TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 795th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 11.9.2026

Present

Director of Planning Mr C.K. Yip	Chairperson
Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong	Vice-chairperson
Mr Ben S.S. Lui	
Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui	
Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan	
Mr Daniel K.W. Chung	
Dr Tony C.M. Ip	
Professor Simon K.L. Wong	
Professor Janet K.Y. Chan	
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
Dr Karen K.M. Lee

Assistant Director/Regional 2,
Lands Department
Ms Ritz S.P. Lee

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

Absent with Apologies

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

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

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

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 794th MPC Meeting

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 794th MPC meeting held on 28.8.2026 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Deferral Cases

Sections 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, Member's declaration of interest for a case and the Committee's view on the declared interest were in **Annex 1**.

Deliberation Session

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

Renewal Case

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The Committee noted that there was one case for renewal of temporary planning approval and the Planning Department had no objection to the application for the further renewal period. Details of the planning application were in **Annex 2**.

Deliberation Session

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

[Messrs Matthew H.H. Law and Kervis W.C. Chan, Senior Town Planners/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STPs/TWK), and Mr H.Y. Wong and Ms Sylvia L.Y. Lam, Town Planners/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TPs/TWK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K5/879 Proposed Hotel with Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business (1)" Zone, 646-648A Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/879)

7. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Cheung Sha Wan, and Arup Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Limited (RLP) were the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Professor Herbert P.K. Chia	-	his spouse owning a property near Cheung Sha Wan;
Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung	-	currently conducting a valuation for a company at the Site;
Dr Tony C.M. Ip	-	having past business dealings with Arup; and
Mr Derrick S.M. Yip	-	being a personal friend of the chairman and vice-chairman of RLP.

8. The Committee noted that Professor Herbert P.K. Chia and Mr Derrick S.M. Yip had tendered apoloies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Dr Tony C.M. Ip had no involvement in the item, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting. As the interest of Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung was considered direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

Traffic

10. Noting the severe traffic and pedestrian congestion, as well as frequent loading and unloading (L/UL) activities at the junction of Tai Nan West Street and Castle Peak Road during peak hours, a Member enquired about details of the traffic management arrangements during the construction period and whether any relevant guidelines were provided for the applicant's compliance. In response, Mr Matthew H.H. Law, STP/TWK, said that according to the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) submitted by the applicant, no specific details were provided regarding the traffic management arrangements during construction. Nevertheless, relevant traffic management/control requirements would be followed in liaison with relevant government departments, including the Transport Department (TD), to minimise the traffic impact on the surrounding area during the construction period.

Demand and Supply of Hotels in the District

11. Noting that a number of sites had been approved for hotel developments within the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" ("OU(B)") zone on the Cheung Sha Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), and there might be a potential oversupply of hotels in the district, a Member enquired about the current hotel supply situation and the total number of existing

hotel rooms in the district. In response, Mr Matthew H.H. Law, STP/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that 14 applications covering 13 sites had been approved for hotel developments within the "OU(B)" zone in the district. Among which, four applications covering three sites had commenced with building plan approvals, including one completed hotel development, namely Hotel YX, providing about 119 hotel rooms and currently in operation. In a wider context of the Sham Shui Po (SSP) district, there were currently six hotels including the aforementioned Hotel YX, providing a total of approximately 1,377 hotel rooms. According to the data provided by the Tourism Commission (TC), as of 2026, the occupancy rate of these hotels was approximately 90%, which indicated that there was demand for hotel accommodation in the district and the application would not result in an oversupply of hotel rooms. In addition, the Commissioner for Tourism welcomed initiatives that were conducive to the sustainable development of the tourism industry in Hong Kong, and supported initiatives that would provide more hotel rooms and tourism facilities to visitors.

Previous Application

12. Noting that the Site was the subject of a previous application (No. A/K5/838) for minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) restriction for permitted non-polluting industrial use, the Chairperson enquired whether the planning and design merits proposed under the currently proposed scheme were the same as those under the previously approved scheme. In response, Mr Matthew H.H. Law, STP/TWK, said that in addition to incorporating the planning and design merits proposed under the previous application, the applicant enhanced the current scheme with further planning and design merits. For instance, as compared to the 1.5m-wide canopy proposed under the previous application, a 2m-wide continuous canopy would be provided under the current proposal to fully cover the setback area along Castle Peak Road and Tai Nan West Street for pedestrian weather protection. He added that PlanD's assessment had taken into account the additional planning and design merits newly proposed by the applicant.

13. The Vice-chairperson enquired whether the planning approval of the previous application No. A/K5/838 was still valid. In response, Mr Matthew H.H. Law, STP/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the application was submitted having regard to the Industrial Building (IB) Revitalisation Scheme launched in 2018 (the IB Policy) and

was approved with conditions by the Committee in 2021. Subsequently, a set of general building plans was approved, and the proposed development was regarded as having commenced, rendering the planning permission still valid. Nevertheless, as the applicant failed to execute the lease modification/land exchange within the specified period after the planning approval was granted as required under the IB Policy, the proposed development under the previous application could not proceed further.

Cumulative Impacts

14. Noting that a number of applications for minor relaxation of PR and/or building height (BH) restrictions had been approved within the OZP, the Vice-chairperson enquired about the range of BHs of the developments under those applications, as well as the cumulative air ventilation and visual impacts arising from those approved developments. In response, Mr Matthew H.H. Law, STP/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that most of the approved applications for minor relaxation of PR restriction within the "OU(B)" zone on the OZP were made pursuant to the IB Policy announced in the Chief Executive's 2018 Policy Address to allow relaxation of the maximum permissible non-domestic PR as specified in an OZP by up to 20% for the redevelopment of pre-1987 IBs located outside "Residential" zones in main urban areas and new towns. Among those 14 approved applications in the district, the majority only sought minor relaxation of PR restriction from 12 to 14.4 (i.e. a 20% increase), and only three out of the 14 applications also involved minor relaxation of BH restriction (with relaxed BH from 125.7 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) to 152mPD). As the BH restriction of 130mPD was sufficient to accommodate the proposed development with PR relaxed by 20%, most of these cases as well as the current application did not involve minor relaxation of BH restriction. The imposition of BH restriction of 130mPD on the OZP had already taken into account the air ventilation and urban design aspects of the area. In order to ensure that the transformation of the Cheung Sha Wan Industrial/Business Area (CSWIBA) would not cause significant adverse air ventilation impacts on the locality, setback requirements along main roads had been incorporated into the Notes of the OZP in accordance with the recommendations of the expert evaluation on air ventilation assessment conducted in 2010. In compliance with the requirements, the applicant proposed a 2m-wide full-height setback from Castle Peak Road as required by the OZP, together with a 2m-wide full-height setback from Tai Nan West Street

and a 3m-wide corner splay at the intersection of Castle Peak Road/Tai Nan West Street under the current proposal.

Deliberation Session

15. The Chairperson recapitulated that the proposal had obtained policy support from the Development Bureau (DEVB). Besides, TC supported the application. The Site was zoned "OU(B)" amidst the CSWIBA and the proposed hotel was considered in line with the planning intention of the "OU(B)" zone for general business uses, and was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses comprising various non-industrial, commercial/office and hotel developments. A number of similar applications for minor relaxation of PR by about 20% and for hotel developments within the OZP had also been approved. In addition to maintaining the planning and design merits under the previously approved application, the applicant proposed enhanced planning and design merits, and there were no adverse departmental comments on the technical aspects. The implementation of hotel developments was market-driven. While some hotel developments might not be implemented even if planning permission was granted, the policy on student hostels under the Hostels in the City Scheme (the Scheme) might provide incentive for redevelopment of IBs for student hostel use under the Scheme, which was regarded as 'Hotel' use under the Definition of Terms used in Statutory Plans (DoT).

Hotel for Student Hostel Use

16. A Member was concerned about the differences in the licensing and regulatory requirements between hotel developments and student hostels eligible under the Scheme, given that students could choose to reside in either type of accommodation. The Chairperson explained that hotel developments served all people, including visitors and students, and were governed by the requirements applicable to hotel licences, rather than those under the Scheme. Conversely, student hostels proposed under the Scheme could only accommodate full-time local or non-local students from the 31 eligible post-secondary institutions. To ensure that the proposed student hostels met relevant building standards and safeguarded student welfare, compliance with specific requirements stipulated by DEVB and the Education Bureau (EDB) was required. When receiving applications under the Scheme, relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) would vet the design and layout of the

proposed student hostels, and the Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) would scrutinise the proposed scheme if planning permission was required. In addition, the operator of student hostel was required to submit annual report to EDB. In response to the Member's enquiry, the Secretary said that a dedicated webpage had been set up on EDB's website to publish details of the Scheme, as well as a list of eligible student hostels that had secured the relevant approvals.

17. A Member raised concern as to why hotel developers would be willing to convert hotels into student hostels as hotels could provide rental services to students direct without joining the Scheme. The Chairperson said that under the planning regime, student hostel provided off-campus was regarded as 'Residential Institution' use, which was generally always permitted in residential zonings. With the Board's agreement in June 2025 to expand the scope of DoT for 'Hotel' use to include student hostel supported by the Government's policy, planning permission for student hostel in "Commercial" zone was not required while the operator could submit section 16 (s.16) application for student hostel if 'Hotel' use was a Column 2 use of the respective zones (e.g. "OU(B)"). The measure facilitated the Government's policy by allowing more zonings for student hostels with or without planning permission. The Secretary supplemented that in terms of building control, eligible student hostel under the Scheme would be regarded as non-domestic building for PR calculation under the Buildings Ordinance, and the Buildings Department (BD) would also allow gross floor area (GFA) exempted space for previous hotel use to be converted to supporting facilities (such as study rooms, communal kitchen/pantry, etc.) that were conducive to a better living environment for student tenants, and the GFA of such supporting facilities would be exempted. The Chairperson added that converting existing hotels into student hostels was also a response to the strong market demand. For the current application, should the applicant wish to convert the proposed hotel into a student hostel under the Scheme, certain back-of-house facilities could be converted into communal facilities for student tenants with the associated GFA exempted in accordance with the relevant Practice Note issued by BD, which was the incentive provided under the Scheme to encourage developers to convert commercial buildings or hotels into student hostels to meet market needs. A Member enquired whether there would be any additional gain in exempted GFA under the current application if the proposed hotel, with an 20% increase in PR, would be converted to a student hostel under the Scheme. The Secretary explained that should the s.16 application for hotel use be approved and the applicant subsequently chose to operate a

student hostel under the Scheme, the calculation of GFA exemption would be dealt with by BD.

18. With regard to the type of building that could be converted to student hostel, a Member remarked that IBs were not permitted to be converted into student hostels under the Scheme.

Information on Demand and Supply and Cumulative Impacts

19. Noting that there were a number of approved s.16 applications for minor relaxation of PR and/or BH restrictions in the district, the Vice-chairperson opined that when considering similar applications in future, the Committee should take into account the cumulative impacts on the area arising from the approved applications, particularly in terms of infrastructure capacity, air ventilation and visual impact, and suggested that information on the cumulative impacts could be provided for the Committee's consideration in future. Besides, while acknowledging the need to allow flexibility and respect market dynamics, due consideration should be given to the demand and supply of hotels within a district to avoid over concentration of hotel developments, which might not be beneficial to Hong Kong as a whole. Another Member considered that it would be helpful if data on the demand and supply of hotels and student hostels could be made available to the Committee when considering such s.16 applications.

20. With regard to whether there would be over concentration of student hostels in specific districts, a Member opined that it was difficult to estimate the number of student hostels required on a district basis. Instead, locations with convenient public transport facilities, such as those near MTR stations, would be preferred for student hostels. For student hostels not located near post-secondary institutions but close to public transport services, they could provide more affordable accommodation options.

21. Another Member expressed that it was hardly to determine whether there was an oversupply of a certain type of development, even if more data and statistics were provided, such as in the case of hotels, which were more inclined to be market-driven. In considering s.16 applications, the Board could assess the applications by taking into account the planning

circumstances of the application sites, technical feasibility, and the planning and design merits proposed.

22. The Chairperson said that when considering an application, apart from evaluating the proposed development itself and making reference to relevant similar cases, relevant government departments, including PlanD and TD, would also take into account approved/committed developments in the vicinity of the application site in assessing the cumulative impacts on the surrounding area. For the subject application, the Paper had provided relevant information regarding previously approved similar applications in the "OU(B)" zone on the OZP, and PlanD's representative had provided information on the number of hotel rooms in the SSP district.

Information on Overall Picture at Macro Level

23. A Member opined that it was the impression that the focus of the Board's work was on the consideration of individual planning applications on a micro level, and the associated impacts on the surrounding area such as air ventilation and traffic. Whether to implement the approved schemes was determined by the applicants, having regard to various considerations including the economic situation. Any imbalance in the provision was not solely the responsibility of the Government or the Board. For this and similar cases, the only available information on overall hotel provision was based on the comments from TC, which generally welcomed initiatives that sustained the development of Hong Kong's tourism industry and hence supported applications for hotel developments. If information on the overall picture of hotel provision as well as forecasts on the need for hotel rooms in Hong Kong was available, consideration would be more comprehensive. More information from macro perspective would assist the Board to play a more active role in planning and allocating the required land resources across different districts for the benefit of Hong Kong as a whole.

24. The Chairperson said that while focusing primarily on the proposed development at the application site itself and its impacts on the surrounding area, the Board also played an important role in plan-making and Hong Kong's overall planning from macro perspective, in that the Board would consider new/amended OZPs to guide developments and would be consulted on the findings/recommendations of planning studies from time to time. For

instance, regular reviews were conducted by PlanD to assess the industrial land provision/reservation under the "Area Assessments of Industrial Land in the Territory" and PlanD was currently undertaking the "Study on Utilisation of Existing Industrial Stock" and would consult the Board on the findings and recommendations, which might involve forward-looking rezoning of identified industrial land for other uses. At the strategic level, PlanD had conducted the "Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030" (Hong Kong 2030+), which provided a strategic spatial planning framework for the future planning, land and infrastructure development of Hong Kong, including land requirements for housing, economic, government, institution or community uses, open space and transport infrastructure. In relation to the current application for hotel development, relevant data as mentioned in paragraph 11 above were provided by TC, primarily covering the existing number of hotel rooms and occupancy rate, but this did not constitute a long-term statistical forecast. For future similar applications, PlanD could liaise with TC to see if more data could be provided. Demand for hotel rooms could fluctuate significantly, making accurate long-term forecasting challenging, as it was heavily contingent on macroeconomic conditions and relevant government policies. Such fluctuations in demand were also reflected in the non-implementation of certain approved cases, as seen in the SSP district. To accommodate such fluctuations, the planning framework should provide flexibility, for example, by designating land for zonings that permitted a range of uses, rather than restricting a site to a single or a few uses. Notwithstanding the macro level consideration, the Board would still need to assess whether the application site was suitable for the proposed use on its individual merits.

25. Another Member expressed that if forecasts on the demand and supply of hotels/student hostels in the coming years could be available, the Board could have an overall picture of the need for these specific uses. Consideration of forecast/forward planning could also be made in a wider context including the neighbouring cities such as Shenzhen, noting that some university students in Hong Kong chose to reside in Shenzhen due to the high rental costs in Hong Kong and the opening of the redeveloped Huanggang Port would further enhance the convenience and mobility between Hong Kong and Shenzhen.

26. A Member concurred that it would be challenging for TC to provide accurate data on the demand and supply of hotel rooms due to market fluctuations. While the supply would be market-driven, hotel accommodation was also viewed as an infrastructure

component in Chinese Mainland for the future development of a city, providing affordable accommodation not only to tourists but also to expatriates. Despite the difficulty in forecasting Hong Kong's future hotel demand and supply, it would be useful to have some information on the estimates and standards to be incorporated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, while measures to attract more hotel operators to start business in Hong Kong would rely on policy initiatives.

27. In response to a Member's views on the Board's role/work in overall planning of Hong Kong as well as those of PlanD, the Chairperson referred to the purpose of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance), which was "To promote the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community by making provision for the systematic preparation and approval of plans for the lay-out of areas of Hong Kong (as well as for the types of building suitable for erection in those areas)". The Board, as a statutory body, was primarily responsible for considering and examining planning applications and statutory plans prepared by PlanD as stipulated in the Ordinance. PlanD acted as the executive arm of the Board for processing planning applications and preparation of OZPs and the decision to approve/agree or reject an application or proposal rested with the Board. The Board would be consulted on planning related studies conducted by B/Ds, including PlanD. While some studies focused on strategic planning at territorial level, such as Hong Kong 2030+, where the Board was invited to provide views/comments, the findings and recommendations of some other studies at district level involved OZP amendments that required the Board's consideration/agreement. For instance, in relation to the policy initiative on cross-district transfer plot ratio to promote urban renewal/redevelopment, amendments to the relevant TPB Guidelines and the agreement of the Board were required. Similarly, for "Study on Utilisation of Existing Industrial Stock", the Board would be briefed on the findings and recommendations, and if agreed, PlanD would prepare OZP amendments for the Board's consideration. The Board played a pivotal statutory role in the overall planning for Hong Kong at both micro and macro levels.

28. The Vice-chairperson concurred and shared that while the Board relied on PlanD's executive support, it was crucial to recognise that the Ordinance vested statutory powers and duties in the Board. Members drawn from various sectors could leverage their professional expertise and societal experience to make independent decisions, and the exchange of views among Members was also conducive to the effective operation of the

Board. Drawing on the Board's accumulated experience and discussions on planning cases, more information had been provided in the Papers, such as population-based standards on GIC facilities, which facilitated the Board's consideration and decision-making from both micro and macro perspectives.

29. The Chairperson said that views and suggestions from Members on enhancing the planning system were welcomed. Regarding the current application, the Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported the proposal. For similar applications in future, relevant information, particularly on the supply of hotel rooms in the district, could be provided in the Papers for the Committee's consideration.

30. 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 11.9.2030, 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.

[Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung rejoined the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K3/604	Proposed Hotel (Student Hostel) (Partial Conversion of Existing Commercial Building) and Minor Relaxation of Non-domestic Plot Ratio Restriction in "Residential (Group A)" Zone, 10 Anchor Street, Tai Kok Tsui, Kowloon (MPC Paper No. A/K3/604)

31. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Tai Kok Tsui. Mr B.K. Chow had declared an interest on the item for owning a property in Tai Kok

Tsui. As the property owned by Mr B.K. Chow had no direct view of the Site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

32. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Sylvia L.Y. Lam, TP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

33. Noting that the proposed partial conversion of the existing commercial building into a student hostel involved no changes to the height and bulk of the building, a Member enquired whether any planning and design merits were proposed. In response, Mr Kervis W.C. Chan, STP/TWK, said that while no specific planning and design merits were included in the proposal, the proposed student hostel met the eligibility criteria under the Hostels in the City Scheme (the Scheme). In addition to equipping each room with essential amenities, various common facilities would be provided to serve the needs of future student tenants, and satisfy the requirements set out under the Scheme.

Deliberation Session

34. The Chairperson recapitulated that there were several similar applications for minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) restriction involving conversion of existing buildings to hotel/student hostel use within the "Residential (Group A)" zone on the Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan. The current proposal involved no changes in the PR and building height of the existing building. As the surrounding area was mainly characterised by composite residential/commercial developments, the proposed student hostel was considered not incompatible with its surroundings. Relevant government bureaux/departments consulted had no objection to or adverse comment on the application.

35. 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 11.9.2030, 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.

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K3/603 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Domestic Gross Floor Area Restriction for Permitted Residential Development with Commercial/Retail, Government, Institution or Community, Open Space and Public Vehicle Park Uses in Sub-area (1) of "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Mixed Use (2)" Subzone, Government Land bounded by Boundary Street, Sai Yee Street, Flower Market Road and Mong Kok Stadium, Mong Kok, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K3/603)

36. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr C.K. Yip	-	being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its committee;
Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung	-	having past business dealings with URA; and
Dr Tony C.M. Ip	-	having current business dealings with URA.

37. As the interests of Mr C.K. Yip and Dr Tony C.M. Ip 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. As Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

[Mr C.K. Yip and Dr Tony C.M. Ip left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

Allocation of Gross Floor Area (GFA)

39. Noting that the application was "non-scheme-based" in nature and the submitted notional scheme was indicative only for the purpose of technical assessments, and the proposed minor relaxation in domestic GFA was equivalent to an increase in domestic plot ratio (PR) from 6.5 to 7.5, a Member enquired whether any unutilised domestic PR could be transferred to non-domestic PR, provided that the total PR/GFA was not exceeded. In response, Mr Kervis W.C. Chan, STP/TWK, explained that the reduction in non-domestic GFA directly corresponded to the increase in domestic GFA, as the total GFA cap remained unchanged under the application. If approved, flexibility would be allowed to fine-tune the domestic and non-domestic GFAs at implementation, provided that the final scheme did not exceed the proposed maximum domestic GFA under the application and the total GFA (i.e. 64,530m²) stipulated in the Notes for Sub-area (1) of the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Mixed Use (2)" ("OU(MU)2") subzone under the approved URA Sai Yee Street/Flower Market Road Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/K3/URA5/2.

40. A Member enquired about the non-domestic GFA allocations between hotel and retail uses, and whether such allocations could be adjusted, particularly by reducing retail GFA, during the detailed design stage such that there would be no guaranteed amount of GFA for retail use. In response, Mr Kervis W.C. Chan, STP/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, explained that the applicant sought planning permission for minor relaxation of the domestic GFA restriction for Sub-area (1) of the "OU(MU)2" subzone, under which the non-domestic GFA would correspondingly decrease from 17,925m^2 to 10,755m^2 (equivalent to a decrease of the non-domestic PR from 2.5 to 1.5). As no breakdown was specified for individual non-domestic uses, the applicant could adjust the

non-domestic GFA allocation at the detailed design stage, provided that the total GFA cap was not exceeded. Although there was an overall reduction in non-domestic GFA in Sub-area (1) of the "OU(MU)2" subzone, there was an increase in the GFA for retail use to about 14,710m^2 (compared to 11,000m^2 under the original notional scheme for the DSP) for the whole "OU(MU)2" subzone under the application, and there was still a total non-domestic GFA of 19,710m^2 in the DSP area, which was substantial in amount to allow the applicant flexibility in adjusting the GFA allocations for hotel and retail uses at the detailed design stage. That said, the proposed GFA for retail use of about 14,710m^2 for the "OU(MU)2" subzone remained subject to change. Notwithstanding the above, should the applicant subsequently adjust the non-domestic GFA allocations, in particular the allocation for retail use, at the detailed design stage, relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) would comment on the general building plan submissions and require the applicant to provide justifications for such changes, as appropriate.

41. Noting an increase of about 3,710m^2 in retail GFA, a Member enquired whether additional measures had been proposed by the applicant to address concerns of the public, assist the affected Flower Market operators (e.g. through rental arrangements) and sustain the Flower Market's unique character. In response, Mr Kervis W.C. Chan, STP/TWK, said that while the applicant did not provide detailed operational arrangements for the future Flower Market, public sources like District Council documents indicated that the applicant had proposed a specific measure titled "Flower Market 2.0 Trial Shop" (花墟2.0試業空間). This would be implemented to facilitate the interim relocation and ensure business continuity for the affected flower shop operators (e.g. by providing sufficient loading/unloading (L/UL) bays for future trade operations), which was expected to be commissioned in the second half of 2028. Under the measure, the designated retail area would be provided along Flower Market Road within the "OU(MU)2" subzone, with priority offered to affected operators currently carrying on business in the Flower Market, thereby helping to sustain their businesses. In addition, in response to the Town Planning Board (the Board)'s previous views expressed during representation hearing on the draft DSP regarding the strengthening of engagement with local stakeholders, the applicant had engaged a community-making consultant to maintain direct liaison with the affected operators to gauge their interest in continuing their businesses in the Flower Market and identify their operational requirements, such as floor area and L/UL facilities.

Traffic and Provision of Parking Facilities

42. Noting that retail GFA had increased despite the deletion of office use compared with the original DSP notional scheme, a Member enquired whether there was any change in the proposed provision of about 220 car parking spaces and 10 heavy vehicle/goods vehicle L/UL bays at the public vehicle park (PVP), and whether the reduction in non-domestic GFA would lead to a corresponding decrease in the number of parking spaces for public use. In response, Mr Kervis W.C. Chan, STP/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the total number of car parking spaces and L/UL bays at the PVP remained unchanged as the original notional scheme. As for the provision of car parking spaces for the proposed development, the increase in residential units and retail floor area, alongside the deletion of office use, would lead to an increase in ancillary car parking spaces by 45 (i.e. +24%) for residential use and 25 (i.e. +34%) for retail use, while hotel/office parking decreased by 83 (i.e. -71%) and GIC parking remained unchanged. Overall, the total number of ancillary car parking spaces decreased by 13 (i.e. -3%). He added that the original scheme had no requirement for ancillary office parking to be publicly accessible. Mr B.K. Chow, Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD) supplemented that the provision of ancillary car parking spaces designated for different uses under the current proposal complied with the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). For instance, the number of ancillary car parking spaces designated for residential and retail uses increased while that for office use decreased based on the changes in GFA allocated to the three uses.

43. Noting that about additional 200 residential units would be provided under the current proposal, the Vice-chairperson enquired whether the applicant had submitted a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) taking into account the increased population. In response, Mr Kervis W.C. Chan, STP/TWK, said that the applicant had submitted a revised TIA taking into account the increased population. The revised TIA demonstrated that the local pedestrian and transport networks could accommodate the increased traffic without causing adverse impacts, and TD had no adverse comment on the application. Nevertheless, given the high traffic flow during festive occasions and major events at the Flower Market, the applicant would submit a detailed assessment at a later stage to set out traffic operational arrangements and contingency measures for peak traffic volumes.

Provision of Government, Institution and Community (GIC) Facilities

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

(a) whether the provision of about 20,000m^2 GFA for GIC facilities constituted a mandatory maximum or minimum requirement for the proposed development;

(b) the general requirements for the provision of GIC facilities under the Government's 'single site, multiple use (SSMU)' approach; and

(c) whether the provision of the GIC facilities was correspondingly adjusted and adequate to cater for the needs of the additional population.

45. In response, Mr Kervis W.C. Chan, STP/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

(a) as stipulated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the DSP, about 20,000m^2 GFA for GIC uses within the "OU(MU)2" subzone would be provided for the reprovisioning of GIC facilities under the proposed development. Under the current proposal, a GIC complex accommodating about 20,000m^2 GFA was proposed to house the reprovisioned facilities and new GIC facilities for the community. These included reprovisioning of a refuse collection point, a public toilet and various sports/recreational facilities, alongside new facilities including a permanent district health centre and six other social welfare facilities. The actual provision of GIC facilities and their GFAs remained subject to confirmation by relevant B/Ds at the detailed design stage;

(b) there were no specific requirements or standardised provision benchmarks for GIC facilities under the 'SSMU' approach. With reference to similar developments in the district, such as the Shantung Street/Thistle Street Development, which was also proposed by the applicant, GIC provision was smaller due to the limited site area. Other than site constraints, GIC

provision for each site depended on various factors, including agreements reached between project proponents and relevant B/Ds, local GIC facilities deficits and funding availability. Under the DSP, the proposed GIC GFA of about 20,000m^2 was more than three times the existing GIC floor area in the "OU(MU)2" subzone. Such a scale of provision was considered substantial in a well-established urban area; and

(c) in light of the population increase arising from the additional 200 residential units, the applicant proposed to provide corresponding private open space and other amenities in accordance with HKPSG requirements. It was envisaged that the proposed GIC facilities were adequate to meet the demand arising from the additional population.

Public Comments

46. The Vice-chairperson enquired about a public comment alleging that the inflated commercial GFA under the current DSP notional scheme was a ploy to obtain planning permission. In response, Mr Kervis W.C. Chan, STP/TWK, said that the concerned public comment could be interpreted as suggesting that the commercial GFA remained excessive and questioning whether there was scope for further reduction. Under the current proposal, the deletion of office use had already reduced the non-domestic GFA, while the retail floor area within the "OU(MU)2" subzone was increased by about 33%. This reflected a balanced approach by the applicant to reduce commercial GFA (mainly for office use) in response to market conditions while increasing retail floor area to accommodate the relocated Flower Market operations.

Deliberation Session

47. Members generally supported the application. A Member opined that a retail floor area of about 20,000m^2 would effectively attract visitors. According to the original DSP notional scheme, only about 11,000m^2 of retail GFA was proposed, which, after taking into account layout and structural constraints, would yield an effective retail area of only around 60% (i.e. about 6,600m^2), and this was considered insufficient to attract a critical mass of visitors. Under the current proposal, the increased GFA for retail use could draw

visitors to the area and also accommodate more local community-oriented uses, such as medical clinics, hair salons and supermarkets. The increase in GFA for retail use in the "OU(MU)2" subzone was welcomed. Nevertheless, the Member noted that while the current proposal would allow design flexibility in allocating non-domestic GFA at the detailed design stage, it remained essential to ensure that sufficient floor space was reserved for retail and hotel uses to bring vibrancy to the area. Another Member echoed that the increase in GFA for retail use would facilitate a more attractive spatial design for the future Flower Market.

48. A Member considered that assistance should be provided to facilitate the return of affected operators to the Flower Market, and public parking facilities in the proposed development played a vital role in supporting the future operation of the Flower Market. While the provision should comply with HKPSG standards, sufficient flexibility should be allowed to cater for the future needs of the Flower Market. At present, particularly during festive seasons and major events, visitors to the Flower Market relied on parking spaces in nearby developments (such as MOKO) and on-street parking facilities. Providing more parking spaces in the PVP or allowing greater flexibility, such as by avoiding restrictive lease conditions that confined certain parking spaces to specific uses, would benefit the revitalisation and smooth operation of the future Flower Market. Another Member expressed that while the applicant had submitted a revised TIA demonstrating that the proposed provision of parking spaces complied with the relevant requirements, special consideration should be given to traffic and parking arrangements during festive seasons and major events.

49. In response to a Member's enquiry about the GFA requirement for GIC facilities under the DSP, the Secretary explained that while there was no statutory requirement under the Notes of the DSP specifying the area for GIC facilities, the ES of the DSP stated about 20,000m^2 of GFA would be provided for GIC uses. This figure was formulated based on liaison between the applicant and relevant B/Ds. The actual provision of GIC facilities and the eventual total GFA for GIC facilities would be subject to confirmation by the relevant B/Ds regarding the types of GIC facilities, the area required to meet the operational needs, and the detailed design.

50. Noting from the public comments that there were still concerns on the project and that the applicant had communicated with the existing operators in the Flower Market, a Member suggested that the applicant could proactively disseminate more information and maintain liaison with concerned stakeholders, so that the public could be kept informed of the relevant details.

51. The Vice-chairperson appreciated that the current proposal had responded to the Board's comments made at its meeting held in January 2025 when deliberating the representations on the draft DSP, namely, that the applicant should consider carefully the proportion of the commercial component in the "OU(MU)2" subzone with an increased GFA for retail use, and the development of the DSP should be designed in a manner to retain and cultivate the distinctive ambience of the Flower Market. It was worth giving due consideration not only to the floor space for retail use, but also to the overall design of the retail portion, such as reserving more area for ground-floor retail shops rather than merely providing a retail mall, so as to preserve the existing character of the Flower Market to foster its vibrancy. Another Member pointed out that with good design, a mall incorporating ground-floor shop frontage could also effectively create vitality and attract visitors, citing Lee Garden Two as an example.

52. 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 11.9.2030, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

[Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui left the meeting during deliberation.]

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

[Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

[Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon, and Mr Ryan M.H. Kwok, Town Planner/Kowloon (TP/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K9/289 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for the Permitted Residential Development with Government, Institution or Community, and Commercial/ Retail Uses in "Residential (Group A)" Zone, 1-31 To Kwa Wan Road (odd nos.), 111-127D Ma Tau Wai Road (odd nos.), 2-6 and 10-14 Hung Fook Street (even nos.), 1-5 and 11-19 Kai Ming Street (odd nos.), 1-7 Yuk Shing Street (odd nos.), 2-12 Yuk Shing Street (even nos.), whole of Yuk Shing Street, part of the road sections of Hung Fook Street and Kai Ming Street and various back lanes, Hung Hom, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K9/289)

53. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Hung Hom and the application was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr C.K. Yip	-	being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its committee;
Mr Ben S.S. Lui	-	being a former executive director of URA and involved in the development project at the Site during his tenure in URA;
Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung	-	for having past business dealings with URA and having conducted valuations for

claimants in respect of various properties at the Site for submission to URA;

Dr Tony C.M. Ip	-	having current business dealings with URA;
Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan	-	jointly owned with family member a property in Hung Hom; and
Professor Janet K.Y. Chan	-	owning a property in Hung Hom.

54. The Committee noted that Mr C.K. Yip, Dr Tony C.M. Ip and Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan had left the meeting. The Vice-chairperson continued to chair the meeting. As the interests of Messrs 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. As the property owned by Professor Janet K.Y. Chan had no direct view of the Site, she could join the meeting.

[Messrs Ben S.S. Lui and Vincent K.C. Cheung and Ms Fancy L.M. Cheung left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

55. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ryan M.H. Kwok, 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 (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

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

56. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

57. 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 11.9.2030, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H6/98	Proposed Underground Vehicular Tunnel (Connecting Lee Garden Three and Lee Garden Eight) in Area shown as 'Road', Area below Leighton Road and Sunning Road, between Lee Garden Three (10 Hysan Avenue) and Lee Garden Eight (8 Caroline Hill Road) (MPC Paper No. A/H6/98)

58. The Secretary reported that consideration of the application had been rescheduled.

Agenda Item 11

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

59. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:25 a.m.

Annex 1

Minutes of 795th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee
(held on 11.9.2026)

Deferral Cases

Requests for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
4	A/TW-CLHFS/5	1st
8	A/K10/282	1st

Declaration of Interest

The Committee noted the following declaration of interest:

Item No.	Member's Declared Interest	
8	The application site (the Site) was located at 42 Grampian Road.	- Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung for currently handling a lease modification application related to the Site

As the interest of Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung was considered direct, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion for Item 8.

** Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/795_mpc_agenda.html for details of the planning applications.*

Annex 2

Minutes of 795th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee
(held on 11.9.2026)

Renewal Case

Application for renewal of temporary approval for 5 years

Item No.	Application No.	Renewal Application	Renewal Period
3	A/TY/153	Temporary Concrete Batching Plant in "Industrial" Zone, Tsing Yi Town Lot 98, 14-18 Tsing Tim Street, Tsing Yi	15.10.2026 to 14.10.2031