

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 760th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 28.2.2025

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Assistant Commissioner/Urban,
Transport Department
Mr B.K. Chow

Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department
Mr Bond C.P. Chow

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South),
Environmental Protection Department
Miss Queenie Y.C. Ng

Assistant Director/Regional 1,
Lands Department
Ms Catherine W.S. Pang

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr K.K. Lee

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Alex M.K. Choi

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 759th MPC Meeting held on 14.2.2025

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 759th MPC meeting held on 14.2.2025 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Deferral Cases

Sections 12A and 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Committee noted that there were two cases requesting the Town Planning Board to defer consideration of the applications. Details of the requests for deferral, Members' declaration of interests for the cases and the Committee's views on the declared interests were in **Annex 1**.

Deliberation Session

4. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer decisions on the applications as requested by the applicants pending submission of further information, as recommended in the Papers.

[Professor Simon K.L. Wong joined the meeting at this point.]

Case for Streamlining Arrangement

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The Committee noted that there was one case selected for streamlining arrangement and the Planning Department had no objection to the application. Details of the planning application were in **Annex 2**.

Deliberation Session

6. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K13/32

(MPC Paper No. 1/25)

7. Noting that the sites at Choi Hing Road under Amendment Items A1 and A2 were in close proximity to St. Joseph's Anglo-Chinese School, Mr Stanley T.S. Choi declared an interest on the item for being an alumni of St. Joseph's Anglo-Chinese School and was currently involving in the school affairs. As the interest of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi was considered indirect, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

8. The following government representatives and the consultants were invited to the meeting at this point:

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Vivian M.F. Lai	-	District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)
Mr Patrick W.Y. Wong	-	Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)
Ms Peggy L.Y. Wong	-	Town Planner/Kowloon

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Jason K.C. Wong	-	Senior Engineer/10 (East)
Mr Ephes M.K. Lau	-	Senior Architect/1 (East) (SA/1(E))

Consultants

AtkinsRealis Asia Limited

Mr Louis N.K. Lau

Ms F.C. Kwan

Mr Kelvin H.F. Chau

Mr Alex P.Y. Sung

Mr Kevin Lee

Mr W.K. Chiu

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Patrick W.Y. Wong, STP/K, PlanD, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments included:

- (a) Amendment Item A1 – rezoning a site at Choi Hing Road from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Residential (Group A) 4” (“R(A)4”) subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 7.5 for a domestic building or 9.0 for a building that was partly domestic and partly non-domestic and a maximum building height (BH) of 175mPD;
- (b) Amendment Item A2 – rezoning two residual strips of land at the northwestern and southeastern corners of Item A1 Site from “G/IC” to areas shown as ‘Road’;
- (c) Amendment Item B1 – rezoning a site at Choi Ha Road from “G/IC” to “R(A)4” subject to a maximum PR of 7.5 for a domestic building or 9.0 for a building that was partly domestic and partly non-domestic and a maximum BH of 140mPD; and
- (d) Amendment Item B2 – rezoning the staircase to the north of Item B1 Site from “G/IC” to “G/IC(3)”.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong joined the meeting during PlanD’s presentation.]

10. As the presentation of PlanD’s representative was completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

Planning Context

11. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) what the major shortfalls of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in the district were, and how the situation could be alleviated through the proposed amendments;
- (b) whether the proposed residential developments at Items A1 and B1 Sites were justified given the abundant housing supply in Kowloon Bay and Kai Tak; and
- (c) whether the requirements to provide GIC facilities at Items A1 and B1 Sites would discourage developers from purchasing the two residential sites in public tenders.

12. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) information on the provision of GIC facilities in the district was provided in Attachment VI of the Paper. In general, the existing and planned provisions of GIC facilities and open space were adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population in the district, except for child care, elderly and rehabilitation services/facilities. In consideration of the individual site context and the requirements of the concerned government departments, it was the current practice to incorporate suitable GIC facilities into development sites where appropriate, such as the proposed rehabilitation facilities at Item A1 Site and elderly and other social welfare facilities at Item B1 Site. It was expected that the GIC facilities to be provided in the proposed residential developments could alleviate part of the GIC shortfall in the district. Other shortfalls would be addressed gradually through the provision of appropriate GIC facilities in new developments/redevelopments when opportunities arose;

- (b) both Items A1 and B1 Sites were currently zoned “G/IC” on the OZP. Item A1 Site was originally reserved for a social welfare complex and an electricity substation, but there was no implementation programme for the facilities. Item B1 Site comprised the vacant school premises (VSP) of the Former Maryknoll Secondary School. Relevant government departments had been consulted and did not require the sites for GIC uses. To optimise the use of valuable land resources, PlanD had reviewed the land use of the two sites. Taking into account various land use scenarios and site considerations, the feasibility study conducted by CEDD confirmed that both sites were suitable for residential use. There was a long-term housing demand in the territory, and the proposed residential developments aligned with the Government’s policy of a continued increase in land supply through a multi-pronged approach to support housing needs; and
- (c) the proposed GIC facilities constituted only a small portion of the residential developments. With reasonable site configurations, the future developers should be able to effectively integrate the GIC facilities into the residential developments through appropriate layout and building design.

13. The Chairperson supplemented that according to the Annual Progress Report 2024 of the Long Term Housing Strategy (LTHS), the projected total housing supply target for the 10-year period from 2025-26 to 2034-35 was about 440,000 units and the public/private split of new housing supply remained at 70:30, accounting for about 132,000 private housing units in the coming 10-year period. Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD further explained that as both sites were located in a well-established community and were ready for development, the proposed residential developments could be completed by 2030/31 for Item A1 Site and 2031/32 for Item B1 Site. As such, they could contribute to the private housing supply during the first 5 years of the 10-year LTHS when the demand was more acute.

Land Use Compatibility

14. Noting that there were three schools in the vicinity of Item A1 Site, two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed residential use would be in conflict with the neighbouring schools, considering that future residents might be disturbed by noise from the schools and that the proposed residential development overlooking the schools might have impact on students' activities; and
- (b) what measures could be taken to minimise nuisances to the schools during construction stage.

15. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) Item A1 Site was separated from the neighbouring St. Joseph's Anglo-Chinese School by a road, and Sing Yin Secondary School was farther away. Only the school hall and classroom building of St. Joseph's Anglo-Chinese School were fronting Item A1 Site, and the basketball courts with more noise-generating activities were located at the eastern side farther from Item A1 Site. Therefore, the future residents would be less susceptible to noise from the schools and direct overlooking was considered minimal. For Caritas Mother Teresa School to the south of Item A1 Site, as it was situated in a higher platform, the interface was minimal. The future developer would have to follow the requirements under the building regulations, including the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, in the detailed design of the residential development; and
- (b) the construction of Item A1 Site would be governed by relevant legislation and guidelines to control and mitigate noise impact, air emissions and solid waste discharge.

Site Context and Current Land Use

16. In response to a Member's enquiry on tree removal and any ecological impact arising from the proposed developments, Mr Ephes M.K. Lau, SA/1(E), CEDD said that a Preliminary Environmental Review and a tree survey had been conducted, which confirmed

that the proposed developments at both Item A1 and B1 Sites would not have significant ecological impacts and there were no Old Valuable Trees or Trees of Particular Interest in both sites. Instead, only common tree species found in urban areas, such as *Acacia confusa* (台灣相思), *Ficus virens* (大葉榕), *Aleurites moluccana* (石栗), *Macaranga tanarius* var. *tomentosa* (血桐), were recorded.

17. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed rehabilitation facilities at Item A1 Site could be provided in a standalone low-rise block to minimise interface issues with the residential building and enhance convenience for future users. If so, whether the current BH restriction could accommodate a combination of low-rise and high-rise blocks; and
- (b) the current land use at Item B1 Site, and whether re-provisioning was necessary.

18. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) a scenario for separating the uses in low-rise and high-rise blocks had been devised and tested, and the result indicated that the proposed BH of 175mPD for Item A1 Site could accommodate such a separation. Alternatively, the uses could be physically separated within the same building with separate entrances; and
- (b) the VSP at Item B1 Site was currently used as a temporary training and youth development centre by the Hong Kong Customs and Excise Department. Upon termination of the temporary use, the site had been handed over to the Government. The re-provisioning arrangement, if necessary, would be subject to further discussions with relevant government departments.

19. As Item B1 Site was one of the VSP sites, the Chairperson explained that a Central Clearing House Mechanism (the Mechanism) was in place to monitor the uses of these sites. At the invitation of the Chairperson, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD further elaborated on the Mechanism for VSP sites that the Mechanism would be activated when the Education Bureau confirmed that a VSP site was no longer required for school use. In accordance with the Mechanism, PlanD would review the use of VSP sites to identify and recommend suitable long-term uses. To optimise land resources, some VSP sites could be put to short-term uses prior to implementation of the long-term uses. The Lands Department compiled and published a list of VSP sites available for short-term community, institutional or non-profit making uses in their website. Users, including government departments and non-governmental organisations, were fully aware of the short-term availability of those sites. Upon confirmation of the long-term uses, the Government would take back the sites to implement the long-term uses.

20. Members generally supported the proposed amendments to the OZP. The Chairperson remarked that the proposed amendments to the OZP mainly involved rezoning Item A1 and B1 Sites from “G/IC” to “R(A)4” for private residential developments through land sale. Should the Committee agree with the proposed amendments, the draft OZP would be gazetted for public inspection for 2 months and the representations received, if any, would be submitted to the Town Planning Board for consideration.

[Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui joined the meeting during the question and answer session.]

21. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and that the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay OZP No. S/K13/32A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/K13/33 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay OZP No.

S/K13/32A (to be renumbered to S/K13/33 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.”

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

[The Chairperson thanked the government representatives and the consultants for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

23. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 9:45 a.m.

**Minutes of 760th Metro Planning Committee
(held on 28.2.2025)**

Deferral Cases

Requests for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
3	Y/TW/18	1 st
6	A/K15/132	1 st

Declaration of Interests

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

Item No.	Members' Declared Interests	
3	Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) was one of the consultants of the applicant.	- Dr Tony C.M. Ip for his company having current business dealings with ARUP
6	The application site was located in Yau Tong and ARUP was the consultant of the applicants.	- Professor Simon K.L. Wong for his company owning properties in Yau Tong - Dr Tony C.M. Ip for his company having current business dealings with ARUP

The Committee noted that Dr Tony C.M. Ip had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Professor Simon K.L. Wong had not joined the meeting yet.

* Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/760_mpc_agenda.html for details of the planning applications.

**Minutes of 760th Metro Planning Committee
(held on 28.2.2025)**

Case for Streamlining Arrangement

Application approved on a permanent basis

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
4	A/K5/872	Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (1)” Zone, Unit 8, G/F, 680 Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon