

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 792nd Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 24.7.2026

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

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung

Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon,
Transport Department
Mr Vico P. Cheung

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Leo H.Y. Luk

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

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Professor Janet K.Y. Chan

Professor Herbert P.K. Chia

Dr Chris K.T. Lam

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Jeff K.C. Ho

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Jack H. Lau

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 791st MPC Meeting

[Open Meeting]

1. The Secretary reported that subsequent to the circulation of the draft minutes of the 791st MPC meeting held on 10.7.2026 to Members, amendments to paragraph 43 incorporating a Member's comments as shown on the screen were proposed. The Committee agreed that the minutes were confirmed with incorporation of the said amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Deferral Cases

Section 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**.

Deliberation Session

4. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer decisions on the applications as requested by the applicants pending submission of further information, as recommended in the Papers.

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

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

5. The Secretary reported that the application site (the 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. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Professor Herbert P.K. Chia - being the Adjunct Associate Professor of
HKU:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Mr Ben S.S. Lui | - 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 | - his spouse being a programme director of a course of HKU; and |
| Mr Derrick S.M. Yip | - having past business dealings with HKU. |

6. The Committee noted that Professor Janet K.Y. Chan, Dr Tony C.M. Ip and Professor Herbert P.K. Chia had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui would not attend the meeting for this item. As the properties of Mr Ben S.S. Lui, his spouse and their company had no direct view of the Site, and Mr Derrick S.M. Yip had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting. As the interest of Professor Simon K.L. Wong was considered direct, the meeting agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ronald C.H. Chan, TP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

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

- (a) whether right turns by northbound traffic from Pok Fu Lam Road (PFLR) into the Site were currently allowed;
- (b) noting that right turns by northbound traffic from PFLR into the Site would be

prohibited, whether northbound traffic turning around at the access road leading to Alberose (HKU senior staff quarters) had been taken into account in the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), and whether other traffic measures, such as provision of a right-turn pocket on PFLR or allowing right turns by northbound traffic from PFLR during off-peak hours, were considered to facilitate access to the Site;

- (c) whether the TIA covered the impacts of both northbound and southbound traffic, as well as the impact on emergency vehicles travelling to and from Queen Mary Hospital (QMH); and
- (d) how many staff quarters units and student hostel units would be provided in the adjoining High West development.

9. In response, Ms Erica S.M. Wong, STP/HK, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) currently, northbound traffic from PFLR could make right turns to approach the Site;
- (b) the Site was currently accessible to and from PLFR via a vehicular ramp with a pedestrian footpath alongside, part of which was shared with the High West development. To enhance traffic safety and ensure sufficient manoeuvring space along the existing vehicular ramp, the applicant proposed a traffic management scheme. The existing ingress to the adjoining HKU developments, namely the High West development and University Hall, would be converted to one-way ingress only, serving all three developments. A section of the current access road from PFLR to the Site would be converted to one-way egress towards PFLR. These two routes would be linked by a new internal link road within the High West development. Northbound traffic from PFLR would be prohibited from turning right into the Site with the installation of flexible tubular markers on PFLR, and would instead be required to turn around at the PFLR/Sassoon Road junction to the further north. The suitability of allowing the access road leading to Alberose to serve as location

for northbound traffic to turn around, as well as other appropriate traffic enhancements measures, could be further reviewed during the submission of an updated TIA in consultation with the Transport Department (TD) as required under the approval condition, if the application was approved;

- (c) the TIA assessed the impacts of both northbound and southbound traffic, and took into account the existing conditions and all nearby planned developments, including QMH redevelopment and HKU's developments at High West site and Sassoon Road. The existing vehicular ramp would be designed with sufficient queuing space to prevent vehicles from queuing back onto PFLR, thereby ensuring that there would be no adverse traffic impact on PFLR, including on emergency vehicles travelling to and from QMH. Separately, in relation to another proposed development project on PFLR (i.e. the proposed residential development at Ebenezer School), TD had requested the concerned developer to relocate and replace the existing in-lane bus stop on PFLR with a bus lay-by, as the existing in-lane configuration blocked one of the traffic lanes when buses were boarding or alighting passengers. Such traffic improvement measure would help enhance the traffic conditions on PFLR and facilitate unimpeded access for emergency vehicles travelling to and from QMH; and
- (d) the High West development, currently under construction, comprised two staff quarters towers and two student hostel towers, providing about 280 staff quarters units and 900 hostel units respectively.

10. The Chairperson supplemented that at present, northbound traffic waiting to turn right to access developments to the east of PFLR might block one traffic lane on PFLR. In light of the considerable amount of traffic expected to be generated by the proposed conversion of the staff quarters into a student hostel at the Site, refinement of the traffic improvement measures could be explored by the applicant in consultation with TD.

11. At the invitation of the Chairperson, Mr Vico P. Cheung, Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, TD said that once the proposal was finalised at the detailed design stage, the applicant would be required under the approval condition to submit an updated TIA, which would provide an opportunity to refine the traffic arrangements, taking into account Members'

comments.

12. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed student hostel at the Site would be operated by HKU;
- (b) whether any structures were erected within the “Green Belt” (“GB”) portion of the Site; and
- (c) the arrangements for relocating the staff members currently residing in the existing staff quarters.

13. In response, Ms Erica S.M. Wong, STP/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) HKU had reiterated that the proposed student hostel was intended to be operated in line with its other hostels through the Centre of Development and Resources for Students of HKU, and was intended for HKU’s students and staff affiliated with HKU, such as wardens and tutors. No student tenants from other educational institutions would be accommodated;
- (b) there was a minor discrepancy between the zoning boundary on the outline zoning plan and the lot boundary, such that a small portion of the Site (about 0.7%) encroached upon the “GB” zone. As the proposal primarily involved the wholesale conversion of the existing HKU staff quarters (i.e. Middleton Towers) into a student hostel, with internal re-partitioning of existing buildings and minor road works for traffic improvements, the surrounding slopes including the “GB” portion would not be affected; and
- (c) according to the applicant, the existing staff quarters were constructed in the 1960s and comprised relatively large units, which were no longer suitable for meeting the predominant housing needs of current HKU staff with smaller household sizes. At present, Block 1 of the staff quarters was vacant, while Blocks 2 and 3 were partly occupied. The applicant was exploring ways to better utilise the premises, and the staff members currently residing in the staff

quarters might consider alternatives, e.g. using the housing allowances provided by HKU to secure other types of accommodation.

[Mr Vico P. Cheung joined the meeting during the question and answer session.]

Deliberation Session

14. The Chairperson recapitulated that the application was for the proposed wholesale conversion of HKU's existing staff quarters into a student hostel, and the modification works involved only internal re-partitioning without alteration to the external built form. The proposed student hostel would be directly operated by the applicant. The applicant would be required, under the approval condition, to submit an updated TIA, through which traffic improvement measures would be further explored, taking into account Members' comments.

15. Members generally supported the application. While expressing support for the application, a Member said that the Site was subject to the Pok Fu Lam Moratorium and the traffic impact arising from any developments in the area should be carefully assessed. Having observed traffic congestion on PFLR caused by northbound traffic turning right to access developments to the east of PFLR, the same Member opined that in view of various planned developments and redevelopments along PFLR, including HKU's Global Innovation Centre, Wah Fu Estate redevelopment and Ebenezer School redevelopment, traffic arrangements along PFLR should be subject to a holistic review, rather than piecemeal and site-by-site refinement.

16. 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 24.7.2030, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

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

[Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui joined and Professor Simon K.L. Wong rejoined the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

[Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au and Ms Paulina L.S. Pun, Senior Town Planners/Kowloon (STPs/K), and Ms Jenny W.C. Lai and Ms Helen K.W. Ip, Town Planners/Kowloon (TPs/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K10/280 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Domestic Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Residential Development with Commercial/Retail uses, and Proposed Public Vehicle Park in “Residential (Group A)” Zone, Nos. 324 – 354 Ma Tau Wai Road (even nos.) and the Adjoining Government Land, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K10/280)

17. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Ma Tau Kok and the application was submitted by Urban Renewal Authority (URA), with Aurecon Hong Kong Limited (Aurecon) as one of the consultants of the applicant. The Chairperson and following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|---|--|
| Mr C.K. Yip
(as Director of Planning)
(the Chairperson) | - being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its committee; |
| Dr Tony C.M. Ip | - having current business dealings with URA and Aurecon; |

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Professor Herbert P.K. Chia | - owning a property near Ma Tau Kok; |
| Mr Ben S.S. Lui | - being a former executive director of URA and having involvement in the Kau Pui Lung Road/Chi Kiang Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) (CBS-2:KC) project during his tenure in URA; and |
| Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung | - having past business dealings with URA, and having conducted a valuation for an individual claimant in respect of a property at the Site for submission to URA. |

18. The Committee noted that Dr Tony C.M. Ip and Professor Herbert P.K. Chia had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Messrs C.K. Yip (the Chairperson), Ben S.S. Lui and Vincent K.C. Cheung were considered direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. The Vice-chairperson took over the chairpersonship of the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Messrs C.K. Yip, Ben S.S. Lui and Vincent K.C. Cheung left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jenny W.C. Lai, TP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

20. In response to the Vice-chairperson's and a Member's enquiries regarding the public vehicle park (PVP) provision, Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au, STP/K, said that the applicant intended to pursue an integrated development by combining the Site and the adjoining CBS-2:KC site (the combined site). The proposed PVP use at the Site was intended to provide flexibility for relocating some parking spaces (not more than 80 spaces) of the committed PVP

within the CBS-2:KC site to the Site, while keeping the overall PVP provision (i.e. 164 spaces) unchanged within the combined site. Coupled with the proposed traffic improvement measures, no adverse traffic impact was anticipated as there would be no additional PVP in total. The arrangement for the committed PVP would remain the same, with the facility open to the public.

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

- (a) noting that the proposed increase in building height (BH) at the Site would provide the design flexibility necessary to accommodate the aboveground carparks in line with the Government's latest policy, whether there were other justifications to support the proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction (BHR) from 120 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) to 140mPD;
- (b) the impact of the proposed BH of 140mPD at the Site on the intended stepped height profile for the area descending towards the waterfront; and
- (c) whether the proposed measures to improve the local connectivity were notional only, and whether alternative options had been considered in the event that the proposed measures could not be realised.

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

- (a) as background, the Kau Pui Lung Road/Chi Kiang Street DSP, involving upzoning an area from "Residential (Group A)" ("R(A)") subject to maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) 7.5/total PR 9 and BHR of 120mPD with areas shown as 'Road' to "R(A)" with maximum domestic PR 8/total PR 9 and BHR of 140mPD respectively, was gazetted in 2023 to facilitate and guide the re-planning and restructuring of the CBS-2:KC site. The DSP was subsequently approved in 2024. Following its approval, URA commenced the Development Project (DP) covering the Site, aiming to redevelop a group of private tenement buildings. The Site was zoned "R(A)" with the prevailing restrictions at the time of commencement of the DP and had remained

unchanged since then. The application sought to align the domestic PR and BH of the Site with those of the DSP, so as to facilitate an integrated development with holistic planning and implementation for both URA projects at the Site and CBS-2:KC site. The Site was subject to various site constraints. It was elongated and abutted a primary distributor (i.e. Ma Tau Wai Road) with only a narrow frontage onto Lok Shan Road, making it exceptionally difficult to optimise the building layout and design efficiently, or to provide self-sufficient vehicular access. With a consistent set of domestic PR and BH restrictions as proposed by the applicant, the Site could be holistically planned with the adjoining CBS-2:KC site, allowing strategic building massing, optimised tower and podium separation, and reconfigured block layout conducive to enhanced walkability, connectivity and efficient internal circulation. In view of the above, the proposal was considered acceptable;

- (b) the Site was situated in the inland area of Ma Tau Kok within a cluster of “R(A)” zones, which were subject to BHRs of 120mPD to its north and south, and 140mPD to its west including the adjoining CBS-2:KC site and Lok Man Sun Chuen across Kau Pui Lung Road. The proposed BH of 140mPD at the Site was considered acceptable within the broader context and was generally compatible with the prevailing character and intended height profile of the surrounding area. In particular, there were sites with planned BHs of up to 140mPD farther south along Ma Tau Wai Road; and
- (c) an approval condition relating to the connectivity of the Site would be imposed should the application be approved. Under this approval condition, the applicant would be required to provide a setback of not less than 10m along the southern boundary of the Site up to 8m above street level to provide an aboveground pedestrian connection between the adjoining CBS-2:KC site and Ma Tau Wai Road. In addition, according to the Explanatory Statement of the DSP, two ventilation corridors in north-south and east-west directions in the form of pedestrianised avenue/event plaza and public open space would be provided. The pedestrianised avenue/event plaza in north-south direction would also connect to the two exits of To Kwa Wan MTR Station at Lok Shan Road and Kiang Su Street respectively. With the above measures in place,

synergy was expected to be achieved to improve connectivity within the area.

Deliberation Session

23. Members generally supported the application. While no significant adverse impact was anticipated, two Members opined that as the proposed minor relaxation of development restrictions was mainly to facilitate design flexibility enabling holistic planning for both the Site and the adjoining CBS-2:KC site, the applicant should be reminded to respect the existing BH profile of about 120mPD along Ma Tau Wai Road as far as practicable, and should endeavour to reduce the BH of the development at the Site at the detailed design stage, rather than fully utilising the maximum BH relaxed. Another Member emphasised that approval of the current application should not be taken to imply that similar applications for minor relaxation of development restrictions in the area would be approved in the future. Each application would be considered by the Town Planning Board based on its individual merits.

24. 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 24.7.2030, 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.

[Messrs C.K. Yip, Ben S.S. Lui and Vincent K.C. Cheung rejoined the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K22/49 School (Tutorial School) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Stadium”
Zone, Shop M3-301B, Level 3, Kai Tak Mall 3, Kai Tak Sports Park,
Kai Tak, Kowloon City, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K22/49)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

26. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

27. The Chairperson remarked that the Committee had approved several similar applications in Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP), and had previously expressed concerns regarding the proliferation of ‘School’ uses within Kai Tak Malls. In that connection, the Culture, Sports and Tourism Bureau (CSTB) had been consulted on the application. From policy perspective, CSTB considered that the applied use was small in scale and would have strong synergy in enhancing visitor engagement through educational trade categories.

28. While supporting the application, a Member reiterated the concern about the potential cumulative effects of similar applications on the positioning and operation of the KTSP in the future. The Committee noted that the applied use was on a permanent basis and that no further planning application would be required for the continuation of the ‘School’ use at the subject premises, unless there was a material change of use. Another Member opined that materiality of tutorial school use in KTSP was relative and suggested that subjective wording, e.g. ‘only’, be avoided when describing the proportion of tutorial school use in terms of total retail area in KTSP in the Paper.

29. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported the application. As ‘School’ use falling within the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Stadium” zone would require planning permission, the Committee would have the opportunity to consider each application for ‘School’ use in KTSP on its individual merits.

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

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

Agenda Item 8

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

31. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 10:25 a.m.

**Minutes of 792nd Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee
(held on 24.7.2026)**

Deferral Cases

Requests for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
3	A/H5/423	2 nd [^]
5	A/H25/24	1 st

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.

* Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/792_mpc_agenda.html for details of the planning applications.