

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 789th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 5.6.2026

Present

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

Chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

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
Ms Fancy L.M. Cheung

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

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

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

In Attendance

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

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Eva K.Y. Tam

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 788th MPC Meeting

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 788th MPC meeting held on 22.5.2026 were confirmed without amendment.

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

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Deferral Cases

Sections 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 were in **Annex 1**.

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.

Case for Streamlining Arrangement

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The Committee noted that there was one case selected for streamlining arrangement and the Planning Department had no objection to the application. Details of the planning application, Member's declaration of interest for the case and the Committee's view on the declared interest were in **Annex 2**.

Deliberation Session

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

[Messrs Michael K.K. Cheung and Matthew H.H. Law, Senior Town Planners/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STPs/TWK), and Messrs Frankie H.C. Tsang and H.Y. Wong, Town Planners/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TPs/TWK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/TW/549 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Government Use (Water Treatment Works) in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, Tsuen Wan Water Treatment Works, Tsuen Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/549)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

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

Operation of Sludge Treatment Plants (STPs)

8. A Member raised the following questions:

(a) noting from the applicant’s submission that the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) required a minimum solid content of 30% of the sludge for disposal to landfill (the minimum requirement), whether the design of the proposed development, i.e. the proposed two STPs, was only sufficient

to meet the minimum requirement or they were designed with buffer in capacity for the long-term operation in meeting EPD's requirement;

- (b) whether chemicals would be stored at the proposed development, which might cause risk to the residents living in the vicinity of the application site (the Site);
- (c) the reason for two access routes to the Site as shown in Drawing A-2 of the Paper; and
- (d) the purpose of the two vehicle trips as mentioned in the comments of the Transport Department (TD).

9. In response, Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the applicant's submission, the proposed STPs were designed to meet EPD's minimum solid content requirement of 30% for disposal of sludge to landfill, and there was no information in the submission as to whether the proposed STPs were designed with buffer in capacity;
- (b) there was no storage of dangerous goods or chemicals at the Site;
- (c) as the access to the Site was via a one-way access road, as shown in Drawing A-2 of the Paper, one route was for entering the Site and another route was for leaving the Site; and
- (d) two loading and unloading bays had been reserved for heavy goods vehicle for transporting the sludge to landfill.

10. At the invitation of the Chairperson, Ms Marlene Y.H. Ho, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South), EPD said that chemical addition (e.g. coagulants) and filter press were commonly adopted at sewage treatment plants and water treatment plants in Hong Kong to dewater the sludge to meet the minimum requirement for disposal. The Chairperson added that there should be established mechanism to ensure meeting the minimum requirement set by EPD.

Aesthetic Design

11. Noting from Drawing A-16 of the Paper that there were two large buildings located next to the proposed development, a Member enquired whether the proposed development formed part of the Tsuen Wan Water Treatment Works (TWWTW) upgrading works and whether the building height (BH) of the two large buildings were permitted under the zoning of the draft Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TW/40 and hence the current application only covered the proposed STPs. In response, Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, STP/TWK said that the proposed STPs were an integral and essential part of the entire TWWTW upgrading works. The two buildings located to the east of the Site shown in Drawing A-16 were the main part of the redeveloped TWWTW and subject to a BH restriction of 4 storeys under the OZP. As the two buildings of 4 storeys were within the BH restriction, no planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board) was required. Since the Site was subject to a lower BH restriction of 2 storeys and the proposed STPs would have 4 storeys, planning permission for minor relaxation of BH restriction from the Board was required.

12. The Member expressed that the Drainage Services Department had an internal mechanism to review the aesthetic design of its facilities, and enquired whether the Water Supplies Department (WSD) had similar mechanism to review the design of its facilities. The Member further enquired whether the design of the entire redeveloped TWWTW including the two proposed STPs had been reviewed holistically for compatibility with the surrounding environment including the visual aspect. In response, Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, STP/TWK, said that WSD should had an internal mechanism to review the overall building design of the entire TWWTW upgrading works, although such information was not provided in the submission.

13. The Chairperson supplemented that there was established mechanism within the Government to review the technical feasibility and architectural design of government projects, with concerned departments consulted on respective aspects such as TD on traffic and PlanD on visual and landscape aspects, and the project proponent i.e. WSD would follow the established practice.

Deliberation Session

14. The Chairperson said that the proposed development was a permitted use under the “Government, Institution or Community” zone. At the time the BH restrictions were imposed on the OZP, the intention was to reflect BHs of the existing water treatment facilities. To meet the need of the community, upgrading of TWWTW was required to enhance the reliability of freshwater supply in the area. As the proposed development, forming part of the entire TWWTW upgrading works, would have 4 storeys, which exceeded the BH restriction of 2 storeys under the OZP, application for minor relaxation of BH restriction was required. The area surrounding the Site was relatively open, with the nearest residential area to the south being about 100m away. The proposed BH of 4 storeys of the proposed development was considered not excessive, and the applicant had conducted visual appraisal demonstrating that significant adverse visual impact on the surrounding area was not anticipated. There was no objection from the relevant government departments to the proposed development.

15. Members had no objection to the application. The Vice-chairperson and a Member suggested that for future similar applications including those from government departments, applicants could elaborate more on the planning gains such as how the proposal would better serve the community. For the subject case, the Member opined that the applicant could explain that with the adoption of the sludge treatment processes in the proposed STPs, the sludge would be disposed of to landfill and this would alleviate the pressure on the overall sewerage system. Another Member expressed that information on the overall design concept and aesthetic design of the entire redevelopment project could be provided, including on the aspect of compatibility with surrounding environment/developments.

16. The Chairperson acknowledged the Vice-chairperson and Members’ views and suggestions. The proposed development could release the pressure on the public sewage treatment system and this could be elaborated in the applicant’s submission. For future applications of similar nature, applicants including government departments could be encouraged to explain more on the overall design concept of development proposals, and to provide more information on benefits/gains to the community.

17. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the

terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 5.6.2030, 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 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K5/878 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Religious Institution and Social Welfare Facility in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, 43-45 Berwick Street, Sham Shui Po, Kowloon

(MPC Paper No. A/K5/878)

18. The Secretary reported the application site (the Site) was currently occupied by Hong Kong Sheung Kung Hui St. Thomas Church (the Church) at Berwick Street, and Hong Kong Sheung Kung Hui (HKSKH) Welfare Council Limited was the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr C.K. Yip - for his spouse being a member of the Church; and

- Mr Daniel K.W. Chung - for being a personal friend of the Chief Executive Officer of HKSKH Welfare Council Limited.

19. The Committee noted that as the spouse of Mr C.K. Yip had no involvement in the application, he could continue to chair the meeting for the Item. As the interest of Mr Daniel K.W. Chung was considered direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Mr Daniel K.W. Chung left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

20. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Matthew H.H. Law, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

Proposed Scheme and Building Height (BH)

21. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) as a reference, the BH of the similar application for minor relaxation of BH restriction as stated in paragraph 6 of the Paper;
- (b) noting from Drawing A-13 that the floor-to-floor height (FTFH) of the church of the proposed development was 7m, whether there was an increase in the FTFH compared with the existing church;
- (c) whether there was any elaboration on the proposed BH in view of the precise BH of 55.37 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) (main roof level) and whether the FTFH of 2.9m at 11/F would be sufficient to accommodate the proposed electrical and mechanical (E&M) and other roof-top facilities, which had been included in BH of 55.37mPD as shown in Drawing A-13;
- (d) whether pastor quarters were part of the existing church, whether the area could be changed and whether there were requirements for such provision; and
- (e) whether there was any information on the building design of the proposed development that contributed to community gain.

22. In response, Mr Matthew H.H. Law, STP/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the similar application No. A/K5/709 approved in 2011 was for minor relaxation of BH restriction from 7 to 8 storeys with a BH of about 44 mPD

for a proposed church-cum-kindergarten development. The BHs for some government, institution and community (GIC) and social welfare facilities in the district also reached up to 11 to 12 storeys;

- (b) the FTFH of the proposed church at 1/F of the proposed development was similar to the existing church;
- (c) the proposed development was pursued under the “Special Scheme on Privately Owned Sites for Welfare Uses” (the Special Scheme) launched by the Labour and Welfare Bureau/the Social Welfare Department (SWD). The applicant had conducted technical feasibility study to come up with the scheme including the design of pastor quarters ancillary to the permitted ‘Religious Institution’ use and the E&M facilities at 11/F of the proposed development. Consideration of whether roof-top structures to be counted towards BH would be in accordance with Joint Practice Note No. 5 on Development Control Parameters – Building Height Restriction;
- (d) the existing pastor quarter was provided in the Religious Education Resource Centre located in western part of the Site, and the affected pastor quarter would be reprovisioned in the proposed development on a similar scale. There was no prescribed area requirement for pastor quarter, and such provision would be subject to scrutiny and approval by relevant bureaux/departments; and
- (e) while the detailed building design was not available at this stage, the Architectural Services Department would be consulted during the subsequent detailed design stage, which would take into account compatibility with the surrounding developments.

23. In response to a Member’s enquiry whether the religious institution with pastor quarters on a privately owned land together with social welfare facilities would be the subject of consideration in the current application, the Chairperson explained that both ‘Religious Institution’ and ‘Social Welfare Facility’ uses were Column 1 uses, which were always permitted in the subject “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone. The application sought minor relaxation of the BH restriction to accommodate the additional

gross floor area (GFA) for social welfare facilities, as the proposed development was pursued under the Special Scheme which aimed to encourage non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to better utilise their own sites, through expansion, redevelopment or new development, to provide or increase those welfare facilities considered by the Government as being in acute demand, particularly child care, elderly and rehabilitation service places that were much needed in the Sham Shui Po (SSP) district. The proposed 'Religious Institution' was for reprovisioning of the existing religious facilities at the Site.

Traffic and Transport Arrangements

24. Noting that Berwick Street was busy and finding a parking space was difficult, some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the types of social welfare facilities provided in the proposed development and whether traffic generated from the social welfare facilities and the church would clash with peak-hour traffic;
- (b) the provision of parking and loading/unloading facilities and the traffic arrangements including the pick-up/drop-off of users and visitors of the social welfare facilities to minimise potential vehicle/pedestrian interface;
- (c) whether there was sufficient manoeuvring space for vehicles entering and leaving the Site; and
- (d) reprovisioning of the 3 metered parking spaces at Berwick Street proposed to be removed due to footpath widening as shown in Drawing A-15 of the Paper.

25. In response, Mr Matthew H.H. Law, STP/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the social welfare facilities in the proposed development included Child Care Centre (CCC), Special Child Care Centre, Day Care Centre for the Elderly, Integrated Elderly Rehabilitation Services Centre (IERSC) and Neighbourhood Elderly Centre which mainly provided day care services.

It was anticipated that users and visitors to these facilities and the church would mainly arrive during off-peak hours and would primarily rely on public transport. The applicant had carried out traffic impact assessment (TIA) demonstrating that no adverse traffic impact would be generated and the Transport Department (TD) had no objection to the application;

- (b) as shown in the layout plan of ground floor, 3 light bus parking spaces and a loading/unloading bay would be provided within the building. The pick-up, drop-off and loading/unloading activities would be conducted mainly inside the building, thereby minimising potential vehicle/pedestrian interface at Berwick Street;
- (c) the TIA demonstrated that there was sufficient room for vehicles entering and leaving the Site; and
- (d) the affected metered car parking spaces would be reprovisioned within the same district (e.g. Pak Tin Street) subject to further confirmation with TD at the detailed design stage.

Proposed Social Welfare Facilities

26. The Vice-chairperson raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed social welfare facilities would address the provision shortfall in the district and thereby a planning gain to the community; and
- (b) whether the physiotherapy services formed part of the required community care facilities.

27. In response, Mr Matthew H.H. Law, STP/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) there were a shortfall of 1,118 places for CCC and a shortfall of 996 places for Community Care Services Facilities in the SSP district. The proposal could help address the demand for these facilities. Given that the Site was

not large and some elderly facilities required special design considerations, the application mainly focused on providing day care services to meet the local needs; and

- (b) the physiotherapy/occupation therapy treatment room was located in IERSC of the proposed development to provide rehabilitation services for the elderly.

28. In response to the Chairperson's enquiry on the proportion of GFA allocated to the religious Institution and the social welfare facilities in the proposed development, Mr Matthew H.H. Law, STP/TWK, said that the religious institution and social welfare facilities would account for about 40% and 60% of the total GFA respectively.

Deliberation Session

29. The Chairperson remarked while some social welfare facilities could be provided in the public housing developments, given the difficulty to identify new sites particularly in the urban area, the Special Scheme could utilise private land of NGOs to provide social welfare facilities. The proposed development was pursued under the Special Scheme and the proposed social welfare facilities, which could address the community's needs and would be monitored by SWD, were considered planning gains to the community. The project would be financed by the Lotteries Fund and other relevant government funding. The proposed uses were always permitted under the "G/IC" zone, and the application was for minor relaxation of BH restriction from 4 and 8 storeys to 12 storeys. Various technical assessments had been conducted to demonstrate no adverse impact in the aspects of traffic, visual, environment, etc. on the surrounding area.

30. Members generally supported the application as the proposed development provided additional social welfare facilities to meet the needs of the district. The Vice-chairperson opined that in light of the "single site, multiple use" policy, the Government should strengthen coordination and encourage provision of GIC facilities in private developments to address the shortfall.

31. 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 5.6.2030, 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.]

Agenda Item 8

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

32. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 10:15 a.m.

**Minutes of 789th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee
(held on 5.6.2026)**

Deferral Cases

Requests for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
6	A/H5/423	1 st
7	A/H21/160	2 nd [^]
<p><u>Note:</u> [^] <i>The 2nd Deferment as requested by the applicant was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted unless under special circumstances and supported with strong justifications.</i></p>		

* Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/789_mpc_agenda.html for details of the planning applications.

**Minutes of 789th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee
(held on 5.6.2026)**

Case for Streamlining Arrangement

Application approved on a permanent basis

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
4	A/K3/602	Shop and Services in “Residential (Group E)” Zone, Workshop No. 6 (Portion), G/F, Cheung Fat Industrial Building, 64-76 Larch Street, Tai Kok Tsui, Kowloon

Declaration of Interest

The Committee noted the following declaration of interest:

Item No.	Member’s Declared Interest	
4	The application premises for shop and services use were located in Tai Kok Tsui.	- Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan for being an independent non-executive director of a company with rental premises for shop use in the vicinity

The Committee noted that Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.