings with SYW. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

59. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 21.8.2019 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. This was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

60. 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

Any Other Business

61. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 11:25 a.m..