

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 791st Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 10.7.2026

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

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung

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

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Professor Janet K.Y. Chan

Professor Herbert P.K. Chia

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 Loree L.Y. Duen

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 790th MPC Meeting

[Open Meeting]

1. The Secretary reported that subsequent to the circulation of the draft minutes of 790th MPC meeting held on 26.6.2026 to Members, an amendment to paragraph 22 incorporating a Member's comment as shown on the screen was proposed. The Committee agreed that the minutes were confirmed with incorporation of the said amendment.

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 three cases requesting the Town Planning Board (the Board) to defer consideration of the applications. Details of the requests for deferral, Members' declaration of interests for individual cases and the Committee's views on the declared interests were in **Annex**.

4. For application No. A/H10/98 under Item 6, the applicant requested deferral for 1 month in order to allow sufficient time to prepare further information (FI) in response to departmental comments. The Committee noted that normally, the applicant would be given 2 months for the preparation of the submission of FI upon the Board's agreement to the deferral request. The application would be submitted to the Committee for consideration within 2 months upon receipt of FI from the applicant. If the FI submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. As such, it was suggested that the Committee agreed to the deferral request and allowed 2 months for the applicant to prepare and submit FI.

Deliberation Session

5. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer decisions on the applications as requested by the applicants under Items 5 and 7 as recommended in the Papers and on application No. A/H10/98 under Item 6 as recommended in paragraph 4, pending submission of further information.

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/H21/7 Application for Amendment to the Approved Quarry Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H21/28, To amend the Notes of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Cultural and/or Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses (1)” zone applicable to the site, Inland Lots 8590 RP (Part) and 8723 RP (Part) and Adjoining Government Land, Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. Y/H21/7B)

6. The Secretary reported that Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Limited (RPL) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Derrick S.M. Yip had declared an interest on the item for being a personal friend of the chairman and vice-chairman of RPL. As Mr Derrick S.M. Yip had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

PlanD

Ms Janet K.K. Cheung	-	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK)
Mr Elton H.T. Chung	-	Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK)
Mr Henry H.C. Au	-	Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK)

Applicant's Representatives

MBK Partners

Mr Stephen Le

Mr Jackie Ho

Mr Rock Li

Broad Peak Investment Advisers Pte. Limited

Mr Sandeep Gupta

Mr Hugo Chong

Neon Global

Mr Ron Tan

WELBEYOND

Mr Welby Altidor

Masterplan Ltd.

Mr Ian Brownlee

Ms Kira Whitman

Ms Heather Yuen

Foster + Partners

Mr Colin Ward

Mr Lawrence Wong

Ms Jade Ip

SCENIC Landscape Studio Limited

Mr Chris Foot

Ms Winza Choi

SJ Consultants Hong Kong Limited

Mr Alex Cheung

MVA Hong Kong Limited

Ms Kathy Wan

8. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. To ensure smooth and efficient conduct of the meeting, it was the general practice to have a time limit of 15 minutes for presentation of the applicant. The applicant's consultant wrote to the Secretariat on 18.6.2026 requesting 25 minutes for presentation (including a video presentation) due to the long and complex history of the application site at Hoi Yu Street (the Site), the unique waterfront location and the proposal to provide a landmark cultural and tourism destination. The Chairperson acceded to the request, taking into account the relevant circumstances of the subject case and the agenda of the meeting. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the background of the application.

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Elton H.T. Chung, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed amendments to the Notes of the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Cultural and/or Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses" ("OU(CCLTRU)") zone to facilitate a proposed cultural, leisure and tourism-led development supported by residential use (about 67% of total gross floor area (GFA)), departmental comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. While PlanD had no in-principle objection to the proposed incorporation of 'Flat' use under Column 2 of the Notes, which required subsequent planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board), PlanD considered that appropriate development restriction(s) to the effect that not more than 50% of the total GFA of the future development of the Site for domestic use should be stipulated at the OZP amendment stage to uphold the planning intention of the "OU(CCLTRU)" zone, and PlanD did not support to amend the building height restriction (BHR) from 35 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) to 47mPD as the applicant failed to provide strong justifications for the proposed BHR and the existing provision of the Notes of the "OU(CCLTRU)(1)" zone already allowed minor relaxation of the BHR upon planning application.

[Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

10. The Chairperson then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the

application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and video, Messrs Stephen Le, Jackie Ho, Ron Tan, Ian Brownlee, Colin Ward and Chris Foot, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

Development Background

- (a) Inland Lots 8590 RP and 8723 RP (the Lots), which formed part of the Site, were granted to the then lot owner in 1986 as compensatory lots following the Government's resumption of the original Hoi Tai Street site for the Eastern Harbour Crossing. In 2001, a set of general building plans (GBPs) for a 25-storey industrial building (IB) at the Site with a plot ratio (PR) of 15 and a BH of about 80mPD was approved when the Lots were zoned "Industrial" ("I") on the then Quarry Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). In 2003, the then lot owners submitted a rezoning request to rezone the Site, together with another two sites in the vicinity, for a comprehensive hotel, retail, recreational and open space development with a PR of 4.6 and a BH of 78mPD. While the Committee rejected the rezoning request, it agreed in principle with the proposed development concept of revitalising the waterfront area for leisure and tourism-related development. Subsequently, the private lots of the Site and the adjoining government land (GL) were rezoned to "Open Space" and "OU(CCLTRU)(1)" subject to a BHR of 35mPD under the then Quarry Bay OZP No. S/H21/18. Under this restriction, the attainable GFA of the Lots under the "OU(CCLTRU)(1)" zone was only 22.4% of that permitted in the approved GBPs. The zoning had remained unchanged since then;
- (b) a section 16 (s.16) application covering the "OU(CCLTRU)(1)" zone for a proposed hotel, retail and office development was submitted by the then lot owner but was rejected by the Committee in 2005 because of the excessive GFA for office use. Due to the lack of financially viable alternatives, the then lot owners proceeded with the approved IB development and began construction in mid-2017. Nevertheless, the construction was later put on hold as the then lot owners were approached by the Development Bureau (DEVB) to explore alternative development options. After review, the

then lot owners submitted a planning application (No. A/H21/150) for a mixed-use development comprising hotel, office, shop and services, eating place, place of recreation, sports or culture and an elevated walkway with minor relaxation of the BHR to 41mPD in 2019, which was approved with conditions by the Committee (the approved scheme). However, the subsequent provisional basic terms offer (PBT0) by the Government for the in-situ land exchange was not accepted by the then lot owners as it was considered not financially feasible. As the planning permission (together with its subsequent application for extension of time for commencement approved) would lapse in 2027, the approved scheme would not be realised as planned;

- (c) the prolonged vacancy of the Site for decades was mainly due to the failure of the previous development proposals to achieve financial viability. After the applicant acquired the Lots through a receivership sale process in 2024, the applicant decided to put forward the proposed cultural, leisure and tourism-led development supported by residential use (the proposed development) under the current rezoning application, which was considered a financially viable option for developing the Site into a cultural tourism hub that would enhance Hong Kong's global appeal;
- (d) the applicant retained the right to revert to the IB development with the approved GBPs (with a PR of 15 and a BH of 80mPD) as the land premium had already been settled and the foundation works could be resumed at any time. Yet, the applicant believed that the unique waterfront location of the Site offered an opportunity to transform the area into a cultural tourism hub that would deliver a multitude of public benefits;

The Rezoning Proposal, the Conceptual Scheme and the Alternative Conceptual Scheme

- (e) the rezoning application sought to include 'Flat' use under Column 2 of the Notes of the "OU(CCLTRU)" zone, and to amend the BHR of the "OU(CCLTRU)(1)" zone from 35mPD to 47mPD to facilitate the proposed

development at the Site. Planning permission from the Board would be required for the proposed development, the detailed design of which would be subject to further scrutiny under the planning regime;

- (f) the vision of the proposed development was to transform the Site, which adjoined the Quarry Bay Park waterfront promenade and was considered under-utilised, into a distinctive landmark and a major tourist attraction in Hong Kong. The proposed development was not a residential scheme for its own sake, but a comprehensive mixed-use development with high-quality residential elements that aimed to create a cultural, leisure and tourism destination while also offering public benefits in terms of enhancing pedestrian connectivity and open space provision. The proposed development would be privately funded, without reliance on government funding or assistance. The financial viability of the project would be fundamental to its success. The inclusion of residential elements would ensure that the proposed development would be financially feasible and sustainable;
- (g) compared with the approved scheme, the proposed development would provide about 7,700m² GFA for cultural, leisure and entertainment facilities. The proposed building bulk would be minimised through terraces, greening, setbacks and varied BHs to enhance visual permeability. Both the Conceptual Scheme and the Alternative Conceptual Scheme comprised a cultural venue at the heart of the proposed development, with residential towers featuring green terraces on both sides, harmonising with the surrounding mountain backdrop and waterfront landscape. The cultural venue plaza, located at ground level, would seamlessly connect with the adjacent waterfront promenade, including the East Coast Boardwalk. Key features, including a footbridge connecting the upper cultural deck to Quarry Bay Park (Phase II) (QBPII), grand steps serving as an all-weather outdoor amphitheatre, a continuous public promenade open to the public at all times, and a curated food and beverage hub with alfresco dining, were proposed to enhance vibrancy and provide a lively destination for the community;

- (h) compared with a maximum BH of 44mPD under the Conceptual Scheme, the Alternative Conceptual Scheme maintained the same GFA and land use mix but proposed a maximum BH to 47mPD. The difference between the two schemes was that under the Alternative Conceptual Scheme, the residential clubhouse was relocated beneath the two residential blocks, thereby making the dome-shaped cultural venue a free-standing structure and allowing greater variation in BH;
- (i) the proposed BHR of 47mPD was considered compatible with the surrounding developments and was modest as it represented a minor increase compared with 41mPD under the approved scheme, which was considered within the lower end of the overall height bands of the OZP, ranging from 45mPD to 220mPD. The proposed BHR also included a 1.5m allowance for storm surge mitigation;
- (j) neither the Conceptual Scheme nor the Alternative Conceptual Scheme would result in adverse visual impact from the public viewing point in Kai Tak. The proposed development would not obstruct the urban skyline and would create no perceptible difference from the existing urban context when compared with the approved scheme;

Planning Gains

- (k) a new footbridge across the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) to connect the proposed development to QBPII was proposed. Together with the at-grade pedestrian links at the existing vehicular access to the ex-FEHD Vehicle Depot, this would strengthen the overall pedestrian connectivity and accessibility of the waterfront area;
- (l) a new waterfront public realm would be established at the Site for public enjoyment. A series of harbour steps linking the proposed development to the harbour was also proposed, and all necessary statutory procedures and requirements would be complied with;

Immersive Experience

- (m) to bring cutting-edge immersive entertainment experiences to Hong Kong, a digital museum for immersive and interactive experiences was proposed. The applicant engaged MBK Partners, which was experienced in building and operating popular travel destinations around the globe, such as Universal Studios Japan with over 30,000 daily visitors and INSPIRE Entertainment Resort in Korea with over 13,000 daily visitors. The applicant also engaged Neon Global, which had extensive experience in creating immersive and interactive entertainment based on globally recognised, world-class intellectual properties (IPs), such as Rames the Great, Harry Potter and Jurassic Park, in various cities/countries, including Sydney, Singapore, Germany, etc. More than 90 exhibitions and experiences had been delivered, attracting more than 23 million visitors globally. By combining Hong Kong's unique cultural stories with other world-class IPs, the digital museum would become a world-class immersive experience venue for both locals and tourists, especially those from the Greater Bay Area;
- (n) the proposed GFA of about 7,700m² for cultural, leisure and entertainment facilities under the proposed development was considered comparable with that of other immersive exhibition venues around the world, and the target of attracting approximately 5,000 visitors per day was comparable to that of the Palace Museum;

Conclusion

- (o) no objection or adverse comments from relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) were received on the rezoning application. Regarding the comments of the Commissioner for Harbourfront, Harbour Office, Development Bureau (C for H, HO, DEVB) on the predominant domestic component of the proposed development, the provision of the proposed cultural, leisure and entertainment facilities was considered

optimal for providing an iconic waterfront scheme that was in line with the planning intention of the Site. The residential element was considered essential to providing financial support for the cultural, leisure and entertainment facilities under the proposed development. The Commissioner for Tourism had no adverse comment on the proposal;

- (p) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of PlanD, and C for H, HO, DEVB had no adverse comment on the proposed BHR of 47mPD for the Site; and
- (q) imposing a limit of not more than 50% of the total GFA for residential use and maintaining the BHR at 35mPD as recommended in the Paper would impose constraints on the proposed development. With reference to DEVB General Circular No. 1/2024 on adopting a facilitating and collaborative mindset, flexibility could be allowed to achieve a better design for the proposed development and to cater for changing market conditions. After all, planning permission from the Board would be required for the proposed development, under which the project details, together with updated/new technical assessments, would be subject to scrutiny by the Board to ensure that the proposed development would realise the vision of the project as a cultural tourism hub and would not generate adverse impacts on the surrounding areas.

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

Planning Intention

12. A Member enquired about the rationale for agreeing to add 'Flat' use under Column 2 of the Notes as proposed by the applicant, the suggestion of imposing a restriction of not more than 50% of the total GFA for residential use as recommended in the Paper, and how the considerations of allowing planning flexibility and safeguarding the planning intention of the "OU(CCLTRU)" zone could be balanced. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the applicant did not

propose rezoning amendment nor amendment to the planning intention of the “OU(CCLTRU)(1)” zone, which remained primarily to provide land intended for cultural, leisure and tourism uses taking advantage of the waterfront setting. The applicant had submitted technical assessments including, among others, Traffic Impact Assessment and Environmental Assessment, to support the Conceptual Scheme with the inclusion of ‘Flat’ use under Column 2 of the Notes, the proposed GFAs for different uses and the proposed BHR for the Site. The technical assessments concluded that the Conceptual Scheme and the Alternative Conceptual Scheme were technically feasible with mitigation measures incorporated. The concerned government departments had no adverse comments on the application. Detailed technical impacts of the proposal could be examined at the s.16 application stage. From the perspective of land use compatibility, taking into account the residential cluster along Hoi Chak Street located about 160m to 200m to the southwest of the Site and the public housing development to further southwest near Quarry Bay MTR Station, the proposed residential use was considered not incompatible with surrounding developments. However, having considered that about two-thirds of the total GFA allocated for residential use under the Conceptual Scheme/Alternative Conceptual Scheme would undermine the planning intention of the “OU(CCLTRU)(1)” zone of developing the Site for cultural, commercial, leisure and tourism uses, PlanD suggested that a restriction of not more than 50% of the total GFA for the residential use at the Site should be stipulated at the OZP amendment stage to ensure that major proportion of the GFA would be allocated to the intended uses, thereby upholding the planning intention of the zone. In response to the Vice-chairperson’s follow-up enquiry, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, said that the emphasis on the intended uses of the zone and the proportion of the total GFA for residential use could be elaborated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) to guide the future s.16 application and the details could be worked out at the OZP amendment stage.

13. Another Member enquired whether there were other sites in Hong Kong with the same zoning and whether agreeing to the proposal to add ‘Flat’ use to Column 2 of the Notes would set a precedent for other sites under the same or similar zones. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, said that except the “OU(CCLTRU)(2)” zone located to the east of the Site, there was no other site under the same “OU(CCLTRU)” zone, while there were similar zones for other waterfront sites designated for leisure and tourism-related uses on other OZPs, such as the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Waterfront Related Commercial and Leisure Uses” zones with BHRs of 13mPD to 15mPD on the Central District OZP and

with BHRs of 10mPD to 25mPD on the Wan Chai OZP, but those sites comprised mainly GL. Each application should be considered on its individual merits.

14. Noting that some technical issues such as the proposed harbour terrace and the proposed footbridge would need to be resolved as presented in the Paper, the Vice-chairperson enquired whether there was sufficient information for making a decision on the s.12A application at this stage. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, said that the applicant had conducted technical assessments based on the Conceptual Scheme on aspects such as traffic and environment to support the application for adding 'Flat' use under Column 2, and there were no objection or adverse comments from relevant B/Ds. Should the application be approved, the applicant would have to come up with a proposed scheme with details and supported by the required technical assessments, and liaise with the relevant B/Ds on the proposal e.g. the proposed footbridge, harbour terrace, etc. The proposed scheme with all supporting information would be submitted to the Committee for consideration at the s.16 application stage.

Proportion of Land Use Mix

15. Noting that the application did not involve rezoning of the Site but sought to add 'Flat' use under Column 2 of the Notes, some Members raised concerns regarding the high proportion of GFA proposed for residential use relative to the intended cultural, commercial, tourism and leisure uses specified for the zone.

16. A Member enquired whether the proposed development with such a high proportion of residential use would be akin to a residential project rather than a cultural project. In response, Messrs Ian Brownlee and Colin Ward, the applicant's representatives, said that the benefits and merits of the proposed cultural facilities should be assessed based on public visitation and tourism impact rather than the GFA allocated to such use. By capping the residential use at 50%, other commercial uses, e.g. hotel, would have to be added to the proposed development, which would likely generate undesirable traffic congestion. While it was considered that the planning intention of the "OU(CCLTRU)" zone should remain unchanged, the residential use was essential to fund and sustain the cultural facilities at the Site to elevate Hong Kong's tourism image. The residential and cultural components formed an inseparable and financially viable package to meet the operational requirements of

the proposed development. Examples from international cultural hubs were cited, such as the South Bank in London, which was a world-class cultural district integrated with residential developments with iconic and distinctive landmarks. The proposed development would be perceived as a similar cultural project, which aimed to add vibrancy to Hong Kong.

17. In response to a Member's question on whether assessment had been carried out to evaluate the financial viability of the project if the residential component was capped at a maximum of 50% of the total GFA, Mr Jackie Ho, the applicant's representative, said that detailed planning assessments had been conducted since the applicant acquired the Site in 2024 for formulating the proposed development, but no financial analysis based on a 50% cap on the total GFA for residential use had been conducted. If there would be such a limit, the applicant would have to draw up another scheme at the s.16 application stage, taking into account the planning intention, public benefit and financial viability.

18. In response to the Vice-chairperson's enquiry on how the proposed flat sizes as stated in the Paper were determined, Mr Jackie Ho, the applicant's representative, said that flat sizes ranging from 45m² to 105m² were aimed at providing a diverse flat mix, and the flat size could be adjusted during the s.16 application stage.

Land Use Balance in Quarry Bay

19. Noting that the Quarry Bay area was predominantly zoned for residential use and the area zoned for non-residential purposes such as commercial, cultural, entertainment and hotel uses was comparatively smaller, and taking into account the planning intention of the "OU(CCLTRU)" zone, a Member enquired whether there were any other sites within the Quarry Bay area intended for cultural, commercial and tourism uses, and whether there would be scope to increase the provision of cultural, commercial and tourism uses at the s.16 application stage to better adhere to the planning intention of the zone.

20. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the Site was strategically located at a prime harbourfront location and to the east of the Site was an area zoned "OU(CCLTRU)(2)" which shared the same planning intention as the "OU(CCLTRU)(1)" zone to provide land for cultural, leisure and tourism uses taking advantage of the harbourfront setting. Given the rarity of sites with a similar

setting for providing the above uses along the waterfront area in Quarry Bay, it was of paramount importance to maintain a higher proportion of GFA at the Site for cultural, tourism and leisure purposes rather than residential use. In response to the Chairperson's enquiry about the "OU(CCLTRU)(2)" zone, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, explained that the "OU(CCLTRU)(2)" zone was subject to a BHR of 25mPD. Compared with the "OU(CCLTRU)(1)" zone, it was subject to more site constraints as it was located in close proximity to the Quarry Bay pigging station, with an underground gas pipeline beneath it and the need to reserve land for emergency vehicular access to the pigging station. Comparatively, the Site possessed greater flexibility for development and design.

21. Mr Ian Brownlee, the applicant's representative, supplemented that the Lots within the Site were permitted for industrial use under lease, which was different from the site zoned "OU(CCLTRU)(2)", which fell entirely on GL and could be developed by the Government in accordance with its planning intention. The proposed cultural venue under the proposed development at the Site would be privately developed and would have to be self-financed. Without financial support from the residential use, the proposed development would not be financially viable and the Site would either remain vacant or revert to IB development. For Members' information, the Chairperson said that the total GFA under the approved GBPs for the IB (i.e. 37,159m²) was generally comparable to that of the proposed development (i.e. 39,480m²) and the previously approved scheme under application No. A/H21/150 (i.e. 37,155m²).

22. Noting that the Site was different from the new development areas such as Kai Tak which had undergone comprehensive planning to create a community with a variety of uses and well-supported community facilities and that the Site was relatively isolated from established residential community in the Quarry Bay area, the Chairperson and a Member enquired how the residential portion of the proposed development could contribute to a balanced development from a district-wide perspective and how it could benefit the community and inject vibrancy into the waterfront.

23. In response, Messrs Ian Brownlee and Jackie Ho, the applicant's representatives, said that the proposed development could serve as an extension of the nearby residential development, namely Harbour North, adjacent to the North Point Ferry Pier to the west of the

Site. For reference, the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) also had residential developments together with retail, dining, entertainment, office and hotel uses to create synergy and vibrancy within the district as stated in the ES of the WKCD Development Plan. By transforming the waterfront promenade into a vibrant node with mixed and diverse uses encompassing not only residential, but also cultural, entertainment, retail and food and beverage (F&B) facilities, the proposed development could enhance public enjoyment and bring vitality to the harbourfront. Unlike Kai Tak and the WKCD, the proposed development did not involve government investment but would be wholly financed by the private sector. The proposed development was formulated having regard to the need to adhere to the planning intention of the zone, maximise public benefits and remain financially viable.

BHR

24. Noting that the approved scheme had a BH of 41mPD, a Member enquired about the rationale for imposing the BHR of 35mPD for the “OU(CCLTRU)(1)” zone. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, said that the private lots owned by the applicant accounted for about 16% of the Site, with the remaining area being GL. A set of GBPs for an IB with a total GFA of 37,159m² at the private lots was approved, which remained valid. In view of public aspirations for better alignment with harbourfront planning, an in-situ land exchange proposal was approved by the Executive Council (ExCo) to replace the original IB with a harbourfront leisure, tourism and commercial development. To preserve public views to and from the harbour, making reference to similar zones located at the harbourfront e.g. in Central and Wan Chai, and taking into account the approved GBPs, the site development context, site configuration and site constraints, the Site was restricted to a maximum BH of 35mPD. To encourage innovative design for the development proposal, a minor relaxation clause for the BHR was stipulated under the “OU(CCLTLU)” zone, allowing submission of s.16 application for the Board’s consideration. The previous application No. A/H21/150 was approved with a maximum BH of 41mPD after taking into account the design merits, such as the incorporation of building gaps, variations in BH and reduced building footprint, for promoting visual permeability and visual interest.

25. Mr Ian Brownlee, the applicant’s representative, supplemented that the proposed BHR for the “OU(CCLTRU)(1)” zone was to accommodate a higher site formation level of

approximately 1.5m to mitigate climate change impacts and storm surge risk. The existing BHR of 35mPD could not accommodate modern architectural requirements and the state-of-the-art cultural facilities.

26. In response to the same Member's enquiry on whether there were precedents for minor relaxation of the BHR by over 30%, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, said that there were similar applications involving minor relaxation of BHR of similar magnitude. Each application would be considered on a case-by-case basis, taking into account a basket of factors, including the proposed scheme, technical feasibility, public gain, design merits, etc. The comments of the District Officer (Eastern) of the Home Affairs Department (paragraph 9.1.14 of the Paper) expressed concerns about the possible heightened concerns among locals over the relaxation of the BH to 47mPD under the current application, which could also be subject to further minor relaxation. As such, it was considered more appropriate for the applicant to demonstrate the necessity and merits of the proposed BH at the s.16 application stage.

27. Another Member enquired whether it was financially viable to proceed with the proposed development with residential element should the BHR of 35mPD for the "OU(CCLTRU)" zone be maintained. In response, Mr Ian Brownlee, the applicant's representative, explained that a BHR of 35mPD for the "OU(CCLTRU)(1)" zone was not justified given the BH of 41mPD approved under the previous application (i.e. the approved scheme). Messrs Colin Ward and Jackie Ho, the applicant's representatives, echoed that a BHR of 35mPD would make the design of the proposed development difficult. Situated in front of the commercial cluster at Taikoo Place with Mount Parker and Siu Ma Shan as the backdrop, the proposed development respected the stepped height profile towards the waterfront and the proposed BHR of 47mPD, which represented a minor increase in BH compared with the current BHR, was considered compatible with the development context of Quarry Bay, and the BHR of 35mPD would hinder the delivering of the unique and iconic design currently proposed and would likely result in standard rectangular building blocks. However, it was difficult to conclude at this stage whether the proposed development with a BHR of 35mPD was financially feasible as further assessments were required.

Proposed Cultural Venue

28. The Chairperson, Vice-chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed floor-to-floor height of about 3.2m for the elevated cultural venue and about 5.5m for the cultural facilities at the basement under the Conceptual Scheme would be sufficient for the digital museum;
- (b) whether consideration had been given to accommodating the immersive exhibitions in other commercial venues such as local shopping malls;
- (c) examples of successful international immersive experiences;
- (d) details of the operation of the immersive exhibitions at the cultural venue/digital museum compared with those of cultural venues in Hong Kong, e.g. Tai Kwun, M+ Museum, Palace Museum, Xiqu Centre and the Peak Tower;
- (e) whether the high visitor volume would cause disturbance to the future residents of the proposed residential development at the Site and how the applicant would mitigate such disturbance;
- (f) whether the cultural venue would incorporate distinctive/well-known local IPs and Hong Kong's harbourfront identity to promote Hong Kong as a destination for cultural and tourism activities at the Site; and
- (g) as commercially operated tourism attractions such as Hong Kong Disneyland relied solely on operational revenue without being subsidised by residential development, how the applicant could demonstrate that the proposed development would adhere to the planning intention with the high proportion of residential use so as to avoid turning it into a residential-led development.

29. In response, Messrs Jackie Ho and Ron Tan, the applicant's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the headroom for the cultural venues could be further examined at the s.16 application stage. The applicant's consultant, namely Neon Global, possessed extensive experience in operating immersive exhibitions globally. Technical experts were also consulted and confirmed that immersive experiences, which could be customised to accommodate different height, did not necessarily require high ceiling clearance or uniform ceiling across the entire exhibition venue. The operation depended primarily on spatial utilisation relative to the venue configuration. There would be flexibility to increase the headroom for the cultural facilities, if necessary;
- (b) the proposed development, which would be developed as a landmark, provided an ideal venue, and similar strategic partnership framework necessary for introducing cultural IPs to Hong Kong, was not available at other local commercial venues;
- (c) the applicant's consultant was involved in two major immersive exhibitions in Singapore, namely Gardens by the Bay and Resorts World Sentosa, which were successful in attracting a high number of visitors annually;
- (d) the distinct operation model of the immersive exhibitions was different from that of traditional cultural venues, such as the Xiqu Centre and M+ Museum, which experienced highly concentrated peak arrivals in prolonged visiting times. In contrast, the proposed cultural facilities would adopt staggered visitor entry in small groups, e.g. at 5 to 10-minute intervals, for a stay of approximately 40 minutes per session. The immersive exhibition was considered operationally viable and suitable for the cultural venue given its spatial efficiency;
- (e) as the cultural venue would be fully contained within a dome-shaped free-standing structure and at the underground level, there should be no interface issue between the residential and cultural uses and no noise and light

nuisance would be generated to the surrounding residents or future residents of the Site. Crowd control would be managed through a timed-ticketing system that distributed visitors evenly throughout the operation periods, e.g. operating at approximately seven to eight turns per hour, to prevent gathering of large groups of people inside and around the cultural venue. It was considered that buyers of the residential units at the Site would be those looking for flats with harbour views and a neighbourhood embraced by cultural ambience;

- (f) the applicant's consultant, Neon Global, operated immersive exhibitions globally but had not yet established a venue in Hong Kong. Similar to its collaboration with the museums in Chinese Mainland, the applicant's consultant was committed to working with local IP providers to develop distinct Hong Kong-themed IPs once the permanent venue was established. The cultural venue of the proposed development could serve as a catalyst for cultivating Hong Kong's local creative and digital media industries; and
- (g) the cultural exhibition employed an immersive strategy by incorporating tailor-made animatronics for each specific exhibition to create a unique experience. With reference to the successful global cultural-residential districts such as the High Line in New York, the long-term sustainability depended on the provision of high-quality and continuously refreshed programmes for visitors. By combining the ongoing rotation of globally recognised IPs and collaborating with well-known local IPs, the cultural venue would remain a vibrant and self-sustaining anchor for the community over time. Moreover, MBK Partners had experience in building world-class travel destinations and Neon Neon had extensive experience in immersive and interactive entertainment. All these factors demonstrated that the applicant had the commitment to develop the Site in accordance with the planning intention of the zone.

30. A Member raised the following follow-up questions regarding financial viability of the cultural venue:

- (a) how to ensure that the cultural venue could be financially self-sustained, with high-quality operation maintained in the long term, as the proposed cultural facilities would be entirely privately funded, particularly after the sale of the residential portion; and
- (b) whether there were any examples of privately funded digital cultural facilities that had remained financially sustainable and retained high visitor patronage over the long term.

31. In response, Messrs Jackie Ho, Ron Tan and Welby Altidor, the applicant's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) a financial sustainability report had been submitted to the relevant B/Ds on a confidential basis. Disclosure was restricted due to commercial confidentiality. The proposed development would rely on the revenue from the sale of residential units to fund both the upfront capital expenditure and the construction costs of the cultural facilities. By partnering with a global operator specialising in immersive experiences, the cultural venue/digital museum would be operated through a strategic partnership model rather than a traditional landlord-tenant relationship, and the collaborative framework could reduce financial risk and secure the long-term viability of the cultural facilities. The applicant had strong financial incentive to maintain and invest the cultural venue in the long run as it was regarded as a high-growth sector. In addition to the revenue from ticket sales of the exhibitions, ancillary revenue streams, such as F&B and retail businesses leveraging the digital museum with international IPs, would also help support the operation of the cultural venue. The new cultural attraction at the Site would attract international tourists and hence local and international operators joining the commercial/cultural/entertainment businesses of the proposed development; and
- (b) the applicant's consultant had successful international track record of highly profitable and self-sustaining operations. With reference to the experiences mentioned in paragraph 29(c) above, together with exhibitions

organised in partnership with museums in Chinese Mainland, the operation of the cultural venue did not involve heavy capital investment like that required for Hong Kong Ocean Park, but would instead be smaller in scale, with the aim of achieving a rapid payback period. Given the prime waterfront location and the continued updating of the exhibitions, the operation of the cultural venue would remain financially self-sustaining.

Public Open Space Provision and Pedestrian Connection

32. The Chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there would be any interim arrangement for the existing pet garden during construction stage of the proposed development; and
- (b) whether there was any overlap between public open space and privately owned open space accessible to the public in the Conceptual Scheme.

33. In response, Messrs Colin Ward and Chris Foot, the applicant's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the pet garden would be re-provided to the east of the Site at an early stage of construction to minimise disturbance to the public; and
- (b) the public open space comprised open space at ground level outside the Site, while the privately owned open space accessible to the public comprised open space within the Site, of which 615m² would be covered open space. There was no overlap between the two types of open space, both of which would be accessible to the public.

34. In response to the Vice-chairperson's enquiry as to whether a shorter footbridge over IEC would affect public accessibility and connectivity to/from the harbourfront, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the Site was separated from the hinterland of Quarry Bay by IEC. With the opening of the East Coast Boardwalk, the pedestrian connectivity to the Site from North Point and the Quarry Bay area

had been improved. The proposed footbridge connecting the proposed development to QBPII was critical and could further improve the pedestrian connectivity, though its alignment was indicative under the current application and did not form part of the application, which required further study and discussion with relevant B/Ds.

35. Mr Ian Brownlee, the applicant's representative said that a shorter footbridge over IEC in the submission was indicative and was proposed taking into account the improved site accessibility following the opening of the East Coast Boardwalk. As compared with the previous alignment of the elevated walkway shown on the Quarry Bay OZP, the shorter footbridge would connect the Site with QBPII, which would enhance walkability by providing a comfortable and tree-lined walking environment that could disperse pedestrian traffic to various parts of Quarry Bay. The Transport Department had no strong view on the proposed shorter footbridge as long as it would link the proposed development with the harbourfront and the hinterland via QBPII. Detailed proposal, including the long-term management and maintenance of the proposed footbridge, would be further discussed with relevant B/Ds at the s.16 application and land exchange stages.

Provision of Harbour Terrace

36. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed harbour terrace protruding onto the harbour would comply with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO) (Cap. 531);
- (b) whether the harbour terrace featuring stepped seatings descending towards the harbour would give rise to safety concern; and
- (c) whether any challenges, such as those relating to the land administration process, were anticipated in implementing the harbour terrace.

37. In response, Messrs Ian Brownlee and Colin Ward, the applicant's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) prior to the submission of the current application, the Harbourfront

Commission was consulted on the waterfront design and the statutory requirements under PHO. The current design of the harbour terrace was conceptual and relevant B/Ds would be further consulted on the design and implementation of the proposed harbour terrace at the detailed design stage. While acknowledging that no similar harbour terrace with stepped seatings was proposed along the harbourfront in Hong Kong and the current design of the harbour terrace was conceptual in nature, the requirements under PHO would be carefully examined to ensure that all necessary statutory procedures and requirements would be complied with;

- (b) there were examples in international cities, such as New York, Sydney, and Copenhagen, featuring vibrant waterfront landscapes with stepped profiles descending towards the waterfront for public enjoyment without safety issues. No major safety issue was envisaged, and appropriate protective design measures would be proposed during the detailed design stage; and
- (c) given that the proposed development was in conflict with the current lease entitlement for industrial and/or godown purposes, the applicant would apply to the Lands Department for a land exchange to ensure that the provision of the harbour terrace and other public facilities, such as the footbridge over IEC, would be incorporated into the lease requirements to safeguard the public interest.

38. The Vice-chairperson enquired whether the reclamation proposal for the proposed development should be considered under the s.16 application if the s.12A application was approved. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, said that the amended PHO (Cap. 531) enacted in 2025 enhanced flexibility by allowing small-scale reclamation projects with a reclamation area of not more than 0.8 hectare for the purpose of public interest. The reclamation proposal in the Conceptual Scheme/Alternative Conceptual Scheme was still subject to further discussion with relevant B/Ds to confirm whether it could be regarded as a small-scale reclamation project under the amended PHO. During prior consultation with the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island of the Harbourfront Commission on 31.10.2025, the applicant was reminded that an s.16 application could only be pursued after obtaining an exemption from the “presumption against

reclamation”.

Technical Aspect

39. Noting that there was no public sewer at Hoi Yu Street as stated in paragraph 8.2(c) of the Paper, a Member enquired about the measures proposed for sewage discharge from the proposed development. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the Site was situated within a mix of commercial and residential developments with established public sewers and the proposed development would require the construction of a new sewerage system to connect to the existing public sewers nearby. Having reviewed the technical assessments, relevant government departments, including the Environmental Protection Department and the Drainage Services Department, had no adverse comments on the application. Detailed sewerage proposal would be submitted at the s.16 application stage, should the s.12A application be agreed.

40. 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 procedures 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 representatives and the applicant’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung, Dr Chris K.T. Lam and Mr Derrick S.M. Yip left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break.]

Deliberation Session

41. The Chairperson recapitulated the background and planning history of the Site. The private lots of the Site were zoned “I” with a set of GBPs for IB development approved before the Site was rezoned to “OU(CCLTRU)(1)” in 2003, and construction of the IB commenced around mid-2017. In view of public aspirations to better align the development with harbourfront planning and public use of the waterfront, DEVB approached the then lot

owner to explore alternative development option to replace the planned IB. Approval from ExCo was sought in 2018 for an in-situ land exchange for a waterfront development at the Site subject to the development proposal obtaining endorsement by the Board. With the approved scheme as stated in paragraph 10(b) above, an in-situ land exchange application was subsequently approved by ExCo. However, the then lot owner did not accept the PBTO, and the approved scheme was not realised. In 2024, the current applicant acquired Inland Lots 8590 RP and 8723 RP through a receivership sale process. The application mainly sought to include ‘Flat’ use under Column 2 of the Notes for the “OU(CCLTRU)” zone and to amend the BHR of the “OU(CCLTRU)(1)” zone from 35mPD to 47mPD, without changing the planning intention of the “OU(CCLTRU)” zone.

42. On land use planning, the Chairperson remarked that the planning intention of the “OU(CCLTRU)” zone for cultural, leisure and tourism uses at the Site should be upheld. Consideration could be given to restricting the GFA for residential use, e.g. by capping the domestic GFA at a maximum of 50% of the total GFA, or stipulating the minimum proportion of GFA, e.g. not less than 50% of the total GFA, be allocated to the intended uses in accordance with the planning intention of the “OU(CCLTRU)” zone. Regarding the BHR, Members should consider whether the proposed relaxation to 47mPD was justified, in particular that there would be room to adjust BHR if the Committee considered that a lower portion of GFA for residential use should be allowed. If the Board partially agree to the application to amend the Notes of the OZP for the “OU(CCLTRU)” zone to include ‘Flat’ use under Column 2 and to maintain the current BHR of 35mPD for the “OU(CCLTRU)(1)” zone, the applicant could refine the proposal to demonstrate the proposed BH at the s.16 application stage, given that the existing provision of the Notes allowed the submission of planning application for minor relaxation of the BHR. PlanD would work out the appropriate amendments to the OZP for the Committee’s consideration and agreement prior to gazetting under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The public would then be invited to submit representations, which would be considered by the Board. The Chairperson then invited views from Members.

43. A Member did not agree with including ‘Flat’ use under Column 2 of the “OU(CCLTRU)” zone, while agreeing with PlanD’s recommendation to maintain the BHR of 35mPD. As the Site was located at a prime waterfront location, which was rarely available in Hong Kong, it should be retained for the intended uses in the public interest rather than for

development with residential component, which might take up a high portion of the total GFA and be developed as a high-end residential development, and this deviated from the planning intention. It was doubtful whether the proposed GFA of 4,617m² for eating place and shop and services would be sufficient to support the proposed development as a tourism attraction and enhance the vibrancy of the area. There was insufficient information provided by the applicant on the technical aspects, e.g. the sufficiency of the headroom proposed for the cultural venue to accommodate the proposed digital museum. The area of open space proposed under the rezoning application was smaller than that under approved scheme in 2019, and the covered open space might be put to other uses. There were successful cases, e.g. Sai Ying Pun Harbourfront Park, which demonstrated that with good planning and design, a quality public space could be created with leisure and recreation functions while also providing seaside experiences to the public. Besides, while there was no provision under the Ordinance for the public to submit comments on a s.12A application, in the subsequent plan-making process, the public could submit representations and attend a hearing, which was not available for a s.16 application. The two processes thus involved different forms of public participation. Therefore, when there was insufficient supporting information about a particular use during the s.12A application stage, the Committee should neither agree to it nor rely on a subsequent s.16 application to confirm the validity of that use.

44. The majority of Members agreed with PlanD's recommendations to include 'Flat' use under Column 2 of the Notes for the "OU(CCLTRU)" zone and to maintain the BHR of 35mPD for the "OU(CCLTRU)(1)" zone, as all the concerned B/Ds had no in-principle objection to or adverse comments on adding 'Flat' use under Column 2, which could provide flexibility in the land use mix to enhance the financial viability of the project and enable the Site to be developed as intended rather than remain vacant. As regards the BHRs, there was insufficient information to justify the proposed relaxed BHR, particularly taking into account the high proportion of GFA for residential use in the Conceptual Scheme/Alternative Conceptual Scheme. The development proposal, including the mix and GFA of the proposed uses as well as the BH, could be scrutinised at the s.16 application stage when more details of the proposal were available.

45. The Vice-chairperson and some Members considered that the allocation of about two-thirds of the total GFA for residential use as proposed would transform the proposed development into a residential property-led development, which would significantly

undermine the primary intention of developing the waterfront land for cultural, leisure and tourism purposes, and was therefore not acceptable. Otherwise, the applicant should apply to amend the zoning of the Site. Given the prime waterfront location of the Site, the planning intention of the “OU(CCLTRU)” zone should be upheld, and the zone should be used primarily and predominantly for the intended cultural, commercial, leisure and tourism related uses. To ensure that the residential portion would not undermine the planning intention, the Vice-chairperson opined that the residential portion should not be more than 30% of the total GFA while some Members considered that it should not be more than 50% of the total GFA. To reflect the Committee’s views on the planning intention of the zone, the Vice-chairperson and some Members made the following suggestions:

- (a) to amend the planning intention in the Notes by adding “and predominantly” after “primarily” so as to read as “This zone is primarily and predominantly to provide land intended for cultural, leisure and tourism uses taking advantage of its waterfront setting”, and to add a minimum percentage of the total GFA for the provision of the four intended uses (i.e. cultural, commercial, leisure and tourism uses) specified for the zone;
- (b) to allow flexibility in drawing up the proposed scheme at the s.16 application stage, with the proposed amendments stated in paragraph 45(a) above incorporated in the ES; and
- (c) if a percentage of GFA for the provision of the intended uses was stated in the Notes or ES, it was likely that the applicant would perceive it as the minimum requirement and merely provide such in formulating the proposed scheme. This might limit Members’ flexibility when considering the subsequent s.16 planning application.

46. With regard to the suggestion in paragraph 45(a) above, the Chairperson said that given the statutory effect of the Notes, adding the qualifier “predominantly” might constrain flexibility in designing the proposed scheme. The Secretary supplemented that as a matter of general practice, the planning intention of a zone as stated in the Notes was usually expressed by using the word “primarily”, rather than “predominantly” or both. After discussion, the Committee agreed that there was no need to amend the Notes in order to

maintain planning flexibility. Instead, the ES should be amended to reflect the Committee's views on the importance of upholding the planning intention of the zone.

47. The Vice-chairperson and some Members added that should the Committee agree to the application, the applicant should provide detailed information on the proposed scheme, including the different uses and their respective GFA as well as the proposed BHs with justifications and technical details, such as the junction improvement measures and the design, management and maintenance of the proposed footbridge over IEC. As the international IPs quoted by the applicant's consultant would incur high cost and lacked authentic local cultural elements, the applicant should improve the design of the waterfront promenade by incorporating more innovative cultural facilities, such as making good use of the proposed harbour terrace for cultural/recreational uses to realise greater public gain. The proposed footbridge across IEC should be designed as an all-weather pedestrian connection linking the Site to the hinterland, and the applicant should examine and liaise with relevant B/Ds on the proposed harbour terrace, particularly its implications under PHO.

48. The Chairperson concluded that the majority of Members generally supported the inclusion of 'Flat' use under Column 2 of the Notes and maintaining the current BHR of 35mPD, and agreed that the ES should clearly state that the "OU(CCLTRU)" zone was primarily and predominantly to provide land for cultural, commercial, leisure and tourism uses, without the need to specify a percentage for such provision. Members also agreed that the ES for the zone should encourage the enhancement of open space and other public facilities for public enjoyment, and should be updated to reflect the changing planning circumstances in the subsequent OZP amendment stage.

[Dr Tony C.M. Ip, Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui and Ms Fancy L.M. Cheung left the meeting during deliberation.]

49. After deliberation, the Committee decided to partially agree to the application, and the Planning Department would work out the appropriate amendments to the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) with stipulation of appropriate development restrictions and other requirements to be set out in the Notes and/or ES of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) including those stated in paragraphs 45 and 48 above. The relevant proposed amendments to the Quarry Bay OZP, together with the revised Notes and ES, would be submitted to the

Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/KC/32
(MPC Paper No. 5/26)

50. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the approved Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/KC/32 (the OZP) involved, among others, rezoning a site at Lei Muk Road to facilitate a Land Sharing Pilot Scheme (LSPS) for public and private housing developments (Item A) and rezoning a site at Tsing Tsuen Road for the columbarium expansion of the Board of Management of the Chinese Permanent Cemeteries (BMCPC) (Items B1 and B2). The public housing development of LSPS would be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), and Lawson David & Sung Surveyors Limited was one of the consultants of the LSPS applicant. P & T Architects Limited (P&T) was one of the consultants of the project proponent for Items B1 and B2. The following Members had declared interests on the items:

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan	] being members of HKHA;
Professor Simon K.L. Wong	]

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip	- being a personal friend of the partner of Lawson David & Sung Surveyors Limited; and
---------------------	--

Dr Tony C.M. Ip	- his firm having current business dealings with P&T.
-----------------	--

51. The Committee noted that Professor Simon K.L. Wong had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting, and Mr Derrick S.M. Yip and Dr Tony C.M. Ip had already left the meeting. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the proposed amendment for public housing development was

the subject of amendment to the OZP proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interest of Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan in relation to HKHA on the item only needed to be recorded and she could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

52. The following government representatives (including the consultants) (hereinafter referred to as “government representatives”) were invited to the meeting at this point:

Development Bureau (DEVB)

Mr Mann M.H. Chow	-	Head of Land Sharing Office
Mr Steven S.F. Har	-	Senior Engineer (Planning & Lands)
Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan	-	Senior Town Planner (Planning & Lands)
Ms Jessie M.H. Kwok	-	Town Planner (Planning & Lands)

PlanD

Mr Steven Y.H. Siu	-	District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK)
Ms Jacqueline C.P. Cheuk	-	Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon
Mr Sam K.S. Ho	-	Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK)

Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Ms L.F. Wu	-	Chief Health Inspector (Cemeteries & Crematoria)
------------	---	--

BMCPC

Mr Desmond Cheung	-	Head - Projects
-------------------	---	-----------------

Ms Carol Chau - Deputy Head - Projects

Consultants

Lawson David & Sung Surveyors Limited

Ms Cannis Lee

AGC Design Limited

Mr Terence Kong

Mr Anthony Leung

Ramboll Hong Kong Limited

Mr Tony Cheung

LLA Consultancy Limited

Mr Hank So

CTA Consultants Limited

Mr Horace Mak

KTA Planning Limited

Ms Kitty Wong

53. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Sam Ho, TP/TWK, PlanD briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the OZP, technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments mainly included:

- (a) Amendment Item A – rezoning of a site at the junction of Lei Muk Road and Kwok Shui Road from “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Buildings with Historical and Architectural Interests Preserved for Social Welfare Facility Use”, “Open Space” and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group A) 5” subject to a maximum building height (BH) of 130 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) and a maximum gross floor area

(GFA) of 41,000m² for the public housing portion and a maximum GFA of 26,086m² for the private housing portion, of which not less than 10,363m² should be provided for government, institution and community (GIC) facilities;

- (b) Amendment Item B1 – revising the BH restriction for the “OU” annotated “Columbarium” (“OU(Columbarium)”) zone at Tsing Tsuen Road from 45mPD to 60mPD and the restriction on total number of niches from 20,000 to 70,000;
- (c) Amendment Item B2 – rezoning of three strips of land from “Green Belt” and “Industrial” (“I”) to “OU(Columbarium)” subject to a maximum BH of 60mPD,
- (d) Amendment Item B3 – rezoning of three parcels of land near Wing Kei Road to the east of Tsuen Wan Chinese Permanent Cemetery (TWCPC) from “OU(Columbarium)”, “OU(Cemetery)” and “OU(Funeral Parlours and Crematorium)” (“OU(FPC)”) to “I” to rationalise the zoning boundaries;
- (e) Amendment Item B4 – rezoning of a parcel of land to the east of TWCPC from “OU(Cemetery)” and “I” to “OU(FPC)” to rationalise the zoning boundaries; and
- (f) Amendment Item C – rezoning of a site at Wo Yi Hop Road from “OU(Business)” to “Residential (Group E) 2” subject to a maximum BH of 130mPD and a maximum GFA of 28,589m², of which not more than 16,458m² should be for domestic purpose and not less than 12,000m² should be for GIC facilities including not less than 7,200m² for residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) and/or residential care home for persons with disabilities (RCHD) to take forward a section 12A (s.12A) application that was partially agreed by the Committee.

54. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP in relation to the above rezonings as well as other amendments to the Notes, including revisions to the covering

Notes and technical amendments to align with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans.

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

56. In response to the Vice-chairperson's enquiry on whether the GIC table at Attachment VIII of the Paper reflected the latest provision, particularly after the Committee's decision to partially agreed to the s.12A application (No. Y/KC/17), i.e. Amendment Item C, which involved the provision of RCHE and/or RCHD, Mr Steven Siu, DPO/TWK, PlanD said that the GIC table was prepared taking into account all the updated planning information available, though GIC facilities without funding support and definitive implementation details were excluded, e.g. the floorspace equivalent to 5% of the total attainable domestic GFA in some planned public housing projects without a definitive GIC facility specified.

Conclusion

57. The Chairperson remarked that the proposed amendments were mainly to facilitate the LSPS development and the columbarium expansion, both with technical assessments conducted to ascertain their feasibility and consultation conducted, and to reflect a s.12A application that was partially agreed by the Committee. Should the Committee agree with the proposed amendments, the draft OZP would be gazetted for public inspection for 2 months and the representations received, if any, would be submitted to the Board for consideration.

58. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/KC/32 and that the draft Kwai Chung OZP No. S/KC/32A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/KC/33 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 Kwai Chung OZP No. S/KC/32A (to be renumbered to S/KC/33 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.”

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

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

Agenda Item 8

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

60. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:40 p.m.

**Minutes of 791st Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee
(held on 10.7.2026)**

Deferral Cases

(a) Requests for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
5	A/H6/97	1 st
7	A/K22/47	2 nd [^]

Note:

[^] The 2nd Deferment as requested by the applicant(s) was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted unless under special circumstances and supported with strong justifications.

(b) Request for Deferment by Applicant for 1 Month

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
6	A/H10/98 [#]	1 st

Note:

[#] The request for deferment was for 1 month, but approved by the Committee for 2 months as recorded in the minutes.

Declaration of Interests

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

Item No.	Members' Declared Interests	
5	The application site was located in Tai Hang.	- Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong for living in Tai Hang
6	The application site was located in Pok Fu Lam and the application was submitted by The University of Hong Kong (HKU), with AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) as one of the consultants of the applicant.	- Professor Janet K.Y. Chan for being the Associate Professor of HKU - Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui for being the Adjunct Professor of HKU, and having close relative living in Pok Fu Lam - Dr Tony C.M. Ip for being the Adjunct Associate Professor of HKU, and having current business dealings with AECOM - Professor Herbert P.K. Chia for being the Adjunct Associate Professor of HKU

Item No.	Members' Declared Interests	
		- Mr Ben S.S. Lui for co-owning with spouse a property in Pok Fu Lam, his spouse owning a car parking space in Pok Fu Lam, and he and his spouse being directors of a company owning properties and car parking spaces in Pok Fu Lam - Professor Simon K.L. Wong for his spouse being a programme director of a course of HKU - Mr Derrick S.M. Yip for having current business dealings with HKU

The Committee noted that Professor Janet K.Y. Chan, Professor Herbert P.K. Chia and Professor Simon K.L. Wong had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the residence of Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and the concerned properties of Mr Ben S.S. Lui, his spouse and their company had no direct view of the application site under Items 5 and 6 respectively, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. As the interests of Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui, Dr Tony C.M. Ip and Mr Derrick S.M. Yip in relation to HKU were considered direct under Item 6, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion for Item 6.

* Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/791_mpc_agenda.html for details of the planning application.