

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 782nd Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 6.2.2026

Present

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

Chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South),
Environmental Protection Department
Ms Marlene Y.H. Ho

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

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

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

In Attendance

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

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Jack H. Lau

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 781st MPC Meeting

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 781st MPC meeting held on 23.1.2026 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Case for Streamlining Arrangement

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Committee noted that there was one case selected for streamlining arrangement and the Planning Department had no objection to the application. Details of the planning application, Members' declaration of interests for the case and the Committee's view on the declared interests were in **Annex**.

Deliberation Session

4. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

[Messrs Michael K.K. Cheung and Kervis W.C. Chan, Senior Town Planners/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STPs/TWK), and Messrs Jacky K.C. Kong and Chris K.C. Ma, Town Planners/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/TW/546 Proposed Hotel with Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 46-48 Pak Tin Par Street, Tsuen Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/546)

5. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Tsuen Wan and Arup Hong Kong Limited (Arup) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan;

- Professor Simon K.L. Wong - his company owning a property in Tsuen Wan; and

- Dr Tony C.M. Ip - his company having past business dealings with Arup.

6. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting, and Professor Simon K.L. Wong had not yet joined the meeting. As the property owned by Professor Simon K.L. Wong’s company 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 join/stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, STP/TWK, 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.

[Professor Simon K.L. Wong, Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

8. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that there was an increase in building height (BH) of about 10 metres (m) as compared with the previously approved scheme under application No. A/TW/529, whether the proposed floor-to-floor heights (FTFHs) (including 3.6m for typical floors, 6.4m for G/F and 4.75m for the refuge floor) under the current application were reasonable;
- (b) the details regarding the right of way (ROW) for the adjacent Goodwill Industrial Building to the west of the Site; and
- (c) whether the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) submitted by the applicant had assessed the potential traffic impact on the street generated by hotel guests arriving by taxi.

9. In response, Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, STP/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the applicant's submission, the proposed typical FTFH of about 3.6m was composed of structural beams (0.95m), building services (0.3m) and floor finishes (0.05m), resulting in an effective headroom of about 2.3m. It was considered reasonable when compared with post-pandemic hotel developments, which often incorporated higher standards for ventilation and air ducting. The proposed FTFH of 6.4m on G/F was composed of transfer beams (1.5m) and building services (0.2m), resulting in an effective headroom

of about 4.7m to accommodate the entry of heavy goods vehicles into the loading/unloading bay. In addition, the inclusion of a refuge floor was also a mandatory requirement for the proposed 28-storey building;

- (b) the ROW reserved along the western boundary of the Site was a private contractual agreement between the land owner of the Site and the owner of the adjacent Goodwill Industrial Building. According to the applicant's submission, no structure would be erected on the 2.286m-wide ROW, ensuring unobstructed emergency access to Goodwill Industrial Building. Both the Fire Services Department and the Buildings Department had no adverse comment on such arrangement; and
- (c) the TIA had taken into account the impact associated with all modes of transport used by hotel guests, including taxis.

Deliberation Session

10. The Chairperson recapitulated that the Site fell within the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" ("OU(B)") zone and the application was supported by the Development Bureau (DEVB) and the Tourism Commission for being in line with the policies of redevelopment of aged industrial buildings (the IB Policy) and enhancing the tourism offering of Hong Kong. The Site was the subject of a previously approved application (No. A/TW/529) submitted by the same applicant for minor relaxation of the plot ratio (PR) restriction from 9.832 to 11.4 (i.e. not more than 20% under the IB policy) and the BH restriction from 100 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) to 108.305mPD for permitted office, shop and services and eating place uses, which was made pursuant to the IB Policy. As for the proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction from 100mPD to 118.931mPD under the current application, this increase was intended to provide better accommodation space for hotel development, noting that several hotel developments in recent years adopting central air-conditioning system had comparable FTFH. Relevant technical assessments had confirmed the technical feasibility of the proposal.

11. A Member expressed support for the proposed hotel development with minor relaxation of PR restriction, but had reservation on the proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction as the proposed BH was considered excessive and might result in guest rooms

being less cosy due to high FTFH. The building services requirements, including those for a central air-conditioning system, could be adequately accommodated within a lower FTFH of 3.2m, providing about 2.9m clear headroom. In addition, there was doubt on the structural thickness of 1m to 2.4m for elements such as transfer beams and refuge floor structures, as some of the structural elements were localised and would not span the entire floor. The Member opined that there was scope to reduce the proposed BH without compromising structural or functional requirements.

12. Another Member said that the proposed increase in BH might primarily benefit the future occupants, resulting in a compromised visual amenity for the community, and was concerned whether a land premium would be required for the proposed increase in BH at the Site. The Chairperson said that a lease modification would be required for the proposed hotel, and any land premium would be assessed by the Lands Department based on the enhancement in land value arising from the proposed modifications, by comparing the new lease conditions with the existing ones. In response to the same Member's concern on the potential visual impact, the Chairperson said that the evaluation of visual impact was conducted on a broad, townscape-wide scale. Taking into account the urban development context surrounding the Site, the proposed BH of 118.931mPD would not generate significant adverse visual impact when viewed from the public realm. Moreover, some existing buildings within the "OU(B)" zone in Chai Wan Kok Industrial/Business Area (CWKIBA) already exceeded the BH restriction of 100mPD, with some reaching up to 181mPD. With reference to the photomontages for the proposed development, the Committee noted that the visual impact from most viewing points would be negligible, and hence significant adverse impact on the visual character of the townscape was not anticipated. The Chairperson remarked that the proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction of 18.9% was to accommodate the increase in PR of 20% allowed under the IB Policy, and there were similar approved applications for minor relaxation of PR and/or BH restrictions in Tsuen Wan. The proposed BH would provide greater flexibility at the detailed design stage.

13. Noting that the proposed planning and design merits were the same as those of the previously approved application (No. A/TW/529), a Member was concerned whether the applicant had provided sufficient justifications or additional planning gain to warrant the proposed 10m increase in BH. The Committee noted that unlike the previously approved office development, the proposed hotel development under the current application could be granted gross floor area exemption for some hotel facilities including back-of-house facilities,

which would result in a larger building bulk that partially accounted for the increased height. There were also several site constraints, including the elongated shape of the Site and the need to respect the existing ROW for the adjacent Goodwill Industrial Building. The Chairperson said that these site constraints would pose constraints in meeting the natural lighting and ventilation requirements for a hotel development on the Site. Apart from the support from DEVB on the IB Policy, the proposal had also received policy support from the Tourism Commission in relation to tourism promotion.

14. The Vice-chairperson and other Members supported the application and expressed the following views:

- (a) the proposed BH was considered acceptable within the broader context of the Site, particularly as some existing buildings in the “OU(B)” zone of the CWKIBA already exceeded 100mPD, and other low-rise buildings in the area might be redeveloped gradually with similar BH of around 100mPD;
- (b) the increase in BH of about 10m as compared with the previously approved application (No. A/TW/529) would not result in significant adverse visual impact on the townscape;
- (c) the 3.6m FTFH was considered acceptable with respect to the site constraints and requirements for building services. Flexibility should also be allowed to achieve better design for the development of high-quality hotel environment which could bring a better experience to visitors; and
- (d) the applicant had demonstrated efforts to improve the streetscape by providing a setback and greenery facing Pak Tin Par Street.

15. The Committee noted that a precedent in Lai Chi Kok which involved the conversion of an office building into a hotel with a FTFH of 3.6m, to which relevant government departments had no objection during the approval process. Besides, among the four similar applications for minor relaxation of PR and/or BH restrictions within CWKIBA, which were all approved, while three applications involved minor relaxation of PR restriction only, one application (No. A/TW/522) involved minor relaxation of both PR and BH restrictions.

16. The Chairperson concluded that while there were differing views on the proposed FTFH, Members generally considered after discussion that the application could be supported, having regard to various factors including the change of use to a hotel, site constraints, no significant adverse visual impact resulting from the increase in BH, and the proposal's alignment with the Government's policies on industrial building revitalisation and tourism promotion. In response to a Member's suggestion, the Chairperson said that PlanD would compile information on the FTFH of recent hotel developments in the Mainland and overseas countries to serve as a useful benchmark for Members' general reference in considering similar applications in future.

17. 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 6.2.2030, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the approval condition stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K3/601	Proposed Hotel (Student Hostel) (Wholesale Conversion of Existing Commercial Building) and Minor Relaxation of Non-domestic Plot Ratio Restriction in "Residential (Group A)" Zone, 992-998 Canton Road, Mong Kok, Kowloon (MPC Paper No. A/K3/601)
----------	--

Presentation and Question Sessions

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kervis W.C. Chan, STP/TWK, 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.

19. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether the assessment had taken into account the behavioural differences between conventional hotel guests and longer-term student residents, particularly the potential need for cooking facilities and the associated fire safety implications;
 - (b) noting that some rooms appeared relatively small which might lack sufficient space to comfortably accommodate a bed, desk and wardrobe, whether there was a minimum size for student hostel rooms with a view to ensuring a reasonable and pleasant living environment for the students;
 - (c) what the intended function of the “hostel lobby” was, as shown on Drawing A-1 of the Paper, and whether it constituted a special facility; and
 - (d) details on the future management and operation of the proposed student hostel.
20. In response, Mr Kervis W.C. Chan, STP/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:
- (a) by way of background, the Hostels in the City Scheme (the Scheme) was introduced by the Government to incentivise the private market to convert commercial buildings into student hostels, thereby increasing the supply of student hostel accommodation in support of the policy objective to develop Hong Kong into an international education hub. That said, similar to hotel developments, student hostels under the Scheme were required to comply with relevant building, fire safety, lighting and ventilation requirements under the Buildings Ordinance and relevant regulations. According to the applicant’s submission, common hostel facilities, including meeting rooms, common rooms, study rooms, laundry facilities and a gymnasium, would be provided on 1/F to 3/F to cater for the needs of student tenants. The Buildings Department and the Fire Services Department would scrutinise the

proposal and ensure compliance with relevant requirements at the building plan submission stage;

- (b) based on the applicant's submission, room sizes would range from approximately 9 square metres (m²) to 29m². Both the Education Bureau (EDB) and the Development Bureau had confirmed that the proposed layout under the current application was generally in line with the indicative layout submitted under the Scheme;
- (c) the "hostel lobby" on G/F would serve as the main entrance to the hostel and as a lift lobby area, equipped with access control. It was not intended for any special or communal activities beyond basic circulation and security functions; and
- (d) the applicant was not required to submit detailed management arrangements at the planning stage. Nevertheless, relevant authorities might request further information at later stages prior to completion of the conversion works. The applicant had verbally indicated its intention to engage an experienced operator to manage the hostel. To ensure ongoing compliance, the applicant would be required to submit an annual certified audit report to EDB to confirm ongoing compliance with the Scheme.

Deliberation Session

21. The Chairperson recapitulated that the application was for the proposed wholesale conversion of an existing commercial building to a student hostel with minor relaxation of the non-domestic plot ratio (PR) restriction from 9 to 15.323 in the "Residential (Group A)" zone. The existing commercial building had been developed under a previous application (No. A/K3/161) approved in 1988, and the current proposal would not entail any increase in the building bulk, gross floor area, PR or building height. As confirmed by EDB, the proposed student hostel was, *prima facie*, eligible under the Scheme and was required to fulfil the eligibility criteria laid down by EDB. The applicant would also be required to submit an annual certified audit report to EDB to demonstrate ongoing compliance with the requirements under the Scheme.

22. While expressing no objection to the application, a Member suggested that the living environment for students could be improved by refining the hostel room layouts, including enlarging the room sizes, at the detailed design stage. The Chairperson said that the submitted layout was indicative only and could be fine-tuned at the later stage.

23. Some Members expressed support for the application and had the following views:

- (a) a room size of at least 9m² (including bathroom) was comparable to that of some newly developed studio flats in Hong Kong and was considered not inappropriate for student accommodation, offering a reasonable standard of living;
- (b) when compared with traditional student hostels with shared bathroom facilities across an entire floor, the provision of an en-suite bathroom in each room represented an improvement and could better align with contemporary student expectations and preferences for privacy and convenience;
- (c) offering a variety of room sizes, ranging from 9m² to 29m², was a market-driven decision by the developer, allowing flexibility to cater for diverse student needs, including different budget levels and preferences for shared or single occupancy; and
- (d) the quality and operational standards of the proposed student hostel would be subject to EDB's ongoing oversight and monitoring under the Scheme, including through the submission of annual certified audit reports and compliance checks.

24. While supporting the application, two Members raised concerns regarding future management arrangements, specifically the potential visual impact on the streetscape from students drying laundry, including personal items, in visible areas such as window sills and external facades. The future operator would need to be fully prepared to manage such day-to-day operational issues, and appropriate mechanisms should be put in place to address them.

25. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported the application, while different views were expressed on the room layout and sizing, as well as on the future management arrangements. PlanD would convey the Committee's views on these issues to the applicant, as appropriate.

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 6.2.2030, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the approval 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.]

Hong Kong District

[Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H19/88 Proposed Utility Installation for Private Project in "Green Belt" Zone,
Government Land Adjoining 44 Stanley Village Road, Stanley, Hong
Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H19/88)

27. 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. The Committee noted that Mr Ricky

W.Y. Yu had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

28. Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan declared an interest on the item for living in the vicinity. As Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan's residence had no direct view of the Site, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

29. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed installation, 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.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

30. The Chairperson and two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) in light of a public comment expressing concern on the potential visual impact, and noting the significance of the viewpoint from Stanley Plaza to the south of Maryknoll House when considering the related previous application (No. A/H19/87), whether a photomontage had been submitted by the applicant to illustrate the appearance of the proposed installation from that viewpoint;
- (b) which parts of the proposed installation, as shown on Drawing A-3 of the Paper (i.e. the landscape plan of the proposed installation), would be placed aboveground;
- (c) whether the maintenance staircase would be open to the public or the future residents of the Maryknoll House site, and the proposed width of the staircase;
- (d) noting that the proposed tree compensation ratio of 1:3.08 was considered high, whether the ecological impact on the "Green Belt" ("GB") zone, particularly on fauna, had been assessed; and
- (e) if the application was rejected, whether there were any viable alternative

options to the applicant.

31. In response, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, STP/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant did not submit photomontage illustrating the visual impact of the proposed installation;
- (b) while the lead-in pipes and the maintenance staircase would be placed aboveground, the other facilities (e.g. draw pits, catch pits and drainage and sewerage pipelines) would be installed partially underground and partially aboveground (with the aboveground portions of the draw pits and catch pits ranging from about 30 centimetres to 1 metre (m)). Placing the pipelines aboveground was intended to facilitate future maintenance and monitoring. To mitigate the potential visual and landscape impacts, the applicant proposed planting new trees to screen the proposed installation;
- (c) the proposed staircase was 1.5m wide, with a clear width of 1.05m, and the remaining space would be allocated for kerbs to support railings. The staircase was restricted to maintenance use only and would be secured with gates and locks. Neither residents of the proposed development at the Maryknoll House site nor the public would be granted access;
- (d) the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) was consulted on the application. No specific protected or ecologically significant species were identified within the application site (the Site), and AFCD had no objection to the proposal. There were no Old and Valuable Trees at the Site; and
- (e) if the application (i.e. Option C) was rejected, the applicant had to explore the other three alignment options (i.e. Options A, B and D), of which Options B and D also involved “GB” zone, while Option A involved the existing access road/right-of-way (ROW) within Stanley Knoll.

32. The Chairperson supplemented that apart from Option A, the other three options

all fell within “GB” zones. Nonetheless, Option A traversed private lot (i.e. Stanley Knoll) where only a ROW for pedestrian and vehicular access had been granted to Maryknoll House. The ROW did not include any provision for laying pipelines, and obtaining the necessary consent from the owners of Stanley Knoll for laying the proposed installation would likely be difficult. In addition, the access road under Option A was relatively narrow, and any proposed works would affect nearby residents, which might pose technical challenges for utility installation.

Deliberation Session

33. The Chairperson recapitulated that Maryknoll House site had been uninhabited for a long time, and its existing utilities were no longer adequate to support the proposed residential development in terms of capacity and compliance with current regulations and standards as required by relevant government departments and utility providers. Given the proposed intensification of use at the Maryknoll House site, an upgrade of the utilities was essential, and the current proposal represented the shortest feasible option for this necessary upgrade. While some pipelines within the “GB” zone would be visible, the overall visual impact was considered not significant.

34. Members generally supported the application and had the following observations/suggestions:

- (a) while the proposed tree compensation ratio was deemed adequate, and the new trees and woodland shrubs were expected to provide screening, the visual impact, particularly from major viewpoints such as Stanley Plaza, should be better managed. An additional advisory clause should be included to ensure that the visual impact would be properly addressed;
- (b) the absence of a photomontage to illustrate the eventual visual screening effect of the new planting made it difficult to fully assess the proposal’s visual impact. For similar applications in future, applicants should be requested to submit photomontages to demonstrate the effectiveness of proposed visual mitigation measures, as appropriate;

- (c) while Option C was considered acceptable, Option D might not be entirely infeasible as there were precedents of utilities being constructed on retaining walls; and
- (d) the proposed utilities were essential to support the approved preservation-cum-residential development at the Maryknoll House site. It would be preferable for the applicant to have included these utilities in the original planning application.

35. To address Members' concerns on the potential visual impact of the proposed installation, the Committee agreed to incorporate an additional advisory clause requesting the applicant to provide appropriate landscaping screening to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed utility installation, particularly the visual impact on the view from the west of Carmel Road.

36. 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 6.2.2030, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper and the following additional advisory clause:

“ - to provide appropriate landscaping screening to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed utility installation, particularly the visual impact on the view from the west of Carmel Road.”

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

Agenda Item 7

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

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

**Minutes of 782nd Meeting of Metro Planning Committee
(held on 6.2.2026)**

Case for Streamlining Arrangement

Application approved on a permanent basis

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
4	A/TW/547	Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Workshop B4, G/F, Superluck Industrial Centre Phase 2, 57 Sha Tsui Road and 30-38 Tai Chung Road, Tsuen Wan

Declaration of Interests

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

Item No.	Members’ Declared Interests	
4	The application premises were located in Tsuen Wan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Professor Simon K.L. Wong for his company owning a property in Tsuen Wan - Mr Stanley T.S. Choi for his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan - Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan for being an independent non-executive director of a company with rental premises for shop use in the vicinity

The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting, and Professor Simon K.L. Wong and Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan had not yet joined the meeting.