

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 786th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 17.4.2026

Present

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

Chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Professor Janet K.Y. Chan

Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung

Professor Herbert P.K. Chia

Dr Chris K.T. Lam

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 North),
Environmental Protection Department
Ms Clara K.W. U

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

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Secretary

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr K.K. Lee

Assistant Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Alanna W.H. Chan

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 785th MPC Meeting

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 785th MPC meeting held on 27.3.2026 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Hong Kong District

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

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H7/189 Proposed Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Sports and Recreation Centre) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sports and Recreation Club” Zone, 88 Caroline Hill Road, Wong Nai Chung, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H7/189A)

3. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in So Kon Po near Happy Valley and Causeway Bay, and the application was submitted by South China Athletic Association (SCAA). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip - for co-owning with spouse a property in Happy Valley; and

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - for living in Causeway Bay and being a member of SCAA.

4. As the property co-owned by Mr Derrick S.M. Yip with spouse and the residence of Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had no direct view of the Site and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, 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.

[Professor Janet K.Y. Chan joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

The Proposed Scheme

6. A Member raised the following questions:
 - (a) noting the erection of golf fence on the roof of the proposed comprehensive sports and recreation centre (the Centre), whether there would be any golf driving range proposed under the scheme; and
 - (b) the scale of the proposed multi-function rooms on 1/F, and whether those multi-function rooms would contravene the lease conditions.

7. In response, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, and Mr Harvey T.H. Law, TP/HK, made the following main points:
 - (a) while no additional golf driving range was proposed under the current scheme, a new golf fence of approximately 16.2m in height was proposed on the roof of the Centre to replace the existing fence to serve the existing driving range located to its west, maintaining a similar height of up to 61.6 metres above Principal Datum (mPD); and
 - (b) while there was no breakdown of gross floor area (GFA) calculation for the Centre, based on the indicative scheme submitted by the applicant, it was estimated that the multi-function rooms would take up no less than 10% of the total GFA of the Centre. Since the floor area of the multi-function rooms was relatively small, they could be considered as ancillary facilities of the proposed development. Should the application be approved, the applicant could apply for renewal of the current lease, with the lease conditions suitably modified to cater for the proposed development.

Traffic

8. The Chairperson, the Vice-chairperson and two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) details of the Transport Department (TD)'s comments, and whether the proposed development, together with other planned developments in the vicinity, would exacerbate the current traffic conditions in the So Kon Po area;
- (b) the traffic improvement works proposed under the new commercial development (i.e. Lee Garden 8) and district court to the immediate northwest of the Site;
- (c) whether the assumption of the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) that the future visitors would mainly access the Centre by public transport was supported by references to comparable developments;
- (d) whether the proposed car park would lead to vehicles queuing onto nearby roads, particularly Caroline Hill Road, and consequently result in adverse traffic impacts on the local road network; and
- (e) whether the applicant had proposed any traffic improvement works for the scheme, having regard to the cumulative impact of the nearby planned developments and those under construction.

9. In response, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, and Mr Harvey T.H. Law, TP/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the Centre, named as SCAA Sport Link, was designed to serve as an integrated extension of the existing SCAA Causeway Bay Clubhouse. It would accommodate a range of sports facilities, including six tennis courts, two 5-a-side soccer courts and multi-function rooms. According to the applicant's further information in response to TD's comments, no

large-scale events attracting a significant number of spectators were expected to be held at the Centre. In view of this, TD considered that the proposed development would not generate significant additional traffic and pedestrian flows in the surrounding area, and therefore had no objection to the application. Moreover, an ancillary car park providing 63 private car parking spaces and nine motorcycle parking spaces was proposed within the proposed development, which could help mitigate illegal on-street parking and alleviate parking pressure in the Caroline Hill Road area;

- (b) various traffic improvement works were planned under the adjoining commercial development of Lee Garden 8, including a new internal two-way road connecting the western and eastern sections of Caroline Hill Road to divert vehicular flow and prevent traffic concentration; road improvement works on the eastern section of Caroline Hill Road near the new internal road and on the junction of the western section of Caroline Hill Road/Leighton Road to be carried out in accordance with the lease conditions; and provision of adequate car parking spaces in accordance with relevant requirements. Most of those traffic improvement works were expected to be completed by 2026, with a view to mitigating traffic impacts arising from new developments and alleviating traffic congestion within the district;
- (c) while the Site was not situated in the centre of Causeway Bay, it benefited from convenient road and rail transport networks. As indicated in the TIA submitted by the applicant, with reference to the Monthly Traffic and Transport Digest 2025 published by TD and the trip generation survey conducted at the existing SCAA car park, the majority of visitors were expected to access the Centre via rail-based and road-based public transport. This model split was consistent with other similar developments and was agreed by TD;
- (d) vehicles were expected to enter the Site from Leighton Road via the western section of Caroline Hill Road and exit the Site via the eastern section of Caroline Hill Road. According to the TIA, the number of car

parking spaces provided within the proposed development was determined based on a ratio of one car parking space per 497m² of GFA. On this basis, 63 private car parking spaces would be provided within the Site, which was considered acceptable by TD. Together with approximately 600 car parking spaces provided in Lee Garden 8 and around 190 car parking spaces provided in the existing SCAA Causeway Bay Clubhouse, a total of about 900 car parking spaces would be available in the area, which would help meet local parking demand; and

- (e) while no traffic improvement works were proposed under the application, traffic improvement measures had been planned under other development proposals in the area. For instance, the commercial development of Lee Garden 8 was required to improve the junction of the western section of Caroline Hill Road/Leighton Road under lease conditions. Such improvement works were expected to be completed by Q4 2026 to enhance the traffic network in the vicinity.

10. Mr B.K. Chow, Assistant Commissioner/Urban (AC/U), TD supplemented that the proposed car parking spaces under the current scheme had made reference to the parking provision for the existing SCAA Causeway Bay Clubhouse. Regarding the issue of illegal parking on Caroline Hill Road, TD had worked closely with the Police to monitor the situation and advised the Police to consider appropriate enforcement action whenever necessary. Under the Lee Garden 8 development, traffic improvement measures, including the provision of a new carriageway connecting the eastern and western sections of Caroline Hill Road and improvements to the junction of Caroline Hill Road/Link Road, would be implemented. Adequate parking spaces would also be provided under the Lee Garden 8 development to meet the parking demand in the area. Moreover, as the Centre was considered as a small-to-medium sports and recreational facility designed to serve SCAA members, with usage staggered across different time slots, its impact on local traffic was expected to be limited. In view of the above, it was anticipated that there would not be significant traffic and pedestrian flows generated by the Centre.

11. In response to a Member's enquiry regarding the traffic arrangements during major events at the Hong Kong Stadium, Mr Harvey T.H. Law, TP/HK, said that following

the opening of the Kai Tak Sports Park, the Government was currently reviewing the future use of the Hong Kong Stadium. Based on their track record, both the Police and the Hong Kong Stadium operator had extensive experience in managing high volumes of pedestrian and vehicular traffic generated by large-scale events. Given that the Centre was a relatively small-scale sports and recreational facility, it was not expected to generate significant additional traffic or pedestrian flow.

Landscape Proposal

12. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was a mechanism to monitor the implementation of the landscape proposal, particularly provision of vertical greening; and
- (b) noting that 12 existing trees would be felled and only 11 compensatory trees would be planted within the Site, the reasons for not compensating for the loss of all 12 trees.

13. In response, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, with the aid of a visualiser, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the submitted landscape proposal, apart from committing to a compensatory ratio of 1:1 for tree removal at the Site, the applicant had proposed to incorporate several landscape features at the Site, such as a green roof and a vertical green wall on the reinstated vegetated slope. Should the application be approved, it would be scheme-based, and the applicant would be required to implement the landscape proposal in accordance with the submitted layout. The requirements for providing the proposed landscape features could also be stipulated in the lease, as appropriate, during the lease renewal stage, in consultation with relevant government departments. Implementation of the landscape proposal would be monitored through established mechanism to ensure compliance; and

- (b) 12 existing trees, predominantly common species with poor conditions and low values (including one *Leucaena leucocephala* (銀合歡)), had been identified within the Site. The applicant proposed to remove the 12 trees and compensate with 11 high-quality new trees. According to the latest version of the “Guidance Notes on Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal for Building Development in Private Projects” published by the Lands Department (LandsD), the total number of compensatory trees should not be less than that of the trees lost, including dead trees and any transplanted tree that subsequently died, but excluding trees of undesirable species (e.g. *Leucaena leucocephala* (銀合歡) which was an undesirable species characterised by aggressive and invasive growth and the ability to hinder natural succession of native species). In that regard, to compensate for the removal of 11 existing trees (excluding one *Leucaena leucocephala* (銀合歡)), the applicant proposed to plant 11 high-quality new trees, including *Cinnamomum burmannii* (陰香) and *Terminalia mantaly* (小葉欖仁), together with new shrubs within the Site, thereby achieving a tree compensation ratio of 1:1.

Others

14. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) details of the previous section 16 (s.16) application (No. A/H7/182) for a proposed E-Sports Complex at the Site, and whether staff quarters had been proposed;
 - (b) whether the number of SCAA members would increase significantly in order to generate additional income for the development of the Centre;
 - (c) any measures to ensure that no large events would be conducted at the Site; and
 - (d) in view of the Lands Department (LandsD)’s comments that the current lease for Inland Lot 9041 (the Lot) pertaining to the Site was due to expire

in December 2026, whether any actions would be required to address the lease validity issue should the application be approved.

15. In response, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, and Mr Harvey T.H. Law, TP/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) the previous s.16 application No. A/H7/182 for a proposed E-Sports Complex at the Site was withdrawn by the applicant. Compared with the proposed E-Sports Complex with a building height (BH) of about 50mPD and a capacity of approximately 3,000 people under that application, the proposed development under the current application was of a relatively smaller scale. No staff quarters were proposed in both the previous and current applications;
- (b) at present, SCAA had over 70,000 members. SCAA did not indicate whether they would recruit more members in the future, which was more of a management issue;
- (c) as visitors to the SCAA Clubhouse including the Centre were expected to use the sports facilities provided in the Centre and the number of visitors would be managed through a mandatory advance booking system, the likelihood of conducting large events at the Site was low. Making reference to other similar developments hosting large events, such as the Rugby Sevens at the Hong Kong Stadium, the Police would implement corresponding crowd and traffic control measures to ensure the smooth dispersal of pedestrian and vehicular flows; and
- (d) should the application be approved, the applicant would be advised to apply for renewal of the lease term of the Lot. The user and maintenance of the Lot would be governed by the lease conditions, while the design and layout of the proposed development would be governed by the general building plans.

16. Mr B.K. Chow, AC/U, TD supplemented that TD had concerns on the previous

application No. A/H7/182 in view of the potential traffic impacts induced by a large number of vehicular and pedestrian flows to Caroline Hill Road area during major events and other activities.

Deliberation Session

17. The Chairperson recapitulated that the application sought planning permission for a new comprehensive sports and recreation centre as an extension of the existing SCAA Causeway Bay Clubhouse. According to the Notes of the approved Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (the OZP), 'Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture' use was always permitted within the subject "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Sports and Recreation Club" zone. Nevertheless, in order to preserve the existing character of the Site, planning permission was required for new development on land where no maximum BH was stipulated on the OZP. Relevant government departments had no adverse comment on or objection to the application, mainly based on the considerations that the proposed development was relatively small-scale and was not expected to generate excessive traffic or pedestrian flow.

18. Members generally supported the application. A Member observed that the Site had been formed and left vacant for over 20 years, and was concerned whether the Government would have any control over the idling of a development site, particularly given that the Site was granted at a concessionary rate. The Chairperson remarked that there was no provision for the Town Planning Board (the Board) to mandate whether vacant land should be developed or when it should be developed, except for the stipulation of a validity period (generally 4 years) for a planning permission to ensure the timely commencement of the permitted development. That said, in a new or modified lease, a building covenant (BC) would generally be imposed, requiring the lot owner to complete development of the lot within the period specified in the BC under the lease. One of the Board's roles was to review whether proposals submitted by the applicants were in accordance with the development controls and requirements of the statutory town plans. Regarding the current scheme, the Site was formerly occupied by a grandstand. The proposed development would utilise the Site by constructing a 4-storey building accommodating a range of sports facilities in accordance with the lease conditions, which mandated that the Site be used for sporting and recreational purposes.

19. Ms Catherine W.S. Pang, Assistant Director/Regional 1, LandsD supplemented that according to the established mechanism, the lease conditions for sporting and recreational leases were monitored by relevant government bureaux and departments (B/Ds). Should any breach of lease conditions be identified by the relevant B/Ds, the matter would be referred to LandsD for enforcement action.

20. A Member opined that the delivery of planning gains, such as the proposed landscape area on G/F and a full-height building setback of up to 20m at the southeastern portion of the Site, should be duly monitored to ensure their actual implementation. Furthermore, to complement the landscape area, it was suggested that the façade facing the Disciplined Services Sports and Recreation Club and Caroline Hill Road should incorporate architectural detailing or extend the greenery from the landscape area on G/F, instead of adopting a blank yellow wall design, to enhance the visual amenity of the Site.

21. Noting the presence of driving training activities in the vicinity, a Member expressed concern that such activities might further aggravate traffic conditions. Mr B.K. Chow, AC/U, TD said that the driving training arrangements in the area were similar to those in other areas and learner drivers were not allowed to undergo driving training during peak hours. TD would continue to explore suitable sites for more widely distributed driving test centres to alleviate the traffic impacts induced by learner driving activities in the area.

22. 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 17.4.2030, 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

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K11/31
(MPC Paper No. 2/26)

23. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments mainly involved rezoning of two sites at San Po Kong (i.e. Amendment Items A1 and A2 Sites) (collectively the Site). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Professor Simon K.L. Wong - for his company owning a property at Tsz Wan Shan near San Po Kong; and

Professor Janet K.Y. Chan - for her spouse owning an office and a car parking space in San Po Kong.

24. 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. While the interest declared by Professor Janet K.Y. Chan in relation to the car parking space of her spouse was considered indirect, the office property owned by her spouse had direct view of the Site and her interest was considered direct in that regard. The Committee agreed that she should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Professor Janet K.Y. Chan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

25. The following government representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Vivian M.F. Lai	-	District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)
Ms Paulina L.S. Pun	-	Senior Town Planner/Kowloon
Mr Charles K.K. Lee	-	Town Planner/Kowloon (TP/K)

Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) of Development Bureau (DEVB)

Ms Paulina Y.L. Kwan	-	Senior Place Making Manager (Planning) (SPMM(P))
Mr W.K. Li	-	Place Making Manager (Planning)

26. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Charles K.K. Lee, TP/K, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the approved Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K11/31, technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments mainly included:

- (a) Amendment Item A1 – rezoning of a site abutting Choi Hung Road (CHR) from “Open Space” (“O”) and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Open Space (1)” (“O(1)”) and deletion of building height (BH) restriction; and
- (b) Amendment Item A2 – rezoning of a site abutting Sheung Hei Street from “O” and “G/IC” to “G/IC” and deletion of BH restriction.

27. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP in relation to the above rezonings and other specific zones including technical amendments, as well as amendments to the covering Notes.

28. The Chairperson recapitulated that the proposed amendments mainly involved the reconfiguration of the boundaries of the existing “G/C” and “O” zones to optimise the design and use of a new government, institution and community (GIC) complex that incorporated various community facilities, and the introduction of the “O(1)” zone to facilitate the development of a new open space under the ‘Single Site, Multiple Use’ principle.

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

Redevelopment Scheme

30. The Vice-chairperson and two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the justifications for the reconfiguration of the zoning boundaries, which involved inclusion of the proposed GIC complex within the "G/IC" zone while excluding the proposed Indoor Sports Facilities Building (ISFB);
- (b) the rationale for adopting a 'U-shaped' design for the open space, with the proposed GIC complex located centrally within the Site rather than at the southern corner abutting the existing secondary school so as to create a more integrated open space; and
- (c) whether emerging sports facilities could be incorporated into the proposed redevelopment.

31. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, and Ms Paulina Y.L. Kwan, SPMM(P), EKEO of DEVB, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the reconfiguration, with the proposed GIC complex located within the "G/IC" zone and the proposed ISFB located within the "O(1)" zone, could allow flexibility in developing the new GIC complex and open space at the detailed design stage. The proposed redevelopment aimed to sustain the Site's current function by re-provisioning and upgrading the existing open space and sports and recreational facilities while adding other essential welfare, healthcare and community facilities to serve district needs. To ensure that the overall area of the open space in the "O(1)" zone would remain unchanged, the community facilities would be consolidated within the "G/IC" zone. The proposed ISFB, incorporating part of the existing sports and recreational facilities, would be integrated into the "O(1)" zone

to achieve functional synergy with the open space. To facilitate the reconfiguration, ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (on land designated “O(1)” only)’ use was put under Column 1 of the “O” zone;

- (b) unlike the existing CHR Sports Centre and CHR Badminton Centre, which formed an irregular building footprint, the proposed square-shaped GIC complex would improve the design efficiency of the open space. The area between the existing Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority (HKEAA)/Ho Lap College and the proposed GIC complex would be reserved for the reprovisioning of the ball courts. Besides, the dispositions and footprints of the proposed GIC complex and ISFB had been designed to respect the important air path of the district along the existing non-building area extending from Pat Tat Street towards the district open space at Sze Mei Street, and the air path from Sam Chuk Street towards Sheung Hei Street and CHR. This layout would facilitate and improve wind availability in the district and had incorporated visual considerations, such as the BH profile and compatibility with the surrounding area, while optimising the use of the entire site area; and
- (c) the multi-purpose arena in the GIC complex and the outdoor ball courts could accommodate emerging sports, such as pickleball.

Design of the Proposed GIC Complex

32. The Vice-chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) in view of the inclusion of welfare facilities for the elderly and children in the new GIC complex, whether all-weather public access would be provided to facilitate users going to the GIC complex; and
- (b) the justification for the proposed BH (i.e. nine storeys) of the new GIC complex.

33. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of some

PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) regardless of whether users approached the Site from Lower Wong Tai Sin Estate to the west or the Diamond Hill Water Feature Park to the northeast, they would need to traverse the open space to access the GIC complex. In addition to the greenery concentrated in the southwest-to-northeast portion of the open space, covered walkways leading to the new GIC complex could be explored during the detailed design stage to enhance pedestrian connectivity and comfort; and
- (b) a 9-storey GIC complex was proposed to accommodate and group a wide range of welfare, healthcare and community facilities in a mixed-use building to meet local needs. Although no BH restriction would be imposed on the new “G/IC” zone so as to allow flexibility in developing the proposed GIC complex and open space at the detailed design stage, the proposed BH of the GIC complex (i.e. nine storeys or about 60 metres above Principal Datum (mPD)) had already taken into account the types and quantities of facilities as requested by relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) and Wong Tin Sin (WTS) District Council (DC), as well as the potential air ventilation and visual impacts arising from the redevelopment. The proposed BH of the GIC complex was considered compatible with the San Po Kong Business Area (SPKBA), which was subject to a maximum BH of 120mPD.

Design of the Proposed Public Vehicle Park (PVP) at Basement Level

34. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the scale, location and justifications for the provision of the proposed PVP at basement level;
- (b) whether the removal of existing roadside trees along Sheung Hei Street for the proposed basement PVP was unavoidable; and

- (c) how the proposed basement PVP would improve the local traffic conditions and whether any review had been conducted to support the proposal.

35. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, and Ms Paulina Y.L. Kwan, SPMM(P), EKEO of DEVB, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the Site was located adjacent to SPKBA and abutted almost the entire length of Sheung Hei Street, where there was significant demand for on-street parking of goods vehicles and illegal parking currently existed. To address this issue, a basement PVP, with its layout subject to review at the detailed design stage, was proposed beneath the outdoor sports and recreational facilities next to HKEAA, the GIC complex and ISFB abutting Sheung Hei Street, with the aim of providing about 300 parking spaces for various types of vehicles. It was expected that the proposed PVP could help resolve the current on-street parking issues and release road capacity for SPKBA. Furthermore, the indicative layout and location of the proposed PVP had taken into account the two ingress/egress points at Sheung Hei Street, one serving the proposed GIC complex and ISFB and the other serving the proposed PVP. The proposal to integrate the new GIC complex and open space above a basement PVP within a single site was in line with the 'Single Site, Multiple Use' principle advocated by the Government;
- (b) the design of the proposed basement PVP, which was subject to review, had been optimised to balance technical requirements and tree preservation. Although some existing trees would need to be removed for the alignment of the proposed basement PVP, most of the valuable greenery would be preserved, including all four Trees of Particular Interest (TPIs) and eight mature trees located in the north, east and west of the Site. In addition, the redevelopment aimed to provide a total greenery coverage of about 30% of the Site in the future, which would exceed the current greenery provision. Moving forward to the detailed design stage, the design of the proposed PVP and other facilities along Sheung Hei Street would be further reviewed

and discussed with relevant government departments to explore opportunities to enhance greenery and the streetscape along Sheung Hei Street; and

- (c) the “SPKBA Pedestrian Environment and Traffic Improvement – Feasibility Study” (the Study) commissioned by EKEO had identified 17 junction and pedestrian improvement works for SPKBA, of which 10 had been completed. The remaining improvement works would be implemented subject to funding and coordination among relevant government departments. The proposed basement PVP, providing approximately 300 parking spaces, aligned with the Transport Department (TD)’s advice on providing a relatively large-scale PVP within the Site to offer comprehensive parking and loading/unloading (L/UL) facilities for various types of vehicles and was supported by the findings of the technical assessment on the traffic impact of the PVP under the Study, thereby relieving on-street parking congestion and improving the local traffic network within SPKBA. The future design and distribution of parking spaces would be reviewed during the detailed design stage in liaison with relevant parties.

Traffic Impact of the Proposed Redevelopment

36. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the lack of a buffer between the proposed ingress/egress point of the proposed PVP and Sheung Hei Street would lead to traffic queuing back onto the road, particularly when frequent L/UL activities occurred;
- (b) noting that the majority of business and industrial developments in SPKBA were located to the southeast of the Site, whether there were any arrangements to ensure that the L/UL activities would be confined to the proposed PVP instead of taking place on public roads;
- (c) whether the proposed PVP would facilitate Sheung Hei Street to operate as

a two-lane one-way carriageway with both lanes fully opened for traffic;
and

- (d) the possibility of Sheung Hei Street operating as a two-lane two-way carriageway.

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

- (a) although the ingress/egress point of the proposed PVP was proposed to directly abut Sheung Hei Street with no buffer, goods vehicles were required to circulate internally within the PVP to reach designated areas for L/UL activities, rather than carrying out such activities near the ingress/egress point. Relevant government departments, including TD, had no adverse comment on the proposal. The future arrangements for L/UL activities would be refined during the detailed design stage to prevent vehicles from queuing back onto the road or blocking the ingress/egress point;
- (b) with the pedestrian network improvements proposed under the Study conducted by EKEO, the enhanced pedestrian facilities would facilitate the delivery of goods from the proposed PVP to the surrounding business and industrial developments. Along with stringent management, monitoring and enforcement by relevant government departments, the impact of illegal on-street L/UL activities on road traffic in the vicinity would be minimised;
- (c) Sheung Hei Street was originally a two-lane one-way carriageway but was currently operating as a one-lane one-way carriageway because one lane was taken up by on-street metered parking spaces mainly for goods vehicles and motorcycles. The proposed PVP would offer an opportunity to free up the on-street metered parking spaces so that both lanes might be opened for traffic, thus helping to alleviate traffic congestion caused by vehicles entering and exiting SPKBA via Tai Yau Street, Sam Chuk Street and Sze Mei Street. The possibility of operating Sheung Hei Street as a two-lane

one-way carriageway, or other options, would be further explored by relevant parties during the detailed design stage; and

- (d) noting that Sheung Hei Street and its connecting roads, such as a portion of Sam Chuk Street, were currently operated as two-lane one-way carriageways, the feasibility of operating Sheung Hei Street as a two-lane two-way carriageway would be subject to further review by relevant B/Ds, taking into account the broader road network of the entire district.

Provision of GIC Facilities and Open Spaces in WTS District

38. The Vice-chairperson raised the following questions:

- (a) the current provision of various GIC facilities within the WTSDC area, and how the proposed redevelopment would address those identified deficits; and
- (b) the current provision of open space within the WTSDC area, and how the Site would function as a ‘green lung’ of the district under the proposed redevelopment.

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

- (a) there were deficits mainly in the provision of children, elderly and rehabilitation services within the WTSDC area, particularly in child care centres, residential care homes for the elderly, community care services facilities and day rehabilitation services, most of which were provided in premises-based setting. While the proposed GIC complex could not fully resolve all the deficits, it served as a response to those local needs by integrating various welfare facilities and new facilities, including an integrated home care services team, a day care centre, a neighbourhood elderly centre and a child care centre, as well as reprovisioning of a social security field unit within the proposed GIC complex, thereby providing a

comprehensive range of welfare facilities at a centralised location for the local community. Relevant government departments, including the Social Welfare Department, had been consulted to determine the specific types of facilities to be provided within the GIC complex; and

- (b) currently, there was a surplus in the provision of district open space and local open space in the WTSDC area. Nevertheless, according to the latest methodology in assessing open space provision under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines updated in 2025 (i.e. achieving the standard for provision of 3.5m² of open space per person), there might be a possible deficit of about 7 hectares in open space provision for the WTSDC area. That said, the above only reflected a reduction in calculated provision rather than an actual reduction in open space. In fact, the open space to be provided through the proposed redevelopment was expected to enhance the overall quality of the open space without significant reduction in site area. Owing to its size and the improved landscape design and greenery coverage, the Site would continue to serve as a ‘green lung’ for the district. The ‘U-shaped’ layout, with the proposed GIC complex surrounded by open space, would help avoid fragmenting the landscaped area and allow diverse landscape elements to be incorporated into the open space.

Local Consultation

40. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) details of the concerns raised by WTSDC members regarding the potential traffic and noise impacts caused by the proposed redevelopment; and
- (b) the principles regarding the provision of landscape and greenery within the Site.

41. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, made the following main points:

- (a) in terms of traffic concerns, WTSDC members were primarily concerned that the proposed redevelopment might worsen existing local traffic congestion. In response, as the Site was well served by public transport and most future users were expected to access the Site on foot, the proposed redevelopment was unlikely to burden the local traffic network. Besides, the proposed basement PVP could help alleviate on-street and illegal parking along Sheung Hei Street and nearby streets by providing a certain number of parking spaces, thereby improving the overall traffic flow in the area. Regarding noise concerns, some WTSDC members were concerned about the potential noise impacts arising from the outdoor sports facilities, particularly whether the tennis courts and roller hockey rinks atop the proposed ISFB would generate significant noise impact. As the nearest residential developments to the northeast were located at considerable distances from the Site across CHR, which was already a busy road with high traffic volume, noise generated from the ball courts was not expected to cause significant impacts on residents; and

- (b) the landscape and greenery provision within the Site would adhere to the requirements and principles set out in the Development Bureau Technical Circular (Works) No. 3/2012 and the Greening Master Plan for WTS District, including the adoption of the ‘Right Plant, Right Place’ principle to select suitable plants for planting in appropriate locations, with due consideration of various factors before implementation.

Others

42. The Vice-chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed redevelopment had reflected the historical context of the former Po Kong Village, which was previously located at the Site until its demolition in the 1940s, through the integration of relevant heritage and cultural elements;

- (b) details of the current number of users of the Site and the estimated number of users upon completion of the redevelopment; and
- (c) the traffic arrangements and potential traffic and environmental impacts during the construction period.

43. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, made the following main points:

- (a) the natural knoll at the northeastern portion of the Site comprised the remnants of a small hill north of the former Po Kong Village, which was an ancient village demolished in the 1940s and significantly disturbed by later developments, including the former Kai Tak Amusement Park and the existing CHR Playground at the Site. Under the redevelopment proposal, the natural knoll would be preserved in situ. Given the historical background of the Site and the scope of the proposal, the proposed redevelopment might explore opportunities to display the history of the Site, such as through the potential installation of information boards at various locations within the Site;
- (b) there was no information on the current or estimated number of users after completion of the redevelopment. While the proposed redevelopment might attract more people, the Site was located in a prime location well served by the public transport network. With future upgrade to the pedestrian environment and roadside landscaping, future users would be encouraged to access the Site on foot. Coupled with planned traffic improvement works, excessive traffic flow in the vicinity was not anticipated, and no significant adverse traffic impact was envisaged for the district; and
- (c) relevant technical assessments had been conducted to review the potential traffic and environmental impacts during the construction period. With the adoption of appropriate mitigation measures, no significant adverse impacts on the surrounding areas were anticipated.

44. The Chairperson recapitulated that the proposed amendments would facilitate the development of the proposed GIC complex, ISFB and open space at the Site under the ‘Single Site, Multiple Use’ principle. The proposed reconfiguration of zoning boundaries, as well as the types and quantities of various facilities to be reprovisioned or incorporated within the Site, were considered appropriate. Traffic mitigation measures to address on-street and illegal parking issues in SPKBA, enhancements to the pedestrian connections, the inclusion of historical and cultural elements to promote the Site’s history, and tree preservation arrangements would be duly considered to advance the redevelopment proposal during the detailed design stage.

45. Members generally supported the proposed amendments to the OZP. A Member opined that the BH of the proposed GIC complex should be carefully balanced with the provision and functional requirements of GIC facilities, rather than simply being maximised. Taking into account the rich historical context of the Site, the Member expected that more heritage and cultural elements could be incorporated into the redevelopment proposal to transform the Site into an iconic node for the local community.

46. A Member acknowledged the opportunity arising from the proposed redevelopment, particularly the provision of a basement PVP providing about 300 parking spaces for nearby business developments, which would benefit the local traffic network. To achieve improvement in a more comprehensive and consistent manner, the Member suggested that an overall traffic review for SPKBA should be conducted. This would ensure that the planned and upcoming developments in SPKBA could work together to improve the overall traffic situation in the district. Another Member suggested that the construction works could be carried out in phases to ensure the continuous provision of relevant facilities on the Site.

47. A Member opined that as most users, in particular local residents, would access the Site on foot, the provision of covered walkways was considered essential, especially to cater for extreme weather conditions. The Member also observed that the Site was located between residential developments to its west and SPKBA to its east. The at-grade facilities would mainly serve local residents, while the proposed PVP would serve nearby business developments. The proposed redevelopment would provide an opportunity to better

integrate residential and business uses together and contribute to a more vibrant atmosphere in SPK. In that regard, Sheung Hei Street should play an important role as a connection between the two uses, and it should be designed carefully at the detailed design stage to support the long-term vibrancy of the whole area.

48. While noting that the tree compensation arrangements for the Site would meet the requirements as set out in the Development Bureau Technical Circular (Works) No. 3/2012, the Vice-chairperson opined that it would be preferable to achieve a tree compensation ratio of more than 1:1 as this was a government redevelopment project. Providing sufficient trees would help the Site continue to function as a 'green lung' for the WTS district.

49. The Committee noted that the proposed redevelopment would provide a total greenery coverage of not less than 30% of the Site, which exceeded the current greenery provision. There were 383 existing trees identified on the Site. Amongst the existing trees, 66 trees (including all TPIs and mature trees) would be retained in situ while 83 trees would be transplanted within the Site. For the remaining 234 trees that were mainly in poor structural and health conditions and would be affected due to conflict with the proposed buildings and at-grade ballcourts, 62 compensatory trees were proposed within the Site. In that regard, a total of 211 existing trees (i.e. 55%) would be retained on-site. To achieve a 1:1 tree compensation ratio, 172 trees would be planted off-site within the WTS district by phases in accordance with the development programme for the Site, in liaison with the Leisure and Cultural Services Department. The proposed tree density at the Site after redevelopment would be much lower than the existing condition as it was necessary to provide adequate space for tree growth and to maximise tree health and stability in accordance with the latest standard.

[Professor Simon K.L. Wong and Mr Derrick S.M. Yip left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

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

51. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K11/31 and that the draft Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong OZP No. S/K11/31A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/K11/32 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 Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong OZP No. S/K11/31A (to be renumbered to S/K11/32 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.”

52. 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 Chairman thanked the government representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Professor Janet K.Y. Chan rejoined the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), and Mr Jeff C.N. Leung, Town Planner/Kowloon (TP/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K14/839 Proposed Hotel (Student Hostel) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated
“Business” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, 31 Chong Yip Street,
Kwun Tong, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K14/839)

53. Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung declared an interest on the item as he knew the director of the applicant (i.e. Allied Nice Enterprise Limited). Professor Herbert P.K. Chia also declared an interest on the item as his business partner was renting a unit in the vicinity of the application site (the Site). As Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung had no discussion with the director of the applicant on the application and the interest declared by Professor Herbert P.K. Chia was considered indirect, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

54. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Jeff C.N. Leung, TP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development under the Hostels in the City Scheme (the Scheme), 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.

Design and Operation of the Proposed Student Hotel

55. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the user-to-facility ratio of the shared toilet and shower facilities among student residents, and the rationale for providing such shared facilities;
 - (b) whether there were any restrictions on forbidding the conversion from standard beds to bunk beds;
 - (c) whether the proposed minimum room size of 5.4m² was appropriate, and

whether a requirement on minimum per capita living area had been established under the Scheme;

- (d) the provision of communal facilities, including pantries, activity rooms and laundry facilities;
- (e) the arrangements for cooking in the proposed student hostel; and
- (f) whether there were mixed-gender floors.

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

- (a) students living on 2/F to 11/F would need to share toilet and shower facilities. There were 14 toilets and 10 shower rooms proposed on 2/F which were to be shared by 47 students, while on 3/F to 11/F, 14 toilets and eight shower rooms were to be shared by about 52 to 53 students per floor. Besides, en-suites with toilet and shower facilities would be provided on 12/F and 13/F, each accommodating two students per room. However, the applicant did not provide information and explanations for the sharing arrangement for most of the floors;
- (b) there were 31 single rooms of smaller size in the proposed student hostel. Under the current proposal, no bunk beds would be provided and all beds were single beds. As advised by the Education Bureau (EDB) and the Development Bureau (DEVB), a maximum of two students per room was preferred. The operation of the proposed student hostel would be closely monitored by EDB under the Scheme. It was unlikely that the single beds would subsequently be converted into bunk beds to increase occupancy per room;
- (c) on 3/F to 11/F, there were eight rooms with a room size below 6m² (ranging from 5.4m² to 5.9m²). At present, there was no specific requirement regarding room size or minimum per capita living area under the Scheme.

Nevertheless, by reference to the student hostels across various universities in Hong Kong, the average living area per person was about 5m² to 6m². While the proposed room size might not be ideal, it was not significantly lower than the referenced figures. The dimensions and design of the hostel rooms would be monitored by EDB to ensure the living quality of the student residents;

- (d) according to the applicant's proposal, pantries with floor areas ranging from about 13m² to 15m² were provided on the 2/F to 11/F, while a larger pantry and multiple activity rooms were located on 13/F to serve as communal spaces for the student residents. Furthermore, laundry facilities would be provided, although their locations had not yet been reflected in the current layout plan. The design of the pantries, including their size and configuration, as well as the integration of laundry facilities, would be dealt with during the detailed design stage and subject to further review by EDB;
- (e) similar to hotel development and constrained by the building design and relevant restrictions, cooking was prohibited within individual rooms of the student hostel. However, the applicant did not indicate whether cooking facilities would be available within the common pantries; and
- (f) there was no information from the applicant on whether there were any mixed-gender floors in the student hostel.

57. A Member expressed concern that there might not be any restriction on using bunk beds under the relevant student hostel licence. Consequently, there would be a perceived lack of regulatory control over this aspect, which could potentially lead to unauthorised increase in occupancy. Regarding the communal facilities, the Member remarked that referencing the average room size of on-campus student hostels was not appropriate, as students have access to ample activity rooms and common areas on campus. Besides, the Member also suggested that it would be preferable to set a per capita communal space or a user-to-facility ratio, designating specific toilet and shower facilities to a small group of students (e.g. 4 to 6 students), rather than having all students on the same floor to share those facilities without assigned use, in order to maintain hygiene and management

standards. In response, the Chairperson supplemented that the layout design of the student hostel would be vetted by EDB at subsequent stage to ensure its appropriateness.

Air Ventilation

58. Noting that the windows would generally remain closed during operation, a Member enquired whether the windows were openable and whether there were any requirements for air ventilation of the hostel rooms under the Scheme. In response, Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, STP/K, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that considering that the proposed student hostel was located in Kwun Tong Business Area (KTBA), there might be interface issues between the student hostel and the neighbouring uses. To address this issue, the proposed development would not rely on open windows for ventilation. The proposed fresh air intake points of the air supply system would be located about 15m away from adjacent roads so as to mitigate potential noise and air quality impacts from KTBA. While the windows would generally remain closed during daily operations, they were openable to ensure compliance with the relevant building regulations. As no chimney was found within a 200m radius of the Site, the largest source of air pollution would be road emissions. Given that the proposed development would not rely on open-window ventilation, no insurmountable air quality impact was anticipated. It should be noted that the primary objective of the Scheme was to encourage the market to convert commercial buildings into student hostels, thereby increasing the supply of student accommodation. To ensure the liveability of the converted hostels, student hostels under the Scheme should comply with the same natural lighting and ventilation standards applicable to domestic buildings, such as the requirement that the distance between the required window and any part of a hostel room should be within 9m. However, there was no mandatory requirement for the development to adopt fresh air ventilation.

Provision on Car Parking Spaces and Loading/Unloading (L/UL) Facilities

59. Two Members enquired whether the proposed parking and L/UL spaces could adequately cater for the needs of student residents, particularly during the two peak periods of check-in and check-out. In response, Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, STP/K, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the building, now known as LT Tower, was wholesale-converted to commercial purposes in 2020. It provided eight parking spaces and two L/UL spaces on

G/F for shared use of the building. There was no specific L/UL provision requirement stipulated under the Scheme. Nevertheless, two parking spaces and one L/UL space were specifically allocated to the proposed student hostel, while the remaining spaces would serve the shops and restaurants located on G/F and 1/F. Students might use the designated L/UL space for loading and unloading of luggage during the check-in and check-out periods. As it was anticipated that the student residents would not be driving, the two parking spaces reserved for the student hostel were mainly intended for use by staff (such as wardens) and visiting scholars.

Others

60. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the distances between the proposed student hostel and various post-secondary institutions; and
- (b) whether the student residents were from a specific post-secondary institution or from multiple institutions.

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

- (a) the Site was well served by public transport, with Ngau Tau Kok MTR Station located in close proximity. It was also adjacent to Kwun Tong Road, which was served by a wide range of bus routes to different parts of Hong Kong. The student residents could reach a number of post-secondary institutions on the 'List of Eligible Post-secondary Institutions' under the Scheme (the List), such as the City University of Hong Kong and the Hong Kong Baptist University, within an hour via public transport; and
- (b) eligibility for residency in the student hostels under the Scheme was restricted to students from the 31 post-secondary institutions on the List. The applicant had not entered into a partnership with any specific

post-secondary institution. In principle, all full-time local or non-local students enrolled in relevant programmes of any of the 31 eligible institutions might apply for residency at the proposed student hostel.

62. To provide the Town Planning Board (the Board) with a consistent set of benchmarks for considering similar applications for student hostels in the future, a Member opined that EDB should formulate clear requirements regarding minimum room sizes and the provision of ancillary and communal facilities, such as parking and L/UL facilities, toilets and shower rooms. Guidelines on measures to prevent unauthorised occupancy (e.g. overnight stays by non-tenants) should also be introduced.

[Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

Deliberation Session

63. The Chairperson recapitulated that student hostels supported by Government's policy were regarded as 'Hotel' use under the Definitions of Terms promulgated by the Board. According to Schedule I of the Notes for the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" ("OU(B)") zone, 'Hotel' was a Column 2 use which required planning permission from the Board. The proposed development was located in KTBA, with several hotel developments located nearby. The proposed student hostel under the Scheme was considered generally in line with the planning intention of the "OU(B)" zone and not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The Board might assess the subject application from planning perspective, such as land use compatibility with the surrounding area. As for the detailed design of the proposed student hostel, it would be vetted by EDB at a later stage.

64. Members generally had reservation on the application and expressed the following views/suggestions:

- (a) whilst the location of the proposed student hostel was generally considered appropriate and not incompatible with the surrounding land uses, the interior layout was not ideal as most of the hostel rooms were generally narrow and elongated in configuration (with a minimum width of about 1.6m excluding wall thickness) and small in size (the smallest being 5.4m²).

Only the layout on 12/F, with rooms generally having a larger size and a more reasonable configuration, was deemed relatively acceptable. Given the Government's commitment to tackling the issue of substandard subdivided units (typically those with a living area of 8m² or less), the design of the proposed student hostel should be reviewed in order to enhance the living quality of student tenants;

- (b) apart from the adequacy of per capita communal space, and whilst acknowledging that the proposed student hostel would be developed through the partial conversion of an existing commercial development, which inevitably encountered design constraints, designating corner areas with no access to natural sunlight as communal spaces appeared to be an 'opportunistic' design choice;
- (c) the occupancy density of the proposed student hostel was considered excessively high. Given that the interior layouts of most rooms were narrow and elongated and windows would remain closed most of the time without fresh air ventilation, the student residents who generally stayed longer than hotel visitors would be prone to poor hygienic conditions and fire risk, ultimately affecting their well-being. It was suggested that the applicant should consider increasing per capita living space by reducing the number of beds or rooms, thereby improving the overall living quality for the student residents; and
- (d) regarding air ventilation, it was noted that the proposed development would not rely on open windows for ventilation, but instead an air supply system would be used. There were concerns that if the air supply system malfunctioned, the lack of air exchange would significantly compromise indoor air circulation and quality.

65. Two Members opined that to consolidate Hong Kong's position as an international hub for post-secondary education, maintaining a decent living quality for student residents, especially those from outside Hong Kong, was essential. The Board had the responsibility to act as a gatekeeper to safeguard and promote the health, safety,

convenience and general welfare of the students.

66. Noting the anticipated increase in student hostel applications and considering that approval of substandard proposals could lead to potential damage to Hong Kong's reputation as an international education hub, some Members requested PlanD to liaise with EDB on the formulation of appropriate and clear design requirements, guidelines and controls for a decent student hostel, as opposed to those for a standard hotel for short-stay visitors, in order to ensure a consistent standard of living quality for all student residents. There should also be measures to prevent non-eligible persons (e.g. tenants displaced from substandard subdivided units) from residing in the student hostels under the Scheme. Members noted that EDB would be invited to provide information regarding the Scheme as appropriate in response to Members' concerns.

67. While acknowledging that the proposed student hostel, situated in a convenient location, would contribute to the supply of student accommodation, the Chairperson noted Members' concerns regarding the interior layout and room size of the proposed student hostel, as well as its potential air ventilation, hygiene and fire safety impacts. In that regard, the Chairperson said that the Committee might consider deferring a decision on the application pending the applicant's submission of supplementary information to address Members' concerns as stated above.

68. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application for 2 months pending the submission of further information from the applicant, including (i) a review of the layout, room size and supporting facilities of the student hostel; and (ii) clarifications or further assessments on the potential air ventilation, hygienic and fire safety impacts, for consideration by the Committee.

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

Agenda Item 6

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

69. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:20 p.m.