

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 684th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 26.11.2021**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M. K. Chung

Chairman

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Vice-chairman

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Mr C.H. Tse

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),
Transport Department
Mr Patrick K.H. Ho

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

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

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department
Mr Albert K.L. Cheung

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Mr C. K. Yip

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss Kirstie Y. L. Law

Opening Remarks

1. The Chairman said that the meeting would be conducted with video conferencing arrangement.

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 683rd MPC Meeting held on 12.11.2021

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 683rd MPC meeting held on 12.11.2021 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/H10/13 Application for Amendment to the Approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/19, To rezone the application site from “Green Belt” to “Government, Institution or Community”, Government Land to the East of 3 Sassoon Road, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. Y/H10/13A)

4. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Pok Fu Lam. The application was submitted by the University of Hong Kong (HKU), with MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) and Urbis Limited (Urbis) being two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| Dr Roger C.K. Chan | - | being an Honorary Associate Professor of HKU; |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung | - | being the Chairman of the Accounting Advisory Board of School of Business, HKU; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | | having current business dealings with MVA and Urbis; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his former firm having current business dealings with HKU and MVA; |
| Professor John C.Y. Ng | - | being an Adjunct Professor of HKU; |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law | - | being an Adjunct Associate Professor of HKU;
and |
| Professor T.S. Liu | - | having current education programme with the Caritas Pokfulam Community Development |

Project Centre at Pok Fu Lam Village.

5. As the interests of Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung and Professor Y.S. Liu were remote, and Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai, Ms Lilian S.K. Law, Dr Roger C.K. Chan and Professor John C.Y. Ng had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. In response to some Members, the Chairman said that the interest of being alumni of HKU was too remote and needed not be recorded.

[Dr Roger C.K. Chan left the meeting temporarily and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

6. The Secretary reported that two letters and one email, addressed to the Chairman, Members and/or Secretary of TPB, raising concerns on the application were received on 23.11.2021 and 25.11.2021, and were circulated to Members before the meeting. One letter was from Mr Paul Zimmerman, Vice-chairman of the Southern District Council (SDC); another letter was from the Incorporated Owners (IO) of Yee On (located at 13-15 Northcote Close abutting the Site), represented by Masterplan Limited; and the email was from the Chairman of the IO of Royalton II (located opposite the Site).

Letter from Mr Paul Zimmerman, Vice-chairman of SDC (dated 23.11.2021)

7. Mr Paul Zimmerman considered that the further information (FI) submitted by the applicant on 15.11.2021 should not be exempted from publication as it deprived the community of an opportunity to comment. He requested that the FI be published for public comments. Some comments relating to the subject application were also provided in the letter.

8. The Secretary said that the concerned FI in Appendix 1a of the Paper was mainly to respond to the comments received from relevant Government departments and the public, and provide clarifications on the technical assessments. The FI did not result in a 'material change' to the nature of the application and involved only minor changes to the indicative scheme and the revised technical assessments did not involve major changes in the assumptions and methodologies, findings and proposed mitigation measures. In accordance with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 32A (TPB PG-No. 32A) on "Submission of

Further Information in Relation to Applications for Amendment of Plan, Planning Permission and Review”, the FI was accepted and exempted from publication.

9. The Secretary continued to say that as the letter was received after the statutory publication period of the subject application, the comments made therein should be treated as received out-of-time. Nonetheless, Members might note that the comments in the letter were similar to those provided in other public comments as highlighted in para. 9.3 of the Paper.

Letter from IO of Yee On (dated 23.11.2021)

10. The IO of Yee On, represented by Masterplan Limited, raised the following main points in the letter:

- (a) the FI submitted by the applicant on 15.11.2021 involved substantial changes and, in accordance with TPB PG-No. 32A, should be published for public comment;
- (b) a separate section 12A application was submitted by the IO of Yee On to the Board on 18.10.2021, but that submission was yet to be formally accepted; and
- (c) the section 12A application of the IO of Yee On proposed to rezone a strip of land at 1, 3, 5, 7, 9-11 and 13-15 Northcote Close abutting the Site from “Residential (Group C)1” (“R(C)1”) to either “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) or “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) which might serve as an alternative site for HKU’s proposal under the current application or as an additional site for future HKU expansion. It was considered that the application of the IO of Yee On should be considered at the same meeting with the subject application, and the Board was requested to defer consideration or defer making a decision on the subject application until such time when their submitted application was being considered.

11. The Secretary informed Members of the following:

- (a) the concerns regarding the FI were similar to those raised in the aforementioned letter from Mr Paul Zimmerman and the decision to accept and exempt it from publication had already been explained;
- (b) the application form and supplementary statement of the section 12A application from the IO of Yee On were received on 18.10.2021. The Secretariat had been liaising with Masterplan on clarifications and rectifications of some application details including development parameters, site area and site boundary. Once the information was rectified, the submission could be formally accepted; and

[Post-meeting note: clarifications on the submission were received on 29.11.2021 and the submission was formally accepted on the same day.]

- (c) regarding the request to defer consideration of HKU's application, the TPB PG-No. 33A on "Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Application Made under the Town Planning Ordinance" was not applicable for deferral by third parties. The deferral request was not reasonable as the application of the IO of Yee On involved a different site. The interests of HKU would also be affected.

Email from Chairman of the IO of Royalton II (dated 25.11.2021)

12. Mr Alexander T.S. Wong, Chairman of the IO of Royalton II, stated in the email that the FI submitted by the applicant on 15.11.2021 involved substantial changes and should be published for public comment in accordance with TPB PG-No.32A. The Secretary said that the concerns raised in the email were similar to those in the aforementioned letters and the decision to accept and exempt the FI had already been explained.

13. Members noted the above letters and email and had no question to raise. The Secretary said that the Secretariat would provide replies to the letters and email accordingly after the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

14. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the Food and Health Bureau (FHB), as well as the applicant's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

Mr Mann M.H. Chow - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK)

Ms Erica S.M. Wong - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK)

FHB

Ms Shirley Y.P. Kwan - Deputy Secretary for Food & Health (Health)3/FHB

Mr Chris P.C. Fung - Principal Assistant Secretary for Food & Health (Health)3/FHB

Applicant's Representatives

The University of Hong Kong

Professor Gabriel M. Leung

Professor Ying Shing Chan

Ms Vikkie Chan

Mr K.L. Tam

Mr Jason Luk

Ms Vivian Kwok

Dr Paul Hunt

KTA Planning Limited

Ms Pauline Lam

Ms Kitty Wong

P&T Architects and Engineers Limited

Mr Brian Sze Chiu Wong

Ms Hei Man Lau

Muse Consultancy Group Limited

Mr K.K. Yuen

Urbis Limited

Mr Timothy J. Osborne

MVA Hong Kong Limited

Mr Gary Tsui

China-Hong Kong Ecology Consultant Company

Mr Mark Shea

Meinhardt Infrastructure and Environment Limited

Mr Chiu Wai Kwan

Ms Candy Ming Wai Hui

David S. K. Au & Associates Limited

Mr Wai Bun Yiu

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Erica S.M. Wong, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed rezoning, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. PlanD had no objection to the application.

16. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application. Professor Ying Shing Chan, Mr Brian S.C Wong and Ms Pauline Lam, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

Background

- (a) as announced in the 2018 Policy Address, the Government would deploy sufficient resources to enhance the healthcare services in view of the

increasing service demand arising from the growing ageing population as well as to support the Ten-Year Hospital Development Plan. Starting from the 2019/20 triennium, the number of healthcare-related publicly-funded first-year first-degree (FYFD) intake places would increase by over 150 from about 1,780 to 1,930 to address the foreseeable tight manpower in the healthcare profession;

- (b) about \$20 billion was earmarked by the government to enable the University Grants Committee (UGC) funded universities to expand the relevant healthcare training capacity so as to accommodate the learning and research needs of medical related students;

Site Selection

- (c) the Medical Faculty of HKU (HKUMed) had a long history of over a hundred years. The campus buildings were mainly located in the vicinity of the Queen Mary Hospital (QMH), which included the Madam S. H. Ho Residence for Medical Students completed in 1990 and the medical campus on Sassoon Road gradually completed since 2002. With the increasing number of students and staff over the past decades, the existing campus facilities of the HKUMed were over-utilised and inadequate. The possibility to decant existing occupied facilities for redevelopment was low;
- (d) the Site was the only feasible location for the new HKUMed facilities. It was strategically located close to the QMH (HKUMed's flagship teaching hospital); and within short walking distance from existing HKUMed complex, clinical training centres and student residences. Development at the Site would allow full integration with those existing facilities;
- (e) the uses proposed in the development included classrooms, laboratories, data centre, offices and animal facilities. Funding approval for the initial studies was obtained from the Legislative Council. If the application was approved and with completion of the statutory plan-making process, the Site allocation would be made in around 2023 and the proposed development was targeted for completion in 2027;

Formulation of Proposed Scheme

- (f) the proposed scheme was formulated with an aim to create a green and healthy complex for students and staff of HKU and the public, to enhance pedestrian connectivity of the area, and to maximise greenery to minimise impacts on the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone;
- (g) since formulation of the first indicative scheme in 2019, the team had continuously strived to enhance the scheme by revising the blocking, orientation and massing of the buildings. The submitted indicative scheme was the fourth version, which had struck an optimal balance between the development needs, preservation of the existing green environment, concerns of nearby residents and minimising impacts on the surroundings;

Design Concept, Merits and Planning Gain

- (h) maintaining the green character of the “GB” zone - by making use of the slope setting, the building masses were lifted up from the steep slope through four structural cores to minimise disturbance to the ground of the Site, including the two existing watercourses that ran across it. Hence, a considerable amount of existing trees could be preserved. A compensatory tree planting ratio of 1:1.13 would be provided to increase the amount of vegetation on the Site after development;
- (i) enabling a permeable design - building blocks were carefully designed with stepped height profile, orientation to minimise street canyon effect and provision of building gap between Blocks A and B to reduce visual impact on nearby residential towers, including Royalton I and II;
- (j) adoption of sensitive design measures – a minimum 8m-building setback from Pok Fu Lam Road would reduce the street canyon effect, minimise the sense of encroachment for pedestrians and protect existing wall trees. A building separation of about 28m between Blocks A and B could effectively enhance the visual/wind permeability of the Site;
- (k) building height (BH) profile – the four blocks were proposed with

staggered BHs. To address concerns from nearby residents, the BH of Block A was further reduced from 169mPD to 164mPD and that of Block B from 150mPD to 148mPD. A clear stepped BH profile from the north with 3 Sassoon Road at 169mPD in the north to the south with Block B at 148mPD and Block C at 143mPD was proposed. The BH of Block B was lower than that of the adjacent Ebenezer School;

- (l) provision of quality and accessible communal open space – not less than 4,000m² of quality communal open space would be provided on G/F and 3/F for enjoyment of patients and their family members of the QMH, nearby residents and the public. There were other green spaces at various levels for enjoyment of staff and students of HKU. That was a planning gain as compared to the originally inaccessible slope covered by unkempt vegetation at the Site;
- (m) improving pedestrian connectivity - through the provision of both horizontal and vertical barrier-free connections, including lift towers from Victoria Road and Northcote Close, multi-level connections to Sassoon Road and Pok Fu Lam Road, and proposed link bridge on 4/F to connect to the proposed HKU development at 3 Sassoon Road and the QMH, the pedestrian connectivity of the area would be enhanced;

Consultation

- (n) relevant stakeholders and nearby residents had been consulted on the proposed development at the Site. In response to comments from residents at Royalton, Radcliffe and Northcote Close, the indicative scheme had been refined. The concerns of the Ebenezer School & Home for the Visually Impaired regarding impacts during construction would be duly addressed. The Caritas Wu Cheng-Chung Secondary School supported the new pedestrian linkages provided within the Site. Presentation and discussion were also held at the SDC and DC members generally supported the proposed development;
- (o) in formulating the detailed design of the proposed development which

involved laboratories, strict adherence to all statutory regulations and compliance to international safety standards would be observed, which could address the public's concerns on biosafety hazards and contamination risks; and

- (p) an animation video was played to illustrate the design of the proposed scheme as a conclusion to the presentation.

17. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicant's representatives were completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

Site Selection

18. In response to a Member's enquiries on the considerations in selecting the Site for the proposed development, Professor Gabriel M. Leung, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) a great portion of HKU's main campus (including the Centennial campus) was developed from hilly slopes and a reservoir. All developable land in the campus had already been utilised and opportunities to decant existing facilities for redevelopment (e.g. Flora Ho Sports Centre Complex which was planned to be redeveloped for an academic building of the School of Business) had also been explored. There was currently no land available within the HKU campus to accommodate the proposed development;
- (b) the hospital and facilities in the medical school, including facilities for teaching and learning, researches, laboratories and accommodation for students and medical staff, were integral components and had to be located in close proximity. This locational criteria was internationally recognised according to his extensive international experience and exposure;
- (c) the strategic location of the Site would allow the proposed development to create synergy with existing facilities of HKUMed and the QMH. It could also address other concerns including the convenience and safety for staff and students, who might be working on shifts or with clinical attachments

which required them to carry out duties at the hospital at unusual hours where public transport services were limited;

- (d) in view of medical advancement, different types of research laboratories for medical research and practice were required. Unlike the old days where drugs commonly used were largely small molecule drugs which were relatively simple chemical compounds, biologics drugs and regenerative medicine (i.e. stem cell therapy) were also adopted in medical practices nowadays where Good Manufacturing Practice regulations had to be observed. Those concerned laboratories were required to be located very close to the QMH;
- (e) the current facilities, which were planned over 30 years ago, were inadequate to support the teaching, research and learning needs of the growing number of students and staff. Given the growing demand and complexity of medical care services, timely implementation of the proposed development was crucial; and
- (f) given the inseparable connections among such facilities, the medical school and the QMH, the Site was the only feasible option for the proposed development.

Indicative Development Scheme

19. Some Members raised the following questions relating to the indicative development scheme:

- (a) how the proposed development intensity of the scheme was formulated;
- (b) what the foreseeable impacts on the two existing watercourses during construction and after completion of project were, and what mitigation measures were proposed;
- (c) measures to preserve the “GB” character of the Site and the surrounding

areas, tree preservation and compensatory proposals, proposed greening ratio and proposals to enhance biodiversity at the Site;

- (d) whether the alignment of the proposed internal road parallel to Pok Fu Lam Road could be revised to minimise the impact on the natural green slope; and
- (e) impact of the proposed rezoning on the function of the “GB” zone in the area.

20. Professor Gabriel M. Leung, Mr K.L. Tam and Mr Timothy J. Osborne, representatives of the applicant, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed development intensity was formulated based on the facilities required by the university to meet the needs of existing students and staff, as well as the number of student intake of health-care related publicly-funded FYFD that HKU had to provide. The number of student intake was based on the Healthcare Manpower Projection prepared by the government, which provided a forecast on the amount of manpower required in the medical field. The forecast and the funding from the UGC for the FYFD student intake was adopted as the basis in formulating the floor space and facilities in the proposed development;
- (b) the provision of floor space allocated to current health-care related students and staff in Hong Kong was very low, and that for HKU was amongst the lowest in Hong Kong. Part of the reason could be attributed to the adoption of ‘Kaiser Formula’ in calculating the actual need of floor space in support of teaching, research and learning activities of the medical field. The floor space allocated for use by staff mainly undertaking medical practices in hospital wards was just 10% of those of other disciplines such as science, technology, engineering and mathematics. The rationale was that the work performed by those medical staff would largely be within hospital wards and the required office space should be much lower. Hence, the actual floor space provided to the current staff and students was already

in great deficit and the proposed development was much needed to alleviate the problem;

- (c) with a view to preserving the natural landscape as far as possible and to respect the sloping profile of the Site, the building blocks were lifted up through structural cores to avoid encroachment of the two existing watercourses and preserve more trees. During the construction of the development, HKU would ensure that their contractors would follow relevant regulations and guidelines to minimise any impact. Upon completion of the project, regular monitoring would also be carried out. HKU would request their consultants to report regularly on the ecological condition and biodiversity in the area;

- (d) for the 731 trees identified within the Site, it was proposed to retain 216 trees (including two potential Old and Valuable Trees (OVTs) and two wall trees along Pok Fu Lam Road), and to transplant three trees. There were no OVTs or trees with particular conservation interests at the Site. The applicant would try to maintain the “GB” character of the Site by proposing a compensatory planting ratio of 1:1.13 and an overall greening ratio of about 20%. There would be an increased amount of greenery upon completion of the project. The details of the tree preservation and greening proposals would be further enhanced at the detailed design stage and integration with existing preserved vegetation would be an important consideration. However, it was unlikely that the site coverage could be further reduced based on the indicative scheme and the floor space requirements;

- (e) the applicant endeavoured to preserve the biodiversity of the Site by minimising the impact of the development in terms of air quality, ventilation and noise. HKU had previous experience, such as in the development of the Centennial campus, in minimising disturbance to the natural habitat and ensuring biodiversity of the campus upon completion of construction works; and

- (f) the internal road parallel to Pok Fu Lam Road also served as an emergency vehicular access (EVA) and by setting back the pavement, it might help to deter jaywalking across Pok Fu Lam Road.

21. Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, supplemented the following main points:

- (a) the alignment of the internal road parallel to Pok Fu Lam Road would allow preservation of the potential OVTs and two wall trees. Further setback of the road closer to Block C might reduce the area of the void, that would likely reduce the solar penetration to the preserved vegetation within the void area; and
- (b) the “GB” zone covering the Site had an area of about 1.6ha, that was about 1% of the total area zoned “GB” on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). Although the Site was proposed to be rezoned to “G/IC”, the applicant proposed to provide a large amount of greening under the indicative scheme. In addition, the Site would become available for the public to access with communal open spaces for public enjoyment. Balancing the merits of the case, the proposed rezoning was considered acceptable.

Communal Open Space

22. Some Members raised enquiries regarding the users, opening hours and facilities provided at the proposed communal open space. In response, Professor Gabriel M. Leung and Mr K.L. Tam, representatives of the applicant, made the following main points:

- (a) apart from serving the staff and students of HKUMed, the proposed communal open spaces would be opened for public use. It would provide a pleasant environment for the users, including patients and family members of the QMH and nearby residents;
- (b) similar to the main campus of the university, the proposed communal open space and the lifts would be opened for use daily from 6am to 1am (except under special circumstances like closure of the building due to safety or

security concerns); and

- (c) the communal open space was intended to serve as passive open space with sitting areas for public enjoyment such as morning exercises. Further details on the design of the communal open space would be formulated at the detailed design stage.

Pedestrian Connectivity and Traffic Impact

23. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) how the development would be connected with the surrounding areas;
- (b) the vehicular access and car parking provision of the proposed development; and
- (c) whether any mitigation measures were proposed to alleviate the cumulative traffic impact of both the subject development and the Cyberport Expansion; and whether there would be railway connection to the area.

24. In response, Professor Gabriel M. Leung and Mr K.L. Tam, representatives of the applicant, made the following main points:

- (a) the Site was located between Pok Fu Lam Road (at 138mPD in the north) and Victoria Road (at 80mPD in the south), which had a level difference of about 60m. The pedestrian connectivity of the Site with the surrounding developments was enhanced through the provision of both horizontal and vertical barrier-free connections, including lift towers from Victoria Road and Northcote Close, multi-level connections to Sassoon Road and Pok Fu Lam Road via the communal open space on G/F and 3/F, and proposed link bridge on 4/F to 3 Sassoon Road and the QMH. The proposed linkages would offer more direct and convenient routes for the public to gain access between Pok Fu Lam Road, Victoria Road, Sassoon Road and Northcote Close. Multi-layers of communal open space of not less than 4,000m² on

G/F and 3/F would be provided for public enjoyment. Given the enhancement of the connection of the area with the QMH across Pok Fu Lam Road, it was hoped that the problem of jaywalking could be alleviated. More than one lift would be provided in each lift core so public access would not be impeded even if any one of the lifts malfunctioned or was under maintenance; and

- (b) the Site would be served by two ingress/egress points, with the main access via the existing ingress/egress of Jockey Club Building for Interdisciplinary Research at 5 Sassoon Road, and a secondary access at Northcote Close to mainly serve loading/unloading activities that would not exceed 10 times a day. An EVA would also be provided at Pok Fu Lam Road. 40 car parking spaces would be provided within Blocks C and D.

25. Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, responded that the subject development had proposed road improvement measures at the junction of Pok Fu Lam Road/Sassoon Road (West). The Cyberport Expansion Project also proposed improvement works at the same junction. The concerned road improvement works for the Cyberport Expansion would be completed by 2024 and those of the current application by 2027. The Transport Department had requested the applicant to liaise with Cyberport to co-ordinate the future junction improvement works and their implementation programme so as to minimise disturbance to the existing road network during construction. The alignment of the MTR South Island Line (West) was still under study by the MTR Corporation Limited.

Others

26. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether there were plans for further expansion on the Site;
 - (b) noting the objections from nearby residents, whether there were arrangements for further consulting the residents in the vicinity;
 - (c) whether eating places would be provided at the proposed development to

serve the staff and students; and

- (d) what the source of irrigation water for the proposed landscape area was.

27. Professor Gabriel M. Leung, Mr K.L. Tam and Ms Pauline Lam, representatives of the applicant, made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant was well-aware of the site constraints, environmental and ecological issues as well as concerns of the nearby residents. While further improvements to the scheme might be incorporated during detailed design stage, given the settings of the Site, it was impossible to propose a development scheme with a much higher development intensity. Furthermore, the amount of floor space required to be accommodated at the proposed development was formulated based on the UGC's forecast of FYFD student intake. The latest policy direction including the passing of the Medical Registration (Amendment) Bill might also have implications on the future demand for local healthcare manpower training. The additional floor space and facilities in the proposed development should be able to satisfy the imminent demand and there was currently no plan for further expansion of HKUMed in the short term;
- (b) the applicant had always cared about the views of stakeholders including residents in the neighbourhood. Rounds of consultation were held since early 2020 and the team had put in a lot of efforts to enhance the scheme in response to the comments received. During the process, four indicative development schemes had been formulated taking into account the concerns of the nearby residents and the proposed BHs of Blocks A and B were further reduced from 169mPD to 164mPD and 150mPD to 148mPD respectively;
- (c) despite objecting views received on the application, many residents in Pok Fu Lam as well as other stakeholders such as patient groups supported the project. While the team was dedicated to continue communicating with nearby residents, there was an overriding need for the proposed

development at the Site. The urgent need for sufficient floor space and facilities to support the provision of healthcare services, teaching, learning and researches could not be compromised, and the proposed development was an integral component of the HKUMed. The Committee was cordially requested to give support to the proposed development;

- (d) due to the work/class schedule of students and staff, the demand for food and beverages at the proposed development would likely be higher during lunch hours. They would try to invite suitable operators for providing such services but from past experience, the interest of operators was not high; and
- (e) HKU had been using recycled water for irrigation on its campus as far as possible and such would likely be adopted at the Site.

28. Some Members raised the following questions to PlanD's representative:

- (a) what planning control would be stipulated for the "G/IC" zone;
- (b) what the view of PlanD was on the suggestion in the public comments for stipulation of the requirement for master layout plan (MLP) submission for the proposed development; and
- (c) what the proposal raised by IO of Yee On was.

29. Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant proposed to rezone the site to "G/IC" with no development restrictions. The indicative development scheme had a plot ratio of 2.6 and HKU had obtained funding approval from LegCo based on that scheme;
- (b) since the proposed indicative scheme and the submitted technical assessments were generally acceptable, it was considered that the

requirement for submission of MLP for consideration by the Board was not necessary; and

- (c) the section 12A application submitted by the IO of Yee On to the Board on 18.10.2021 was yet to be formally accepted. That proposal was to rezone a strip of land at 1, 3, 5, 7, 9-11 and 13-15 Northcote Close abutting the Site from “R(C)1” to either “R(B)” or “G/IC” which might serve as an alternative site for the proposed development. As explained by the Secretary, upon the applicant’s clarification and rectification of the application details, the submission could be formally accepted.

30. A Member remarked that the Committee would consider views from the public when considering planning applications and it was important to ensure that diverse views from the society were being heard and addressed as appropriate.

31. Ms Shirley Y. P. Kwan, Deputy Secretary for Food & Health (Health)3/FHB said that due to the aging population and other relevant factors, it was anticipated that there would be escalating demand for medical and healthcare services in Hong Kong. It was thus imperative to have sufficient medical and healthcare professionals (such as doctors and nurses) to cater for the needs of the society. According to the results from the Healthcare Manpower Projections commissioned by FHB and conducted in 2017 and 2020, the estimated shortfall of doctors and nurses in Hong Kong would continue. As locally-trained healthcare professionals had all along been the backbone of Hong Kong’s healthcare system, there was a need to increase healthcare training places and enhance the associated teaching facilities in a timely manner. In this connection, FHB indicated full support to the proposed development and the subject rezoning application.

32. As the applicant’s representatives had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairman informed the applicant’s representatives that the hearing procedure for the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Committee’s decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representatives from PlanD, FHB and the applicant for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung joined the meeting during the question and answer session.]

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung left the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

33. The Chairman recapitulated the background of the application and the major planning considerations, including the need for the proposed development, site selection, technical feasibility of the rezoning proposal, proposed tree preservation and compensation, provision of communal open space and enhanced pedestrian connectivity, stepped BH profile and other design measures as detailed in the Paper, and invited Members to consider the application.

34. Members generally considered that the application for rezoning the Site from “GB” to “G/IC” could be supported, and expressed appreciation to the applicant’s effort in formulating a sensitive design which was considered generally compatible with the surrounding area. Some Members had the following views:

- (a) the Site was at a strategic location that would form an integral part of the HKUMed campus. It created synergy with the HKUMed campus and was suitable for the proposed development. Developments for the HKUMed should not be done in a piecemeal manner, hence it was justifiable that related facilities and buildings be located close to one another;
- (b) in view of the aging population and increasing demand for medical services, there was an overriding need for the proposed development;
- (c) though the vegetated slope currently zoned “GB” was proposed to be rezoned to “G/IC”, the proposed development was well designed and provided considerable planning merits. The community could benefit from the provision of quality communal open spaces and enhanced pedestrian connectivity in the area;
- (d) the area surrounding the Site was largely developed with residential and government/institution/community facilities and significant adverse impact on the natural habitat was not anticipated; and

- (e) the applicant had shown efforts to refine the proposed scheme to better conserve the landscape environment, maintain the “GB” character and address public concerns.

35. Some Members had the following suggestions on the indicative development scheme:

- (a) the quality and quantity of the proposed landscaping could be further enhanced, such as providing greening that served more than amenity planting purpose which would better integrate with the existing preserved vegetation in the secondary forest; and to provide a higher greening ratio. This might better maintain the “GB” character of the Site and might become a showcase for similar rezoning proposals in future;
- (b) to re-consider whether the proposed EVA connecting Blocks A and B was necessary, as the major facades of the two Blocks were accessible from Pok Fu Lam Road;
- (c) given such a strategic location and the difficulties in identifying another piece of suitable land for expansion, the applicant might consider reviewing the proposed development intensity to provide more design flexibility while striking a balance with the other considerations; and
- (d) the connection between the QMH with the proposed development could be further enhanced and additional road crossing across Pok Fu Lam Road could be considered.

36. One Member expressed concern on whether the indicative scheme would be built as planned, and said that there might be a need to stipulate appropriate development restrictions in the “G/IC” zone, such as BH restriction or non-building area requirements, to guide the implementation of the scheme.

37. Another Member said that HKU should continue to explain to the public and local stakeholders about the merits of the scheme and the overriding justifications on site selection, and that might help to alleviate oppositions to the proposed development.

38. The Chairman concluded that all Members had no objection to the application. The proposed amendment and any development restrictions to be stipulated for the “G/IC” zone or to be stated in the Explanatory Statement would be further studied by PlanD and would be submitted for Members’ consideration before gazettal. After the OZP was published, members of the public could submit their views by way of representations and comments which would be considered by the Town Planning Board. For the suggestions on the indicative scheme, the applicant would take note of Members’ views as recorded in the minutes. As regards a Member’s suggestion for further enhancement of connectivity across Pok Fu Lam Road, the Chairman said that the suggestion would be conveyed to the relevant government department for follow-up as appropriate.

39. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree to the application, and that the Chief Executive in Council would be requested to refer the approved Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/19 to the Board for amendment. Details of the amendments to the approved OZP would be submitted to the Committee for approval prior to gazetting under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance.

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of five minutes.]

[Dr Roger C.K. Chan rejoined and Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and C.H. Tse left the meeting at this point.]

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

[Mr Clement C.M. Miu, Senior Town Planner/ Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K3/593 Shop and Services in “Residential (Group E)” Zone, Unit 1, G/F, Henley Industrial Centre, 9-15 Bute Street, Mong Kok, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K3/593)

40. The Secretary reported that the application premises (the Premises) was located in Mong Kok. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr C.H. Tse - owning a flat in Mong Kok; and

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Mong Kok.

41. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr C.H. Tse had already left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

42. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Clement C.M. Miu, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

43. In response to a Member’s question, Mr Clement C.M. Miu, STP/TWK, said that the previously approved applications on the Premises were not submitted by the current applicant. Noting that the proposed use was for sale of heavy and bulky construction

materials and the applicant's claim that loading/unloading (L/U) activities would take not more than 10 minutes per day at the roadside, another Member asked about the potential traffic impacts. Mr Miu said that the Premises would mainly be used for retail sales and there would not be storage of a lot of construction material so L/U activities would be limited and there were some metered parking spaces for lorries and space for short term L/U nearby.

Deliberation Session

44. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). No time clause on the commencement was proposed as the shop and services use under application was already in operation at the Premises. The application was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission and implementation of fire service installations for the application premises within six months from the date of approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 26.5.2022; and
- (b) if the above planning condition is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr Clement C.M. Miu, STP/TWK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K5/833 Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (2)”
Zone, Portion of Workshop C4, G/F, Block C, Hong Kong Industrial
Centre, 489-491 Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/833B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

46. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

47. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

48. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). No time clause on the commencement was proposed as the shop and services use under application was already in operation at the application premises.

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

[The Chairman thanked Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/838 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 (1)” Zone, 646-648A Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/838A)

50. The Secretary reported that the Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and Archiplus International Limited (Archiplus) were two 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
Mr Franklin Yu		
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	-	his former firm having current business dealings with Arup and Archiplus.

51. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

52. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 23.11.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information.

53. 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 can be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/485 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Industrial Use in "Industrial" Zone, 13-17 Wah Sing Street, Kwai Chung, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/485)

54. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 9.11.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to address comments from relevant government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/486 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, 66-72 Lei Muk Road, Kwai Chung, New Territories

(MPC Paper No. A/KC/486)

56. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 15.11.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to address comments from relevant government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KC/487 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, 543-549 Castle Peak Road, Kwai Chung, New Territories

(MPC Paper No. A/KC/487)

58. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 10.11.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to address comments from relevant government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/H8/432 Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development with Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions (Amendments to an Approved Master Layout Plan) in “Comprehensive Development Area (2)” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, Kai Yuen Street, North Point, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H8/432A)

60. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in North Point. C M Wong & Associates Limited (CMWA) and K & W Architects Limited (K&W) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Franklin Yu - having current business dealings with K&W;

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with K&W; and

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - owning a flat in North Point.

61. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Thomas O.S. Ho had already left the meeting. As Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

62. The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 10.11.2021 deferment of consideration of the applications for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information including a revised air quality impact assessment to address departmental comments. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including new geotechnical planning review report, revised environmental assessment and revised air ventilation assessment to address departmental comments.

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

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 11

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/6
(MPC Paper No. 9/21)

64. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments involved rezoning proposals in Kai Tak that were supported by the Study on Further Review of Land Use in Kai Tak Development (the Review Study), which was commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) with AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM), Urbis Limited (Urbis) and Barrie Ho Architecture Interiors Limited (BHA) as three of the consultants. The proposed amendments for development of a proposed Dedicated Rehousing Estate (DRE) by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) were supported by a feasibility study with AECOM as one of the consultants. Amendment Item I was related to the proposed amendment to take forward the decision of a section 12A application (application No. Y/K22/3), with Ronald Lu & Partners (HK) Limited (RLP), MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA), Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and WSP Hong Kong Limited (WSP) being four of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung - being an ex-officio member of the Supervisory

(the Chairman) Board of HKHS;
(as the Director of
Planning)

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

Mr Franklin Yu - having current business dealings with Arup;

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings
with HKHS, AECOM, BHA, RLP, MVA, Arup
and WSP; and

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of HKHS.

65. The Committee noted that according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the proposed amendments for the DRE was the subject of amendment to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of Members in relation to HKHS would only need to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting. The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting, and as Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the respective amendment items, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

66. The following representatives from PlanD, CEDD, AECOM and Urbis were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

Ms Katy C.W. Fung - District Planning Officer/Kowloon
(DPO/K)

Mr K.K. Lee - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)

Ms Joyce L.M. Lee

Assistant Town Planner/Kowloon

CEDD

Mr George K.M. Mak

- Chief Engineer/E5 (CE/E5)

Mr Jason K.C. Wong

- Senior Engineer/10 (East)

Consultants

AECOM

Mr Igor Ho

Mr Steven Wong

Mr David Wong

Mr Charles Choy

Urbis

Ms Winona Ip

67. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr K.K. Lee, STP/K, presented the background and details of the following proposed amendments:

- (a) Amendment Items A to C and F to H - to rezone five commercial sites (the Reviewed Sites) in Kai Tak Development (KTD) for residential use in view of the latest economic situation and the persistent acute demand for housing which was supported by the Review Study;
- (b) Amendment Item D – to revise the alignment of the proposed Underground Shopping Street (USS);
- (c) Amendment Items E1 to E3 – to rezone and adjust the zoning boundary of the Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP) to accord with the latest boundary of the permanent government land allocation;
- (d) Amendment Item I - to take forward the decision of a section 12A application (No. Y/K22/3) to rezone a site at the junction of To Kwa Wan Road and San Ma Tau Street from “Other Specified Uses” annotated

“Tunnel Vent Shaft” (“OU(TVS)”) and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Commercial (9)” (“C(9)”);

- (e) Amendment Items J1 and J2 – to rezone a site at To Kwa Wan Road for a proposed DRE by HKHS;
- (f) Amendment Item K - to rezone the Kwun Tong Ferry Pier from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “(Pier)” (“OU(Pier)”) to “OU(Pier)(1)” to incorporate ‘Institutional Use’ and ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture’ as Column 1 uses as recommended under the Recommended Outline Development Plan for Kwun Tong Action Area;
- (g) Amendment Item L - to rezone a site at Cha Kwo Ling Road from “G/IC” to “Open Space” (“O”) to reflect the Government’s latest planning intention for development of a continuous waterfront promenade at the Cha Kwo Ling waterfront; and
- (h) other amendments/revisions – to rectify minor discrepancies of zoning boundaries to reflect existing developments/latest proposals; and to remove the indicative alignment of the Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) from the OZP to reflect the Government’s latest decision on the implementation mode of the EFLS.

Rezoning of the five commercial sites for residential use in KTD

68. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) given that no noise mitigation measures were required for the sites at the former runway area originally intended for commercial uses, whether there would be noise impacts on the residential developments upon the rezoning;
- (b) given the rezoning of the Reviewed Sites from commercial use to residential use, why the overall change in residential gross floor area (GFA) was not the same as that for commercial GFA as shown on slide 36 of the PowerPoint presentation;
- (c) as the commercial developments originally intended on the Reviewed Sites

were to use the district cooling system, what the impacts in reduction of commercial uses on district cooling were;

- (d) implications of rezoning the Reviewed Sites on the overall population mix;
- (e) whether the rezoning would affect the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Preservation Corridor (LTSBPC); and
- (f) whether flexibility was allowed for gradual change of types and quantity of social welfare facilities provision to suit the changing demographic profile over time.

69. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, Mr K.K. Lee, STP/K, and Mr George K.M. Mak, CE/E5, CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) road traffic noise impact on Site 4B5, located at the end of the former runway, could be mitigated by the semi-open noise barrier along Shing Fung Road (with the Kai Tak Sky Garden on top). According to the noise impact assessment conducted, the exceedance of road traffic noise level under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines for Sites 4C4 and 4C5 could be mitigated by installation of acoustic balconies and windows;
- (b) the overall change of residential and commercial GFA as shown on slide 36 of the PowerPoint presentation was for the whole OZP, which reflected changes due to rezoning of the Reviewed Sites as well as other amendments under Items I and J;
- (c) while the proposed rezoning of the sites would reduce the demand for district cooling service, given that there were still ample commercial developments (amounting to a total floor space of about 2 million m²), significant adverse impact on the district cooling system was not anticipated;
- (d) since the Reviewed Sites were intended for private residential developments, the resultant housing mix would hinge on the developers' decisions that were affected by market demand, marketing decisions and

other relevant factors. Hence, it was not possible to predict the impact of the proposed rezoning on the population mix;

- (e) the “CDA(4)” site under Amendment Item A abutted the LTSBPC. The proposed amendment was to revise the building height restriction (BHR) and planning intention of the “CDA(4)” zone from commercial to residential use, and the “CDA(4)” zoning would be retained. The planning brief to be prepared for the “CDA(4)” site would guide the future development to ensure its compatibility with and no adverse impact on the LTSBPC. The requirement for submission of Master Layout Plan would also allow the Committee to consider the development proposal at that site; and
- (f) the Social Welfare Department (SWD) had advised their required facilities to be provided on some of the Reviewed Sites and they were still reviewing the facilities to be provided at Sites 4C4 and 4C5. There were flexibility and room to incorporate different social welfare uses thereat to suit the needs of the local community.

70. A Member considered that there should be flexibility for changes in the provision of types and number of social welfare facilities within private developments so as to respond to changing society needs and aging population over time. There should be similar considerations in the provision of facilities by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD).

71. The Chairman supplemented that since social welfare facilities were exempted from GFA calculation under the respective zones, there was more flexibility to include requirements for specific social welfare facilities under the lease if required by SWD. Nonetheless, PlanD could convey the Member’s suggestions to SWD and the LCSD for their consideration as appropriate.

Underground Shopping Street

72. Members enquired on the following:

- (a) connectivity of the USS with the nearby area;
- (b) details about the revised alignment of the USS;
- (c) the party responsible for the design and construction of the USS and how good interface in design and ambience between different sections of the USS could be ensured; and
- (d) whether there were requirements for commercial uses and/or continuous shopfront along the USS.

73. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, Mr K.K. Lee, STP/K, and Mr George K.M. Mak, CE/E5, CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) the USS would provide connection between MTR Kai Tak Station and Sung Wong Toi Station in KTD and would have subway connections to Kowloon City and San Po Kong. The USS would provide a barrier-free pedestrian passageway that would be opened for 24-hour public access. The USS section traversing the LTSBPC would be on LG1/F and that traversing Kai Tak River would be at-grade, but there would be vertical pedestrian facilities including lifts, escalators and staircases at specified locations to allow barrier-free access between the USS and the ground level;
- (b) the amendment to the alignment of the USS near Kai Tak Station were mainly to reflect the as-built conditions. There was also a 24-hour public pedestrian passageway on B1/F between the “CDA(1)” and the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use(2)” (“OU(MU)(2)”) sites. The alignment of the section of USS between the LTSBPC and Sung Wong Toi Station was shifted north-westwards from underneath the adjacent road/public open space (POS) to within the Reviewed Sites as shown on Plan 5 of the Paper. This would allow better integration of the USS with the commercial portions of the Reviewed Sites and had taken into account development programme of the road/POS;

- (c) the developers of the concerned sites were required under land sale conditions to construct, maintain, manage and operate the USS sections within or adjacent to their sites. The concerned sites in the former north apron area would be bundled into two, and as only two developers would construct the USS thereat, the interface issues would be reduced. Furthermore, under the land sale conditions, the developers would be required to submit plans and designs on the interfacing section of the USS for review and comment by relevant government departments, including the CEDD and the Architectural Services Department; and
- (d) a minimum commercial floor area would be required to be provided by the future developers adjoining the USS within the Reviewed Sites to enhance the vibrancy and attractiveness of the USS. Although there was no specific requirement for a continuous shopfront, it was expected that the minimum commercial floor space requirement would result in a fairly continuous shopfront along the USS. For the developments in the “CDA(1)” and “OU(MU)(2)” sites near Kai Tak Station, the proposed commercial floor areas at the USS level by the developers were more than required.

74. Members enquired on the following:

Connectivity and EFLS

- (a) connectivity amongst sites at the former runway;
- (b) implications of removing the EFLS on land use zonings on the OZP;
- (c) implications of removing the EFLS on public transport in KTD and whether there were any additional traffic impacts;
- (d) connectivity of the former runway area with the hinterland under the ‘multi-modal’ EFLS;

Open Space and Greening

- (e) implications of the proposed amendments on the overall provision of open space and greenery in KTD;

LTSBPC and Heritage Trail

- (f) accessibility and connectivity of the LTSBPC to the surrounding areas;
- (g) details of the heritage trail of Kai Tak and the parties responsible for its design and construction;

Amendment Item I

- (h) the reason for rezoning the “OU(TVS)” site for commercial use;
- (i) current status of the ventilation shaft originally intended to be built at the site;
- (j) proposed BHR of the “C(9)” site and proposed uses in the adjacent area zoned “G/IC”; and

Amendment Item J

- (k) the interface between the sewage treatment works and the DRE.

75. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, Mr K. K. Lee, STP/K, and Mr George K. M. Mak, CE/E5, CEDD made the following main points:

Connectivity and EFLS

- (a) different sites at the former runway area were well-connected through the open space network. The Kai Tak Sky Garden, a landscape deck above Shing Fung Road, served as a major connection for sites along the former runway. The landscape deck was connected to the promenades (via footbridges, lifts and staircases with 24-hour pedestrian access) on both

sides of the former runway facing the Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC)/Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) and the Victoria Harbour. Shops and eating places would be provided at designated sites along the promenade. There were also at-grade pedestrian streets connecting the promenades on both sides of the former runway area. The two ends of the landscape deck were connected to the Metro Park and the Tourism Node/ Cruise Terminal. The Kai Tak Bridge Road provided connection to the Hong Kong Children's Hospital's side across KTAC;

- (b) an indicative alignment of the EFLS was shown on the OZP for information and no zoning was designated for the EFLS. Hence, the proposed removal of the EFLS alignment would have no implication on the land use zonings on the OZP;
- (c) the previous proposal for a EFLS in Kowloon East (KE) in the form of an elevated monorail was replaced by a proposed 'multi-modal' EFLS. The key components of the 'multi-modal' EFLS included (i) enhancing public transport services in KE, and deploying electric vehicles to run new bus/green minibus routes in the area; (ii) developing a traveller network that would link up the former runway of Kai Tak, the Kowloon Bay Action Area and the Kwun Tong Action Area; (iii) providing a greenway network that would run through promenades and open spaces in the KTD for shared use by pedestrians and cyclists; and (iv) establishing a "water taxi" service point in the KTD. With the proposed 'multi-modal' EFLS system to replace the originally envisaged monorail EFLS, no adverse traffic impact in KTD was anticipated;
- (d) a 600-metre long pedestrian cum cyclist bridge with travellers was proposed across KTTS to connect the former runway area with the Kwun Tong hinterland under the 'multi-modal' EFLS. Nevertheless, the proposal might have implications on the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance and required further study;

Open Space and Greening

- (e) two of the proposed items were related to open space provision. Amendment Item L involved proposed rezoning of a “G/IC” site with no long-term designated use at the Cha Kwo Ling waterfront to “O” to reflect the Government’s latest planning intention to develop a continuous waterfront promenade. Amendment Item J1 involved proposed rezoning of a piece of land zoned “O” to “R(A)6” for inclusion into HKHS’s DRE project. HKHS would designate an area in the DRE for the provision of a POS, which would be larger than the area of “O” to be rezoned, for public enjoyment. As such, there was no overall reduction in POS provision in Kai Tak;
- (f) although there was a shortfall of 4.31 ha in local open space, the overall provision of POS in the Kai Tak OZP was close to 100 ha, with ample surplus of district open space. Given a total planning scheme area of about 320 ha, the open space provision in KTD was considered comparatively high. In addition, to enhance the greenery in KTD, development sites in Kai Tak were required to provide a minimum green coverage of 30%;

LTSBPC and Heritage Trail

- (g) the LTSBPC was highly accessible and would be connected to the USS on LG1/F, which would be connected to the MTR Kai Tak Station and Sung Wong Toi Station. The LTSBPC would be connected to the Shek Ku Lung Road Playground in Kowloon City via a subway across Prince Edward Road East, which would further link to the Kowloon Walled City Park;
- (h) the heritage trail shown on Plan 4 of the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP showed selected links of pedestrian network connecting sites of heritage/cultural interests in Kai Tak and would largely route through open space. PlanD would discuss with LCSD and relevant project proponents on the possibility of improving accessibility and connectivity to those sites of heritage/cultural interests when opportunities arose;

Amendment Item I

- (i) the rezoning of the site from “OU(TVS)” to “C(9)” was to take forward a section 12A application (No. Y/K22/3) for proposed redevelopment of Lucky Building at San Ma Tau Street for commercial use, which was partially agreed by the Committee;
- (j) the “OU(TVS)” site was previously reserved for development of a tunnel ventilation shaft for the Central Kowloon Route. The site was no longer required as the concerned ventilation shaft was built on another site in KTD;
- (k) the proposed BHR for the “C(9)” zone under Amendment Item I was 100mPD. Regarding the adjacent area currently zoned “G/IC”, its current BHR was 15mPD, and the relevant departments were examining the feasibility for a topside development with a public transport interchange thereat. Hence, the BHR and/or plot ratio restriction to be stipulated for the site would be further considered in the future; and

Amendment Item J

- (l) the southern portion of the “G/IC” zone was originally intended for development of an electricity substation which was subsequently provided in another site within KTD, hence, that part was rezoned to “R(A)6” for the proposed DRE. The northern portion of the “G/IC” site was occupied by an existing sewage pumping station, and the relevant assessment concluded that the sewage pumping station would not have noise and odour impacts on the DRE. The DRE would provide public rental housing and subsidised sale flats for residents affected by government developments and/or urban renewal projects.

76. Members had no questions regarding other proposed amendments to the OZP and generally considered that they were acceptable.

77. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/6 and that the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/6A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/K22/7 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (c) adopt the revised ES at Attachment IV of the Paper for the Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/6A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP.

78. The Committee 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 Town Planning Ordinance. Any major revision would be submitted for the Board's consideration.

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

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K11/241 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, No. 3 Luk Hop Street, San Po Kong, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K11/241)

79. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 10.11.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to address comments from relevant government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

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

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K14/805 Proposed Shop and Services (Bank) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Workshop Units 6C and 6D, G/F, Hoi Luen Industrial Centre, 55 Hoi Yuen Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/805A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

81. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

82. In response to two Members’ enquiries on the location and access of the premises, Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan, STP/K, made the following main points:

- (a) a direct frontage to Hoi Yuen Road was available at the existing bank adjoining the premises. The premises was currently accessible via an exit and corridor through the industrial portion of the building. If the premises was to be used as a bank, the bank and the industrial occupancies had to be completely separated from each other by suitable fire resistance construction and design. Hence, the applicant proposed to provide access to the Premises for the customers via the adjoining existing bank; and
- (b) the applicant had not provided information on its relationship with the owner of or the operator of the bank in the adjoining premises. It might not be unreasonable to assume that the application at the premises was for expansion of the existing bank. In any event, the applicant was required to comply with the approval conditions and fulfil the relevant requirements of concerned government departments including lands, buildings and fire

safety.

Deliberation Session

83. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 26.11.2023 and after the said date, the permission shall cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “ (a) the submission and implementation of a proposal on the fire safety measures before operation of the approved use to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (b) if the above planning condition (a) is not complied with, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K14/809 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Office, Shop and Services and Eating Place Uses in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 1 Tai Yip Street and 111 Wai Yip Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/809)

85. The Secretary reported that Archiplus International Limited (Archiplus) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest on the item for his former firm having current business dealings with Archiplus. The Committee noted

that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

86. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 17.11.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to address comments from relevant Government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 15

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K22/32 Proposed Office, Shop and Services, Eating Place and Wholesale Trade with Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Tunnel Ventilation Shaft” and “Government, Institution or Community” Zones, 3-5 San Ma Tau Street, Ma Tau Kok, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K22/32)

88. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Ma Tau Kok. Ronald Lu & Partners (HK) Limited (RLP) and MVA Asia Limited (MVA) were two 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 RLP and MVA;

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

Mr C.H. Tse - his close relative owning a flat in Ma Tau Kok.

89. The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Alex T.H. Lai and C.H. Tse had already left the meeting.

90. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 10.11.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to address comments from relevant government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 16

Any Other Business

92. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:20 p.m.