

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 768th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 4.7.2025

Present

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

Chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong,
Transport Department
Mr Horace W. HONG

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 Ben S.S. Lui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Katy C.W. Fung

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

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 767th MPC Meeting held on 20.6.2025

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 767th MPC meeting held on 20.6.2025 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Deferral Cases

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Committee noted that there were four cases requesting the Town Planning Board to defer consideration of the applications. Details of the requests for deferral, Members' declaration of interests for individual 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.

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 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/K10/6 Application for Amendment to the Approved Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K10/30, To amend the building height restriction on a “Government, Institution or Community” site, Evangel Hospital, from 5 storeys to 114 metres above Principal Datum, 222 Argyle Street, Kowloon City, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. Y/K10/6)

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicants’ representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Ms Vivian M.F. Lai | - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K) |
| Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au | - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K) |
| Ms Jenny W.C. Lai | - Town Planner/Kowloon |

Applicant’s Representatives

Evangel Hospital - Applicant

Mr W.I. Ho

Dr Vincent Lin

Dr Billy Chui

Townland Consultant Limited

Ms Delius Wong

Architecture Design and Research Group Limited

Mr Bernard Lim

Mr Eugene Chung

8. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. To ensure smooth and efficient conduct of the meeting, a time limit of 15 minutes was set for presentation of the applicant. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the background of the application.

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au, STP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed rezoning of the application site (the Site) to amend the building height (BH) restriction (BHR) of the "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") zone of the Site from 5 storeys to 114mPD to facilitate the redevelopment of the Evangel Hospital (the Hospital), departmental comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. PlanD had no objection to the application.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Mr Stanley T.S. Choi joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

10. The Chairperson then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr W.I. Ho, Dr Vincent Lin, Dr Billy Chui and Mr Bernard Lim, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

Background

- (a) the Hospital was built at the Site in 1965, and was established by the Evangelical Free Church of China. It had served the local community of Kowloon City District for about 60 years with a mission to preach gospel through holistic, high quality and affordable healthcare services;

- (b) the Hospital was a self-financing, non-profit making private hospital, dedicated to providing professional family medicine services. Its revenue was primarily used for the operation and development of the Hospital and for enhancing the quality of medical and clinical services;

Justifications for the Proposed Redevelopment

- (c) the proposed redevelopment would enhance the Hospital's service provision by increasing the number of operating theatres (OTs) and hospital beds, as well as the capacity of out-patient services, which was in line with the Government's policy addressing the challenges posed by an ageing population and the rising prevalence of chronic diseases. The proposed redevelopment had gained policy support from the Health Bureau (HHB);
- (d) the existing hospital building was subject to various constraints, including limited floor space, scattered service in various locations, crowded service and waiting areas, and insufficient infrastructural support (e.g. electricity supply and headroom for installation of the latest medical equipment). The proposed redevelopment could overcome these constraints for enhancement of hospital services to meet the increasing demand for high-quality healthcare services, provide more services on prevention and primary health care and promote sustainable healthcare system (e.g. on the aspects of oncology, chronic disease, degenerative disease and mental health) under the Hospital's mission. The redeveloped hospital would improve patients' environment with enhanced infection control, facilitate the application of smart hospital initiative (e.g. adoption of artificial intelligence), provide better patient services including in terms of price transparency and package pricing, and expand collaboration with non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to provide services to underprivileged groups;

The Indicative Scheme

- (e) the indicative scheme for the proposed amendment of BHR for the Site from 5 storeys to 114mPD comprising 22 storeys over 2 levels of basement would accommodate more medical equipment, facilities for clinical services and professional medical training, and essential electrical and mechanical (E&M) facilities for electricity supply;
- (f) a number of planning and design merits were proposed in the indicative scheme, including a 6m wide full-height setback from Argyle Street, a 6m wide tower setback above podium level from Fu Ning Street, a minimum building setback of 0.65m from the southwestern site boundary, sensitive building facade treatment including a green-patterned wall mural facing Hoover Court located to southwest of the Site, edge plantings at the balcony on 6/F and vertical greening, a mix of glass/wall-like facades on lower podium levels and circulation splay at Fu Ning Street/Fuk Cheung Street with a view to improving pedestrian circulation, street amenity, air ventilation and visual permeability;

Community Engagement

- (g) the Hospital had consulted relevant stakeholders on the rezoning application, including the adjoining residential development (Hoover Court), Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS), Kowloon City District Council and certain universities, and they had no objection to or adverse comment on the current application; and

Way Forward

- (h) after the redevelopment, the Hospital would continue its mission and family doctor approach by providing comprehensive and holistic preventive care, i.e. 'One-stop Care', within the redeveloped building. This approach primarily aimed to address the needs of patients suffering from chronic diseases, such as cancer and mental illness, as well as their caregivers, which were exacerbated by an ageing population.

11. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicant's representatives had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

The Indicative Scheme

12. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the rationale for proposing a building setback of 0.65m from the southwest site boundary and whether the podium setback of 6m at 8/F of the Hospital facing Fu Ning Street could be placed towards Hoover Court to increase the distance between the two buildings;
- (b) whether there were any design measures of the redevelopment that would benefit the local community; and
- (c) whether there was any provision of staff accommodation if the Hospital operated 24 hours a day.

13. In response, Mr Bernard Lim and Dr Billy Chui, the applicant's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) compared with the previous application No. Y/K10/5 (the previous application), the applicant, after taking into account the site constraint, proposed a building setback of 0.65m from the southwestern site boundary adjacent to Hoover Court in the indicative scheme under the current application in order to maintain a wider distance between Hoover Court and the Hospital. As the building of Hoover Court was set back from its site boundary ranging from 4m to 7m from the Hospital and there were just some windows of Hoover Court on its side facing the Hospital, together with the proposed green-patterned wall mural, the proposed measures would minimise the potential interface issues. The setback from Fu Ning Street was intended to enhance street amenity and had taken into account

the planned redevelopment of Chun Seen Mei Chuen in the vicinity;

- (b) the facades of the lower floors of the Hospital would adopt a transparent design which would be the waiting and seating areas for patients, caregivers and visitors. Besides, the applicant had liaised with HKHS on the arrangement of the run-in/out and construction works of the Hospital to minimise impact on the community including Chun Seen Mei Chuen and its redevelopment; and
- (c) owing to the reform on the fees for public healthcare services being reviewed by the Government, it was expected that more patients would choose private hospital services. To enhance the services to the community, the Hospital would operate 24 hours a day and on-call rooms for medical staff would be provided.

14. The Chairperson supplemented that the BH of Hoover Court was 46mPD as shown on Plan Z-5 of the Paper, whereas the approved BH under the previous application was 80mPD, which was already higher than the BH of Hoover Court. It appeared that most of the windows of Hoover Court faced Argyle Street and Fuk Cheung Street. The additional increase in BH and the disposition of the Hospital tower at a higher level might not have significant impact on Hoover Court, as compared with the previous application.

Proposed BHR

15. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the roof could be accessed by users of the Hospital and the proposed BHR had taken this into account; and
- (b) the rationale for the current application for further relaxation of the BHR compared with the previous application, and whether there would be future application for additional relaxation on the BHR.

16. In response, Messrs W.I. Ho and Bernard Lim, the applicant's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the design of the Hospital and the proposed BHR had taken into account the accommodation of E&M facilities and other rooftop structures, as well as the potential for supporting low-altitude economy in the future. As the roof would house the E&M facilities, it would be accessible to the Hospital's staff only; and
- (b) the proposed BHR of 80mPD under the previous application was a conservative decision, which primarily had taken into account the BHRs of the residential developments in the vicinity, which were mainly 80mPD. As a result, the design of the Hospital could only accommodate essential services/facilities, and some services had to be located outside the Hospital. Having considered a Member's enquiry on whether the Hospital would consider pursuing a higher BH for the proposed redevelopment at the Committee's meeting on the previous application in 2023, the project proponent had conducted a comprehensive review to critically assess the technical feasibility and further optimise the site efficiency. With the provision of enhanced hospital facilities and services such as increase in the number of beds and OTs and increase in the room size (e.g. larger OTs) to meet the latest requirements, there would be a corresponding increase in ancillary facilities, such as E&M facilities, lifts and parking spaces. An analysis on lift requirement to meet the operational needs of the Hospital had been conducted and the findings indicated that further increase in BH (i.e. exceeding the currently proposed BH of 114mPD) would necessitate the provision of more lifts to manage the flow and serve different zones of the Hospital and this would take up the space available for medical facilities/services on each floor. Besides, additional car parking spaces for users would also be required. The current scheme with the proposed BH was an optimal design to improve the Hospital's services while meeting relevant requirements such as the design and space requirements of OTs and wards particularly after the pandemic. Applying for further relaxation

of the BHR (i.e. exceeding 114mPD) was considered not necessary.

Community Engagement

17. A Member asked whether the residents of Hoover Court had been consulted regarding the proposed green-patterned wall mural facing Hoover Court. In response, Messrs W.I. Ho and Bernard Lim, the applicant's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) residents of Hoover Court were consulted on the indicative scheme under the current application including the proposed green-patterned wall mural facing their building, and they had no objection to the application. The Hospital had taken into account their feedbacks in formulating the design, including the provision of the planting at the side of the Hospital facing Hoover Court; and
- (b) other stakeholders including nearby schools, HKHS, relevant schools of Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong Metropolitan University and Hong Kong Polytechnic University had been engaged and consulted on the Hospital's redevelopment.

Others

18. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the charges for medical services at the Hospital;
- (b) the financial situation of the Hospital in the past 5 years, and how the profit would be used; and
- (c) the sources of funding for the redevelopment.

19. In response, Dr Billy Chui and Mr W.I. Ho, the applicant's representatives, made

the following main points:

- (a) the consultation fee for family doctor services at the Hospital was \$285, excluding medication, while the consultation fee for specialists was approximately \$600. Eligible patients, such as seniors aged 65 or above and those affiliated with NGOs associated with the Hospital, would receive discounts;
- (b) over the past decade, the Hospital experienced losses in several years, particularly during the pandemic. All revenues generated by the Hospital, including donations, were reinvested to support the Hospital's operation and services; and
- (c) the preliminary estimated cost for the redevelopment was approximately HK\$3 billion. The main sources of funding included donations and fundraising, while loans from banks would also be considered, pending banks' assessment of the sustainability of the business model. The Hospital would start working on the financial arrangement if the current rezoning application was agreed by the Town Planning Board.

20. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether land premium would be required for the proposed redevelopment, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, said that, according to the Lands Department's comments, lease modification was required for the proposed redevelopment subject to payment of premium. Nevertheless, noting that the applicant was a non-profit-making private hospital and with HHB's policy support, the payment of premium might be waived or at a nominal amount subject to the consideration at the lease modification stage. Mr W.I. Ho, the applicant's representative, supplemented that as a non-profit making private hospital, the payment of land premium would impose a burden on the Hospital. The proposed redevelopment would need to rely on donations and fundraising.

21. As the applicant's representatives had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairperson informed the applicant's representatives

that the hearing procedure of 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 Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

22. The Chairperson recapitulated that the previous application, with a proposed BHR of 80mPD, was agreed by the Committee in 2023. The current application sought to further amend the BHR to 114mPD. Members could focus on considering the justifications for further amending the BHR, any resultant adverse impact on the surroundings, and the planning and design merits of the proposed redevelopment.

23. Members generally supported the application as the proposal was well justified and would not generate insurmountable adverse impact, along with the design merits of the redevelopment scheme and the benefits that could be brought to the community. Members were impressed by the community engagement conducted by the applicant especially with residents of Hoover Court on the redevelopment scheme and design measures, including the setback from the southwestern site boundary adjacent to Hoover Court and incorporation of a green-patterned wall mural to minimise interface with Hoover Court. Some Members expressed that the redevelopment had incorporated the element to develop the Hospital as a 'smart hospital' and could supplement the services of public sector to meet the demand by offering relatively affordable medical services provided by the applicant, thereby bringing benefits to the community, while recognising the potential challenges in the financial arrangements for the redevelopment project.

24. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree to the application. The relevant proposed amendments to the Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan, together with the revised Notes and Explanatory Statement, would be submitted to the Committee for agreement prior to its gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

[Mr W.C. Lui, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), Mr Cecil C.C. Chow, Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK) and Ms Iris T.Y. Yik, Town Planning Graduate/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

| | |
|----------|---|
| A/TY/150 | Proposed Temporary Concrete Batching Plant for a Period of 5 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Boatyard and Marine-oriented Industrial Uses” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, Tsing Yi Town Lots Nos. 14 and 15 and Adjoining Government Land, Tam Kon Shan Road, Tsing Yi (MPC Paper No. A/TY/150) |
|----------|---|

25. The Secretary reported that AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants of the applicant and Dr Tony C.M. Ip declared an interest on this item for his company having current business dealings with 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

26. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr W.C. Lui, STP/TWK, 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.

Operation and Impacts

27. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the usage of the sea area, including the operation of fishermen, in the vicinity of the application site (the Site);
- (b) any measures to regulate the transportation of raw materials via the sea route;
- (c) noting from the applicant that a low-carbon strategy would be adopted for the operation of the proposed concrete batching plant (CBP), such as using electric mixers and new technologies for dust prevention and sound insulation, whether there was any mechanism to ascertain the adoption of the proposed measures by the applicant;
- (d) details of pedestrian activities adjacent to the Site along Tam Kon Shan Road; and
- (e) noting the concern of the Commissioner of Police (C of P) that the concrete mixer trucks would affect the safety of road users, whether the recommended approval condition for a traffic management plan (TMP) should also be submitted to C of P for comment.

28. In response, Mr W.C. Lui, STP/TWK, with aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the marine frontage of the Site was mainly occupied by mooring facilities and ships/boats for repairing purpose. As advised by the Director of Marine (D of Marine), the applicant was required to obtain consent from the nearby private mooring owner(s) for future barging operation of the proposed CBP;
- (b) according to the applicant, raw materials would be delivered mainly through sea transport. The applicant had submitted a Barging Operation

Plan (BOP) to demonstrate the barge delivery routes, mooring and barging processes and associated mitigation measures. Approval conditions on submission of an updated BOP, implementation of measures recommended in the updated BOP, and submission of a Marine Traffic Impact Assessment (MTIA) for the approval of D of Marine were recommended;

- (c) the applicant had submitted an Environmental Assessment which demonstrated that no adverse environmental impacts on the surroundings were anticipated with implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, and the Director of Environmental Protection had no objection to the application in that regard. Besides, the applicant was required to submit application to the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) for a Specified Process Licence (the Licence) for the operation of the proposed CBP;
- (d) there were pedestrians travelling along Tam Kon Shan Road as a public convenience and Tsing Yi Northeast Park were located to the east of the Site, but pedestrians using the concerned section of Tam Kon Shan Road were mainly workers of the adjacent shipyards. According to the information from C of P, past traffic accidents mainly occurred near the Tam Kon Shan Interchange; and
- (e) as the proposed CBP would generate concrete mixer trucks travelling along Tam Kon Shan Road, C of P expressed concerns about the safety of road users. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had no objection to the application from traffic points of view, subject to imposition of relevant approval conditions including submission and implementation of measures recommended in the TMP. The TMP should include details such as proposed traffic control measures and routings of the concrete mixer trucks. While the TMP was subject to C for T's approval, it would also be circulated to C of P for comment.

29. In response to a Member's enquiry regarding the timeline for the implementation

of the proposed CBP given a number of follow-up tasks for the applicant while the application only sought an approval period of 5 years, Mr W.C. Lui, STP/TWK, said that if necessary, the applicant could apply for renewal of the planning permission with the required supporting information and technical assessments for scrutiny by relevant government departments and approval by the Town Planning Board.

30. Regarding the TMP, the Chairperson supplemented that according to the applicant's submission, concrete mixer trucks would travel mainly via the western section of Tam Kon Shan Road with slip roads leading to Tsing Yi North Coastal Road direct, without passing through the town centre. Thus, there would be minimal impact on the safety of road users. The operation and routing(s) of concrete mixer trucks would be addressed in the TMP as required under the approval conditions, which would be circulated to C of P for comment and to C for T for approval. The Licence issued by EPD would govern the design and operation of the proposed CBP for compliance with the relevant government regulations and requirements.

Surrounding Developments

31. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) details of the cement factory (i.e. Hong Kong Cement Tsing Yi Plant) located to the north of the Site; and
- (b) the reason why the proposed CBP located to the east of Hong Kong Cement Tsing Yi Plant had not commenced operation though it had obtained several previous planning approvals.

32. In response, Mr W.C. Lui, STP/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) in order to facilitate the development at the eastern shore of Tsing Yi, Hong Kong Cement Tsing Yi Plant originally located there was relocated to the northern coastal area of Tsing Yi where a specific zoning was designated

for this purpose (i.e. “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Cement Plant”). The cement plant also transported raw materials via the sea route and concrete products via road transport along Tam Kon Shan Road; and

- (b) the proposed CBP adjacent to Hong Kong Cement Tsing Yi Plant had not commenced operation, probably due to commercial considerations.

Public Comments

33. Two Members enquired about details of public comments, specifically regarding the grounds for supporting and objecting to the application. In response, Mr W.C. Lui, STP/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that as summarised in the Paper and at appendix IV of the Paper, there were 17 public comments submitted by individuals supporting the application, mainly on the grounds of the need for the proposed CBP to meet the concrete demand of the construction industry, compatibility with surrounding land uses, and its convenient location with quick access to highways and technical feasibility. There were 189 public comments objecting to or providing adverse comments on the application submitted by a Legislative Council member, shipyard operators, a workers’ concern group and individuals with some in standard format. One of the major grounds of objection was related to marine traffic and safety, including the risk of concrete dropping into the sea if vessels capsized, which could affect the seabed level.

34. The Chairperson said that as he had another official duty, the Vice-chairperson would take up the chairmanship of the meeting.

[The Chairperson left the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

35. Members generally considered that the application could be approved. A Member pointed out that while CBPs were often seen as obnoxious facilities, they were essential for supporting development projects in Hong Kong. The proposed CBP was considered compatible with the surrounding industrial operations in Tsing Yi North, and was

accessible by both road and marine traffic. Its operation would also be regulated by the relevant government departments and statutory requirements.

36. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 4.7.2030, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and 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.

Agenda Items 6 and 7

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

| | |
|----------|--|
| A/TY/151 | Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Concrete Batching Plant for a Period of 5 Years in “Industrial” Zone, Tsing Yi Town Lot No. 108 RP (Part), Tsing Yi (MPC Paper No. A/TY/151) |
|----------|--|

| | |
|----------|--|
| A/TY/152 | Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Asphalt Plant for a Period of 5 Years in “Industrial” Zone, Tsing Yi Town Lot No. 108 RP (Part), Tsing Yi (MPC Paper No. A/TY/152) |
|----------|--|

37. The Committee agreed that as the two renewal cases for temporary concrete batching plant and temporary asphalt plant were similar in nature and the application sites were located in close proximity to each other within the same “Industrial” zone, they could be considered together.

38. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Cecil C.C. Chow, TP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the applications, the applied uses, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Papers. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the applications.

39. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

40. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications each on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years and be renewed from 2.9.2025 until 1.9.2030, on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Papers. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Papers.

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

Agenda Item 12

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

41. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 10:50 a.m.

**Minutes of 768th Metro Planning Committee
(held on 4.7.2025)**

Deferral Cases

Requests for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

| Item No. | Application No.* | Times of Deferment |
|----------|------------------|--------------------|
| 4 | A/KC/509 | 2nd [^] |
| 8 | A/H3/450 | 2nd [^] |
| 9 | A/H6/96 | 2nd [^] |
| 10 | A/K7/123 | 1 st |

Note:

[^] The 2nd Deferment was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted unless under special circumstances and supported with strong justifications.

Declaration of Interests

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

| Item No. | Members' Declared Interests | |
|----------|---|--|
| 9 | The application site was located in Tai Hang. | - Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong for living in Tai Hang |
| 10 | The application premises were located in Ho Man Tin and Great Prosper Development Limited (GPDL) was the applicant. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr Stanley T.S. Choi for owning properties in Ho Man Tin which were in close proximity to the application premises - Mr Derrick S.M. Yip for being a personal friend of the directors of GPDL |

The Committee noted that Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Mr Stanley T.S Choi had not joined the meeting yet. As the interest of Mr Derrick S.M. Yip was direct under Item 10, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion for Item 10.

* Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/768_mpc_agenda.html for details of the planning applications.

**Minutes of 768th Metro Planning Committee
(held on 4.7.2025)**

Case for Streamlining Arrangement

Application approved on a permanent basis

| Item No. | Application No. | Planning Application |
|-----------------|------------------------|---|
| 11 | A/K13/332 | Proposed Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Unit 8B (major portion), G/F, Kowloon Bay Industrial Centre, 15 Wang Hoi Road, Kowloon Bay, Kowloon |