

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 775th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 24.10.2025

Present

Director of Planning
Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Chairperson

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

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

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South),
Environmental Protection Department
Ms Clara P.S. Yu

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

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

In Attendance

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Karen K.Y. Tsui

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 774th MPC Meeting held on 10.10.2025

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 774th MPC meeting held on 10.10.2025 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Refinement of Selection Criteria for Streamlined Consideration of Section 16 Applications

2. The Secretary reported that the Rural and New Town Planning Committee on 10.10.2025 agreed to formalise the current practice of considering public comments for streamlining cases. To ensure consistency, the Secretary, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, recapitulated the existing selection criteria for streamlining cases and proposed the following refinement, highlighted in bold and italics:

- (i) Planning Department's recommendation: no objection/could be tolerated;
- (ii) zoning: not within conservation-related zones (e.g. "Green Belt", "Conservation Area", "Coastal Protection Area", "Other Specified Uses" for conservation, etc.);
- (iii) departmental comments: no adverse comments or the concerns of bureaux/departments could be addressed through imposition of approval conditions/advisory clauses;
- (iv) previous application: no previous rejected application for same/similar use (excluding those with subsequent approval); and

- (v) public comment: no substantial adverse public comments ***or the concerns raised by the public could be addressed through imposition of approval conditions/advisory clauses and/or relevant bureaux/departments had no adverse comments on the relevant aspects raised by the public.***

3. The Chairperson remarked that the Committee had adopted the agreed set of selection criteria to determine whether applications could be processed under the streamlining arrangement. Regarding public comments, the assessment took into account mainly the substance and the issues raised in the public comments, rather than the number. When the public comments were technical in nature and could be resolved by relevant bureaux/departments or addressed through approval conditions or advisory clauses, those applications could be processed under the streamlining arrangement.

4. The Committee agreed to the proposed refinement of the selection criteria for streamlining cases and that it would take effect starting from the next meeting.

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

Hong Kong District

[Mr Ronald C.H. Chan, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), and Ms Natalie S.M. Yim, Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H1/104 Proposed Educational Institution (Academic and Ancillary Facilities)
with Permitted Flat (Staff Quarters) in “Residential (Group B)” Zone,
Inland Lot No. 7704 RP (Part), Pokfield Road, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H1/104)

5. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Kennedy Town and the application was submitted by the University of Hong Kong (HKU). P&T Architects and Engineers Limited (P&T) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Professor Roger C.K. Chan | - | being the Honorary Associate Professor of HKU; |
| Dr Tony C.M. Ip | - | being the Adjunct Associate Professor of HKU, and his company having current business dealing with P&T; |
| Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui | - | being the Adjunct Professor of HKU; |
| Professor Simon K.L. Wong | - | his company owning a property in the vicinity of the application site and his spouse being a programme director of a course of HKU; and |
| Mr Derrick S.M. Yip | - | having current business dealings with HKU. |

6. The Committee noted that Mr Derrick S.M. Yip and Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interest of Professor Roger C.K. Chan was considered indirect, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting. As the interests of Dr Tony C.M. Ip and Professor Simon K.L. Wong were considered direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Dr Tony C.M. Ip, Professor Simon K.L. Wong and Mr Bond C.P. Chow left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Natalie S.M. Yim, TP/HK, 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.

8. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the size and operation hours of the proposed canteen had changed under the current proposal compared with those set out in the approved section 12A (s.12A) application No. Y/H1/2;
- (b) noting that the proposed canteen was not required to obtain a food business licence from the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department, whether there was any regulatory mechanism to monitor its operation, specifically to mitigate concerns about exhaust facing University Heights; and
- (c) whether separate planning permission would be required if the applicant intended to convert the proposed behavioural laboratories into wet/chemical laboratories.

9. In response, Mr Ronald C.H. Chan, STP/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the size of the proposed canteen in the current application remained unchanged from that in the approved s.12A application No. Y/H1/2. The only difference was that the proposed canteen would now serve both staff and students;
- (b) the applicant had committed to implementing appropriate odour and oily fume control measures in accordance with the Environmental Protection Department's Guidelines on 'Control of Oily Fume and Cooking Odour from Restaurant and Food Business'. The exhaust vent of the proposed canteen would not be directed towards the residential units of University Heights. While a portion of the exhaust would be discharged towards the level below the University Heights podium, the relevant emission was controlled under the Air Pollution Control Ordinance; and
- (c) the Site was planned as a campus for the HKU Business School. According to the applicant, the proposed laboratories were primarily behavioural laboratories equipped with computers and augmented reality/virtual reality devices. They would not operate as wet or chemical laboratories, and no dangerous goods or related storage facilities would be involved. The HKU Safety Office would monitor the operation of the laboratories. As those laboratories were ancillary facilities for an educational institution, no separate planning permission was required.

10. The Chairperson supplemented that any planning permission granted would be scheme-based, and the applicant was required to implement the approved scheme as submitted. PlanD would continue to monitor the development during the subsequent building plan submission stage. Should the current section 16 application be approved, if the uses and details of the laboratories shown on the building plans deviated from the approved scheme, PlanD would raise objection to the submitted building plans.

Deliberation Session

11. In response to Members' concern that the proposed behavioural laboratories might be used as wet/chemical laboratories, the Chairperson clarified that the change of use

in the podium under the current application would require building plan submission under the Buildings Ordinance, and that monitoring mechanism was in place under the building regime. At the building plan submission stage, PlanD would scrutinise the proposed laboratories uses and floor areas to ensure that the submitted building plans conformed to the approved scheme. Given that wet laboratories were subject to stricter safety and storage regulations, any future decision by the applicant to convert the proposed dry laboratories into wet laboratories would require new building plan submission.

12. Members noted that the current application only involved change of use in the podium levels, and the originally planned multiple pedestrian connections to Pok Fu Lam Road, Pokfield Road and Smithfield under the approved s.12A application No. Y/H1/2 and being implemented by HKU would remain unaffected. A lift (Lift L8) and its adjacent staircase would connect LG2/F (Landscape Terrace) and LG5/F (Landscape Avenue) of the podium, providing an alternative pedestrian route along Pokfield Road. Moreover, three lifts connecting all podium levels and opening onto the external area would be accessible to the public. Those facilities would operate from 6 a.m. to 1 a.m., matching the proposed escalator service to Smithfield Road and the MTR service hours. The internal circulation network, including common corridor, stairs, lifts and escalators on the podium levels, would be open to the public during campus opening hours, enabling pedestrian movement between LG2/F (Landscape Terrace) and LG5/F (Landscape Avenue).

13. The Chairperson concluded that Members were generally in support of the application. To address Members' concern regarding the nature of the laboratories, the potential environmental nuisance of the proposed canteen and the provision of pedestrian connections, the Committee agreed that the applicant should be reminded to adhere to the approved scheme under the current application.

14. 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 24.10.2029, 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 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.]

[Dr Tony C.M. Ip, Professor Simon K.L. Wong and Mr Bond C.P. Chow rejoined the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), and Mr Harvey T.H. Law, Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H7/188 Submission of Layout Plan and Proposed Minor Relaxation of Gross Floor Area Restriction for Permitted ‘Eating Place’, ‘Office’, ‘Shop and Services’, ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture’, ‘Public Clinic’, ‘Public Transport Terminus or Station’, ‘Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle)’ and ‘Social Welfare Facility Uses’ (Amendments to Approved Layout Plan) in “Commercial (2)” Zone, Inland Lot No. 8945, Caroline Hill Road, Causeway Bay, Hong Kong (MPC Paper No. A/H7/188)

15. The application site (the Site) was located in Causeway Bay and the application was submitted by Patchway Holdings (HK) Limited, which was a joint venture of Hysan Development Company Limited and Chime Corporation Limited. Ove Arup Hong Kong Limited (ARUP), Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Limited (RLP) and Otherland Limited (Otherland) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| Dr Tony C.M. Ip | - | his company having current business dealings with Otherland and past business dealings with ARUP; |
| Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu | - | having some of his projects sponsored by the Lee Hysan Foundation and being the director and chief executive officer of a company |

which had recently received donations from the Foundation; and

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip - co-owning with spouse a property in the vicinity of the Site and being a personal friend of the chairman and vice-chairman of RLP.

16. The Committee noted that Mr Derrick S.M. Yip had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As Dr Tony C.M. Ip had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he 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 temporarily at this point.]

[Post-meeting note: The Chairperson declared an interest for her close relative being an employee of ARUP. Her close relative had no involvement in the application.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

17. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, 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.

18. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the existing condition of the Banyan Garden;
- (b) whether the design of the Banyan Garden under the approved scheme was mainly a soft landscape design intended for public enjoyment, and whether there had been any changes to the greenery coverage, overall landscape and thematic design concept under the current scheme;
- (c) noting that the current scheme proposed fencing the open-soil area of the Banyan Garden with a balustrade, whether the balustraded portion would be counted towards the public open space (POS) provision, and the size of the

concerned area; and

- (d) noting that a 9.8m-wide area (Zone 3 of the soil rooting zones within the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) of the Old and Valuable Tree (OVT) near Leighton Road), which was a lawn area under the approved scheme, would be replaced by a suspended pavement, and that the open-soil area of the Banyan Garden would be fenced off, whether the loss of greenery and interactive POS resulting from those changes would be compensated elsewhere on the Site and whether it was possible to replace the suspended pavement with a shallower lawn to retain the soft landscape provision at the Banyan Garden.

19. In response, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following points:

- (a) the entire Banyan Garden was formerly a hard-paved sports court;
- (b) under the approved scheme, the Banyan Garden was primarily designed as a lawn area. As the OVT near Leighton Road was suffering from physiological decline caused by Brown Root Rot Disease (褐根病), the current application proposed to revise the layout and soft/hard landscape design of the Banyan Garden to implement a protection-cum-rehabilitation scheme for the OVT. Since continuous foot traffic could spread the disease via spores on shoes, if the original landscape design was retained, perimeter balustrades would have to be erected around the lawn area of the Banyan Garden to restrict public access in order to curb the spread of the disease to other trees in the surrounding area, such as the OVT (No. JUD WCH/1) to the south of the Site. As the OVT near Leighton Road was a local landmark that significantly enhanced the Leighton Road streetscape and the Banyan Garden in the proposed development, the revised design aimed to improve the growing conditions of the OVT while keeping the surrounding area publicly accessible, especially allowing the public to approach it. In view of the reduction of greenery within the Banyan Garden itself, additional green area would be provided within the Site to

retain the greenery ratio. The greenery coverage under the current application remained unchanged at 20%;

- (c) the balustraded open-soil area was about 440m² and would be counted towards the POS provision. The overall POS provision of not less than 6,000m² would be maintained; and
- (d) three distinct soil rooting zones within the TPZ were defined based on crown spread, growth direction and risk assessment. According to the arboricultural assessment carried out by the applicant, over 60% of the OVT's crown mass extended towards the Site, where existing impermeable paving constrained root development and restricted the aerial roots to develop into new trunks. To improve the growing condition of the OVT and mitigate the risk of collapse, a new 5.7m-wide tree strip (Zone 2) of open soil would be created and fenced off with balustrades. Since foot traffic could spread Brown Root Rot Disease, Zone 3 would employ a modern soil-cell system to construct a suspended pavement that retained rootable soil while allowing shared use of the area. The OVT's expansive canopy would provide extensive shading for the Banyan Garden. Street furniture would be installed around the OVT to create resting spots for the public.

20. The Chairperson supplemented that both soft and hard landscape areas could be counted towards the POS provision. Even though portions of the TPZ in the Banyan Garden would be fenced off or transformed into a hard-paved civic plaza with a soil-cell system underneath to improve tree health, those spaces remained accessible and multifunctional, thereby serving as POS.

21. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether the 5.7m-wide tree strip under Zone 2 of the Banyan Garden (Plan A-26 of the Paper) would be covered with mulch or planted with shrubs as illustrated in the photomontage submitted by the applicant, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, said that the final treatment would be determined by the applicant based on the condition of the OVT. The Member was concerned that while shrubs were preferred due to their aesthetic appeal, they required ample sunlight and might not be able to survive in

the shade of the OVT, casting doubt on the accuracy of the photomontage. In response, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, said that the photomontage was only a conceptual illustration and the landscape design would be refined during the detailed design stage.

22. The Chairperson remarked that the current scheme proposed converting the 5.7m-wide strip into an open-soil area that would be fenced off with balustrades, and the specific landscaping for this strip had yet to be confirmed. If the application was approved, the applicant was required to submit a revised Landscape Master Plan for approval by the Director of Planning under the approval condition. The applicant would identify suitable planting scheme at the detailed design stage and the Planning Department would review the submission and provide professional advice, as appropriate. A Member remarked that the photomontage might not accurately reflect the proposed design, and the overall greenery area in the Banyan Garden should not be further compromised.

23. In response to a Member's enquiry about whether similar tree protection plan had been prepared for the other OVT (No. JUD WCH/1) to the south of the Site, the Chairperson clarified that OVT (No. JUD WCH/1) fell outside the Site. At the invitation of the Chairperson, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, said that according to the record from the Greening, Landscape and Tree Management Section of Development Bureau, the OVT (No. JUD WCH/1) had not yet been infected by Brown Root Rot Disease, but the independent tree specialist considered that it was at risk of infection due to its close proximity. Regarding the other trees that would be retained or planted on the Site, no specific protection measures were required as they were not infected.

Deliberation Session

24. The Chairperson recapitulated that the application primarily sought amendments to the approved layout plan, particularly changes to the layout and soft/hard landscape design of the Banyan Garden to accommodate the OVT near Leighton Road, while the overall development parameters remained largely unchanged from the previously approved scheme.

25. A Member, while expressing respect for the tree protection plan proposed by the applicant's independent tree specialist and indicating no objection to the application, observed that the Banyan Garden had been redesigned as an active commercial recreation

open space, deviating from the passive recreation area shown in the previously approved scheme. Another Member concurred and was concerned whether there was any mechanism to prevent the POS at the Banyan Garden from being used for commercial events that would benefit only the developer and undermine the community's interests. In response, the Chairperson said that the revised POS design at the Banyan Garden formed an integral part of the protection-cum-rehabilitation scheme for the OVT. To promote healthy root development of the OVT, a suspended pavement of removable paving slabs had been adopted. This permitted pedestrian access while preventing spores of Brown Root Rot Disease from reaching the uncompacted soil underneath. The requirement for providing not less than 6,000m² of POS had been incorporated into the lease, ensuring that its use served public interest objectives.

26. A Member expressed support for the application and commended the applicant's efforts to preserve the OVT. The Member further suggested that the applicant should consider incorporating an aesthetic design for the POS and a cohesive landscape treatment within the Banyan Garden.

27. The Chairperson concluded that Members were generally in support of the application. To address Members' concerns regarding the landscape treatment, design and functionality of the POS at the Banyan Garden, the Committee agreed that the applicant should be reminded to review the landscape treatment and enhance the POS design at the detailed design stage.

28. 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 24.10.2029, 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.]

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

Kowloon District

[Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), Messrs Patrick W.Y. Wong and Ernest C.M. Fung, Senior Town Planners/Kowloon (STPs/K), and Messrs Jaime H.M. Chan and Charles K.K. Lee, Town Planners/Kowloon (TPs/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Ho Man Tin Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K7/24
(MPC Paper No. 10/25)

29. The Secretary reported that proposed amendments to the Ho Man Tin Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) mainly involved rezoning of a site at Fat Kwong Street (the Site) for a proposed residential development (Amendment Item A). Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had declared an interest on this item for owning properties in Ho Man Tin. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

30. Other than the Planning Department (PlanD)'s representatives as listed out before paragraph 20 above, the following government representatives and consultant were invited to the meeting at this point:

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Jason K.C Wong	-	Senior Engineer
Mr Ray L.W. Lau	-	Senior Architect

Consultant

AtkinsRealis Asia Limited

Mr Louis N.K. Lau

31. With the aid of a PowerPoint Presentation, Mr Patrick W.Y. Wong, STP/K, PlanD briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the OZP, technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments mainly involved rezoning of the Site in Ho Man Tin from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Residential (Group B) 4” (“R(B)4”) for private residential development (Amendment Item A), subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 19,300m² and a maximum building height (BH) of 160mPD, with provision of social welfare facilities.

32. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP consequential to the amendments to the OZP. Other proposed amendments included revisions to the Notes for the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone to align with the control of “R(A)” zones of other Kowloon OZPs and technical amendments in accordance with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans.

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

34. In response to a Member’s enquiry about the possibility of developing the Site as a student hostel after rezoning, the Chairperson said that the Site would be rezoned to “R(B)4”, under which ‘Residential Institution’, which included student hostels, was an always permitted use under Column 1 of the Notes. That said, the proposed amendments to the OZP was intended to rezone the Site for private residential development through land sale, with the aim of increasing housing supply.

35. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that only about 800m² GFA had been reserved for social welfare

facilities, whether the proposed provision was sufficient to meet the community needs;

- (b) whether the floor area of the Neighbourhood Elderly Community Centre Sub-base could be increased if required by the Government, and if such additional space would be exempted from GFA calculation; and
- (c) the future arrangement of the Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA) and pick-up/drop-off facilities for the proposed social welfare facilities.

36. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following points:

- (a) about 5% of the domestic GFA in the proposed private residential development would be reserved for social welfare facilities with reference to the latest standard for new public housing development. The Social Welfare Department (SWD) considered that the types and scales of the proposed social welfare facilities, i.e. the Neighbourhood Elderly Community Centre Sub-base and an Integrated Community Centre for Mental Wellness Sub-base, were appropriate and would help alleviate the shortfalls in the district. It should also be noted that the planned 8-storey Ho Man Tin Government Complex at Sheung Foo street near Ho Man Tin Estate, currently in the detailed design stage, would provide additional social welfare facilities to meet the future needs of the local community;
- (b) there were three District Elderly Community Centres and nine Neighbourhood Elderly Centres currently in operation in Kowloon City District. The proposed Neighbourhood Elderly Community Centre Sub-base at the Site was intended to supplement the Neighbourhood Elderly Centre serving Ho Man Tin Estate, which was undersized and experiencing acute service demand. Nevertheless, the location, type and actual provision of social welfare facilities would be examined by SWD during the planning and development process. The proposed BH restriction already incorporated design flexibility, enabling any necessary adjustments

to social welfare facilities, and provision of Government, institution or community facilities as required by the Government would be disregarded from GFA calculation under the Notes of the proposed “R(B)4” zone; and

- (c) SWD had indicated that no extra pick-up/drop-off area was needed for either the proposed Neighbourhood Elderly Community Centre Sub-base or Integrated Community Centre for Mental Wellness Sub-base. A covered turn space of EVA was allowed on the ground floor under the podium footprint in the notional scheme.

37. Members generally supported the proposed amendments to the OZP. The Chairperson remarked that should the Committee agree with the proposed amendments, the draft OZP would be gazetted for public inspection for 2 months and the representations received, if any, would be submitted to the Town Planning Board for consideration.

38. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Ho Man Tin Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K7/24 and that the draft Ho Man Tin OZP No. S/K7/24A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/K7/25 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 Ho Man Tin OZP No. S/K7/24A (to be renumbered to S/K7/25 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.”

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

submitted for the Board's consideration.

[The Chairperson thanked the government representatives and the consultant for attending the meeting. Mr Patrick W.Y. Wong, Mr Jaime H.M. Chan, CEDD's representatives and the consultant left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K7/123 Proposed Shop and Services (Convenience Store) in "Residential (Group B)" Zone, G/F (Part), 128 Waterloo Road, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K7/123A)

40. The Secretary reported that the application premises (the Premises) were located in Ho Man Tin and the application was submitted by Great Prosper Development Limited (GPDL). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|
| Mr Stanley T.S. Choi | - | owning properties in Ho Man Tin which were in close proximity to the application premises; and |
| Mr Derrick S.M. Yip | - | being a personal friend of the directors of GPDL. |

41. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi and Mr Derrick S.M. Yip had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

42. With the aid of some plans, Mr Charles K.K. Lee, TP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

43. In response to a Member's enquiry about the ownership status of the residential development in which the Premises were located, Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, STP/K, said that the development was held under multiple ownership.

Deliberation Session

44. A Member expressed no objection to the application, and observed that the Premises were situated within an existing residential development and the residents had no objection to the application. The Chairperson remarked that the neighbourhood currently had limited convenience store services and the proposed store would meet local needs, operating daily from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m.

45. 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 24.10.2029, 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 an 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.]

Agenda Item 7

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

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