

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 783rd Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 27.2.2026

Present

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

Chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

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

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

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

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 Katy C.W. Fung

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Tommy T.W. Wong

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 782nd MPC Meeting

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 782nd MPC meeting held on 6.2.2026 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Deferral Cases

Sections 12A and 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Committee noted that there were two cases requesting the Town Planning Board to defer consideration of the applications. Details of the requests for deferral, Members' declaration of interests for the two cases and the Committee's views on the declared interests 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.

[Professor Simon K.L. Wong joined the meeting at this point.]

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/KC/17 Application for Amendment to the Approved Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/KC/32, To rezone the application site from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” to “Residential (Group E)2” and amend the Notes of the zone applicable to the site, 97-107 Wo Yi Hop Road, Kwai Chung
(MPC Paper No. Y/KC/17A)

5. The Secretary reported the application site (the Site) was located in Shek Lei. Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had declared an interest on the item for being a supervisor of a primary school in the vicinity of the Site. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

PlanD

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Mr Steven Y.H Siu | - | District Planning Officer/ Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK) |
| Mr W.C. Lui | - | Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK) |
| Mr Sam K.S. Ho | - | Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon |

Applicant's Representatives

Lai Sun Textiles Company Limited – Applicant

Mr P.O. Lee

Ms Vicky Lam

Mr W.P. Tsang

Ms Annisa Chan

DeSPACE (International) Limited

Mr Greg Lam

Ms Rebecca Lau

Mr Mario Li

Mr Kenji Wong

Index Architecture Limited

Mr Anderson Lee

Mr Louis Hung

DF Consultant

Mr D.F. Lam

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

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr W.C. Lui, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed rezoning of the Site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" ("OU(B)") to "Residential (Group E) 2" ("R(E)2") to facilitate the redevelopment of an existing 15-storey industrial building (IB), namely Park Sun Building, into a 28-storey residential-cum-social welfare facilities (i.e. Residential Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE) and/or Residential Care Home for Persons with Disabilities (RCHD)) and commercial development, departmental comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. While PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application, it was considered more appropriate to stipulate the requirement for the provision of a minimum gross floor area (GFA) of 7,200m² for government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in the Remarks of the Notes of the

Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for the proposed “R(E)2” subzone, instead of confining the GFA to RCHE and/or RCHD use as proposed by the applicant, so as to provide more flexibility for other complementary GIC facilities alongside the RCHE and/or RCHD uses. The intention to provide RCHE and/or RCHD at the Site would be reflected in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP. Should the application be agreed by the Committee, the exact stipulation of development restrictions (i.e. whether in terms of GFA as proposed by the applicant or in terms of plot ratio (PR) in accordance with the prevailing restriction in the Notes of the OZP for the “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) zone) would be subject to further consideration. Regarding the applicant’s proposal to include a clause excluding areas occupied or intended to be occupied by free-standing purpose-designed buildings solely for accommodating GIC facilities including school(s) that might be required by the Government from the site area for the purpose of determining the PR of the Site within the proposed “R(E)2” subzone, it was considered not relevant as the proposed development would be a composite development and no free-standing GIC facility as required by the Government was proposed. Should the Committee agree in principle to the application, appropriate revisions to the Notes and ES of the OZP would be recommended when the proposed amendments to the OZP were submitted to the Committee for consideration.

9. The Chairperson then invited the applicant’s representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Greg Lam, the applicant’s representative, made the following main points:

- (a) Park Sun Building was built in 1974. Being an aged IB, more frequent maintenance and repair works were anticipated to maintain the building conditions with increasing costs, while there was a decrease in the occupancy rate of the building in the past few years. The revenue from rental was unable to cover the maintenance costs in recent years;
- (b) a previous section 16 application for minor relaxation of the PR restriction for a commercial/office building submitted by the current applicant was approved in 1994 but was not implemented due to the limited PR gain upon redevelopment and the significant amount of land premium required for commercial development. Subsequently, a special waiver for wholesale conversion to a commercial/office building was approved in

2018 but was not implemented due to changes in market situation during the outbreak of COVID-19 between 2020 and 2023;

- (c) since the rezoning of the Wo Yi Hop Road Industrial/Business Area (WYHRIBA) from “Industrial” (“I”) to “OU(B)” in 2001, there were 10 (re)developments for non-polluting industrial uses, business/offices, hotels and data centres. Some existing IBs had been demolished but the sites were left vacant due to the changing market situation for commercial development;
- (d) across Wo Yi Hop Road in Shek Lei were residential developments. According to the applicant’s estimation, a total population of about 300,000 (equivalent to about 100,000 households based on an assumption of an average household size of three persons) lived in the vicinity of the Site, with a significant portion of the residents being elderly. The ES of the OZP stated that the planned population of the Kwai Chung area would be about 376,000 and there would be further population growth and hence an increase in the elderly population;
- (e) there was a keen demand for RCHE and/or RCHDs in the vicinity of the Site, as revealed by the presence of such facilities in the non-domestic portion of nearby residential developments, as well as the long waiting list for these facilities. As these existing facilities were not situated in purpose-designed buildings dedicated to RCHEs and/or RCHDs, various design aspects, including floor-to-floor height, ventilation and lighting, might not be optimal for their operation;
- (f) the Site was proposed to be rezoned from “OU(B)” to “R(E)2” with a planning intention of phasing out the existing industrial uses through redevelopment. Under the indicative scheme, a total GFA of 28,589m² was proposed with a maximum domestic GFA of about 16,458m², providing a total of 253 units. Of these, 60% of the units had a floor area of about 40m² while 40% of the units had a floor area of about 60m² to 70m². Given the limited supply of new residential developments within

the Kwai Chung OZP in the past 20 years, the proposed rezoning could facilitate the prompt delivery of 253 new private housing units without the need for land resumption;

- (g) in response to the Government's policy initiatives on RCHE and RCHD as announced in successive Policy Addresses and the Incentive Schemes to Encourage Provision of RCHE/RCHDs in New Private Development promulgated by the Lands Department in 2023, a minimum GFA of 7,200m² would be provided for RCHD and RCHE in the proposed development, equivalent to 113 beds and 185 beds respectively, which could help alleviate the strong local demand for RCHEs and/or RCHDs. In addition, a GFA of 131m² was proposed for 'Shop and Services' use on the ground floor of the proposed development to serve the local community; and
- (h) PlanD's recommendations to stipulate a minimum GFA of 7,200m² for GIC facilities in the Remarks of the Notes for the proposed "R(E)2" subzone, and not to include the "R(E)2" subzone in the clause excluding areas occupied or intended to be occupied by free-standing purpose-designed buildings solely for accommodating GIC facilities including school(s) as might be required by the Government from the site area for the purpose of determining the PR of the Site were acceptable to the applicant.

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr D.F. Lam, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the proportion of the ageing population in Hong Kong would rise to 36% by 2064, which would increase the demand for RCHE. As regards the supply of RCHD, there were only 26 private RCHDs participating in the Bought Place Scheme for Private Residential Care Homes for Persons with Disabilities. The provision of more high-quality private RCHDs would therefore be welcomed;

- (b) the waiting lists for subvented RCHE places and subvented RCHD places were about 17,664 applicants and 10,323 applicants respectively. The average waiting time for a subvented RCHE place was about 21 months while that for a subvented RCHD place ranged from 4.2 months to 150.8 months. While the number of applicants on the waiting list for a subvented RCHD place was smaller than that for a subvented RCHE place, the slow turnover rate of RCHD places would exert greater pressure on the demand for subvented RCHD places; and
- (c) the RCHEs and/or RCHDs in the vicinity of the Site were located on the lower floors of existing buildings, were not purpose-built, and lacked functional areas to meet the recreational and outdoor needs of the users. The proposed development would provide high-quality purpose-built RCHEs and RCHDs.

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and a physical 3D model at 1:100 scale, Mr Anderson Lee, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the porous design of the proposed development allowed ventilation and penetration of sunlight to the street level. Carved voids would be provided in the residential towers to facilitate cross ventilation through common areas, and voids were also provided in the RCHE and RCHD portions;
- (b) a 5m-wide voluntary setback from Wo Yi Hop Road and a 2.3m-wide voluntary setback along the southern site boundary would be provided for streetscape enhancement and to reduce the wall effect on the neighbourhood. The setbacks would be open for public access, with the latter setback along the southern site boundary to be opened for public use from 9:00 am to 6:00 pm daily;
- (c) an outdoor leisure sky garden of about 300m in length (i.e. Green Ring) would be provided on 4/F for the enjoyment of the users of the proposed RCHE and/or RCHD;

- (d) separate entrance lobbies would be provided to segregate to the residential development with the RCHE and/or RCHD; and
- (e) the design would achieve operational synergy between the residential use and RCHE and/or RCHD in the proposed composite development, thereby facilitating social interaction.

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

Precedent Effect on WYHRIBA

13. The Vice-chairperson asked whether the current application was the first section 12A (s.12A) application within the "OU(B)" zone in WYHRIBA, and whether approval of the application would set a precedent for any subsequent s.12A application within the same "OU(B)" zone. In response, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, DPO/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the current application was the first s.12A application for rezoning a site from "OU(B)" to "R(E)" within WYHRIBA. Since the rezoning of WYHRIBA from "I" to "OU(B)" in 2001, wholesale conversion or redevelopment of IBs had been implemented or proposed at 15 sites, all of which were under single ownership (except iCity to the south of the Site which was once under single ownership but had since been alienated and sold off after redevelopment). Most of them were proposed or implemented under the policy initiatives of Revitalisation of IBs. Eight of the 15 sites involved planning permission granted by the Town Planning Board (the Board). For the current application, the Site was located at the eastern fringe of WYHRIBA with residential developments in Shek Lei located to its immediate east across Wo Yi Hop Road. Besides, the Site was one of the few remaining single-ownership sites that had not undergone conversion or redevelopment in WYHRIBA, and redevelopment of sites under multiple ownership tended to be more difficult to pursue. In any case, each s.12A application would be considered on its individual merits.

Interface of the Proposed RCHE and/or RCHD and IBs

14. The Chairperson and a Member asked the following questions:

- (a) the existing uses and/or conditions of Cheung Wing Industrial Building and Kam Chong Industrial Building to the north and west of the Site respectively; and
- (b) whether the IBs would have any adverse impacts on the environmental aspects or the provision of natural lighting to the proposed RCHE and/or RCHD and residential development.

15. In response, Messrs Greg Lam, Anderson Lee and Mario Li, the applicant's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the site visit conducted by the applicant, office, storage and non-polluting industrial uses were observed in Cheung Wing Industrial Building and Kam Chong Industrial Building; and
- (b) a separation distance of about 5m would be available between the proposed RCHE and/or RCHD and Kam Chong Industrial Building to the west of the Site. Besides, there would be setbacks from Wo Yi Hop Road and along the southern site boundary. Relevant statutory requirements on lighting and ventilation could be complied with. Various technical assessments, including air quality and noise impact assessments, had been conducted, which demonstrated that the proposed development would be technically feasible without insurmountable environmental problems. The Environmental Protection Department had no objection to the application. Further technical assessments would be submitted during the s.16 application stage.

Design and Operation of the proposed RCHE and/or RCHD

16. The Chairperson, Vice-chairperson and two Members asked the following questions:

- (a) the applicant's vision for the proposed RCHE and/or RCHD;
- (b) whether the applicant would operate the proposed RCHE and/or RCHD, and whether the services would be affordable to the residents in the area;
- (c) noting the inclusive concept of the proposed development whereby the elderly could live in the proposed RCHE and/or RCHD while their families might live in the residential portion, whether families with elderly member(s) residing in the proposed RCHE/RCHD would be the targeted buyers of the residential units; and
- (d) whether the sky gardens on 4/F and 7/F would be dedicated to different users.

17. In response, Messrs P.O. Lee, Greg Lam, Mario Li and D.F. Lam, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) the application could better utilise the scarce land resources by phasing out the obsolete industrial uses while providing quality RCHE and/or RCHD services to the local area. The proposed development with residential element co-located with RCHE and/or RCHD under the indicative scheme could achieve synergy effect, whereby members of younger generation of a family living in the proposed residential portion, could conveniently visit and take care of their elderly family members residing in the proposed RCEH and/or RCHD on the lower floors without long travelling time. In addition, residents of the proposed RCHE might perform voluntary services for residents in the proposed RCHD or vice versa. The model of co-locating residential element with RCHE and/or RCHD facilities could be considered a novel development model that

might set a good example for similar developments in the future;

- (b) the proposed RCHE and/or RCHD might be operated by the applicant or by an RCHE and/or RCHD operator. If the latter option was adopted, a vetting committee would be established to select a suitable operator for the operation and provision of quality services. The proposed RCHE and/or RCHD was not aiming at profit maximisation. Having considered the socio-economic composition of residents in the area, the proposed RCHE and/or RCHD would not target at the high-end market;
- (c) residents of the proposed RCHE and/or RCHD would not be limited to those living in the area but to the general public. Residence in or purchase of units in the proposed residential portion would not be a prerequisite for admission to the RCHE and/or RCHD on the lower floors of the proposed development; and
- (d) elderly-friendly design features would be adopted for the sky garden on 4/F for the enjoyment of residents of the RCHE and/or RCHD. An inclusive design concept would be adopted for the sky garden on 7/F for the enjoyment of residents of the residential units as well as their elderly family members residing in the proposed RCHE and/or RCHD.

GFA Requirements for RCHE and/or RCHD under the Notes

18. Noting that a minimum GFA of 7,200m² for GIC facilities was recommended to be stipulated in the Remarks of the Notes of the proposed “R(E)2” subzone as stated in paragraph 10.13(a) of the Paper, the Vice-chairperson asked about the rationale for the recommendation. In response, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, DPO/TWK, said that while the applicant intended to provide a GFA of 12,000m² for RCHE and/or RCHD under the indicative scheme, the applicant proposed a non-domestic GFA of not less than 7,200m² for RCHE and/or RCHD in the Notes of the proposed “R(E)2” subzone as a more conservative figure in the event that no operator for an RCHE and/or RCHD of such scale could be secured. The recommendation to stipulate a minimum GFA of 7,200m² for GIC facilities in the Notes could allow flexibility for the introduction of other complementary GIC facilities in

the event that a GFA of 7,200m² for RCHE and/or RCHD could not be realised at the implementation stage. The intention to provide a minimum GFA of 7,200m² for RCHE and/or RCHD would be stated in the ES of the OZP to guide future development of the Site. Mr Greg Lam, the applicant's representative, supplemented that such flexibility was welcomed by the applicant as it would obviate the need for a separate planning application to introduce complementary GIC facilities, such as day care centres or dental clinics for the elderly, should the need for such complementary GIC facilities emerge during the implementation stage.

19. As the applicant's representatives had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairperson informed the applicant's representatives that the hearing procedure of the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked PlanD's and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point

Deliberation Session

20. The Chairperson remarked that the application sought to rezone the Site from "OU(B)" to "R(E)2". In considering the application, Members might focus on the suitability of the proposed "R(E)2" subzone, while details of the proposed scheme could be further scrutinised at the s.16 application stage.

21. Noting the long average waiting time for a subvented RCHE and/or RCHD place and the relatively constrained conditions of some existing RCHEs and RCHDs in the area, Members generally supported the application mainly on the consideration that the proposed RCHE and/or RCHD would constitute the key planning gain, together with the provision of building voids, sky gardens and voluntary setbacks. Two Members expressed concerns on land use compatibility in locating the proposed residential use and RCHE and/or RCHD uses near existing IBs, and considered that there might be impacts on the integrity of the "OU(B)" zone in WYHRIBA. A Member opined that the application could provide residential units together with RCHE and/or RCHD facilities in a residential neighbourhood dominated by ageing public housing developments, where the existing old RCHEs/RCHDs were only located within the podia of residential buildings. This Member and another Member

considered that the co-location concept, which was a new design concept, could help the elderly live close to their family members in the area. They also considered that the proposed setbacks could be regarded as a planning gain, and the design had incorporated separate areas for the activities of the elderly and the residents.

22. On the other hand, the Vice-chairperson and three Members generally had reservation about stipulating the provision of not less than a GFA of 7,200m² for GIC facilities in the Notes as recommended by PlanD, which was different from the Notes proposed by the applicant (a GFA of not than 7,200m² for RCHE and/or RCHD) and the indicative scheme (which reflected a GFA of 12,000m² for RCHE and/or RCHD). As GIC facilities did not necessarily confine to RCHE and/or RCHD, it was considered that a clear intention to provide RCHE and/or RCHD at the Site, which was the main planning gain, should be set out in the Notes to ensure that the proposed RCHE and/or RCHD would be materialised.

23. The Chairperson summarised that Members generally supported the application. With regard to Members' concern on the industrial/residential interface issue, the Chairperson said that the planning intention of the "OU(B)" zone was to phase out the existing industrial uses. Since the rezoning of WYHRIBA from "I" to "OU(B)" in 2001, WYHRIBA had undergone transformation, with a number of non-polluting industrial uses, commercial/office buildings, hotels and data centres. The applicant had also conducted technical assessments, including air quality and noise assessments, to demonstrate the feasibility of the indicative scheme. The Site was located at the fringe of WYHRIBA and there were residential developments located near the Site across Wo Yi Hop Road. The proposed development could provide RCHE and/or RCHD of considerable scale, incorporate the inclusive concept of co-locating RCHE and/or RCHD with residential element, and provide sky garden for residents of the RCHE and/or RCHD, which could be considered as planning gains.

24. With regard to the stipulation of the GFA requirement for RCHE and/or RCHD, the Chairperson said that under the indicative scheme, a maximum non-domestic GFA of 12,000m² could be provided for RCHE and/or RCHD. Taking into account potential market changes and operator capacity, the applicant proposed to stipulate the requirement of providing a non-domestic GFA of not less than of 7,200m² for RCHE and/or RCHD in the

Notes of the proposed “R(E)2” subzone. As stated in paragraph 10.13(a) of the Paper, in order to allow greater flexibility to provide other complementary GIC uses alongside the RCHE and/or RCHD uses, especially if the intended non-domestic GFA of 12,000m² could not be fully utilised for RCHE and/or RCHD uses at the implementation stage, PlanD recommended stipulating a minimum GFA of 7,200m² for GIC facilities in the Notes. The intention to provide RCHE and/or RCHD at the Site would be reflected in the ES of the OZP. Details of the proposed development, including the uses and design, could be scrutinised at the s.16 application stage. For Members’ reference, there was a case in the Mid-level area in which the Notes of the “Residential (Group C) 3” zone on the approved Mid-level East OZP No. S/H12/14 had stipulated a maximum GFA of 11,010m², of which not less than 2,258m² should be for the provision of RCHE and related elderly facilities, following the Committee’s consideration of a s.12A application on the site. For the current application, stipulating the provision of a non-domestic GFA of 12,000m² for RCHE and/or RCHD or stipulating the provision of a non-domestic GFA of 12,000m² for GIC facilities of which not less than 7,200m² should be for RCHE and/or RCHD in the Notes for the proposed “R(E)2” subzone, both of which were not proposed by the applicant, would require justifications. Members were invited to consider (i) whether a minimum non-domestic GFA of 7,200m² should be confined to RCHE and/or RCHD, or flexibility could be allowed to include other complementary GIC facilities to fulfil such GFA requirement; and (ii) whether flexibility should be allowed for the use of the remaining non-domestic GFA of 4,800m² for other non-domestic uses (including commercial uses).

25. The Vice-chairperson and some Members considered that the provision of a minimum GFA of 7,200m² for RCHE and/or RCHD should be stipulated in the Notes of the proposed “R(E)2” subzone, as it could genuinely reflect the applicant’s commitment to provide RCHE and/or RCHD as proposed, while the remaining non-domestic GFA of 4,800m² should be confined to GIC uses. Noting that uncertainty in market demand for RCHE and/or RCHD at the implementation stage was one of the reasons for stipulating a non-domestic GFA of not less than 7,200m² for RCHE and/or RCHD in the Notes, and that the previous approval for minor relaxation of PR for commercial/office development granted in 1994 and special waiver for wholesale conversion to a commercial/office building approved in 2018 had not been implemented, a Member considered that flexibility should be allowed in the use of the remaining non-domestic GFA for non-GIC uses. The imposition of stringent GFA requirements might have adverse impact on the financial viability of the

proposal. Should there be genuine market demand for RCHE and/or RCHD, the applicant could still pursue its original intention having regard to the supply and demand conditions of the market, and the proposed scheme would be considered at the s.16 application stage.

26. The Chairperson remarked that Members generally agreed that a minimum non-domestic GFA of 7,200m² for RCHE and/or RCHD should be stipulated in the Notes of the proposed “R(E)2” subzone. Regarding the remaining non-domestic GFA (i.e. 4,800m²), the Chairperson invited Members’ views on whether flexibility should be allowed for the provision of non-GIC uses, including commercial uses, and whether the intention that more GIC uses on top of the statutory requirement of 7,200m² should be explored and provided at the Site could be stipulated in the ES of the OZP.

27. Noting that a non-domestic GFA of 12,000m² for RCHE and/or RCHD and a GFA of 131m² for ‘Shop and Services’ use were proposed by the applicant under the indicative scheme, some Members considered that stipulating a non-domestic GFA of 12,000m² for GIC facilities, of which not less than 7,200m² should be for RCHE and/or RCHD, did not fall beyond the scope of the applicant’s proposal while allowing flexibility for complementary GIC facilities. A Member considered that if there was no statutory requirement for the remaining non-domestic GFA to be used for GIC purposes, it would be probable that the remaining non-domestic GFA would be utilised for commercial uses. While the intention to maximise the remaining non-domestic GFA for GIC uses could be incorporated in the ES of the OZP, it would be uncertain whether there would be well-justified grounds for rejecting the s.16 application if the remaining portion of the non-domestic GFA of 4,800m² was proposed for commercial uses. Another Member considered that the financial viability of the indicative scheme should have been carefully assessed by the applicant prior to submission.

28. The Chairperson concluded that Members agreed that a minimum non-domestic GFA of 12,000m² for GIC facilities, of which not less than 7,200m² should be for RCHE and/or RCHD, should be stipulated in the Notes of the proposed “R(E)2” subzone.

29. After deliberation, the Committee decided to partially agree to the application to rezone the application site to “Residential (Group E) 2” with stipulation of appropriate development parameters and requirements for provision of government, institution and

community facilities (including the minimum provision for the residential care home for the elderly and/or residential care home for persons with disabilities) in the Notes of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The relevant proposed amendments to the Kwai Chung OZP, together with the revised Notes and Explanatory Statement, would be worked out in consultation with relevant government departments and submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.

[Messrs W.C. Lui, Michael K.K. Cheung and Kervis W.C. Chan, Senior Town Planners/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STPs/TWK), Mr Sam K.S. Ho and Ms Ivy H.Y. Fok, Town Planners/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TPs/TWK), and Mr Safin S.A. Wakim and Ms Sharon T.T. Wan, Town Planning Graduates/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/KC/514 Proposed Educational Institution in “Commercial (3)” Zone, Unit 04,
1/F, 83 Tai Lin Pai Road, Kwai Chung
(MPC Paper No. A/KC/514)

Presentation and Question Sessions

30. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Sam K.S. Ho, TP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

31. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

32. 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 27.2.2030, 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.

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/TWW/135 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Maximum Non-domestic Gross Floor Area Restriction for Permitted Public Clinic/Social Welfare Facility for a Period of 5 Years in “Residential (Group A) 3” Zone, Level 5 (Part), Bellagio Mall, Bellagio, 33 Castle Peak Road - Sham Tseng, Sham Tseng, Tsuen Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/TWW/135)

Presentation and Question Sessions

33. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed uses, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

34. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

35. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 27.2.2031, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K2/224 Proposed Religious Institution in “Residential (Group A)” Zone, 3/F,
Xing Hua Centre, 433 Shanghai Street, Yau Ma Tei, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K2/224)

36. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Yau Ma Tei. Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had declared an interest on the item for his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Yau Ma Tei. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

37. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Ivy H.Y. Fok, TP/TWK, 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.

38. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

39. 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 27.2.2030, 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.

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

Hong Kong District

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

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H5/422 Proposed Residential Institution (Student Hostel) in “Government, Institution or Community” and “Residential (Group B)” Zones, Shue Yan University Wan Chai Campus, 7 Wan Chai Gap Road, Wan Chai
(MPC Paper No. A/H5/422)

Presentation and Question Sessions

40. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

41. Noting that the Site had no vehicular access and the Fire Services Department had no specific comment on the application, the Vice-chairperson enquired about the provision of means of escape (MOE) and fire service installations. In response, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the Site was served by two MOEs, both for pedestrian use only as indicated on Drawing A-1 of the Paper. The first MOE, which was also the main access to the Site for daily operation, connected the Site to Queen’s Road East in the north and Kennedy Road in the south via the stairs at Yen Wah Steps. The second MOE, which would only be used during emergency conditions, connected the Site to Wan Chai Gap Road in the east via the stairs within Fu Yee Court.

Deliberation Session

42. The Chairperson remarked that the application was for wholesale conversion of the existing building into a proposed student hostel. While the Site was not served by

emergency vehicular access, fire safety measures were proposed. The Committee noted that according to the applicant, enhanced fire safety measures, including the provision of a sprinkler system, an automatic fire detection and alarm system, a fire hydrant and hose reel system as well as water tanks for the sprinkler and fire services system, would be adopted in the proposed student hostel for compliance with the latest fire safety standards.

43. 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 27.2.2030, 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.

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

Kowloon District

[Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), and Mr Charles K.K. Lee and Ms Helen K.W. Ip, Town Planners/Kowloon (TPs/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K11/249 Proposed Hotel with Minor Relaxation of the Non-Building Area
Restriction in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone,
20-24 Tai Yau Street, San Po Kong, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K11/249)

44. The Secretary reported the application site (the Site) was located near Wong Tai Sin. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which
owned a property in Wong Tai Sin; and

Professor Simon K.L. - his company owning a property near Wong Tin Sin
Wong

45. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the property owned by the company of Professor Simon K.L. Wong had no direct view of the Site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

46. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Charles K.K. Lee, 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 had no objection to the application.

47. Noting that one of the two existing common staircases serving the existing industrial building (IB) at 22-24 Tai Yau Street within the Site and the adjoining IB at 26-28 Tai Yau Street (the adjoining IB) was located within the 3m non-building area (NBA) at Tai Yau Street and the applicants proposed to demolish the two existing common staircases upon redevelopment of the adjoining IB, a Member asked about the ownership of the two existing

common staircases and the implementation mechanism to ensure their demolition by the applicants upon redevelopment of the adjoining IB. In response, Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, STP/K, said that the two existing common staircases were jointly owned by the applicants and the owners of the adjoining IB, and they would be retained for the use of the adjoining IB to ensure compliance with the Buildings Ordinance and relevant regulations. If the adjoining IB was demolished, the two common staircases would not be able to stand on their own, and the demolition could be dealt with at the building plan submission stage. Besides, relevant demolition requirements could be incorporated into the lease condition(s) during lease modification/land exchange stage, subject to further liaison with the Lands Department (LandsD). The Chairperson supplemented that incorporation of a requirement to demolish the two common staircases as an approval condition was considered not appropriate, as the planning permission would lapse when the proposed hotel development at the Site was undertaken while the adjoining IB might still remain in existence.

Deliberation Session

48. The Chairperson remarked that the application was in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zone to facilitate the transformation of the industrial area. The Site was the subject of two previous applications for proposed hotel developments, which were approved in 2004 and 2012 respectively, but both approved schemes had not been implemented.

49. A Member considered that it was possible that the two existing common staircases might not be demolished even if the adjoining IB was redeveloped, as the ownership was not wholly held by the applicants. It would be desirable to have an effective mechanism to realise the planning intention of the NBA at Tai Yau Street with the two common staircases demolished upon redevelopment of the adjoining IB. The Chairperson said that the applicants undertook to demolish the two common staircases upon the redevelopment of the adjoining IB and further liaison with LandsD would be required to effectuate the applicants’ commitment during lease modification/land exchange stage.

50. 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 27.2.2030, 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 applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K22/46 School (Tutorial School) in “Residential (Group B)2” Zone, Shop 6,
G/F, Retail Block 1, The Henley, 7 Muk Tai Street, Kai Tak, Kowloon
City, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K22/46)

Presentation and Question Sessions

51. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Helen K.W. Ip, TP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

52. Noting that the applied use was in operation without valid planning permission, two Members asked the following questions:

- (a) whether an application for registration of a school under the Education Ordinance (the school registration application) would still be approved if the application was rejected;
- (b) the reasons for the commencement of the tutorial school at the application premises (the Premises) prior to obtaining planning permission; and
- (c) whether there would be any follow-up action from the Planning Department (PlanD).

53. In response, Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, STP/K, made the following main points:

- (a) should the application be rejected, PlanD would not support the school registration application referred by the Education Bureau (EDB);
- (b) the applicant submitted the school registration application to EDB and carried out renovation works at the Premises for tutorial school concurrently. Upon referral of the school registration application from EDB, PlanD advised the applicant that planning permission was required for the 'School (Tutorial School)' use at the Premises. Hence, the application was submitted while the renovation works continued, and the tutorial school commenced operation after completion of the renovation works. If the application was approved by the Committee, EDB would be informed so that the school registration application at the Premises could be processed; and
- (c) as the Premises was located within an Outline Zoning Plan which was not previously covered by any Interim Development Permission Area/Development Permission Area/Regulated Area plan, no enforcement action could be taken by PlanD under the Town Planning Ordinance. Nonetheless, PlanD had raised objection to EDB for the registration of a school at the Premises as no planning permission was granted to the proposed use.

54. The Chairperson explained that section 16 (s.16) application should be submitted prior to commencement of any use or development requiring planning permission. The applicant submitted a s.16 application for the 'School (Tutorial School)' use as per PlanD's advice upon referral of the school registration application from EDB. An advisory clause reminding the applicant to obtain prior planning permission before commencing the applied use at the Premises was recommended in Appendix III of the Paper. In response to a Member's enquiry as to whether commencement of an applied use without valid planning permission amounted to 'destroy first, build later' activities, the Chairperson said that each application should be considered on its individual merits, taking into account relevant planning considerations, including the site conditions prior to the damage/use. Relevant

information regarding any enforcement action would be provided in the paper as background information. The information in the paper would assist Members in considering whether the applicant was intentionally not submitting planning application and to operate the use without planning permission. Based on the submission from the applicant, the circumstances of the case were different from those unauthorized developments involving ‘destroy first, build later’ activities in the rural areas.

Deliberation Session

55. Members generally considered that it was not uncommon for tutorial schools to be located within the commercial portion of a development or in a commercial building. The tutorial school under application was located within the free-standing retail block of the residential development, which was not in conflict with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group B)” zone on the Outline Zoning Plan. The Committee noted that any enforcement action against the tutorial school for operation without valid school registration, if deemed necessary, would fall within the purview of EDB as the licensing authority for school registration.

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

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

Agenda Item 12

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

57. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:40 a.m.

**Minutes of 783rd Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee
(held on 27.2.2026)**

Deferral Cases

Requests for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
4	Y/H6/3	1 st
9	A/H7/189	1 st

Declaration of Interests

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

Item No.	Members' Declared Interests	
4	The application site was located in Causeway Bay and the application was submitted by Perfect Win Properties Limited, which was a subsidiary of Hysan Development Company Limited. Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Limited (RLP) was one of the consultants of the applicant.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong for living in Causeway Bay - Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu for having some of his projects sponsored by Lee Hysan Foundation and being the director and chief executive officer of a company which had recently received donations from the Foundation - Mr Derrick S.M. Yip for co-owning with spouse a property near Causeway Bay and being a personal friend of the chairman and vice-chairman of RLP
9	The application site was located in Happy Valley near Causeway Bay and the application was submitted by South China Athletic Association (SCAA).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong for living in Causeway Bay and being a member of SCAA - Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu for being a member of SCAA - Mr Derrick S.M. Yip for co-owning with spouse a property in Happy Valley

For Item 4, as the interest of Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu in relation to Lee Hysan Foundation was considered direct, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion for this item. As the residence of Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and the property co-owned by Mr Derrick S.M. Yip with spouse had no direct view of the application site and Mr Derrick S.M. Yip had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

For Item 9, as the residence of Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and the property co-owned by Mr Derrick S.M. Yip with spouse had no direct view of the application site and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

* Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/783_mpc_agenda.html for details of the planning applications.