

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 764th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 2.5.2025

Present

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

Chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

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
Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Anny P.K. Tang

Assistant Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Alanna W.H. Chan

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 763rd MPC Meeting held on 11.4.2025

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 763rd MPC meeting held on 11.4.2025 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Deferral Case

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Committee noted that there was one case requesting the Town Planning Board to defer consideration of the application. Details of the request for deferral were in **Annex 1**.

Deliberation Session

4. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information, as recommended in the Paper.

Cases for Streamlining Arrangement

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The Committee noted that there were two cases selected for streamlining arrangement and the Planning Department had no objection to the applications. Details of the planning applications, Member's declaration of interests for the cases and the Committee's views on the declared interests were in **Annex 2**.

6. Regarding a Member's enquiry about the declaration of interests as recorded in **Annex 2**, the Committee noted that the need to declare an interest in a premises-based

application depended on two main principles: (i) whether the business nature associated with a Member was similar to the proposed use in the application; and (ii) whether the concerned premises were located within 500m of the application premises. Under such circumstances, the concerned Member should refrain from participating in the discussion of the relevant applications. The Chairperson remarked that this was an established practice and prudent approach in considering potential conflicts of interests. The Vice-chairperson said that in general, perceived interests should also be declared to avoid any potential controversies. The Committee agreed to uphold the abovementioned established practice in considering declaration of interests.

Deliberation Session

7. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board subject to the approval conditions, if any, stated in the Papers. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses, if any, as set out in the appendix of the Papers.

Hong Kong District

[Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), Mr Elton H.T. Chung, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), and Ms Gloria Y.L. Sze, Town Planner/Hong Kong, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H9/20
(MPC Paper No. 2/25)

Presentation and Question Sessions

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Elton H.T. Chung, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the approved Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H9/20 (the approved OZP), technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments included:

- (a) Item A – rezoning of a site at the Former Sau Kei Wan Market (SKWM) Building and SKWM Building Sitting-out Area from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Residential (Group A) 7” (“R(A)7”) subject to a maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) of 8 for Class A site, 9 for Class B site and 10 for Class C site, or a maximum non-domestic PR of 15, and a maximum building height (BH) of 120mPD; and
- (b) Item B – rezoning of a site to the west of Ming Wah Dai Ha from “G/IC” to “Open Space” (“O”).

9. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP consequential to the amendments to the Plan and minor adjustment of zoning boundaries of three pieces of land to the immediate south of the proposed public housing development at A Kung Ngam Village.

10. As the presentation of the Planning Department (PlanD)'s representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

11. Noting that a stepped BH profile was adopted in the approved OZP and the BH restriction for the surrounding areas of Item A site was 100mPD, a Member enquired the reasons for proposing an additional BH of 20m (i.e. a maximum BH of 120mPD) for Item A Site. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that while Item A Site was mainly surrounded by "R(A)" and "R(A)2" zones with a BH restriction of 100mPD, for those sites designated "R(A)2" to the south, a maximum BH of 120mPD would be permitted for sites with an area of 400m² or more. The two-tier approach was indicated in the Notes of the OZP, mainly to cater for provision of on-site parking, loading and unloading (L/UL) facilities and other supporting facilities. Besides, according to the Notes of the OZP for the "R(A)" zone, some commercial uses, such as 'Eating Place' and 'Shop and Services', were always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building. The proposed BH restriction of 120mPD had taken into account the flexibility for architectural design, possible accommodation of permitted commercial facilities (shop and services/eating places), carpark, L/UL facilities, and possible provision of public/community facilities which was being actively considered among relevant government bureaux and departments (B/Ds) at Item A Site.

12. The Chairperson supplemented that as the site area for Item A Site was over 1,000m², the BH restriction of 120mPD was in line with that of the "R(A)2" sites to its south.

13. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there were sufficient government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in Shau Kei Wan;
- (b) whether there was any specific requirement or restriction stipulated in the OZP for the provision of GIC facilities at Item A Site; and
- (c) the area of a site that would necessitate the provision of on-site parking and L/UL facilities.

14. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the provision of GIC facilities for the planning area was generally adequate to meet the demand of the planned population as stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), except for shortfalls in hospital beds, child care centres, rehabilitation and elderly services/facilities. Premises-based GIC facilities could be incorporated in other large-scale development/redevelopment in future when opportunities arose;
- (b) given the relatively small size of Item A Site and the recent trend in land sale, there might be certain challenges in the provision of GIC facilities at Item A Site. Nevertheless, the provision of public/community facilities at Item A Site was being actively considered by the relevant B/Ds; and
- (c) the Transport Department (TD) was consulted regarding the provision of on-site car parking spaces and L/UL facilities at Item A site. According to TD, on-site car parking spaces and L/UL facilities were necessary for Item A Site although the amount to be provided might not be substantial as the site was well served by public transport networks. The necessity for parking and L/UL facilities was evaluated on a site-by-site basis, and the provision should be in accordance with the HKPSG.

15. The Chairperson recapitulated that Item A Site had been identified as a land sale site for private residential development. As the market use was no longer required, the proposed rezoning was to facilitate better utilisation of land resources in the urban area. The relevant B/Ds consulted had no in-principle objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed amendments to the OZP. The proposed development was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas, and GIC facilities might be provided at Item A Site subject to further review.

16. Members generally supported the proposed amendments of the OZP. A Member opined that the Former SKWM Building was left vacant, which represented a waste

of valuable land resources. The Chairperson supplemented that there was a mechanism for the Government to regularly review the uses of vacant government land. Item A Site had been identified as having potential for private residential development under this mechanism.

17. The Chairperson remarked that the proposed amendments to the OZP mainly involved rezoning Item A Site from “G/IC” to “R(A)7” for private residential development through land sale and rezoning Item B Site from “G/IC” to “O” to reflect the as-built condition. 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.

18. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and that the draft Shau Kei Wan OZP No. S/H9/20A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/H9/21 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 Shau Kei Wan OZP No. S/H9/20A (to be renumbered to S/H9/21 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.”

19. 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 PlanD’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Bond C.P. Chow left the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

[Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), and Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, Town Planner/Kowloon, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K22/43 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio, Site Coverage and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted/Proposed Commercial Development, Public Transport Station and Underground Vehicle Tunnels at Kai Tak Area 4C Sites 4 and 5 and Adjoining Road Portion of Shing King Street; and Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Private Housing Development with Proposed Eating Place, Shop and Services and Social Welfare Facilities at Kai Tak Area 3E Sites 1 and 2 in “Commercial (5)”, “Commercial (7)” and “Residential (Group B) 2” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’, Kai Tak Area 3E Sites 1 and 2, Area 4C Sites 4 and 5 and Portion of Shing King Street, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K22/43)

20. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) were two of the consultants of the applicant. Dr Tony C.M. Ip had declared an interest on the item for having current business dealings with Arup and AECOM. As Dr Tony C.M. Ip had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

21. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, STP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed developments, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

Proposed Scheme

22. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the control of the notional scheme under the current application, and whether the detailed design would be submitted to the Committee for consideration in the future;
- (b) the rationale for proposing two hotel towers at Kai Tak Area 4C Sites 4 and 5 (Sites 4C4 and 4C5) and adjoining road portion of Shing King Street (Site A), and any demand analysis for hotel development in the Kai Tak area;
- (c) the consideration for incorporating some Column 2 uses, such as 'Eating Place' and 'Shop and Services', at Kai Tak Area 3E Sites 1 and 2 (Site B), despite local objections; and
- (d) considering the Government's initiative to provide multi-level communal spaces atop commercial buildings, whether a publicly accessible rooftop garden would be provided at Site 4C4.

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

- (a) the notional scheme had been prepared to demonstrate the technical feasibility of the proposed minor relaxation of development parameters and to provide a framework for the future development. Details such as development layout, proposed uses and deposition of the buildings would

be subject to the detailed design at a later stage. Members were invited to consider the acceptability of the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR), building height (BH) and/or site coverage (SC) restrictions. Most of the proposed uses were always permitted under the “Commercial (5)” (“C(5)”), “Commercial (7)” (“C(7)”) and “Residential (Group B) 2” (“R(B)2”) zones, except the proposed commercial and the public transport stations uses which fell within an area shown as ‘Road’, and the proposed eating place, shop and services and social welfare facilities in Site B which constituted only a small portion of the development. The current application including the proposed uses and development parameters, if approved, would govern the future developments at the general building plans (GBPs) submission stage;

- (b) during the consideration of representations and comments in respect of the draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/7 in 2022, the Town Planning Board (the Board) agreed that the zoning of Sites 4C4 and 4C5 should be reverted back to commercial use. Hence, the proposed hotels at Site A were in line with the Board’s previous decision. The applicant had also conducted a financial assessment to confirm the feasibility of the proposed hotels. While the proposed maximum non-domestic gross floor area (GFA) for commercial uses, including retail, hotel and office uses, was indicated in the notional scheme for assessment purpose, to allow for design flexibility, future developers could reallocate the GFA among different types of commercial uses;
- (c) Site B had been zoned “R(B)2” on the OZP since 2017, with a planning intention for medium-density residential developments. There was provision on the OZP to apply for retail use on the “R(B)” zone which was abutting open space, waterfront promenade or pedestrian streets. The proposed retail facilities at Site B could enhance vibrancy and public enjoyment of the waterfront promenade; and
- (d) the applicant did not propose any rooftop garden at Site 4C4, which might prone to noise and air quality issues. The provisions of both district and

local open spaces in Kai Tak were sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population as stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). There was no requirement for the applicant to provide public access to the future private development. Nevertheless, the applicant proposed building setbacks with a view to enhancing the connectivity to the open space and waterfront promenade.

24. The Chairperson supplemented that the future developer could decide whether to provide rooftop garden at the detailed design stage, which could benefit the hotel staff/guests, even if it would not be open to the public. Miss Queenie Y.C. Ng, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South), Environmental Protection Department (EPD), added that in general, open space was not regarded as a noise-sensitive use. However, if open space included facilities encouraging extended use by the public, such as benches, the public thereat would be considered as air quality sensitive receivers, and relevant technical assessment would be required.

BH Restrictions

25. Noting that the proposed BH restrictions included rooftop structures for both Sites A and B, two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the rationale for proposing a BH restriction of 115mPD at Site 4C4; and
- (b) whether building maintenance unit would be counted towards the height of the building for the purpose of administrating BH restriction.

26. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, and Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, STP/K, with aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the BH restriction for Site 4C4 proposed by the applicant had taken into account the ridgeline between Lion Rock and Tsz Wan Shan as well as the Airport Height Restriction (AHR). Relevant government departments consulted had no objection to the proposed BH restriction. To ensure the BH remained below the 20% building-free zone of the ridgeline, an

approval condition requiring the submission of a refined BH profile was recommended; and

- (b) labour safety facilities for maintenance and repair purposes would not be counted towards the BH restriction under Joint Practice Note No. 5 issued by PlanD, the Lands Department and the Buildings Department. According to the Civil Aviation Department (CAD), the application sites, in particular Site B, were in close proximity to the helipad at the planned Kai Tak New Acute Hospital (NAH) and the associated helicopter routes. GFS indicated that no further fixtures/obstructions or activities would take place on top of buildings on Site B that would affect the safe and smooth flight operation at NAH. Both departments had no objection to the current application.

27. In response to a Member's further enquiry about the technical details concerning the proposed BH restrictions, the Chairperson said that relevant government departments would work out the detailed requirements before incorporating the appropriate BH restrictions in the land document for tender to address the possible concerns including flight safety.

Government, Institution and Community (GIC) Facilities

28. In response to a Member's enquiry on the provision of GIC facilities in Kai Tak area and the consideration of providing GIC facilities in Site B, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, said that the provision of GIC facilities was generally adequate to meet the demand of the planned population in Kai Tak area in accordance with the HKPSG, except for Child Care Centre (CCC). In that regard, a CCC was proposed at Site B to address the needs.

Pedestrian Connectivity

29. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the connection between Site A and the waterfront promenade, in particular whether the proposed plant rooms and ramp at the eastern part of Site 4C5

would affect the accessibility to the nearby developments, such as the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal, Tourism Node and waterfront promenade, and whether there would be any all-weather passageways; and

- (b) whether there would be any all-weather public access connecting to the social welfare facilities (SWFs) at Site B.

30. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, and Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, STP/K, with aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the buildings at Site A would be set back on the ground floor to provide direct access to the waterfront promenade. Regarding the plant rooms at Site 4C5, they were facing existing facilities of the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal, but not the proposed waterfront promenade. The notional scheme, which was indicative in nature, did not indicate the provision of an all-weather passageway as it would be subject to the future rail operator's decision at the detailed design stage; and
- (b) the current access to the Hong Kong Children's Hospital and the planned NAH (viz. the hospitals) was via the at-grade pedestrian walkways from Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay MTR Stations. There would be a new pedestrian walkway connecting Mega Box and the hospitals. To better connect the proposed Kai Tak Sky Garden station to Site B, the applicant proposed the construction of a covered walkway along Kai Tak Bridge Road.

Traffic Impact

31. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed retail facilities would generate adverse traffic impact on the hospitals; and
- (b) whether the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) conducted by the applicant

was based on the provision of the Smart and Green Mass Transit System in Kai Tak (KTGTS), and the potential consequences of a delay in or non-implementation of the KTGTS.

32. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, and Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, STP/K, with aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) adverse traffic impact from the proposed retail facilities on the hospitals was not expected as the proposed retail facilities at Site B were small in scale and intended to serve the local residents and visitors to the adjoining waterfront promenade; and
- (b) according to the Transport Department, the proposed developments under the application were contingent upon implementation of the KTGTS to provide infrastructural support for the anticipated traffic demand. If the KTGTS was not implemented, the applicant would be required to submit a revised TIA to demonstrate that the proposed developments would remain feasible from traffic impact perspective.

33. The Chairperson remarked that with reference to other successful examples such as the waterfront promenade in Tseung Kwan O, integrating commercial elements into sites along the waterfront could enhance the vibrancy and attractiveness of the promenade.

Others

34. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the compatibility of the proposed developments with the Kerry Dangerous Goods (D.G.) Warehouse and former Kowloon Godown sites;
- (b) whether there were any guidelines to control the noise and height of the KTGTS to avoid adverse impacts on the local residents; and
- (c) noting that the area designated as Tourism Node at the Kai Tak Runway Tip

was temporarily granted for a 'Youth Post' hostel, when it would be reverted to its intended use as the Tourism Node.

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

- (a) the former Kowloon Godown was under redevelopment, with a set of GBPs for residential development approved and the modified lease executed. According to a Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) conducted by the project proponent of the former Kowloon Godown, the resultant risk levels of Kerry D.G. Warehouse were acceptable in accordance with the HKPSG and would unlikely pose unacceptable risks to the nearby residents. As per the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department and EPD's requests, a QRA should be conducted by the future developer of Site B to ascertain whether the associated risk remained acceptable, and the requirement would be stipulated in the lease;
- (b) the proposed alignment of the KTGTS would need to be gazetted under the Railways Ordinance (Cap. 519). The noise level would be subject to control under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance and an Environmental Permit would be required prior to the commencement of the KTGTS; and
- (c) a short-term tenancy for a period of 5 years was granted to the 'Youth Post' hostel. It was anticipated that relevant government bureaux/departments would review the use in due course.

36. The Chairperson supplemented that under section 13A of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance), any scheme authorized under the Railways Ordinance (Cap. 519) should be deemed to be approved under the Ordinance.

37. In response to a Member's enquiry about railway vibration, Miss Queenie Y.C. Ng, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South), EPD, said that the impact of ground borne noise would be assessed under the Noise Impact Assessment.

Deliberation Session

38. The Chairperson recapitulated that the application mainly sought minor relaxation of the PR, BH and/or SC restrictions for Sites A and B to optimise the development potential by providing a variety of commercial uses and SWFs, and incorporating diverse elements into the Kai Tak area, while at the same time enhancing the KTGTS' financial viability. Sites A and B had not yet been tendered, and the detailed design would be carried out by the future developer(s) and subject to future market demand. Therefore, flexibility should be allowed for future design. The KTGTS had obtained policy support, and society and the local community had urged the early implementation of the project, as it was considered crucial for facilitating transportation for the Kai Tak area.

39. A Member asked whether the BH restrictions for the Sites could be further relaxed to allow greater flexibility for future developments, so as to obviate the need for further minor relaxation application to enhance overall efficiency in future. In response, the Chairperson said that the proposed BH restrictions were prudently proposed by the applicant based on various technical assessments conducted after taking into account various constraints including AHR, ridgelines protection, and flight operation of helicopter. It was considered that the proposed BH restrictions would be sufficient to accommodate the proposed developments, and there was no basis for proposing further relaxation of BH restrictions at this juncture without conducting the support of the relevant technical assessments.

40. A Member suggested that given Hong Kong's extreme weather conditions, the provision of an all-weather pedestrian network from Site A to the Tourism Node and Kai Tak Cruise Terminal should be incorporated in the lease conditions. Another Member concurred and added that the Committee agreed in 2022, during the consideration of representations and comments in respect of the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/7, on the need to maintain commercial use in the area with a critical mass of commercial GFA to enhance the vibrancy of the Tourism Node and sustain the Kai Tak Runway Tip (KTRT) as an attractive destination as well as a tourism hub. Echoing this view, the Chairperson said that the application was in line with the Committee's previous decision, and the Member's suggestion regarding the all-weather pedestrian network, which would involve areas outside the

application sites, would be conveyed by PlanD to the relevant government departments for consideration.

41. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 2.5.2030, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the approval condition stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clause as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 8

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

42. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:05 a.m.

**Minutes of 764th Metro Planning Committee
(held on 2.5.2025)**

Deferral Case

Request for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Time of Deferment
3	A/KC/510	1st

** Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/764_mpc_agenda.html for details of the planning application.*

**Minutes of 764th Metro Planning Committee
(held on 2.5.2025)**

Cases for Streamlining Arrangement

Applications approved on a permanent basis

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
5	A/H24/34	Proposed Eating Place and Shop and Services (Retail Shop) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pier and Associated Facilities” Zone, Shop B, Lower Deck, Central Pier No. 8, Hong Kong
6	A/K13/331	Shop and Services (Fast Food Shop) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Workshop No. 4A, G/F, Wing Fat Industrial Building, 12 Wang Tai Road, Kowloon Bay, Kowloon

Declaration of Interests

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

Item No.	Member’s Declared Interests	
5	The application premises were located in Central.	- Professor Simon K.L. Wong for being the director of a company which rented premises for catering services in the vicinity.
6	The application premises were located in Kowloon Bay.	- Professor Simon K.L. Wong for being the director of a company which rented premises for catering services in the vicinity.

As the interests of Professor Simon K.L. Wong were considered direct, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion for Items 5 and 6.