

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 771<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 15.8.2025**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr C.K. Yip

Chairperson

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

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  
Mr Alex H.K. Tang

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**

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

**In Attendance**

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

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Ophelia C.M. Wong

**Agenda Item 1**

**Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 770<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 1.8.2025**

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 770<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 1.8.2025 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 three cases requesting the Town Planning Board to defer consideration of the applications. Details of the requests for deferral, Member's declaration of interest for a case and the Committee's view on the declared interest were in **Annex**.

### **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.

[Messrs Derrick S.M. Yip and Alex H.K. Tang joined the meeting at this point.]

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/28  
(MPC Paper No. 7/25)

---

5. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) involved rezoning of a site at the junction of Bailey Street and Chi Kiang Street (Amendment Item A) for a proposed residential development by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA), with AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) as one of the consultants of the project, and rezoning of two sites near URA's proposed development to reflect the as-built open space and a pigging station. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Mr C.K. Yip<br>(as <i>Director of Planning</i> ) | - being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its Committee; |
| Dr Tony C.M. Ip                                  | - having current business dealings with URA and AECOM;                           |
| Mr Ben S.S. Lui                                  | - being a former executive director of URA; and                                  |
| Mr Stanley T.S. Choi                             | - owning a flat in Hung Hom.   |

6. The Committee noted that Messrs Ben S.S. Lui and Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the proposed amendments to the OZP in relation to URA's proposed residential development were proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interest of Mr C.K. Yip only needed to be recorded and he could stay in the meeting. As the interest of Dr Tony C.M. Ip in relation to URA was direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Dr Tony C.M. Ip left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

## Presentation and Question Sessions

7. The following representatives from the Development Bureau (DEVB), PlanD and URA were invited to the meeting at this point:

### **DEVB**

Mr K.S. Ng - Assistant Secretary (Urban Renewal)

### **PlanD**

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

Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)

Mr Ryan M.H. Kwok - Town Planner/Kowloon

### **URA**

Mr Lawrence Mak

Mr Mike Kwan

Ms Y.T. Li

Mr Peter Wu

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au, STP/K, PlanD briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the OZP, technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments mainly included:

- (a) Amendment Item A – rezoning of a site at Bailey Street from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sewage Treatment Plant” (“OU(STP)”) to “Residential (Group A) 9” (“R(A)9”) subject to a maximum domestic and a maximum total gross floor area (GFA) of 60,880m<sup>2</sup> and 68,490m<sup>2</sup> respectively, and a maximum building height (BH) of 110mPD;
- (b) Amendment Item B – rezoning of a site at Bailey Street from “OU(STP)” and “G/IC” to “Open Space” to reflect the as-built Hoi Sham Park extension; and

- (c) Amendment Item C – rezoning of a site at Bailey Street from “OU(STP)” to “G/IC” subject to a maximum BH of 1 storey to reflect the as-built To Kwa Wan Pigging Station.

9. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP consequential to the amendments to the Plan. Other proposed amendments included revisions to the Notes for the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pier” zone to provide flexibility for provision of supporting/ancillary uses within piers and revisions to the Notes for the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone to facilitate government use.

[Professor Simon K.L. Wong joined the meeting during PlanD’s presentation.]

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lawrence Mak and Ms Y.T. Li, URA’s representatives, briefed Members on the following main points:

*Background*

- (a) on 6.6.2025, with the aim of providing additional financial support to URA in carrying out its urban renewal efforts, a site at Bailey Street (Item A Site) was granted to URA for residential development (the Bailey Street/Chi Kiang Street Project). This provided an opportunity to optimise land utilisation for comprehensive high-density residential development at Item A Site through the Government’s ‘Single Site, Multiple Use’ initiative, and offered planning gains for the area by accommodating government, institution and community (GIC) facilities, enhancing connectivity and amalgamating the adjacent Hoi Sham Park to provide communal open space for the benefit of the community. Hence, the rezoning proposal was submitted to the Board for consideration;
- (b) the Bailey Street/Chi Kiang Street Project was in line with URA’s ‘People First, District-based, Public Participatory’ approach, which embraced the concepts of sustainable development and building a quality city through appropriate land use planning, development intensity, urban design, greening

and harbour beautification;

*Item A Site*

- (c) Item A Site was currently occupied by a temporary car park. To its further west across Sung On Street were mainly residential areas including eight URA's renewal projects in To Kwa Wan under its 'District-based Redevelopment New Community', which were currently at various stages of implementation. To its east were Hoi Sham Park and To Kwa Wan Pigging Station;

*Planning Strategy and Vision*

- (d) under URA's To Kwa Wan Harbourfront Study (the Study), a holistic planning approach was adopted to introduce the 'Cove-Waterfront-Inland' concept to make optimal use of inland development, the shoreline and harbour waters, and to strengthen the connectivity between inland areas and the waterfront in shaping the Victoria Cove Area. Under the Study, Bailey Street would serve as the backbone for pedestrian connectivity and accessibility between inland areas and the waterfront/Hoi Sham Park;

*The Proposal, Planning Gains and Urban Design Merits*

- (e) the notional scheme sought to balance development needs with planning gains. By setting back the building blocks, a harbourfront at-grade communal space was proposed in the southern portion of Item A Site to enhance pedestrian connectivity and serve as a gathering space. In the future, the general public could access Hoi Sham Park via the at-grade communal space or through the podium shopping mall. The communal space also facilitated visual access to the waterfront and enhanced permeability between inland areas and the waterfront;
- (f) the floor space of the podium fronting Hoi Sham Park and the proposed at-grade communal space would be developed as a retail belt with dining and



commercial activities, contributing to an attractive and vibrant waterfront. It would also be seamlessly integrated with the adjoining Hoi Sham Park, with landscaping and sitting-out areas to create a comfortable waterfront environment for public enjoyment;

- (g) about 3,100m<sup>2</sup> GFA would be designated for GIC facilities. As per the Social Welfare Department's preliminary request, a residential care home for the elderly cum day care unit was incorporated in the proposed development;
- (h) taking into account the site location, surrounding areas and site constraints, the notional scheme comprised two residential towers, with sufficient building separation proposed in accordance with the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, as appropriate;
- (i) to take forward the proposed development, it was proposed to rezone Item A Site from "G/IC" and "OU(STP)" to "R(A)9" subject to a maximum domestic/total GFA of 60,880m<sup>2</sup>/68,490m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum BH of 110mPD. The proposed development would provide about 1,220 residential units, about 760m<sup>2</sup> of harbourfront at-grade communal space, 343 ancillary private car parking spaces and 15 parking spaces for coaches/commercial vehicles, and was tentatively scheduled for completion in 2032; and

#### *Public Consultation*

- (j) PlanD and URA jointly consulted the Harbourfront Commission (HC) Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing, and the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC). Both generally supported the proposed development.

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

### *Compatibility with Schools*

12. Noting that KCDC and HC had been consulted on the proposed development and their positive responses, two Members asked about the compatibility of the proposed residential development with the schools located at the west of Item A Site. A Member recalled from past experience that there would be concerns regarding the land use compatibility of residential development with school use. For instance, some schools might raise concerns about potential overlooking impact from residential blocks. The two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the adjacent schools had been consulted, and if so, what their responses were; and
- (b) how the layout design could address the interface issue.

13. In response, Messrs Lawrence Mak and Mike Kwan, URA's representatives, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) there were four schools located to the west of Item A Site, and meetings with the principals/staff of the schools were scheduled for late August this year. URA had experience in liaison with schools located near their developments. In the redevelopment project at Kim Shin Lane in Sham Shui Po, a secondary school (i.e. Cheung Sha Wan Catholic Secondary School) located near the redevelopment project was engaged. Through close liaison with the school throughout the development process, mitigation measures, such as suspension of construction works during examination period, were adopted as far as practicable; and
- (b) regarding the layout design, subject to detailed design, most of residential units would be oriented to face the seaside, so that the overlooking impact could be minimised. Other design elements included a minimum 15m-wide building separation and building setbacks from Hoi Sham Park and Bailey Street, which would preserve the existing air pathway and facilitate smoother airflow to inland areas. An Air Ventilation Assessment had been conducted,

which demonstrated that the proposed development with the aforementioned design measures could mitigate air ventilation impact. Besides, a publicly accessible at-grade communal space of about 760m<sup>2</sup> connecting to Hoi Sham Park and the waterfront was proposed in the southern portion of Item A Site. This area would serve as major public passageway and maintain a visual corridor towards the waterfront. With the above design elements, impacts on the schools were expected to be minimal. The proposed development would also add variation to the BH profile of the area.

14. The Chairperson remarked that it was common for schools to be located near residential developments and the possible interface issue could be addressed by adopting appropriate measures through the layout design.

*Traffic and Pedestrian Connectivity*

15. Noting that a public vehicle park (PVP) with 15 coach parking spaces was proposed in the notional scheme, a Member asked whether it was common practice to include commercial parking spaces in a PVP or whether there was specific consideration for the provision at Item A Site. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD said that the provision of public vehicle parking spaces should be considered on a case-by-case basis. For Item A Site, it was currently used as a temporary car park with coaches/commercial vehicles already parking there. Taking into account the current use of Item A Site, the Transport Department (TD)'s request and the estimated future demand for parking, a PVP with 15 parking spaces for coaches/commercial vehicles was proposed in the notional scheme.

16. A Member and the Chairperson further raised the following questions:
- (a) noting that an at-grade communal space was proposed in the southern part of Item A Site, whether any assessment on pedestrian flow around the intersection of Bailey Street and Chi Kiang Street had been conducted; and
  - (b) whether any preliminary assessment on pedestrian flow upon completion of the proposed development had been conducted.

17. In response, Messrs Lawrence Mak and Mike Kwan, URA's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) under the existing situation, pedestrian traffic at the junction of Bailey Street and Chi Kiang Street was minimal. At the detailed design stage, URA would explore whether any improvement measures to pedestrians facilities would be required, and would consult the TD and KCDC in that regard; and
- (b) regarding pedestrian walkway performance in the area, the levels of service under both the current situation and upon completion of the development with implementation of setback and introduction of at-grade communal space were satisfactory (rated A) according to the preliminary assessment. That said, URA also aimed to provide a comfortable and convenient pedestrian environment for the general public.

18. The Chairperson remarked that the proposed development by URA could allow comprehensive planning of Item A Site with enhanced connectivity to the waterfront and provision of communal open space with retail facilities to add vibrancy to the area. The other amendments were technical in nature. 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.

19. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K9/28 and that the draft Hung Hom OZP No. S/K9/28A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/K9/29 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 Hung Hom OZP No. S/K9/28A (to be renumbered as S/K9/29 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.”

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

[The Chairperson thanked the representatives from DEVB, PlanD and URA for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Dr Tony C.M. Ip rejoined the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Mr Patrick W.Y. Wong and Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, Senior Town Planners/Kowloon (STPs/K), and Ms Grace Y.M. Cheung and Mr Kenneth P.C. Wong, Town Planners/Kowloon (TPs/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Kwun Tong (South) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K14S/26

(MPC Paper No. 8/25)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

21. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Patrick W.Y. Wong, STP/K, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the approved Kwun Tong (South) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K14S/26, the technical considerations and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments were mainly to take forward a section 12A (s.12A) application (No. Y/K14S/2) partially agreed by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) by rezoning a site at

Hung To Road from “Commercial (1)” (“C(1)”) and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) to “C(3)” subject to a maximum plot ratio of 12 and a maximum building height of 100mPD with ‘Social Welfare Facility (not elsewhere specified) (on land designated “C(3)” only)’ under Column 2 of the Notes for the “C” zone (instead of under Column 1 as proposed under the s.12A application) in response to the Committee’s decision. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP consequential to the amendments to the Plan and revisions to the Notes for the “OU(B)” zone to facilitate government use.

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

23. Members had no question on the proposed amendments.

24. The Chairperson remarked that the proposed amendments to the OZP were mainly to take forward the Committee’s decision on the s.12A application. 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.

25. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Kwun Tong (South) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K14S/26 and that the draft Kwun Tong (South) OZP No. S/K14S/26A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/K14S/27 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
- (c) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Kwun Tong (South) OZP No. S/K14S/26A (to be renumbered to S/K14S/27 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.”

26. 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. Mr Patrick W.Y. Wong and Ms Grace Y.M. Cheung left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 7**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K15/132                      Proposed Flat and Permitted Shop and Services and Eating Place with  
Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions in  
"Residential (Group E)" Zone, 4 Tung Yuen Street, Yau Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/132B)

---

27. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Yau Tong with Arup Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and P&T Architects Ltd (P&T) as two of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Professor Simon K.L. Wong    - his company owning properties in Yau Tong;

Dr Tony C.M. Ip                      - his company having current business dealing  
with P&T and having past business dealings  
with Arup; and

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu                      - his company was planning and building a  
transitional housing in close proximity to the  
Site.

28. As the properties owned by the company of Professor Simon K.L. Wong had no direct view of the Site and Dr Tony C.M. Ip had no involvement in the application, the

Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. As the interest of Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu was considered direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu left the meeting at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

29. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kenneth P.C. Wong, TP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, 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.

#### *Transformation of Yau Tong Industrial Area (YTIA)*

30. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that YTIA was under transformation to residential use and the Site was sandwiched between Yau Tong Sewage Pumping Station (YTSPS) and a concrete batching plant (the CBP), whether there was any relocation/redevelopment programme for the two facilities and whether comprehensive planning for the three lots was possible;
- (b) the Government's role in the transformation of YTIA; and
- (c) whether there was any redevelopment plan for Kwun Tong Wholesale Fish Market.

31. In response, Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, STP/K, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) there was no relocation/redevelopment plan for YTSPS and the CBP. There were three CBPs in YTIA. The one located to the immediate south of the Site was in operation while the other two CBPs located to the further south



of the Site at 20 and 22 Tung Yuen Street, which were the subjects of complaints, ceased operation in April 2025 as advised by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD). YTIA was previously zoned “Industrial” (“I”) and subsequently rezoned to “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) and “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) in 1998 and 1999 to facilitate transformation of the area. The Site was zoned “R(E)” and the planning intention was to phase out existing industrial uses through redevelopment (or conversion) for residential use. Since the rezoning, a number of sites in YTIA had gradually been redeveloped for residential use. Such transformation had provided incentives for land owners of the remaining industrial uses, including the sites occupied by CBPs in YTIA, to redevelop;

- (b) there was a clear intention of the Government to transform YTIA to a residential area. The zonings of YTIA had been amended as mentioned in paragraph 31(a) above and since the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) amendments, the area had been undergoing gradual transformation. Besides, it was the Government’s intention to have a waterfront promenade in YTIA and Yau Tong Bay, which was located to the north of YTIA. Planning briefs had been prepared for the “CDA” zones of YTIA and Yau Tong Bay to guide their development/redevelopment, and the planning briefs and the OZP had stipulated the requirement for the provision of public waterfront promenade not less than 15m wide in the “CDA” sites in YTIA and Yau Tong Bay. The planning intention had been progressively realised including the completion of the residential developments of Montego Bay in the “CDA(5)” zone and The Coast Line 1 in the waterfront portion of the “CDA(1)” zone with the provision of public waterfront promenade. The residential developments in the inland portion of the “CDA(1)” zone and the “CDA(3)” zone were under construction, and planning approval had been granted for residential development in the “CDA(4)” zone; and
- (c) there was no redevelopment programme for Kwun Tong Wholesale Fish Market at the site zoned “CDA(2)”.

32. A Member opined that the Government could take a proactive role in the YTIA

transformation such as taking the initiative to liaise with the land owner of the CBP site on its relocation and future redevelopment. The Chairperson said that from planning perspective, the rezoning of YTIA from “I” to “R(E)” and “CDA” provided incentive to land owners for redevelopment, thereby facilitating the transformation of YTIA to a residential area. As most of the sites in YTIA were privately owned, future development/redevelopment was subject to the commercial decision of land owners. That said, the Chairperson acknowledged the Member’s suggestion that the Government could take a more proactive approach in negotiating with the land owner of the adjoining CBP site for its relocation and the possibility of integrated development of the CBP site and the Site for better layout design. The operation of the adjoining CBP complied with the licence requirements issued by EPD and it supported the construction industry and development projects, and hence its relocation involved policy considerations.

#### *Residential Developments in the Vicinity*

33. Noting that there was a residential development (i.e. The Coast Line 1) at the “CDA(1)” zone to the further south of the Site with a similar site configuration with narrow sea frontage, a Member enquired about its development parameters. In response, Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, STP/K, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the development at the site zoned “CDA(1)” comprised the inland portion (with a building height (BH) restriction of 100mPD) and the waterfront portion (with a BH restriction of 80mPD) separated by Tung Yuen Street and it was covered by the planning approval under application No. A/K15/122 for comprehensive residential development with the provision of public waterfront promenade. The site condition of the waterfront portion was similar to that of the Site as it was sandwiched between the CBP and Kwun Tong Wholesale Fish Market. Technical assessments were conducted and various mitigation measures were proposed to address the possible air quality and noise impacts. The whole “CDA(1)” site (inland and waterfront portions) had a site area of 7,773m<sup>2</sup>, providing about 900 flats. The development in the waterfront portion was completed, which had a site area of 2,108m<sup>2</sup>, providing about 230 flats. In response to the follow-up enquiry from a Member and the Chairperson, Ms Florence Y.S. Lee said that the overall plot ratio (PR) of the developments in the “CDA(1)” zone as well as those for its inland and waterfront portions were both 5.

*Building Layout*

34. As regards the building layout, a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) while there was setback at its east along Tung Yuen Street and provision of a waterfront promenade at its west fronting the harbour, the proposed residential tower with BH relaxed to 100mPD appeared bulky particularly as there was no setback from the southern and northern boundaries of the Site, whether it would result in wall effect;
- (b) how to avoid the future development in the adjoining CBP site adopting a similar layout that would intensify the wall effect; and
- (c) whether the proposed scheme complied with the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) (i.e. under the Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-152).

35. In response, Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, STP/K, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) in view of various site constraints in relation to the Site, including its close proximity to YTSPS and the CBP, an elongated site configuration with narrow sea frontage of 40m and a depth of 60m, and a relatively small site area of 2,419m<sup>2</sup>, appropriate mitigation measures had been incorporated in the proposed scheme to address the industrial/residential (I/R) interface. These included a single-aspect building design on the side facing the CBP and an L-shape building block with openable windows for sensitive uses facing Tung Yuen Street and the waterfront, positioned at a distance from YTSPS. The applicants had conducted an Environmental Assessment, which demonstrated that there would be no insurmountable environmental problems with the proposed mitigation measures. The Director of Environmental Protection had no objection to the application, and approval conditions on environmental aspect had been suggested. Regarding air

ventilation, the applicants had also conducted an Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA). Compared with the baseline scheme (i.e. the existing 7-storey industrial building), the wind permeability was improved at Ko Fai Road and Tung Yuen Street in the proposed scheme. Although there were some variations in wind permeability performance at different locations when comparing the baseline scheme with the proposed scheme, the AVA concluded that the proposed development would unlikely induce significant adverse air ventilation impact on the surrounding pedestrian environment. With the provision of a 15m-wide waterfront promenade, which accounted for one-fourth of the site area (608m<sup>2</sup>), together with the elongated site configuration, the applicants also applied for minor relaxation of the BH restriction, among others. In the proposed scheme, only the portion of the residential tower abutting Tung Yuen Street had a BH of 100mPD while the portion near the proposed waterfront promenade maintained a BH of 80mPD as permitted under the OZP;

- (b) as the adjoining CBP site was zoned “R(E)” and ‘flat’ was a Column 2 use, submission of a section 16 application for residential development for consideration by the Town Planning Board (the Board) was required, and the Board would consider the proposal, including the design, when considering the application; and
- (c) according to the applicants, the proposed residential development at the Site complied with SBDG. Under SBDG, building sites proposed with building(s) having a continuous projected facade length of 60m or above should comply with the building separation requirements.

36. Noting Members’ concerns on wall effect of the proposed development, the Chairperson remarked that while the Site was subject to site constraints, including the shape and size of the Site and the I/R interface with neighbouring land uses that needed to be addressed, the applicants proposed further setback along Tung Yuen Street in addition to the setback required under the draft Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong and Lei Yue Mun Outline Development Plan (ODP) and a voluntary 15m-wide waterfront promenade for public enjoyment that was not required under the OZP. Given these considerations, area available

for developing the residential tower was limited. Taking The Coast Line 1 as an example, while the residential block was set at an angle to create a slanted form facing the sea, the building block occupied the whole width of the site. As for another residential development, namely The Montego Bay, located further south in “CDA(5)” zone, since it had a wider sea frontage with a comparatively larger site area, a building design with larger building separation could be achieved. Each site had its unique site conditions and constraints, and different design measures would be adopted to address the issues.

#### *Waterfront Promenade*

37. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, STP/K, said that unlike the “CDA(1)” to “CDA(5)” zones in YTIA that the OZP and planning brief had specified the requirement for provision of a public waterfront promenade not less than 15m-wide, there was no such requirement for the “R(E)” zone in the area. The applicants voluntarily proposed a 15m-wide waterfront promenade open for public use 24 hours a day within the Site, and would take up the management and maintenance of the waterfront promenade.

38. Another Member further enquired about the planning and provision of waterfront promenade in the area. In response, Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, STP/K, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that there were requirements under the OZP and planning briefs for the “CDA(1)” to “CDA(5)” zones in YTIA and the “CDA” zone in Yau Tong Bay to provide a public waterfront promenade not less than 15m in width. The applicants, apart from providing the 15m-wide waterfront promenade for public enjoyment at all times, proposed an at-grade 5m-wide covered pedestrian passageway within the Site connecting Tung Yuen Street and the waterfront, and undertook to design and construct a 4.3m-wide waterfront promenade at the adjoining YTSPS site. The said works would effectuate a continuous waterfront promenade from YTIA to Yau Tong Bay (except the adjoining site occupied by the CBP for the time being), achieving a seamless connection to the waterfront promenade in Kowloon East and enhancing the connectivity to the waterfront from inland, thereby bringing public benefits.

#### *Public Comment on Government, Institution and Community (GIC) Facilities*

39. A Member enquired about details of a public comment regarding the provision of GIC facilities. In response, Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, STP/K, said that while the provision of

open space and major GIC facilities in Kwun Tong District was generally adequate, there were shortfalls in some social welfare facilities. That said, as the population increase arising from the current application was estimated at about 855 persons (with 342 flats), the impact on GIC provision was expected to be minimal.

### Deliberation Session

40. The Chairperson recapitulated that the Site was subject to various constraints. The applicants had conducted technical assessments on such aspects as environmental, visual, air ventilation, traffic, etc. to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed residential development with minor relaxation of domestic PR (from 5 to 6) and BH (from 80mPD to 100mPD) restrictions. Relevant government bureaux/departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To support the application, the applicants proposed various design measures including provision of further setback from Tung Yuen Street, a 15m-wide public waterfront promenade within the Site and a 4.3m-wide waterfront promenade on the adjoining YTSPS site, which were not required under the OZP/ODP, as planning gains. The Site was located at the waterfront, and there might be scope to reduce the building mass and refine the building layout to minimise the wall effect as raised by Members. Members were invited to express views on the application.

### *Justifications for Minor Relaxation*

41. A Member, whilst appreciating the voluntary provision of a 15m-wide waterfront promenade by the applicants, enquired whether the extent of the relaxation of PR and BH restrictions could be considered minor. In response, the Chairperson said that there were no hard and fast rules for what constituted minor, which should be assessed based on the facts and degree of relaxation sought for each case, and each case should be considered on its individual merits. For instance, a number of planning applications for minor relaxation of PR restriction for 20% under the Government's policy on revitalising industrial buildings were approved in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay. Members could consider a host of factors including the justifications, technical feasibility and planning merits provided by the applicants when considering the application.

42. As a related issue, the same Member enquired whether the justifications that the

application was in line with the Government's policies on optimisation of flat supply and enhancement of living space as set out in paragraph 2 of the Paper was sufficient to support the increase in BH and PR. The Chairperson said that the justifications were provided by the applicants, and the Committee could assess whether the justifications could support the application. For the current application, due consideration could be given to whether the proposed increase in BH and PR could be justified by the planning gains.

#### *I/R Interface*

43. In response to a Member's enquiry on the planning permission sought, the Chairperson clarified that the Site was zoned "R(E)", which was primarily intended for the phasing out of existing industrial uses through redevelopment for residential use. 'Flat' was a Column 2 use, and hence planning permission from the Board was required even without applying for minor relaxation of PR/BH restriction. For applications concerning "R(E)" zones, the applicants should demonstrate that the possible I/R issue could be addressed. For the current application, the applicants proposed to place non-inhabitant uses facing the CBP and EPD had no objection to the application. The Member doubted whether the proposed scheme could adequately address the potential I/R issue, particularly as the portion of the residential tower along the southern boundary adjoining the CBP occupied a full width up to the proposed waterfront promenade, leaving no separation between the proposed residential tower and the adjoining CBP site. On this point, at the invitation of the Chairperson, Mr Alex H.K. Tang, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South), EPD, said that the proposed single-aspect building design at the side facing the CBP was a more effective way to address the I/R interface than setting back the building of the Site from the CBP.

#### *Minor Relaxation of PR and BH Restrictions and Planning Gains*

44. Whilst Members generally acknowledged and appreciated the applicants' efforts in providing a public waterfront promenade within the Site and the adjoining YTSPS as planning gains, there were concerns on the building layout and the building mass of the proposed scheme. In particular, two Members expressed reservation on the application and made the following main points:

- (a) the building layout of the proposed scheme without separation from the

adjoining CBP site might have adverse impact on the microclimate of the area, particularly if the redevelopment of the adjoining CBP site adopted a similar building layout. Besides, there was no similar approved application for minor relaxation of both PR and BH restrictions within the “R(E)” zone in YTIA. Approval of the current application might set a precedent for similar application(s) with a similar building design;

- (b) while having no strong view on the proposed BH, the building mass appeared bulky. The applicants should review and explore the possibility to reduce the building mass, so that a wider separation between the proposed residential tower and the adjoining CBP could be achieved;
- (c) there was concern on whether the proposed scheme complied with SBDG, in particular noting no separation between the proposed residential tower at the Site and the adjoining CBP site; and
- (d) while relevant technical assessments submitted by the applicants demonstrated that the proposed scheme would not cause adverse technical impacts, the absence of separation/setback from the adjoining CBP site might create wall effect. Approval of the current application might set a precedent to similar application(s) which would not be beneficial to the living environment of the district. The Committee should request the applicants to revise the building layout, as appropriate, to minimise the wall effect for the Committee’s further consideration.

### *Conclusion and Decision*

45. While acknowledging the applicants’ efforts in providing the public waterfront promenade within the Site and the adjoining YTSPS site to enhance the waterfront promenade connectivity in the Yau Tong area, the Chairperson noted Members’ concerns regarding the building layout and the building mass of the proposed scheme, and whether the proposed scheme complied with SBDG. In that regard, the Chairperson said that the Committee might consider deferring a decision on the application pending the applicants’ submission of supplementary information to address Members’ concerns as stated above.



46. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application for 2 months pending the submission of further information from the applicants, including (i) a review of the building layout to provide setback from the southern boundary of the application site to minimise the wall effect; (ii) a review of the building design to reduce the building mass; and (iii) demonstration of compliance of the proposed scheme with the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, for further consideration by the Committee.

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

### **Agenda Item 9**

#### **Any Other Business**

[Open Meeting]

47. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:00 a.m.

**Minutes of 771<sup>st</sup> Metro Planning Committee  
(held on 15.8.2025)**

**Deferral Cases**

**Requests for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.*</b>	<b>Times of Deferment</b>
3	A/KC/510	2 <sup>nd</sup> <sup>^</sup>
4	A/TWW/134	1 <sup>st</sup>
8	A/K18/350	1 <sup>st</sup>

**Note:**

<sup>^</sup> *The 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.*

**Declaration of Interest**

The Committee noted the following declaration of interest:

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Member's Declared Interest</b>	
8	The application site was located in Kowloon Tong.	- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi for his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Kowloon Tong

The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

*\* Refer to the agenda at [https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/771\\_mpc\\_agenda.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/771_mpc_agenda.html) for details of the planning applications.*