

RESTRICTED

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 769th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 18.7.2025**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

Chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

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 Stanley T.S. Choi

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Isabel Y. Yiu

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Helena Y.S. Pang

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 768th MPC Meeting held on 4.7.2025

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 768th MPC meeting held on 4.7.2025 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**.

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.

Hong Kong District

[Ms Karmin Tong and Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, Senior Town Planners/Hong Kong (STPs/HK), and Mr Jacky C.L. Lee, Town Planner/Hong Kong, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H3/451 Proposed Temporary Eating Place for a Period of 5 Years in
 “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, G/F, 3 David Lane, Sai
 Ying Pun, Hong Kong
 (MPC Paper No. A/H3/451)

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Karmin Tong, STP/HK, 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 (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

[Dr Tony C.M. Ip joined the meeting during PlanD’s presentation.]

6. A Member asked whether the applicant could apply for permanent planning approval to use the application premises (the Premises) as an eating place. In response, Ms Karmin Tong, STP/HK, explained that according to the Notes of the Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan, ‘Eating Place’ was a Column 2 use under the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone, thereby requiring planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). While permanent approval could be sought, it was the applicant’s decision to pursue a temporary approval for a period of 5 years to meet their operational needs.

7. Another Member enquired whether there were any different planning considerations for granting a temporary or permanent planning approval for an eating place at

the Premises. In response, Ms Karmin Tong, STP/HK, said that the planning considerations for both temporary and permanent approvals were quite similar. The considerations included compliance with the planning criteria set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on ‘Application for Development/Redevelopment within “G/IC” zone for uses other than government, institution or community (GIC) uses under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ (TPB PG-No.16), and comments from relevant government bureaux/departments. The Chairperson supplemented that the planning intention of the site should be taken into account when assessing the proposed use. Since the Premises were situated within the “G/IC” zone, it was essential to ensure that the proposed use would not undermine the site’s long-term planning intention, which was primarily intended for the provision of GIC facilities to serve the needs of local residents and the wider district, region or territory.

8. In response to a Member’s question on the existing condition of the Premises, Ms Karmin Tong, STP/HK, said that the Premises were situated on the ground floor of a 2-storey tenement building, which was currently vacant.

9. The same Member raised a question as to whether the potential increase in rental value of the Premises or land premium, if the application was approved, were relevant planning considerations for the subject application. The Chairperson explained that planning considerations should focus on land use planning aspect. For matters related to rental value and land premium, they were not relevant planning considerations and should be dealt with by other concerned authorities, such as the Lands Department. Given that the Premises were privately owned and currently unoccupied, and the Government had no immediate plan to develop the concerned site for GIC use in the near future, the proposed temporary use would offer a more efficient utilisation of the Premises for the next 5 years.

Deliberation Session

10. Members generally expressed support for the current application. A Member supported the proposed use, emphasising its potential to effectively utilise vacant premises, serve local residents and enhance the vibrancy of the area. While not objecting to the application, another Member suggested that opportunities could be explored to review the use and development potential of private land zoned “G/IC” with no development programme, like the subject site.

11. The Chairperson concluded that there was currently no designated GIC use for the subject “G/IC” zone. The proposed temporary use would not only facilitate better utilisation of land resources but also serve the needs of local residents. Should the applicant submit another application after 5 years, the Board would consider the case based on its individual merits, taking into account the circumstances prevailing at that time.

12. The Chairperson remarked that certain privately owned land, particularly in densely populated urban areas where space for community facilities and open space was limited, had been designated as “G/IC” zones with the intention of providing more community facilities and breathing space for local residents, subject to their realisation through land resumption. Nevertheless, owing to various factors, including financial constraints and resource prioritisation of the relevant government departments, it was not uncommon that the private land within the “G/IC” zones had not been developed for GIC purposes. PlanD might explore the possibility of reviewing “G/IC” sites with no long-term development plans for other beneficial uses, where appropriate.

13. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 18.7.2030, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H19/87	Further Consideration of Proposed Residential Development with Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio, Building Height and Site Coverage Restrictions in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Residential Development with Historic Building Preserved” Zone, 44 Stanley Village Road, Stanley, Hong Kong (MPC Paper No. A/H19/87B)
----------	---

Presentation and Question Sessions

14. The Secretary reported that LWK & Partners (HK) Limited (LWK) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu had declared an interest on the item for his firm having current business dealings with LWK. As Mr Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

[Miss Queenie Y.C. Ng joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, the Committee's previous consideration, further information submitted by the applicant in response to Members' previous concerns, departmental comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

16. As background, the Chairperson remarked that the application pertained to a preservation-cum-residential development initiative, which included the adaptive reuse of the Grade 1 Maryknoll House, a site currently not open to the public. The application had a lengthy planning history, beginning with a section 12A application approved in 2019, followed by the OZP amendment in 2020, a previously approved section 16 application (No. A/H19/82) in 2021, and the revised scheme (the current application), which was deferred by the Committee in March 2025. The applicant had further refined the proposal to address concerns raised by Members during the previous meeting, particularly regarding (i) the removal of the rooftop cross, which was the significant point of contention for the Members; and (ii) the rationale and design merits of the proposed increase in plot ratio (PR) and site coverage (SC). The Chairperson highlighted that the applicant had committed to preserving the rooftop cross in situ under the current scheme. Moreover, further justifications were provided for the additional gross floor area (GFA) (about 1,146.8m²), with about one-fourth allocated for the proposed Heritage Gallery. The proposed increase in SC aimed to accommodate the new building while maintaining the building height (BH) of the Maryknoll House (i.e. the Main Building) and ensuring visibility of the façade of the Maryknoll House from the south.

Financial and Operational Aspects of the Preservation Initiatives

17. Some Members enquired about details of the financial arrangement and operational

aspect of the Heritage Gallery, including the purpose, amount and source of the sinking fund, the party responsible for the preservation and maintenance works of the historic building, whether the associated costs would be financed through the sinking fund or borne by individual owners via the Deed of Mutual Covenant (DMC), and whether there was any control mechanism.

18. In response, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, STP/HK, said that the applicant indicated that a certain amount of money would be injected to establish the sinking fund, but no exact amount was provided. The operational details of the Heritage Gallery would be determined at a later stage. In response to the Chairperson's question regarding whether the details of such information would be incorporated in the Conservation Management Plan (CMP), which would be submitted by the applicant in accordance with an approval condition suggested in the Paper, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, STP/HK, said that detailed arrangements for the Heritage Gallery and guided tours would be included in the CMP for agreement with the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO). Regarding the operation strategy and financial arrangement of the Heritage Gallery and guided tours, those decisions would be at the discretion of the applicant, and AMO had no specific comments on those aspects at the planning application stage.

Guided Tours

19. A Member queried the efficiency of the guided tours and their effectiveness as a planning gain, specifically noting that (i) the proposed 18 guided tours per year were considered rather low; and (ii) no details about the guided tours were provided, such as the duration of each tour. Another Member enquired about the reservation procedures and the monitoring authority overseeing these arrangements.

20. In response, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, STP/HK, clarified that the applicant had suggested that each guided tour session would last for about 90 minutes. The Chairperson remarked that the applicant had made significant efforts to increase the frequency of the guided tours, from 8 to 12 and now to 18 times per year in the current application, in response to Members' comments. Both the Commissioner of Heritage Office (CHO) and AMO had no adverse comments on the number of guided tours proposed by the applicant. Detailed arrangements for the guided tours would be incorporated into the revised CMP to be submitted by the applicant for AMO's consideration in accordance with the suggested approval condition,

ensuring that the guided tours for the public would be properly conducted as committed.

Preservation of the Heritage Gallery

21. A Member sought clarification on the responsibility for maintaining the Heritage Gallery, and whether residents could use the Heritage Gallery at times other than the scheduled guided tours. The Member also enquired about the scope of the CMP, particularly whether it would include the preservation of interior décor and exhibits in the Heritage Gallery, given that Maryknoll House was a Grade I historic building. Unlike a declared monument, there was currently no mechanism to prevent the landowner from altering the internal décor of a graded historic building.

22. In response, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, STP/HK, said that the applicant did not indicate whether the Heritage Gallery would form part of the clubhouse for use and enjoyment by the prospective residents. Regarding the scope of the CMP, it would generally include a Heritage Impact Assessment to identify and assess the level of significance for character-defining elements and the architectural features to be preserved, evaluate potential heritage impacts and recommend mitigation measures. As indicated in the CMP submitted by the applicant under the application, the Chapel Wing (to be served as the Heritage Gallery) and its architectural features would be retained. The Chairperson supplemented that an approval condition on the submission of a revised CMP formed part of the planning approval with statutory effect. Under the revised CMP, key elements and architectural features with heritage value, such as the rooftop cross, verandahs, the interior of Chapel Wing and Library Wing, would be preserved. AMO would serve as the authority to approve the revised CMP and ensure the implementation of the proposed works and arrangements, including the guided tours, in accordance with the revised CMP. The execution of the proposals outlined in the revised CMP would be governed by other regulatory authorities, such as the building control regimes as appropriate.

Deliberation Session

23. Members generally appreciated the applicant's efforts to retain the rooftop cross, despite the difficulties and constraints involved. Some Members had the following views/suggestions:

- (a) the site where Maryknoll House was situated was privately owned, and the applicant could redevelop it for alternative uses. While the application proposed the in situ preservation of Maryknoll House, the preservation of the historic building and facilitation of public appreciation through guided tours would bring about public benefits. Those outcomes represented key planning gains that were both reasonable and well-justified;
- (b) the applicant's efforts on preservation were acknowledged and appreciated. They included the commitment to retaining the rooftop cross and other character-defining elements, establishing a sinking fund, preserving the façade of the main building for public appreciation, and achieving a balance between heritage conservation and property development, as well as between opportunities for public appreciation of heritage and the privacy of prospective residents;
- (c) the implementation of the preservation-cum-residential development project would pose significant challenges and incur substantial costs. From the public appreciation perspective, the preservation of the façade of the main building carried greater significance than the guided tours. Noting the high maintenance costs associated with the preservation of the historic buildings, it was essential for the applicant to provide detailed information on the financial support allocated for both the operation of the guided tours and the ongoing maintenance of the buildings. The sinking fund might also contribute towards covering the maintenance costs of the project, ensuring a long-term sustainable model;
- (d) it was essential for the prospective residents to acknowledge the historical significance of Maryknoll House, ensuring that the conservation of the building and its interior could be sustained through the DMC. To instil a sense of responsibility, it was not unreasonable to allow the future residents to appreciate and use the Heritage Gallery outside the guided tours periods;
- (e) detailed information on the sinking fund and the operational details of the

Heritage Gallery could be considered for incorporation into the CMP to ensure effective monitoring by AMO or the Board;

- (f) to better justify the proposal including the proposed minor relaxation of the PR restriction, the planning gains such as the provision of guided tours should be further enhanced if practicable; and
- (g) alternative ways for the general public to access and appreciate the historic building could be further explored.

24. The Chairperson concluded that Members were generally supportive of the subject preservation-cum-residential project. Members' concerns raised in the previous meetings regarding the rooftop cross and the building façade had been satisfactorily addressed, as the applicant committed to the in situ preservation of the cross and ensured that the southern façade facing the Stanley's coast would remain unobstructed. These revisions were appreciated by Members. The additional planning gains committed by the applicant, which included a further increase in the frequency of guided tours, the allocation of about one-fourth of the additional GFA to expand the area of the Heritage Gallery for public appreciation, and the establishment of a sinking fund to support future operation of the Heritage Gallery and guided tours were also acknowledged. The proposed relaxation of the PR and SC was considered reasonable and acceptable.

25. The Chairman further said that regarding Members' concerns on the financial arrangement and effectiveness of the proposed measures, CHO and AMO would closely monitor the implementation of the measures outlined in the CMP. In that regard, PlanD was requested to liaise with the applicant and relay Members' views on (i) exploring opportunities for further increasing the number of guided tours; (ii) incorporating detailed arrangements on the sinking fund under the CMP for AMO's consideration; and (iii) making good use of the Heritage Gallery outside the periods allocated for guided tours.

26. 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 18.7.2029, 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 clauses 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.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Kwun Tong (North) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K14N/15

(MPC Paper No. 6/25)

27. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and LWK & Partners (HK) Limited (LWK) were two of the consultants of the Study for the Smart and Green Mass Transit System in East Kowloon (SGMTS-EK) (the Project) commissioned by the Railway Development Office (RDO) of Highways Department (HyD) to support the proposed amendment item. Dr Tony C.M. Ip had declared an interest on the item for his firm having past business dealings with Arup, and Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu had declared an interest on the item for his firm having current business dealings with LWK. As Dr Ip and Mr Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Vivian M.F. Lai - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)

Ms Florence Y.S. Lee - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)
Ms Charlotte P.S. Ng - Town Planner/Kowloon

RDO of HyD

Mr Vincent T.H. Chu - Chief Engineer (CE)
Mr Sunny C.S. Chiang - Senior Engineer
Ms Simone S.M. Chan - Engineer

Consultants

Arup-AIS Joint Venture

Ms Alice Chan
Mr Elvis Lau
Ms Eva Lam
Mr Victus Kwan

KTA Planning Limited

Ms Kitty Wong

Ecosystems Limited

Mr Vincent Lai

29. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, STP/K, PlanD briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the approved Kwun Tong (North) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K14N/15, technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments mainly involved rezoning of two sites, including a “Green Belt” (“GB”) site to the east of Po Tat Estate (the Main Site) and a site at the north of Po Lam Road zoned “Open Space” (“O”) (the Northern Site) (the Sites), to “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Commercial/Residential Development cum Public Transport Facilities” with a BH restriction (BHR) of 290mPD. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP consequential to the amendments.

30. As the presentation of the PlanD’s representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

The Need and Scale of the Depot and “Rail-plus-Property” (R+P) Development

31. Noting that the size of maintenance facilities corresponded to the types of rail system, it was observed that heavy rail systems typically required larger maintenance facilities, while light rail or monorail systems required smaller ones, depending on the specific operation and maintenance requirements. Consequently, the scale of the development atop the proposed depot would be determined by the type of railway projects to be funded. In this connection, the Vice-chairperson and a Member enquired about the type of intended transit system for the SGMTS-EK, the criteria for determining the size of the depot and the scale of the topside development, and the justifications for the need and scale of the proposed “rail plus property” (R+P) development.

32. In response, Mr Vincent T.H. Chu, CE, HyD said that the Project would be among the first for SGMTS, a new system other than the heavy rail model, to be operated in Hong Kong. To take forward the Project, the RDO issued an invitation in August 2024 for suppliers and operators to submit Expressions of Interest (EOI) for the SGMTS-EK. A total of 35 submissions were received from local, Mainland and overseas companies. The feedback gathered from the EOI not only provided a better understanding of the market’s intentions and capabilities, but also offered valuable insight into various technical aspects of the Project. The RDO and the Consultants thoroughly analysed the information collected from the EOI and utilised it as a reference to determine the technical details of the Project, including the alignment, delivery mode, and spatial and operational requirements of the maintenance depot. Such information was carefully considered when determining the area and scale required for the proposed development.

33. As a follow-up, the Vice-chairperson requested further details regarding the size of the maintenance depots for heavy rail systems compared to non-heavy rail systems, citing examples used by the Project Team to benchmark the size of the proposed depot. It was observed that the technical requirements for the new system differed significantly from those of heavy rail systems.

34. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD cited an example for Members’ reference. She said that the proposed SGMTS in Kai Tak, which spanned approximately 3.5km long with five stations, required a depot with a site area of about 2ha. The proposed

SGMTS-EK, which extended about 7km long with nine stations, required a proposed depot site of about 4ha at the Main Site. The development site was delineated after thorough consideration of various factors, including physical constraints and private land ownership, among others. The proposed topside development at the proposed Ma Yau Tong Station-cum-depot would provide the major funding support for the proposed SGMTS-EK.

35. Mr Vincent T.H. Chu, CE, HyD supplemented that given the transit mode would only be finalised upon the awarding of the works contracts, RDO had prepared a notional scheme featuring a station and a depot designed to accommodate the operational requirements of various transit modes. The Project focused on a new transit system tailored for medium to low capacity, distinct from the heavy rail-based model. With limited experience in this type of new transit system, the indicative design including depot size was formulated with reference to case studies in Mainland China. The depot size was primarily determined by various factors such as fleet size, configuration, operational and maintenance needs. For general reference, the depot size for the Tseung Kwan O Line being a heavy rail system was about 8.5ha, compared to the current depot size of about 4ha.

Compatibility with the Surroundings

36. The Vice-chairperson and some Members raised concerns regarding the land use compatibility of the proposed development with the surroundings areas, noting that Kwun Tong area had become a vibrant area with numerous ongoing developments. Referring to the PowerPoint slide, they also questioned the compatibility in BHs as the proposed development, with proposed BHs ranging from 277.4mPD to 290mPD, might not be compatible with the neighbouring Po Tat Estate, where the BHs of the towers were between 233mPD and 236mPD.

37. Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, explained that the proposed commercial and residential development atop the proposed Ma Yau Tong Station-cum-depot was not considered incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The Sites are located in an area mainly occupied by existing or planned residential developments at Development at Anderson Road (DAR), Po Tat Estate and Anderson Road Quarry (ARQ) Development which were predominantly medium- to high-density residential developments integrated with commercial uses and/or public transport facilities. The BHR of the “Residential (Group A)8” (“R(A)8”) site at ARQ was 290mPD.

Visual Impact

38. With reference to the photomontage illustrated in a PowerPoint slide, which was developed based on a notional scheme of the proposed development, some Members raised the following concerns/comments/questions regarding the visual impact of the proposed development:

- (a) when viewed from the Tsueng Kwan O Tunnel Bus-Bus Interchange (Kowloon direction), the proposed development appeared to protrude with a deck and columns on a densely vegetated slope. Given that those elements, including stilted structures, could be visually intrusive, they could not be considered having no insurmountable visual impact on the surrounding areas;
- (b) suitable façade treatments should be explored to mitigate the potential visual impact. Design measures and landscape treatments should also be adopted to reduce the visual impact of any stilted structures supporting the depot and the space underneath;
- (c) the building bulk appeared excessive and incompatible with the neighbouring Po Tat Estate building cluster. A noticeable visual impact was observed even from a distant viewpoint at the Quarry Bay Park Promenade (Viewpoint VP4). It was suggested to consider adopting a stepped height profile to reduce the building bulk and alleviate the visual impact;
- (d) the wall-like structure of the proposed development might draw public concern during the draft OZP exhibition period;
- (e) the criteria for conducting the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), and on what basis it was concluded that no unacceptable visual impact would be caused to the surrounding area; and
- (f) the visual permeability of the Sites.

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

- (a) the proposed commercial/residential development cum public transport facilities would inevitably result in certain environmental and visual impacts on the surrounding areas. Appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented where necessary;
- (b) the proposed development could be considered an extension to the neighbouring Po Tat Estate and DAR, both zoned “R(A)”. When designing the proposed BH profile, other nearby developments were also taken into account, including the medium-density residential ARQ Development and the village houses at Ma Yau Tong;
- (c) variations in BH had been incorporated as far as practicable to respect the terrain setting and rural village character. As stated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP, the ridgeline of Tai Sheung Tok had been respected, and the BH profile of adjacent developments, such as ARQ Development, Po Tat Estate and Ma Yau Tong Village, had been duly considered. The BH profile of the proposed development would gradually descend from north to south and west to east, with variations tailored to harmonise with the terrain and rural village character. For building blocks along the view corridor, the BH should be lower to minimise visual obstruction and maximise openness;
- (d) in general, a VIA should evaluate views from key strategic and popular local vantage points, as well as local visual impacts on the adjacent neighbourhood. The VIA should primarily focus on assessing the impact on sensitive public viewers from the most affected viewing points. Those viewing points normally included key pedestrian nodes, popular areas used by the public or tourists for outdoor activities, recreation, rest, sitting-out, leisure, walking and sight-seeing. Visual impacts, if enhanced or mitigated through design measures, such as improved visual permeability, greening, colour, streetscape improvement, landscape screening, etc, might be considered

acceptable;

- (e) regarding visual permeability, three building separations of about 15m-wide and a building separation of about 40m-wide were proposed at the Sites. Building setbacks from the site boundary, including setbacks of about 10m from Po Lam Road, were proposed. As the eastern-most portion of the Main Site would remain free of high-rise development, a similar view coverage towards Ma Yau Tong Village and beyond would be maintained, comparable to the relevant view corridor from the lookout point (at 310mPD) at Tai Sheung Tok to downhill areas over the north-eastern portion of the Sites. Overall, the inclusion of building separations and setbacks at the proposed development would help mitigate potential visual impacts on the surrounding urban cityscape; and
- (f) since the Project was designated under Schedule 2 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO), the detailed design and alignment of the new transit system, along with the proposed Ma Yau Tong Station-cum-depot, would undergo further study and comprehensive technical assessments. Those assessments would include a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as required under the EIAO.

BH Variations

40. With reference to the sectional plan in Drawing 11 of the Paper, a Member suggested that the Project Team could explore a stepped BH profile from a 3-dimensional perspective. Considering the formation levels for the Tseung Kwan O Tunnel and the podium, which were 81.5mPD and 157.5mPD respectively, there might be opportunities to create a gradual transition in three directions within the Sites.

41. Two Members expressed the view that while variations in BH had been incorporated into the proposal, those variations were considered insignificant (about 5m difference), resulting in a monotonous built form for the proposed development. From urban design perspective, greater variations in BH would contribute to a more dynamic skyline and a diversified cityscape. It was acknowledged that delivering such variations was challenging,

and concerns were raised regarding whether there were existing guidelines to ensure that a genuinely stepped height profile could be delivered by the developer during the implementation stage.

42. The Chairperson pointed out that the principles stated in the ES of the OZP should be upheld as one of the mitigation measures to alleviate the visual impact. In particular, the ridgeline of Tai Sheung Tok, as well as the BH profiles of adjacent developments at ARQ Development, Po Tat Estate and Ma Yau Tong Village, should be respected. The BH profile of the proposed development would gradually descend from north to south and west to east, aligning with the terrain setting and rural village character. Building blocks along the view corridor would be lower to minimise visual obstruction and maximise openness.

Optimising Site Utilisation

43. Noting that there was currently some unused space beneath the proposed Ma Yau Tong Station-cum-depot, the Vice-chairperson and some Members raised concerns regarding site utilisation and made the following points:

- (a) the space underneath Ma Yau Tong Station-cum-depot which included only the proposed covered open space was dull, lifeless and undesirable. Given the increased pedestrian flow and proximity to the station, it was suggested to explore alternative development potential for the space beneath the Ma Yau Tong Station-cum-depot, including but not limited to relocating commercial and/or GIC uses from the podium level to the concerned space. Such an approach would maximise site utilisation and could potentially reduce the overall BH; and
- (b) reference could be made to the recent case of the University of Hong Kong's Global Innovation Centre proposal in Pok Fu Lam, where the slopes at the project site was utilised to accommodate various uses related to the Centre.

44. Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD responded that according to the notional scheme, a covered and open-sided open space was proposed beneath the Ma Yau Tong Station-cum-depot. Other potential uses would be explored to optimise the utilisation of the

concerned space, as the Project proceeded. In addition, the Project Team would explore improvements to the façade treatment of the cantilevered structure of the Ma Yau Tong Station-cum-depot to create a more diverse and visually appealing appearance.

Removal of Trees

45. Noting that all existing trees at the Sites (approximately 2,533 trees including 16 Trees of Particular Interests) were proposed to be felled, the Vice-chairperson had the following questions/views:

- (a) whether the applicant had explored the feasibility of transplanting the affected trees, including *Aquilaria sinensis* (土沉香) and *Artocarpus hypargyreus* (白桂木), as an alternative to felling them;
- (b) the survival rate for the existing trees on the slopes that might be sheltered by the deck structure from inclement weather, whether the tree transplantation proposal included those trees within the affected slope; and
- (c) the possibility of retaining the existing trees or, alternatively, implementing landscaping and mitigation measures to compensate for the loss of trees in the affected area should be explored. While the physical conditions might be different, the Project Team was advised to reference the approach adopted in the Global Innovation Centre.

46. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, explained that as the Sites would be developed as Ma Yau Tong Station-cum-depot and topside development, all existing trees within the Sites (2,533 trees) would inevitably have to be felled. The feasibility of tree transplantation had been explored. Nevertheless, due to the site conditions, most of the existing trees were located on slopes and were generally in poor form and condition, rendering them unsuitable for transplanting. Upon review, it was anticipated that the trees would have a low survival rate even if successfully transplanted. As a mitigation measure, a compensatory planting proposal was prepared to achieve a 1:1 compensation ratio (in terms of quantity) as far as practicable. It was confirmed that the existing trees located outside the development site boundary would not be affected.

47. The Chairperson supplemented that based on past experience, it was indeed challenging to retain trees at locations with sloping terrain and limited sunlight, which complicated the feasibility of preserving large trees. Having said that, there might be opportunities for the Project Team to explore alternative forms of greenery under the EIA Study, such as grassland or shrubs, to enhance the environmental and ecological values.

Traffic Impact and Pedestrian Connectivity

48. In relation to the potential traffic impact and pedestrian connectivity, some Members had the following observations:

- (a) while it was understood that the Project was intended to alleviate existing traffic pressure in East Kowloon, and adoption of the R+P model was necessary to financially support the Project, there were concerns on whether the additional population of approximately 24,000 generated from about 9,000 residential units would potentially exacerbate the existing traffic conditions, particularly if the area was already under significant traffic pressure;
- (b) concerns were raised regarding the potential adverse traffic impact arising from an increased population if no restrictions were imposed on the number of residential units. This was because the current Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment (TTIA) was conducted based on an assumed average flat size of 50m², which could be revised during the detailed design stage, potentially resulting in a higher population;
- (c) whether there were any government guidelines for regulating the number of residential units in a development to ensure that any significant implications on the technical assessments, particularly those related to traffic, were effectively addressed; and
- (d) the pedestrian connectivity network from the perspective of residents.

49. In response, Mr Vincent T.H. Chu, CE, HyD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that a TTIA had been conducted to assess the traffic and transport impacts on the surrounding networks. Various mitigation measures were proposed to enhance traffic circulation of the surrounding areas, including junction improvement works at Sau Mau Ping Road/Po Lam Road (J7), Po Lam Road/On Yu Road/connection road to the Proposed Development (J10) and Po Lam Road/Tsui Lam Road/Ma Yau Tong Road (J11) and provision of roadside laybys at both sides of Po Lam Road. With the implementation of the Project and the proposed road improvement measures and pedestrian connectivity schemes, the proposed development would neither generate adverse traffic impacts on the local road networks nor worsen the existing pedestrian environment.

50. Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD supplemented that the proposed SGMETS-EK with proposed mitigation measures would enhance the overall transport capacity of the area, enabling the accommodation of the estimated traffic flow resulting from the additional population and thereby alleviating traffic congestion. In addition, the assumption of persons per flat (PPF) was expected to be adjusted in response to changing flat size. In other words, as smaller flats would have a lower PPF, it was anticipated that the total population might not increase significantly even if the number of flats increased. Therefore, the relevant assessments were considered reasonable, as they had already taken into account the worst-case scenario in terms of population generated by the proposed development. Furthermore, relevant technical assessments, including TTIA and Water Supply Impact Assessment, would be required by the relevant government departments in the event of significant changes to the proposed development parameters.

51. The Chairperson supplemented that the assumed flat size of 50m² was merely an average figure with allowance for a combination of different flat sizes during the detailed design stage, depending on prevailing market conditions. In addition, the implementation of the Project would be reviewed by various government authorities through established mechanisms to ensure that the development would not result in adverse technical impacts.

52. Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, STP/K, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, elaborated on the proposed pedestrian connectivity network between the development and neighbouring areas. Given that the proposed Mau Yau Tong Station-cum-depot at the Main Site was planned at 135mPD level, the development would incorporate convenient linkages to

enable public accessibility. They included a pedestrian footbridge over Po Lam Road, linking the Main Site to the Northern Site, as well as an at-grade crossing at On Yu Road to connect the ARQ Development to the Northern Site. Furthermore, 24-hour barrier-free pedestrian accesses, comprising pedestrian footbridges, walkways and vertical lift systems, would be provided at the proposed development, thereby offering direct connections to Po Tat Estate, the Tseung Kwan O Tunnel Bus-Bus Interchange, as well as retail, community facilities, and open spaces within the proposed development. An opening at the 120mPD level within the covered open space was also proposed to maintain the existing footpath connecting to Ma Yau Tong Village to the east.

Others

53. In response to Members' concerns regarding the rights and interests of future individual owners under the Deed of Mutual Covenant (DMC) concerning the management of the common areas within the topside development, as well as whether the car parking spaces would be exempted from gross floor area (GFA) calculation, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD said that the relevant details of the tender documents or land lease would be subject to consultation with relevant government departments and stakeholders at a later stage. In addition, a DMC would be established to manage the rights and interests of future individual owners, including those related to common areas. Under Joint Practice Note No. 4 on Development Control Parameters Plot Ratio/GFA, when determining the GFA calculation for ancillary car parks, the Buildings Department's practices in GFA calculation and granting of GFA concessions would be followed.

Conclusion

54. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported the proposed amendments to the OZP, which primarily involved rezoning the Sites to "OU(Commercial/Residential Development cum Public Transport Facilities)" with a BHR of 290mPD. To address Members' views and achieve better explanation at the representation stage, the Chairperson advised the Project Team to enhance the information related to issues discussed at the subject meeting, including visual impact, site utilisation and justifications for the need and scale of the proposed development. 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 Board for consideration.

55. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Kwun Tong (North) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K14N/15 and that the draft Kwun Tong (North) OZP No. S/K14N/15A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/K14N/16 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III are suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Kwun Tong (North) OZP No. S/K14N/15A (to be renumbered as S/K14N/16 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 for inspection together with the OZP.”

56. 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 (including those to address Members’ concerns as mentioned in paragraphs 38, 40 and 41 above), if appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revisions would be submitted for the Board’s consideration.

[Post-meeting note: Paragraph 9.6.7 of the ES of the OZP was amended to address Members’ concerns regarding the mitigation measures for the stilted structure supporting the depot and the space beneath it, as well as the utilisation of the space underneath. The paragraph was amended to read as:

“This zone is subject to a maximum BH of 290mPD. Respecting the ridgeline of Tai Sheung Tok and considering the BH profile of adjacent developments at ARQ Development, Po Tat Estate and Ma Yau Tong Village, the BH profile of the development shall gradually descend from north to south and west to east to commensurate with the terrain setting and rural village character,~~and lower~~

~~building blocks should be placed along the view corridor to minimise visual obstruction and maximise openness.~~ ***Building blocks along the view corridor should be lowered*** to minimise visual obstruction and maximise openness ***for views towards the East Kowloon Peninsula. Besides, the BH profile should exhibit variations to promote visual interest. Proper urban design and landscape treatment shall be adopted to mitigate the visual impact of any stilted structure supporting the depot and the space underneath, and possibility of utilising such space should be examined.*** The layout of the development shall take due consideration of better integration, connection and accessibility of the proposed Ma Yau Tong Station-cum-depot of SGMETS-EK with commercial and residential uses, social welfare facilities and open space within the zone as well as adjacent developments.”]

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

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break.]

[Mr Tony C.M. Ip left the meeting during the break.]

[Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, STP/K and Ms Helen K.W. Ip, TP/K, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K22/42 Proposed Composite Redevelopment with Trade Mart/Exhibition and Commercial, Residential, Social Welfare Facilities and School Uses, and Minor Relaxation of BH Restriction in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Trade Mart and Commercial Development” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, New Kowloon Inland Lot No. 6032, 1 Trademart Drive, Kowloon Bay, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K22/42A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

57. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Helen K.W. Ip, TP/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 (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

58. A Member had the following comments on the application:

- (a) noting a public comment objecting to the application on ground that there were too many hotels in Kowloon area, what the number and distribution of existing hotels in Kowloon Bay and Kai Tak were; and
- (b) considering that the applicant had proposed a free shuttle service between the proposed development and Kowloon Bay, and the Government was implementing the “Green Spine and Green Link” initiative, whether the completion of that initiative would align with the anticipated completion of the proposed development in 2029, as proposed by the applicant.

59. In response, Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, STP/K, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) currently, there were two hotels in the vicinity of the application site (the

Site), one in the Kowloon Bay area and another near Kai Tak Stadium in the Kai Tak area; and

- (b) the “Green Spine and Green Link” initiative was proposed by the Energizing Kowloon East Office, including the cautionary crossing near Lam Hing Street and Wang Chin Street, which would be implemented by the applicant within 12 months from the approval date of the current planning application. Upon completion of the proposed development, the overall connectivity and the pedestrian environment within the Kowloon Bay Business Area would be enhanced.

Deliberation Session

60. The Chairperson remarked that the Site was the subject of a previous planning application for office and retail uses with trade mart, which was approved by the Committee in 2023. Compared with the previous proposal, the current application involved a shift from solely office and retail with trade mart uses to a composite development involving residential use also. One of the major justifications for the change was the significant reduction in the demand for office and commercial uses in the area in recent years. Under the current application, the applicant had taken into account the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Trade Mart and Commercial Development” (“OU(Trade Mart and Commercial Development)”) zone, as well as Hong Kong’s latest office market trends, in formulating the current proposal. The applicant had struck a balance in the distribution of total gross floor area, with 60% allocated to office, hotel, trade mart, kindergarten and social welfare facilities, and 40% allocated to residential flats. Furthermore, the applicant had committed to constructing, maintaining and managing the proposed pedestrian improvement measures, including the two new footbridges. Members were invited to consider whether the proposed composite redevelopment and minor relaxation of BH restriction were acceptable.

61. Noting that the commercial sector in Hong Kong was experiencing a decline, and anticipated that the Board might receive more similar applications proposing to a change from commercial use to mixed use, a Member enquired about the principles for considering such type of applications in the future and whether there were any relevant guidelines for Members’ reference. In response, the Chairperson said that the recent fluctuations in the commercial

market could be a short-term situation and should not affect the long-term planning intention for the site/area. While respecting the planning intentions on the Outline Zoning Plans, the planning mechanism provided flexibility for applying for uses that were not always permitted (i.e. Column 2 uses) within a zone. Each application would be considered based on its own individual merits, taking into account the planning intention, land use compatibility, potential impact on the surroundings, technical feasibility, departmental and public comments, etc. In some cases, other considerations such as government policy and market conditions, if relevant, might also be taken into account. It was hard to set general guidelines as the planning considerations might differ for different locations. For instance, the role of an important commercial district, e.g. the Central Business District in Central, should not be compromised when considering applications involving a change from commercial use to other uses.

62. A Member expressed appreciation for the current proposal, noting that it was an improvement compared to the previously approved scheme under application No. A/K22/34 approved by the Committee on 17.3.2023. The improvements included (i) enhanced pedestrian connectivity; (ii) additional residential portion in the development, which could contribute to a more vibrant atmosphere in the Kowloon Bay area, typically quiet at night; and (iii) the newly proposed hotel use, offering more choices for tourists seeking mid-range accommodation. The Chairperson expressed that the proposal would provide more diverse accommodation choices in the market, aligning with the Government's proactive efforts to promote the development of Hong Kong's tourism industry.

63. A Member welcomed the current redevelopment proposal, highlighting the enhanced pedestrian connectivity measures which were well-considered and thoughtfully designed as well as clearly illustrated. In general, the proposal was well-received by Members.

64. Noting the proposed provision of a 60-place residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) by the applicant, the Vice-chairperson was concerned that such provision might be rather small scale in light of Hong Kong's aging population trend. Considering that the Director of Social Welfare had no objection in principle to the proposed RCHE provision, the Vice-chairperson indicated no objection to the current proposal.

65. The Chairperson remarked that the inclusion of RCHE within the development

could be regarded as a planning gain, as RCHE was not an always permitted use under the subject “OU” zone. This was the applicant’s initiative to provide such facility through planning application. The Chairperson concluded that Members was generally supportive of the application.

66. 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 18.7.2029, 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 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.

[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]

67. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:35 p.m.

**Minutes of 769th Metro Planning Committee
(held on 18.7.2025)**

Deferral Case

Request for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
4	A/H17/143	2 nd [^]
Note: [^] <i>The 2nd Deferment as requested by the applicant was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted unless under special circumstances and supported with strong justifications.</i>		

*Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/769_mpc_agenda.html for details of the planning application.